

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Tuesday, June 10, 1980.

AFTERNOON SESSION

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and the members of this Assembly 23 Grade 9 students from Simpson. They are accompanied by their teacher, Don Sangster, Ernest Pidhorodetsky and their bus driver, Edwin Kopp. I'm glad that you're here; I welcome you to the Assembly. I hope you have a very informative day. I'll be meeting with you at 2:45 to have pictures. I thank you for coming in. This is the second trip from this school in this session and I ask the members of the legislature to join with me in wishing you a very good day and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to introduce to the members of the Assembly and to you, the Hon. Jim Nielsen, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the province of British Columbia, who is sitting at the back.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. B.J. PONIATOWSKI (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to all members of this Assembly, 60 Grade 7 students from Alvin Buckwold School in Saskatoon. They are seated in the west gallery. I should mention also that they are accompanied by three teachers: Margo Hutton, Bill Gordon and Norma Rempel. I am very pleased that they have taken this excursion, because I was always impressed with their very attractive school design and more importantly, with their very high goals in terms of educational learning experience for students. I hope that their visit to Regina will be a pleasant one; one that ties in nicely with our Celebrate Saskatchewan scheme. I would ask all members to join with me at this time to show them our welcome for a good stay in Regina and a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES
SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 105 – An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (continued)

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, members of the Assembly. On behalf of this side of the House, I would like to welcome the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs for British Columbia and if nobody else listens to my speech this afternoon, perhaps he will. And a special welcome to the students.

Mr. Speaker, before lunch I left off with a comparison of Bill No. 105 and its ramifications with respect to the future of democracy and the role of political parties in society. I'd like to carry on, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps the simplest illustration of the necessity for such accommodation is to be found in Canadian politics with respect to political parties and their attitudes. The people in the province of Quebec, overwhelmingly French-speaking and Roman Catholic, make up about one-quarter of the population of Canada. Therefore it is only rarely that a political party can win power without getting substantial support in Quebec. But Quebec opinion on what the national parliament should be instructed to do for the common good shows marked divergences from the lines of policy from which majorities can be found in the rest of Canada.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, political parties must modify their programs to find a compromise that will produce a nation-wide majority. Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 105 (as I have pointed out on one or two occasions and the member for Nipawin has so distinctly and succinctly on several occasions) is going to mark and scar this government for time immemorial. Bill No. 105, as has been stated so clearly in the past, is an attack on a minority which is espousing a cause which members of a majority government don't happen to support and wish to silence. The process is at work in every constituency in every province across this country. It is not the fact that Quebec alone makes this process necessary, although French-English diversities provide the most striking illustration. The process is at work in every constituency. The use of this technique and accommodation is, in varying degrees, a skill required of democratic politicians everywhere.

Britain, with greater social homogeneity than Canada or the United States, gets on with less watering down of programs of political action, but is far from avoiding it entirely. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how the mother parliament of the British Commonwealth, the House of Commons in Britain, and members on all sides of that House, would react to a bill such as Bill No. 105? I wonder how the politicians of the past would react (famous politicians such as Disraeli, Churchill and the likes) to this kind of repressive legislation on a minority?

In the United States, the Republican and Democratic Parties have both drawn traditional support from different regions and diverse interest groups and framed their electoral appeals to attract votes from almost all sections and all interest groups.

Mr. Speaker, I think the members of both sides of the House, particularly the government, should be reminded that Bill No. 105 won't attract votes. It may have for a few days. Bill No. 105, over a period of time, will repel them. It will in fact harm or scar the NDP.

The Democratic Party has first to compromise within itself to hold together the conservative-minded agricultural and business interests of its southern wing, and the more radically-inclined elements of its traditional support in the urban, industrial North.

MR. COLLVER: — Ask them about the guys in Wynyard. Isn't that an NDP seat? Ask them if Wynyard isn't an NDP seat.

MR. HAM: — In what way?

MR. COLLVER: — That guy was from Wynyard. He is supporting us.

MR. HAM: — Oh, I see. Oh, yes, it has been brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that we just had a visit from a constituent in Saskatchewan who is from, I think, an NDP seat in Wynyard, a gentleman who felt he was being attacked as a minority. He required assistance as a minority and was being denied his rights, but refused to go to the government.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States, then, to win a majority the Democratic Party has to woo predominantly agricultural westerners whose interests differ markedly from those of both the southern and northern Democrats.

The Republican Party has won its greatest successes with an alliance of northern business interests, industrial workers and western farmers. I will relate that in a moment, Mr. Speaker, to Bill No. 105.

The political combinations involved are much more complex than this statement indicates, and their patterns have changed from time to time.

And all members of the House should be made aware of the fact that political parties cannot continue (this is the first step, as I have indicated) attempting to oppress rights by retroactively changing laws, and still expect to remain popular with the voters of Saskatchewan.

The main point, however, Mr. Speaker, is that both parties appeal to almost all sections and classes within the United States. A notable exception is the Republican Party which, when it first took shape in the 1850s, was entirely a combination of northern interests. Its first victory in 1860 did not take into account southern interests and demands. At the same time, the Democratic Party failed to maintain its former nation-wide basis of compromise, thereby leading to civil war.

Mr. Speaker will recall when the member for Nipawin read into the record (and I also read into the record last night) the interview on CBC radio of Professor Howard McConnell, constitutional expert in Saskatoon, University of Saskatchewan, wherein he said that the Bill No. 105 was unprecedented, in his mind, in history except during the case of the civil war in the United States, and only at that time designed because there was an upheaval and uprising and war. Party politicians (I alluded earlier to the difference between a party politician and one who believes in principles outside of party politics) therefore are brokers in another sense. They are always arranging deals between different sections of opinion, finding compromise that splits the difference and thus concentrating growth behind the program of their political party. That's fair game; that's what politics is all about.

However, the members have failed to see that Bill No. 105 will work contrary to welding forces and bringing people together to support a cause, to support a party. As long as the sovereign electorate is of numerous diverse opinions there is only one way majorities can be constructed and power gained to push through any political program in a democracy. Now this is going to be interesting with regard to Bill No. 105, Mr. Speaker. It may be objected that the argument proves too much. Maybe the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current have argued too much.

The opinion was naturally so diverse that parties could never herd the bulk of the electorate into one of the two camps. In fact this is precisely what the democratic

politicians of continental Europe have always been able to do. The parties always tend to become more interested in the less numerous. In Britain and the United States a two-party system was established while the electorate was still in numbers and politics was much more than now, again between the ins and the outs where there are naturally only two sides. Mr. Speaker, again Bill No. 105 comes into account here. There is a third party in the House and the bill is designed as an attack on that third party, regardless of what the Premier of Saskatchewan has said. He has already indicated it was designed for a third party, namely the Liberal Party.

Large sections of the electorate became habituated to allegiance to one or the other of the two parties and deeply attached to its leaders and traditions. It's on that note that the Government of Saskatchewan has been able to successfully remain as government in this province for so many years, because it was able to attract people to its cause partly through its leader. And it's unfortunate that they are now bringing into question the public support of their party by an attack on the minority.

Once the two-party systems were finally established, a number of factors discouraged the setting up of additional parties. Now this should be very interesting since we are talking now about a third party. Everyone has had cause to remark on the plausibility of the politicians. Their programs are devised with generally recognized problems in mind, and I wonder if Bill No. 105 weren't designed as a built-in problem so that some months down the road the government can reverse its action once the Unionests are eliminated and take the role of the saviors. Their arguments seem convincing to the electorate who knows little about the nature of the problems and has given little attention to the ways of meeting them.

Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the public at large today isn't even aware that the legislature is still in session, let alone that we are debating a bill with the serious repercussions that Bill No. 105 will have. However, our democratic process may not change. It's only when the public is faced with extreme difficulties and pressures of either the economy or a potential war, that generally the entire public gets excited and then pressures politicians.

Most people find that after earning their daily bread and keeping track of the adventures of their favorite television idols, they have little time for serious study of politics. That is primarily why the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current have attempted to bring to the public of Saskatchewan the seriousness of the introduction of Bill 105.

Their interest and conviction are not strong enough to make them launch new parties, unless there is a pronounced failure of the established parties to meet obvious and urgent problems. Mr. Speaker, that speaks for itself, as has been stated so often. The only reason the Unionest movement was founded was because we felt that people were entitled to consider an option. As a result of that option, and as a result of our declaration, we're faced with this oppressive bill.

The voter, who has not time to study politics, has not time to start an organization to promote his views. Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the continual criticisms as to why the members for Swift Current and Nipawin didn't resign and run in a by-election, I think that statement is indicative of one of the reasons as to why it's not necessary, and why politicians over the period of history in democracies do not run in by-elections after they take a seat with another party or organize a new party. If his vote is to count at all he must attach himself to one of the vote gathering organizations already in the field

with some prospect of winning. And perhaps that's why the government in its wisdom (although that I have questions about at times) decided that because of the public reaction to the announcement of the Unionist Party it was politically wise to capture that ill feeling, if there was much, to garner support for itself.

The voter is more disposed to this because everyone likes to put his money on the winning team. We know our cause isn't popular and it's one of the reasons Bill 105 was brought in. But if every politician stood up once a week or once a month in his constituency to espouse his true feelings or what he recognizes to be serious problems in the country, or the province, I'm certain that more than once a month the electorate of his constituency would be calling for a by-election because this fellow wasn't representing their views. Most politicians very quietly, very diplomatically, talk around touchy subjects in their constituency or within the legislature for fear of causing a problem within the voting electorate of their constituencies and thereby protect their seats. The member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current were not concerned about politics with respect to our cause, and as a result of that are facing this bill.

Third parties are launched from time to time but unless they rapidly come within striking distance of the majority, their support is likely to fall away. And I think probably that should be emphasized again. We've explain to the members of this Assembly that we don't anticipate that within the next several months our party is going to garner much political support in western Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not enough to form a government.

MR. HAM: — Not enough to form a government, that's right. The older parties are deeply entrenched in the community. Mr. Speaker, the older parties in this province obviously have to be the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party. Their organizations are alert to thwart or undermine the competition of any new political party that emerges. Mr. Speaker, isn't that significant? That's exactly why Bill No. 105 has been introduced. Additional factors that have supported the two-party system in the past will be considered later in my speech.

The first essential function of a party system is to organize voters in the majority behind platforms and leaders. I say, Mr. Speaker, that's another reason there's an attack on this party with Bill No. 105. The vast majority of the members of this Chamber are afraid of the leader for Nipawin. They know, and have pronounced on several occasions through the media and through other means, his capabilities to organize and lead. As stated in press reports from the Lethbridge western premiers' conference, the Premier is afraid of any potential change that the member for Nipawin may bring to society.

The voters get alternatives from which to choose and the electorate can reward the party that appears to be deserving. It's this kind of bill that's going to make them a little less deserving. It's not going to defeat you but it's going to help. And be sure that both parties will strive to merit reward. This is the only way in which a numerous electorate can exercise effectively the power which democratic theory assigns to it.

Also, as earlier discussions have shown, the parties by their activity in the legislature contribute to political education of the electorate. Now, Mr. Speaker, I find that somewhat humorous. I'm going to find it very interesting to hear members of the governing party and the official opposition explain to the electorate why they brought in Bill No. 105. I think the member for Nipawin has made it exceedingly clear through

his several days of discussion on Bill No. 105 via the media that so far as the first attack about the money is concerned, it's not the money. I made that very clear. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, it will be most interesting to see what the government intends to do with the first payment that was made to the Nipawin community fund, as to whether or not when the bill passes it intends to go up to Nipawin and ask for the money back. That may be politically hazardous for them.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it's not the two members in the legislature who are concerning the government because every viewpoint we've heard is that we won't be around anyway and we don't have significant support to deserve any votes. So I have to question the reason again why Bill No. 105 was brought in.

By concentrating votes for themselves, the political parties concentrate responsibility in themselves. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan earned the responsibility from the people of Saskatchewan in the last election. The people of Saskatchewan voted in the majority for the governing party and placed in its hands the responsibility to govern this province in an effective, reasonable, democratic way.

I wonder, if there were an election called tomorrow, if Bill No. 105 would be doing substantial harm to a government party if an effective, strong opposition (which I question we have) could bring to the attention of the public that this is an oppressive bill, asking, why are you attacking two members of the legislature? They don't have to agree with their cause; I know they don't agree with our cause. But why would you attack two members of the legislature when the law has been recently passed? They qualified and you're attempting retroactively to remove them. It would be difficult to exaggerate, Mr. Speaker, the importance of this. The majority party has power to implement its promises.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Sit down and we'll talk.

MR. HAM: — O.K. Mr. Speaker, I hope I can take that as a fact this time and as an honest, straightforward promise from members to my right. I've had it from members across the floor and not one of them has attempted to stand up.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You want to believe we'll tell them!

MR. HAM: — That's good. That's good. I'm hoping with all my fervor, Mr. Speaker, that we can get members to my left, or to my right, and to my left for that matter, on record on this bill because it should provide interesting to their constituents to read their remarks.

The majority party has power to influence its promises to meet and promises as they arrive and promises to administer the laws wisely and fairly. Why all of a sudden do we have a government which, contrary to all democratic process and all democratic laws and all well-known world figures who over the centuries promoted the cause of democracy, freedom and liberty, is attempting in the year 1980 to manipulate the system? It may be a sign that power has finally gone to their heads, that there's very little control over . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's true. Send money and not compliments.

So far as it is judged in the sequel to have failed, there is no doubt who is responsible and who is to be punished. The people can bring home responsibility to a determined group of men. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what is going to happen. The people will bring

home responsibility to this government when they realize the seriousness of the attack on two members of the legislature that Bill 105 is bringing into this legislature.

If there were no parties and a crisis arose that was not appropriately met, everybody would be equally responsible, i.e. nobody would be responsible. In this instance, Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis and we have a government that is responsible.

If there were only one party (which is what I believe the New Democratic Party would prefer because obviously when it eliminates one it can eliminate two by Bill 105) the responsibility would be clear, but it could not be brought home because there would be no alternative government. Although the chief defect of the multiparty system is that in the shifting coalitions that it involves, responsibility is blurred and the electorate can scarcely determine where it lies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Bill 105 obviously is an attack on a group that is substantially different in concept and philosophy than the other two parties in the House. This doesn't particularly apply.

The two party system does not enable the sovereign electorate to govern the country. It does not enable it to participate in the process of government, to choose and rule its masters and to make government responsible.

I think that's very significant, Mr. Speaker. Although Bill 105 was specifically designed for the Liberal Party, obviously the Government of Saskatchewan feels that it, in its wisdom, can handle the Liberal Party as effectively as it handles the Conservative opposition.

Those who know the history of government among men will not be disposed to belittle this achievement, member for Estevan. Yet the every day spectacle of party politics rouses widespread disgust and distaste.

Mr. Speaker, there is little question that this bill arises disgust and distaste among a vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan. Those same people, who don't agree with the cause of the party, do find the bill disgusting and distasteful.

To many, politicians are the lowest form of life and all appreciate Artemus Ward's recommendation of himself saying: I am not a politician, and all my other habits are good.

And I think members of this Assembly should be ashamed of themselves with regard to Bill 105. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, if they're ashamed of themselves, maybe I'd better attempt to convince them so they shouldn't be ashamed of themselves, so they can perhaps change their minds on the bill.

In part, this disgust results from a failure to understand why the democratic politician does not summarily enforce the opinion of the critic and have done with it. That's the role of the opposition, Mr. Speaker. Bills are brought in; the opposition criticizes. That's our role.

The indictment against parties must be heard and the verdict considered and given.

Mr. Speaker, how can this House expect a third party, be it the Marxist-Leninist, the Unionest, or the Liberal Party, . . . How can the people of Saskatchewan cast a verdict

on a minority party in this legislature if it doesn't have the proper research staff, or the proper recognition within these Chambers as a party which by law is qualified to be recognized as a party?

The unsavoury features arise mainly from the fact of widespread suffrage, although it must not be inferred from this that politics had a better smell when the franchise was limited to the wellborn. It had a different odor, but by no means a better one.

In politics men are always trying to get their hands on the instruments of legalized coercion, and on the sweets of office, and that is so true, Mr. Speaker.

I really question the future of both the official opposition (most especially the official opposition) and the government with respect to Bill No. 105. I'm looking forward to hearing comments (they're not going to affect me either way, obviously) of party workers and supporters of the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan when they find out that the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan decided to support the Government of Saskatchewan on Bill No. 105, as an attack on a minority. Regardless of our cause, Mr. Speaker, we know (and we don't expect anyone to support our cause in this House) they fail to realize that the vast majority of the people in Saskatchewan do not support Bill No. 105. That's why I can't understand their concern. I'll be long gone, the member says, so there should be no concern about it. I don't know why there is all this concern about members who will be gone.

In politics (as I mentioned) men are only trying to get their hands on the sweets of office, Mr. Speaker. It is therefore the most ill-clad struggle for power short of open war, and is likely to be unmannerly and sometimes unscrupulous, Mr. Speaker. Would you believe unscrupulous?

I can suggest in the strongest of terms that Bill No. 105 is unscrupulous. It makes no sense, Mr. Speaker, to attack a minority they are not at all concerned or worried about.

Politics is also the arena where passionately held views of right and wrong clash, and men are tempted to make the end justify the means. If that isn't a classic case of Bill No. 105, I don't know what is! It is rash to think that the political process can ever be turned wholly into sweetness and light. I don't think anyone in this Chamber realizes that, but Mr. Speaker, we have gone from a mild case of holiness and light to a deep, dark case of wrath, and misunderstanding.

When the franchise was narrowed, and gentlemen were born to politics, there was little evidence of the existence of parties outside the legislature. In parliament itself, the members of the parties made their deals in secret caucuses. I don't think that has changed a whole lot, Mr. Speaker. I wonder which one of the cabinet ministers, or how many of the cabinet ministers who supported Bill No. 105 told the NDP caucus, we have a bill here that you're going to have to support whether or not you want to.

In parliament itself, the members of the parties made their deals in secret caucus, and the only outward evidence of these were the principles the members expounded. I think the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current have been attempting to expound the reasons that the principles of Bill 105 are incorrect, unjust and a concerted attack on a minority.

It was in these circumstances that one well-known politician, by the name of Edmund Burke, framed his famous definition of a party as a body of men united for promoting

the national interest of some particular principle on which they all agreed. I suggest to you that's the very basis on which the CCF was founded and most probably the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party and the Unionist Party. Not one of them, in history, faced an onerous bill such as Bill 105.

Of course the parties tried to extend their membership and influence to the constituencies in the hope of altering or maintaining the complexion of parliament at the next election. That's what politics is all about. Again, that's why I can't understand the reason for Bill 105. But the candidate often knew all the voters personally and in any event could canvass them all himself. That's going to be interesting when candidates from both parties start their door calling during elections, to find out the reaction to . . . Well for example, the native groups in Saskatchewan who are a minority, or certain racial minorities in this province will question whether or not they may be next for the attack.

Elaborate party organizations were unnecessary under these circumstances. All of this has been changed by universal suffrage . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I have a problem that way; I was fed too well. Where the voters in a constituency numbered dozens or hundreds, they now number thousands and tens of thousands. Mr. Speaker, it's those tens of thousands who will eventually know or be affected by repressive legislation such as the bill before us. The candidates cannot personally canvass more than just a few of them. Well that's not quite correct on a provincial basis; most of us I think are able to canvass all our constituents; federally it would be very difficult. Yet their votes are necessary for a victory, obviously.

How does one campaign sincerely as a representative of everyone in his riding when he was involved in an attack on a minority? Each MLA in this legislature was elected to represent each and every voter in his constituency, to fairly represent their views be they a minority or a majority. The party must come to the aid of its candidate with money and scores of tireless workers.

With the concern about Bill 105, Mr. Speaker, I don't know where we are supposed to find all this money and scores of tireless workers, but time will prove whether or not we have them or we don't have them. Then we will find out that Bill 105 was either totally unnecessary or else it was just a mild block on the road of a party to success.

There is much to be done as an election approaches. I think members should consider that with regard to Bill No. 105. The voters must be harangued and canvassed. Wavering voters must have the issues explained to them. Campaign literature must be prepared and widely distributed. Space in the newspapers and time on the radio and television must be arranged and paid for. Transport must be provided to carry eager voters to the polls. All of this is common knowledge with respect to the two parties in this legislature, Mr. Speaker. Having the advantages of party recognition and grants to caucus; the leader's grant, having the advantages which Bill No. 105 is denying to a new party in this House, which qualifies to be here by law.

An organization that does all this efficiently cannot be thrown together on the eve of an election. And again, I think that's very important, Mr. Speaker. The building of a new party from the ground up takes a period of many, many years. It may die in the interim and it may flourish in the interim, but there is no need for an attack on it with a bill such as Bill No. 105.

It becomes necessary to maintain permanent party committees in each constituency,

nor is this enough. The parties carry on a nation-wide campaign on a national platform, and the greatest possible number of seats must be won. A central organization for the overall direction is necessary for maximum results. The local party organizations are sometimes slack and need coaching and encouragement.

I've been involved with a political party for some years, Mr. Speaker, and I perceive that to be very true. I think that its attacks on a political opposition party should concern the party I was involved with, because they may be next.

Doubtful constituencies are the sectors where the front breaks and the central organization must mobilize strategic reserves. Research is undertaken (research, Mr. Speaker) on problems of public policy (which this party is being denied by Bill No. 105) and the party speakers across the country are supplied with facts, arguments and statistics.

I guess that's the reason for Bill No. 105, Mr. Speaker. They're afraid that the facts, statistics and legitimate reasons for our existence are going to be too hard to accept. The people know they're there, but don't want to hear anybody espouse them.

The most important work of the centre organization, however, is not in fighting this election, but in planning the next one. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I admire the NDP for its ability to fight the next election three years before it's called. They're masters at it. But again, that's why I can't understand the reasons for Bill No. 105. Why Bill No. 105? If they're strategically planning for the next election, it's going to be a thorn in their side.

Therefore it should be a permanent organization with substantial permanent staff.

Both other parties in this House, (apart from the third party, have permanent staff, permanent organizations) it's partly through Bill No. 105 that they're denying this to the third party in the House.

The platform of the party must have the widest possible appeal and it must not be settled until the contours of opinion in the constituencies have been plotted. That's quite significant, Mr. Speaker, because parties which are seeking power are going to attempt to take popular public opinion, write it into their campaign literature, and campaign on it. That's the way it happens; that's the way it's done. However, it's pretty obvious to anyone who knows politics that the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current would have never left the party they were connected with to support a cause that they weren't wholly and totally supporting on principle, aside from party politics, with deep earnest concern about the future, to face a bill in this House which would eliminate our stepping stone or eliminate us as a group qualified by law to be here.

The centre organization collects much of the data that the leaders must take into account in drafting the program. It gives attention to alternative plans for campaigns and to the strategy and tactics appropriate to each. It keeps in touch with constituency organizations, bolstering their morale, explaining the government's policy if the party happens to be in power. It's going to be interesting, as I said, Mr. Speaker, to have the government's Bill No. 105 explained to their constituents – even with the opposition.

Analogies are always misleading but it comes close to being the directed reign of the

party. In different countries the vigor of the central party organization varies. They are strongest in Britain attending to all the matters described, and others as well. In the U.S. and Canada, the national central party organizations are both pale reflections of the picture drawn here. This is because the strongest and most effective party organizations are state or provincial in scope. In many of the provinces and states central party organizations attempt most of the functions described above.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, permanent central and constituency organizations are necessities. And I think that members of the House should come to realize, or should consider how long they would last as an effective party in this province without official party recognition by this legislature, without entitlement to the official role the party takes in this Chamber, without the funding, or without official party status when they qualified by law.

This is because the strongest and most effective party organizations are state or provincial in scope. In many of the provinces and states central party organizations attempt most of the functions described above. In any case Mr. Speaker, permanent central constituency organizations are a necessity if parties are to make the most of these possibilities. The maintaining of these organizations and the fighting of periodic elections are a heavy expense to the parties. Maybe that's why the bill was introduced. They feel that if they cut us off at the knees we might just fall over and die, which Bill 105 would do – attempt to do.

Thousands of party workers are needed to garner the vote at election time. In so far as funds are lacking to pay them, the party has to persuade volunteers to help for the sake of the party and that brings in again, Mr. Speaker, what Bill 105 is all about. Why the concern? If we don't have this significant support in Saskatchewan or western Canada to support this party, then we won't be able to find workers; we won't elect anyone; therefore there's no need for the bill. At the very best, large sums are needed to pay party workers and a multitude of other expenses. Money is the root of much evil in political parties as elsewhere. Well, maybe that's the problem, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that's the problem. They allude to the fact that it's money they are concerned about here and I think we've proven time and time again it's not the money.

The parties find it too cramping, if not impossible, to rely on the small contributions of a large number of party supporters and much easier to get large contributions from relatively few people. I think both sides of the House know where money comes from. The government accuses the Conservative side of getting the money from multinationals and the Conservative side accuses the government side of getting theirs from the unions. Both are true in both instances and both sides get money from both. I think that government side probably gets more from unions and multinationals than the Conservative side gets from multinationals, if there's that much.

That should be very interesting Mr. Speaker. As an official party recognized in the province of Saskatchewan under The Election Act, the Unionest Party can only receive funds from Canadian sources. As independents, or not existing as a party, we can receive money from anywhere Mr. Speaker. I thought the members might be interested.

This system is not always pure with respect to donations, and there are lively hopes of favors to come when the party goes into power. Most interesting, very interesting, Mr. Speaker, when we hear accusations regularly in this House that because one party is connected with the unions, they're going to support union causes when they come to the fore, or because one party might be connected with multinationals, the same kind

of argument is used that they are going to be influenced by the decisions of the multinationals. I don't know where the third party comes into play here with respect to from whom or where it gets its financing. Obviously we can't play this big game because we are not involved with the big players and the big donors. Bill No. 105 may indirectly change that. I don't know.

Also it is found that volunteer workers are more numerous and zealous if the party can give concrete recognition for their services. The loyal workers who do the party drudgery are often aspirants for favors that will be the gift of the party when it's victorious. (I think it goes without saying that normally parties in power have regularly seen fit to reward their friends.) Obviously we have an opposite case here. We have two individuals who are making noises that are unpopular with the party in power, so they are going to make certain that we are not rewarded (which we, by a law, should be), and that any rights are taken away.

The party cannot be successful without a vigorous organization, and organization depends on benefactors and loyal workers. Mr. Speaker, party organization has other deluding features. All organizations have a tendency to fall under the control of the few. The organization tends to become autonomous, to exist for its own sake and for the satisfaction it provides for its active personnel, even at the expense of its principles and original purpose. I think it's significant also that it provides for its active personnel even at the expense of its principles and its original purpose.

I always believed through the years the NDP has done a credible job of attempting to convince the public that it represents particular minorities and popular groups in Saskatchewan. I find it most interesting that they would bring in such a bill. Most of the supporters of the party have had little interest in the humdrum matters of organization, and their attention to party affairs subsides between elections. Party organization in the constituency falls into the hands of an interested few who try to control it. I think there, if anywhere, is where some of the reaction came from, what little there was, to the members of the government to give them impetus, or at least give them credibility. I hesitate to use the word credibility in bringing in Bill No. 105.

The national party leaders naturally have a commanding influence in the national organization. These local and central leaders, along with the permanently employed officials of the party, come to regard the organization as important for its own sake. Increasingly evident with the government is that power is starting to control its attitude or we wouldn't be facing this bill.

Since the organization flourishes on victory and languishes in defeat, principles tend to become subordinate to success at the polls. In other words, sacrifice your principles to win the electorate's support. I think that has been going on and probably always will go on, as much as I don't agree with it. But there is a point at which you have to stop and that is when you start attacking the very foundations of the system itself, and that is what Bill No. 105 is doing. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm hoping so. You got it.

The benefactors and the party workers often make a similar judgment. The former often show how much they care about the principles of the party by making equal contributions to both parties. I always found that interesting, knowing those people who want to donate to both parties and stay on the best of both sides. But I think you are going to find, Mr. Speaker, there is going to be a change because of Bill No. 105; people aren't going to be quite so generous when they know that a government is showing signs of becoming arrogant (sometimes known as slightly pig-headed).

The party workers and those benefactors who bet their horse on the nose cannot be rewarded with victory. Furthermore, the sheer delight of battle stirs everyone connected with the party to put victory first.

Mr. Speaker, that again is directly involved with the reasons for my speaking on Bill No. 105. If they are concerned about the few people (there are a few now), with regard to Bill No. 105, they are hurting themselves politically.

There have been times in North America, at any rate, when these influences made the party system primarily a struggle between the ins and the outs. Now, there are two groups which want to be the ins. There are two groups they want to put out here with Bill No. 105.

The only safeguard against this degeneration, at any time, is some minimal amount of intelligence and interest in the electorate. Mr. Speaker, I truly believe the electorate is beginning to find out how onerous this bill is. Mr. Speaker, I wish the members wouldn't get so concerned about the member for Swift Current's riding; I think probably that is something I am going to have to be concerned about. They shouldn't be concerned about it. They should be concerned about their own ridings. It is this kind of legislation which is going to cause some of you serious problems, maybe not in the next election but eventually the chickens will come home to roost.

There is clear support on this estimate in the search of parties for issues that will capture the vote. Since neither party can escape the necessity of encouraging one section of opinion to accept some things that, if stressed too much, will repel other sections of opinion, each party looks for red herrings to draw across the trail, specious issues that divert the public and force the other party to a more favorable battleground. Some manoeuvres can only be prevented by a public that knows too much to let itself be deceived.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, a great number of people are not being deceived by Bill No. 105. I can't understand why people want to go to their electorate and make excuses to defend something which is unnecessary to defend in the first place.

Two of the counts of this indictment against the party system used to be fraud in the buying of votes and the stuffing of ballot boxes. Well, I don't think we are too far from that, Mr. Speaker. If you can eliminate a minority in this legislature because you don't agree with its philosophy, what's next? Maybe it is going to be stuffing ballot boxes and buying votes. Mind you, I have to credit the NDP. They have done a tremendous job buying votes prior to elections, with their concentrated Hollywood-style (Hollywood, that's USA) campaign of, your Crown corporations, your business, and we will run that by them for six or seven months and convince everybody that what we are doing is right even if it is wrong.

Election laws have to be tightened up, and party managers have lost a good deal of their interest in such piecemeal methods. Mr. Speaker, that is quite interesting. Election laws have been tightened up. Election laws – The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act was amended to allow two members to become a party by law in this House. We don't like the color of their hair. We don't like what they are saying, so we had better eliminate them.

Improvements in the art and the media of propaganda make it easier to attempt the wholesale stampede of voters, and bribery now tends to take the form of promising large sections of the population benefits from the public treasury.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, crediting the NDP with these tremendous propaganda campaigns on television. I can't understand why they would even want to bring in something as negative as Bill No. 105, which could negate some of their popularity with the people of Saskatchewan.

After the election has been won by such methods, those who have deserved well of the party are rewarded. The benefactors who have earned their reward are given profitable government contracts, tariff increases and other advantages. Some of the party workers get government jobs, often through the dismissal of employees of the government just learning how to do their work reasonably well. The patronage or spoil system has many unfortunate effects which are too well known to need discussion. It must be acknowledged however that the worst excesses of spoils have been curbed by reasonable and effective reforms.

I am happy that over a period of time, reform has been brought into our electoral system. It should be improved upon, and I encourage improvement upon it, but let's not step backwards. That is what Bill No. 105 is, a step backwards, a long step backwards.

Thus it is claimed that the parties are run by small cliques of politicians who take pains to exclude men of better will than themselves . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I think that should be re-read, some of the members are calling out. It is claimed that parties are run by small cliques of politicians who take pains to exclude men of better will than themselves from influencing party councils or the framing of party platforms. They deceive the public and frustrate the will of the people for better government.

Mr. Speaker, with Bill No. 105 there is no question they are deceiving the government. It's more than deception. As I say, they are thrusting pain upon themselves and attacking the institution we all espouse. They saddle the public with incompetent servants and use their control of government to enrich themselves, their friends and their supporters. They take away the rights of the minorities who have no control over the majority in this legislature.

If a verdict has to be given on the charges summed up in this last paragraph, it will neither be guilty, nor not guilty, but greatly exaggerated. Occasionally, politicians enrich themselves at the public's expense, but most of them live and die poor. I guess they are going to make absolutely certain that the Unionest Party lives or dies poorly.

Corrupt bargains with benefactors are fewer than is generally supposed. Many men give large sums to their party without expectation of any concrete return. Although it would not be correct to say that party policy has been unmindful of the source of contributions to party funds, loyal workers are rewarded whenever possible but the critics of this practice rarely take an adequate account of the difficulty of finding alternative sources of energy for running the party organizations.

That is one thing Bill No. 105 will most definitely profoundly affect, our party organization. It will not stop us. It may slow us down but will affect our party organization and the government knows it. I suspect that is one of the reasons why they are aiming this bill at us.

The hard fact is that the parties need funds and workers for their indispensable function of organizing the electorate. Job seekers are the bane of the politician's existence. There is nothing more welcome than utterly voluntary service to the party. It is equally certain that they would prefer to get party funds which entail no obligation, Mr. Speaker. As was stated a moment ago, the SFL is a fairly heavy contributor to the NDP and it is understandable there would not be too much friction between the SFL and the Government of Saskatchewan. He who pays the piper calls the tune.

The member for Moose Jaw North says, how much money? I didn't think money was an issue in these instances; I don't think we should be discussing money here. These have not come forward from the rank and file supporters of the parties.

It cannot be emphasized too much that party organizations in a democracy are flexible and necessarily responsive to currents of opinion and that is why Bill 105 is a mistake politically. Principally, it is totally mistaken but politically it is also mistaken, Mr. Speaker. They are not aware of the harm it is bringing to their party's future.

Those who are sure that party practices outrage common decency can dictate themselves to reform of those practices. The obstacles they face are nothing compared to those which vital social movements have overcome in the past. I suggest that the cause of the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin is somewhat similar to a social cause. It is probably because it could become a very popular group as Canadian problems increase. If this is a way of protecting the Canadian constitution by eliminating those who are proposing options through Bill No. 105, then I think we are indeed in a sad state in this country.

It is true that a small group of leaders try to control the party. I think it is pretty common knowledge. I have spent some time in a caucus on this side of the House, a larger caucus; it is probably not unlike the NDP caucus in many ways. But there are several people of strong character and convincing speakers within those caucuses who control things. Obviously it goes without saying that same controlling group must have decided (and wrongly so) to bring in Bill No. 105 or the government wouldn't have pulled the strings on all the backbenchers (just like Pinocchio, pull the strings and up goes the arms). Well, they pull the strings over there and up they stand to say no against an adjournment or yes to a vote on the bill.

Men of good will are not excluded from party councils but they often exclude themselves because they are too inflexible to make the compromises essential to gathering the votes. That is again a political fact but it goes on and there are probably some very talented people who would contribute their time and efforts to both political parties in this House if they weren't specifically concerned about keeping or obtaining power and seats on that side of the House. The members from this side of the House are not concerned about that; we simply state a case of principle and we're attacked by Bill No. 105.

The parties do not frustrate the will of the people because it is only rarely that even a transient majority of the people is genuinely of one mind about a specific political problem.

It was unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier missed the first act, because it was a much better act.

The parties deceive the public, Mr. Speaker, but so do the prognosticators of every kind. The deception does not often arise from cynicism but rather from the zest of the game itself.

I wonder if that's not why we have Bill No. 105. The member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current really churned up political excitement in Saskatchewan and in Canada. So maybe, in their zealous way, they thought, well, we'll zing them with Bill No. 105 and solve that problem in a big hurry. That's a general human trait, by the way.

It is said generally that the evils in the party system are not peculiar to it, but are the outcome of general human frailties. Indeed, it is hard to see how parties that must woo the electorate with success can do other than reflect its virtues and its vices.

And, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 105 is just a jim-dandy example of a vice. It is people, perhaps, as much as institutions, which need to be reformed.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's incumbent upon me to bring to the attention of, in particular, the Premier an article written by a newspaper man from the Winnipeg Free Press by the name of Fred Cleverley who attended the western premiers' conference in Lethbridge. I just want to read one paragraph, Mr. Speaker, regarding Bill No. 105. Perhaps the Premier can rebut by saying he was misquoted. I don't believe he was, but it states:

At the western Canada premiers' conference in Lethbridge, Premier Blakeney said that it was never the intention of the Saskatchewan legislature to provide massive public funds to people who want to break up Canada. He said the legislation was designed to accommodate the Liberal Party in the province, which might run 61 candidates and elect 2.

Mr. Speaker, it makes a neat little threesome. If you don't play the game, we'll throw you out of the park.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Accommodate the Liberals.

MR. HAM: — Bring in a bill and eliminate those two.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He's not rising up to correct you.

MR. HAM: — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would be interested in thinking about the scenario, that if the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current today decided to sit as Liberals how we would handle the situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I wonder if that's accommodating the Liberals . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why don't you sit down and ask him if he said that?

AN HON. MEMBER: — He can rise in his place and deny it. He can rise in his place without interfering with the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I know there are two of us working in this Chamber: one is the member for Swift Current and the other is me. I'm trying to make sure that the member for Swift Current stays in order, by staying on the principle of this bill. If I can't hear the member for Swift Current, I can't tell whether he's in order or not. So I know all

members will bear with me, and allow me to listen to the member for Swift Current, to make sure he stays on the principle of this bill.

MR. HAM: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that very much. The member for Souris-Cannington should perhaps go back to the lounge if he's getting tired.

Mr. Speaker, these changes and the verdict of them have been general, and they really make no difference in the party system in different countries. Nor do they take account of the differences between the parties in the same country. Obviously, there's a fair bit of difference in the parties in this province and in this House. It's only because of that difference that we are debating this bill.

In the last 80 years, at any rate, the spoils system and unsavory bargains with political benefactors have been much more common in North America than in Britain. And I guess this debate is indicative of that kind of a situation.

Moreover, many of the charges levelled at the party system are much less applicable to the new third party and fourth parties — the parties of protest, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Attack the parties of protest.

MR. HAM: — The CCF was a party of protest. Was it attacked by the Liberals with a bill like this? No. I don't even think, Mr. Speaker, that we were even protesting at all. We were simply stating some significant reasons why we should examine the future of this country and consider alternatives. When you make statements like that and happen to bring some slight shadow on the constitutional leader in this country, the Premier of Saskatchewan, out comes the knife and hack, hack, hack. We have to get rid of these people. We won't want them in any way overshadowing the image of our Premier.

These latter parties are maintained by generous idealism which finances the party and supplies the workers for the sake of the cause. Mr. Speaker, that's not quite accurate with respect to the Unionists but time will tell. This is a tremendous game and the supporters of these parties, socialists and otherwise, assure us that it is because they appeal to the best rather than the worst in people.

Mr. Speaker, the socialists are going to suggest that they try to attract the best and not the worst in people. That's fine; that's good. But I think they should treat other opposition parties that are constituted under the law of this province for whatever reasons equally, no matter what kind of a cause they're espousing. The law is the law. You don't change it retroactively because you don't happen to agree with the person who's espousing a cause.

This is not the whole reason, Mr. Speaker. As long as these third parties are a long way from power, it's easier for them to be pure. Mr. Speaker, we don't have much to be impure about. We've stated our cause. That was enough. That was enough for the government to say, boys, we're not going to put up with that kind of thing. As I stated last evening, Mr. Speaker, if I can repeat again, they said that if you two had only said let's separate western Canada, you wouldn't have to face a bill like this. You know, you have to play the game by their rules or you don't play the game.

No one tempts this party with donations in return for favors and concessions at public expense. Any money we've received has been out and out donations or party membership purchases done in a sincere manner. The party workers work hard

because until they approach the threshold of power, it's possible for each to believe that the party will bring his ideals to fruition. It is only when you have to try to please everyone in order to catch and retain the votes that the sickening compromises begin and the disillusion that saps enthusiasm among the supporters of older parties sets in.

Mr. Speaker, political figures of all political stripes, and in particular members of the Government of Saskatchewan who have been involved in politics for a greater number of years than this side of the House, know full well it doesn't take much to start removing enthusiasm from the workers and it is onerous attacks on minorities that will create this attitude among those workers.

Mr. Speaker, as long as we adhere to the rule that the ultimate power rests with a diffused electorate, political parties are necessary to frame issues and bring public opinion into focus. I think, fairly, the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current have some public issue to focus. We recognize there are serious problems and that those problems should be dealt with and options should be considered.

However, political parties, two or more in number, perform even more fundamental functions for democracy. They make peaceful change of government possible and thus eliminate the necessity for an armed coup d'état as the means of changing government. Mr. Speaker, that's not very far down the road. If a government can justifiably bring in a bill like this – which it cannot – to eliminate a vocal minority, surely it can eliminate all of its competition if the competition doesn't play the game by its rules, and Bill No. 105 does that.

At a glance, two striking episodes in the Nazi and the Soviet dictatorships help to make this point very clear. It has already been noted that the Soviet Union permits only one party – the Communist Party. Likewise, in Germany under the Nazis, the Nazi Party was the only political party to exist and participate in the processes of government. In 1934, the Nazi Party in Germany purged itself of scores of prominent members of the party by shooting them down under the pretence that they were resisting arrest. Well, maybe that's a bad example for comparison, Mr. Speaker, but it does have some parallels. The fact is that they shot down their opposition because the opposition didn't want to be arrested. This government is attempting to remove by law, members of this Assembly who qualify by law to be here because they don't happen to agree with our philosophy. It's a little radical, but it's not unlike.

Between 1936 and 1938 there were repeated purges in Germany, and in the Communist Party in Russia. Several dozens of the old, distinguished members of the party who suffered imprisonment and exile for the sake of revolution under the czar's regime were tried for treason, and either executed or imprisoned. In each case, these actions were the result of a very serious split in the party.

I still believe, Mr. Speaker, that to some degree, there is a split over there (but it's not serious enough to cause them to vote against the bill). I think there are some members of that party who do have concerns about attacks on minorities, which Bill No. 105 is doing. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There's no split in this party.

The Nazi Party had many genuine socialists who wanted to make the party an instrument of out-and-out socialism. In order to win power, however, Hitler had made infamous bargains with anti-socialist elements which he found to expedite the honor for considerable time after gaining power.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Very similar to the NDP-Conservative alliance.

MR. HAM: — That's just what I was going to refer to – the alliance against Bill No. 105.

The socialist wing, including a minority of important leaders, regarded this as a betrayal of their hopes and the promises that had been made to them. Although the exact circumstances and sequel of events are not clear, it seems that this group threatened to contest Hitler's leadership of the party when Hitler struck first. That maybe is the reason for Bill No. 105, Mr. Speaker. The Premier has already expressed concern – we'll hit them first before they have a chance to gain any power, and perhaps someday, sit there. That's not unbelievable because I don't think the people in Saskatchewan in 1933 believed the NDP would be in power in this province either.

There is also confusion as to what happened in Russia. The accused were charged with, and convicted of, conspiring with Germany and Japan to overthrow the Soviet government. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are being charged with conspiring to overthrow the country and trying to break up Canada, therefore our party recognition has to be taken away. This is totally and absolutely untrue.

If they did conspire, it is clear that the conspiracy was the consequence of a conviction that Stalin had betrayed the revolution. For years there had been a widening rift in the party between those who held with Stalin that a strong socialist state must be established in Russia before trying to convert the rest of the world, and those who sympathized with Trotsky's views that Stalin's policies were bound to fail, and that it was necessary to get on with a world-wide revolution without a day's delay. In other words, they disagreed profoundly over the means by which world-wide socialism could be reached.

There are strong reasons for thinking that such purges are periodically necessary for the one-party system, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that even as insignificant as Bill No. 105 is to the total democratic process, it is carrying a chunk of the process away.

Whether or not they will require bloodshed depends on how deeply and passionately the leaders are divided and how determined both factions are to make their will prevail. But purges of some sort are necessary where free elections are not used to settle disputes over government policy. Fortunately, today in this province, we will have free elections and the people will have a chance to judge not only the member for Swift Current and the member for Nipawin, but also they will have a chance to judge everyone in this Chamber. I am certain Bill 105 will have some effect on that judgment.

To set up a one-party system is to say that there is only one right way to govern the country and that way is clear and unmistakable. If there were any reasonable doubt the sensible thing to do would be to allow two or more parties to experiment in turn with their solutions to the country's problems. The one party monopolizes all political activity and it can entertain only one policy. Any man with political ambitions or with strong views on what the government ought to be doing must get into the party and work his way to influence and authority. Obviously there are very few people in the NDP caucus, who happen to think this bill is wrong, who have any influence on the outcome of its introduction or its eventual passing.

Nazis and Communists, like other people, are of diverse opinions. There is disagreement over policy within the party. When neither group can convince the other

June 10, 1980

and neither will give in, the single party has in fact split into two parties. Isn't that significant, Mr. Speaker? The peaceful way out is to allow the dissenting minority to succeed openly, to set up party organs of its own and then to agree to let the people arbitrate this and any subsequent conflict between them, awarding control of the government to the group that wins the confidence of the electorate for that particular time.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative governments of democracies are made possible only by the unflinching and unhesitating acceptance of the convention that the party in power accepts the verdict of the polls. The frank adoption of this solution is barred in the one-party state because the zealots who set it up are agreed on one thing at least, they know that the government policy should be and is nothing for the public to arbitrate.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but Bill 105 is setting a precedent that may reflect on this party some day, or any other opposition party in the legislature, when the government feels it knows best for everybody and it doesn't want criticism. It just eliminates the people who are saying things which they don't wish to hear. That's the intention, to answer the comments of the member for Moose Jaw North.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the member for Moose Jaw North, until and if this country of Canada breaks up and joins the U.S., this member will be one who holds allegiance to the Queen and sings our national anthem with pride.

How would it be otherwise with men who think they have perceived the only valid goals of human life and society? It is a betrayal of their vision to allow the perverse and the stupid to organize against them. Nothing would be gained and everything may be lost by reasoning and discussion with the obstructors who, if they had any reason or goodwill in them, would have seen the light a long time ago. For such as these, the zealots have only a burning impatience and contempt so they destroy without a qualm all organizations and persons who might talk and act against their views.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 105 is prepared to eliminate and quash or destroy persons who might talk or act against their views. Men who are willing to obliterate all other parties but their own generally will not shrink from obliterating opposition elements within the party, and members of that party better take heed. It becomes a question of which faction will shoot first. There is no ground for thinking that Hitler enjoyed shooting old friends who had shared his struggle, or that Stalin found much satisfaction in the judicial liquidation of comrades with whom he had fought and suffered for an ideal. The logic of the one-party system compels it from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, so when it is asked whether the country can afford to have half its able leaders always obstructing in opposition, the real issue is whether they are more useful there than in the cemetery. The shooting of old friends would not be necessarily bad for the body politic if there were any assurance that those who are quick on the draw also have better political opinions. There is no evidence that this is an index of statesmanship. The prime advantage of the two or more party system is that the only rational test of statesmanship is the testing of policies through their practical application. The public will support one party for awhile and then another. That is sometimes subject to change more quickly than this speech would indicate, Mr. Speaker. The public will support one party for awhile and then another.

If there's another party here to get into power, if the government has not eliminated its competition as they are attempting to do through Bill 105, I suppose it's possible. Each

party experiments with ideas and power, and if the results are satisfactory, the opposition party acknowledges this by continuing to support the results after it comes to power. In the past at any rate, relatively little legislation has been repealed on a change of governments.

This fact is of great importance, Mr. Speaker. It suggests strongly that the liberal-democratic process of discussion is an effective means of enlarging the area of agreement among men and confirming the sense of unity, that is, if they have the patience to thresh out their differences on terms of mutual respect. Mr. Speaker, Bill 105 is not a bill based on mutual respect. We are not considered to be of the same quality as the government in power for some particular reason. We're not on the same level, because we don't play their political gamesmanship in the way they wish we should or want us to.

Those who come into politics with white hot convictions will also be impatient with government by trial and error. Before they reject it they may well examine the alternative and ask whether they wish to put their faith to the test of violence. For violence not only degrades the personality of those on whom it is practised, it also destroys the basis of mutual trust and respect on which the pursuit of liberal-democratic ideals depends.

I mentioned this morning, Mr. Speaker, it is lack of respect that we are witnessing, and have for the last several years, more so for the last several months, within this Chamber from protest groups and from strikers. It's going to continue. It's going to get worse. And it's going to get worse primarily because of this government's attack on minorities. It is government not respecting its own laws.

Those who admit that there may be reasonable differences of opinion on how best to further these ideas will find merit in the open, flexible system. That we don't have, Mr. Speaker. Bill 105 is not open or flexible. Those who lay store by constitutionalism will cling to their party system because alternating governments are the effective device for keeping power contingent. The people can govern their rulers and hold them responsible only as long as they can dismiss them and find out at once a workable alternative government.

He has often complained that the party battle is a sham battle and that parties are not divided on real issues. I guess we have witnessed that in this House in the last seven or eight days on Bill No. 105.

In part, but by no means entirely, the party battle in a working democracy is a sham battle. This is just another way of saying that the parties and the bulk of the people are sufficiently agreed upon a few fundamental issues that they do not have to regard their political opponents as deadly enemies to be fought to the bitter end. The party battle will become really satisfying to the pugnacious only when the issues dividing the parties cleave down through fundamentals.

When the parties are committed to sharply opposed views about the basic principle of a just society, they are compelled to regard one another as dangerous enemies of the state (members have suggested the members for Nipawin and Swift Current are dangerous enemies of the state, otherwise Bill No. 105 wouldn't be on the order paper), to be separated from the control of the army and the police at any costs.

The convention of unhesitating acceptance of the verdict of the electorate breaks down

when all the elements of sham have disappeared. All parties but one will be proscribed. The one party will proclaim that all true men are united behind it, regardless of political opinions. They say, we represent everyone. Supposedly they will protect the fundamental aims of society.

Part of the fundamental aim of society is the protection of minorities in our democratic process. Bill No. 105 is a direct attack on the rights of minorities. This is precisely what has happened in modern dictatorships.

Because of dogmatic assertions by a ruthless group that they alone know the fundamental aims of society (I think that's indicative of the government's Bill No. 105 so I will repeat that) one party will complain that all true men are united behind it, so protect the fundamental aims of society. This is precisely what has happened in modern dictatorships because of dogmatic assertions by a ruthless group that they alone know the fundamental aims of society.

In fact, of course, the establishment of a one-party system is living proof that men are less united than before. This is my concern – that we will become less united. Mutual trust and respect between individuals and groups of differing views have broken down. If the party system of a liberal democracy comes to take the form of a socialist party committee to extensive and rapid socialization as soon as it comes to power and an opposing party which mobilizes all the anti-socialist sentiment, the convention on which alternating governments depends will face a very severe test (which sounds like the province of Saskatchewan).

It might be thought that this test confronted Britain in 1945 when the Labour Party, professed socialists, faced the Conservative Party which was strongly anti-socialist. In the event, however, the British genius for compromise prevailed. I have to admire the mother country. I have not witnessed very much compromising here with respect to bills and especially with Bill No. 105.

Neither party pressed its dogmas to the point of endangering the unity of the community. That's kind of catchy – the unity of the community. In fact it would appear that several of the important socializing measures enacted by the Labour majority were not resisted by the Conservative opposition on the grounds of principle, but rather on the grounds of method and timing.

That's the problem with Bill No. 105 – its method and timing. If there was a different method of making certain that the Unionist Party didn't receive funds, they could have called the member for Nipawin and myself or the member for Nipawin into discussions before the bill was ever introduced. A bill could have been introduced that was reasonably fair to all in this House.

Many British Conservatives are moderate rather than extreme individuals and most British socialists are evolutionary socialists.

As we have seen before, the differences between these two groups are often differences over means and do not involve cleavage over fundamentals. Moreover, the Labour Party has become less doctrinaire in recent years. Many of the voters who helped put it into power in 1945 were not socialists.

They were not socialists – and they voted for a Socialist Party, Mr. Speaker. Did you

hear that? Members on the opposite side of the House were aghast this morning when I suggested there were voters in our constituencies who voted for us as individuals rather than for a PC or New Democrat or a Liberal. Even other people suggest this might be right. There are not only three people in the world who are correct on this particular assumption, Mr. Speaker.

The Labour Party always knows it will need these votes in the future and so does the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker. The overthrow of the Labour government by the Conservatives in 1951 has provided no additional evidence for assuming that the easygoing tolerance found in all ranks of British people has been unable to survive the test of recent acute party strife.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for someone to remark that this discussion has reached the point of complete contradiction. The argument began by finding justification for two or more parties in the inability of the electorate to reach general agreement on what the government should do. It has now reached the conclusion that two or more parties will not work, except when the people are agreed on certain fundamental matters.

Mr. Speaker, there are innumerable people in Saskatchewan who do not agree with the fundamentals of Bill No. 105. There may have been more at the beginning. But fewer agree now. This paradox will bear a great deal of reflection, for whoever resolves it will have laid bare the secret of democratic policies. I guess I can't bare that for the members on this side of the House, because whoever will bare it, unbares the secret. It is still a secret for there is no general accepted analysis, Mr. Speaker. The point is, you don't eliminate the third party retroactively by law if you don't happen to agree with its philosophy. Some hold that the necessary agreement on fundamentals is very slight, requiring no more than an agreement to disagree peaceably. That is all the member for Nipawin and I are suggesting. Our cause is a peaceable cause. We are not asking for an uprising. We are not suggesting a seditious movement in the country. And to observe certain procedures in negotiating about disagreements when they can no longer be ignored but must be resolved, Mr. Speaker . . . You see, rather than negotiate a reasonable settlement before bringing in the bill, it was ram it through. The Premier stated it has to happen. It is titled Unionest Taken Seriously. The Premier of Saskatchewan is concerned about the two members of the legislature, so if we are taken seriously, what you do is use a bat as a fly swatter.

But people will scarcely respect one another sufficiently to agree or to disagree unless they conspicuously share some ultimate objectives in common. Here the general, few, and widely-held ideals of liberal democracy are of decisive importance, Mr. Speaker. All that can be said here is that government by consent is not possible unless there is some minimum agreement on the ends and the purpose of social life. This is a very considerable achievement, Mr. Speaker. However, the agreement on ends, which is generally the unconscious result of tradition and education, seldom encompasses means, which are always conspicuously devised and differently conceived. Since people hold diverse and often uninformed views on what to do and how to do it in detail, political parties are necessary to organize the electorate. Political parties are necessary to organize the electorate, Mr. Speaker.

In this year of our Lord, 1980, the Government of Saskatchewan decided we are not going to have another political party in this province. We don't like what they say, so we'll bring in a bill and get rid of them.

The much debated question that asks: when is a coalition government necessary or

justified, may throw some light on this matter. When a nation is fighting a war for its very existence, Mr. Speaker, all other aims and interests must be subordinate to the one overriding purpose of winning the war. The means necessary to win it are largely a matter of technical calculation. Despite the arm chair strategists, most people are constrained to allow those who understand the problems to make the decisions.

There appears to be sufficient general agreement, Mr. Speaker, on aims and purposes to enable the parties to unite their energies and abilities. Under stress, parties will unite; during a war, parties under a common good will unite.

In actual practice, it turns out not to be quite so simple though. We know from our own experience that various interests do not all accept subordination. Maybe some could suggest that's why Bill No. 105 was brought in because the two members here were not willing to accept subordination. We didn't want to be subordinate to the views of the other two parties in the House, because they are unable to appreciate the connection between the sacrifice demanded of them and the winning of the war. That's partly what they are accusing us of. We are going to attempt to break up the country, which is totally untrue.

There is still disagreement on the necessary means for reaching the agreed end. Winston Churchill, before he knew that he could lead a national coalition in World War II, made an adverse judgment on the British coalition government of World War I. The bringing together of men of diverse temperaments slowed and sometimes watered down the vigor of cabinet decisions. The differences of opinion that are normally fought in the elections and on the floor of the House of Commons had to be fought inside the cabinet, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how much, if any, fighting there was in the cabinet of this government on Bill No. 105?

There is no doubt at what point a nation is so obviously desperate that these differences of temperament and view cease to be a decisive factor. Britain reached that position, but never consciously faced it until 1914 and 1918. In all emergencies, Mr. Speaker, short of this, coalition is a detriment rather than an aid to efficient government because of the variety of opinion in which it ought to be done. With a variety of opinion, even in a coalition government you have problems.

I was always taught in school, and I was under the impression, from my peers that in a free democratic society one could hold views that were not necessarily popular (although for the longest time, I wanted to be with the popular group; like all young people I felt I had to do the same as everybody else). I was always taught that if you wanted to support a cause which wasn't popular you wouldn't be persecuted, although that happened when I was younger to many groups. Fortunately, at that time I didn't belong to a minority group; I do now. Now I understand what those minorities felt when I ran into retroactive, repressive legislation – steps backwards.

This abstract discussion, Mr. Speaker, can be summed up by saying that until human nature is greatly changed and education and knowledge are greatly improved and extended, the party system performs two indispensable functions for a democracy. It enables the sovereign electorate to participate in the operation of government; it makes constitutionalism and the ultimate control of government by the electorate possible, by enabling the people to change their masters when they see fit to do so. But they will not change, Mr. Speaker, if they don't have the opportunity or an opposition party to change.

The matter can be left at this point for the present.

I must draw the members' attention to political parties within the mother country of Britain. Mr. Speaker, a comprehensive description of political parties in any country requires a review of the political history of the country for the past 100 years at least.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Good speech, eh?

MR. HAM: — Political parties cannot be clearly understood unless seen in relation to the development in their environment, Mr. Speaker, and the Unionest Party in this environment attempting to live up to the laws of this province is being forced retroactively out of existence through Bill No. 105.

AN HON. MEMBER: — On attempted union; they are not going to succeed.

MR. HAM: — Their policies and platforms cannot be appreciated except in relation to the social and economic structure that reveals their source of support. The present purpose being limited to a preliminary study of political parties cannot be undertaken. The main emphasis will be on party organization. It seems probable that the Liberal Party in Britain is doomed and that its supporters will be distributed between the other two parties, the Conservative Party and the Labour Party. That's fairly significant, Mr. Speaker, because I have a strong suspicion that's what the future of the Liberal Party is in Saskatchewan. But the Premier of Saskatchewan has already stated that the bill is being amended to accommodate the Liberals in Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yes, they urge them to stay on; they like them.

MR. HAM: — Well, I wonder how they will react if the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current become Liberals. But in any case the Liberal and Conservative organizations are so similar in pattern, Mr. Speaker, (this is important, especially in response to the member for Wilkie) that a description of one will serve for the other. Also the organization of the Labour Party steadily grows more like that of others. It will be sufficient to make a few salient divergences. The basic unit in all these three parties is the local constituency organization, Mr. Speaker, the polls of those who formerly joined the party and maintained their membership.

To qualify to sit as a party in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, by law we are allowed to attend committees, respond to governmental motions, sell memberships if you like outside of the law (outside of the legislative Act we are still allowed to sell memberships.) We have memberships at this time, so any members of the legislature who are interested, I would be most happy to sign them up. The active and effective part of local associations is a small executive committee, which in turn is very powerfully influenced by its secretary and its paid party agent whose job it is to win the constituency in the election. Local associations are in each case united in a national union which maintains a central party office and holds an annual conference made up of delegates from the constituency organizations.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't make a hill of beans difference as to whether or not Bill No. 105 is passed or not with respect to the Unionest Party. We will still exist as long as there is any popular support, or we will die if the popular support wanes. We may become a very, very powerful force in western Canada. But Bill No. 105 is an obvious direct attack on the Unionest Party. The sad thing is, Mr. Speaker, the bill is an attack

upon itself; it's an attack upon this Chamber.

The conference of the party elects the national executive committee which directs the work of the central office. The central office, it will be recalled, is an overall directing and co-ordinating agency devoted to the planning and winning of elections. In theory the conference is a representative party legislature for establishing the policy of the party. But like parliament itself, Mr. Speaker, it has come under the powerful influence of the executive committee and the civil service, the permanent staff of the central office. The central office works in the closest relationship with the party leaders in parliament. The party program is drafted by the leader of the party in parliament, the chairman of the executive committee and the chief officer of the central office. The chief official of the central office headquarters rarely fails to have this draft approved by the annual convention of the party . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We haven't set a date for an annual convention, but we will make certain that those who are interested will be invited.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I wonder when the leadership convention was?

MR. HAM: — Nor does the conference choose the leader of the party. He is chosen by those members of the party who are in parliament, Mr. Speaker. Since he is the leader in the critical party struggles in parliament, it's most desirable that he should be their choice. Equally, those who lead the party in parliament, who have or will have the responsibility of making and enforcing government policy, are sternly set against having an annual conference which saddles them with a policy that is impractical and impossible in application. This helps to explain the centralized party machinery. The natural tendency toward obligatory and human organizations and the inherent logic of responsible cabinet government both contribute to it. The main divergences of the Labour Party from this pattern of organization arises from the connection of the party with the trade unions.

If the Unionest Party was a unionist party and was directly involved with the union movement in Saskatchewan, it would be interesting to see whether or not the NDP government would have brought in a bill such as Bill 105.

Trade unions and local trade councils, as well as individuals, are members of the party entitled to a distinct representation in local and national organizations. The local party agent is often a trade union official. Because the trade unions are powerful principalities within the party, the central organization cannot dominate the party so fully. The annual Labour Party conference discusses party policy more fruitfully.

That's interesting, Mr. Speaker. We have a labor union movement controlling a party in the mother country and perhaps in Saskatchewan. We have a labor union movement controlling, I believe, the federal NDP to a great degree. And yet organized labor, in the North American continent, has been in its own right the unprivileged and the minority. We have a party which represents that group attacking a minority with Bill 105.

Yet the conference cannot force a policy on the parliamentary group of the party. After all, the debate is over. They must approve the policy before it becomes official. The parliamentary group also chooses the person who is to lead them in parliament. His position is somewhat less secure than that of the leaders of the older parties because he must be re-elected each session and he has no acknowledged claim to be prime minister when the party comes to power. I find that most interesting. I wonder if maybe a system like that shouldn't be adopted in Canada.

As part of their duties in planning and executing election campaigns, Mr. Speaker, the central organization insists that every candidate who represents the party be approved by them, making judgments on his orthodox views in cases where doubt arises. Central party officials often want seats in parliament and these and others are recommended to the local associations. It is very rare, however, that the central office will try and force a candidate on a local committee which is determined to pick its own, although the central office may refuse a particular choice.

Ancillary to its principal duties, the central office carries on research on the problems of government; it grinds out party literature; it manages the party funds; it nurses the party press. It is active continuously and not merely at election time. Much less is known about the sources of campaign funds in Britain and America. The two older parties rely mainly on substantial contributions from men of substance. Explicit bargains for the quid pro quo are not common, partly because of the high standard of political morality in the mother country and partly because until very recently, Britain has not maintained a protective tariff and British governments have not engaged in active promotion of economic development. Unlike governments in North America, British governments have not had vast natural resources to give away and have not been subsidizing desirable private economic enterprises such as railways. However, the titles of honor have been a significant substitute for railway concessions, timber limits and tariff increases. The parties exploit social snobbery instead of the natural resources of the country. The Labour Party for obvious reasons has had little part in such tariff. It has drawn its funds in small amounts from the vast body of supporters, particularly through the trade unions.

The merit system of appointment to the civil service covers most government jobs and it is loyal and honestly applied. I believe, Mr. Speaker, they would be taken aback in Britain, both sides of the House, all three parties in the House by an onerous bill such as . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Five parties in the House.

MR. HAM: — Five parties in the House, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Separation parties in Britain and getting equal treatment in Britain and recognized by the House of Commons . . .

MR. HAM: — And recognized by the House of Commons. And these people take an oath of allegiance to the Queen? In the mother country of parliament?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oath of allegiance to the Queen? Scottish Nationals? Irish Nationals? Can you believe that? Right over there in England, they let that go.

MR. HAM: — This emphasizes the fact that it is the state and local organizations of parties which are significant. Although we are mainly concerned with national and not with local, provincial or state government it is necessary to give close attention to the party organizations within each state.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You should repeat that about the Scottish Nationals and the Welsh Nationals and the Irish Nationals.

MR. HAM: — For the benefit of the member for Moose Jaw North, it was brought to his

attention last night that the oath of allegiance is taken by every British subject and every British or Commonwealth politician. We've had British MPs take an oath of allegiance to the Queen and stand up in the House of Commons and ask for the abolition of the monarchy.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hypocrisy in any jurisdiction is still hypocrisy.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Even more than that, how about the Scottish Nationals?

MR. HAM: — The member for Souris-Cannington is an expert in the field of hypocrisy. Fortunately there is a general pattern to which both parties conform in most states. The pattern only will be sketched and what is said about it must be prefaced with warning that the description will not fully, accurately tell all, nor perhaps for any one state or party. Mr. Speaker, it is important that I compare political systems, not only in the mother country but those in the United States for the benefit of all members and the influence the onerous Bill No. 105 would have on these political systems.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's a good point he just made, you know, that right over there in Britain, they have a Welsh National Party and they want to separate from Britain and they're treated equally with everybody. Isn't that interesting?

MR. HAM: — The lowest general unit of organization of a party is the local committee of the city or town formerly chosen by interested supporters of the party and the party caucus or primary. The members of these committees are all active party workers, many of whom hold municipal office, or jobs with state government when their party is in power.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did you know that the Scottish National Party was originally Conservatives who split between elections?

MR. HAM: — Is that right? I just heard a comment that the members may want to hear; the Scottish Nationalist Party was originally Conservatives who split ... It's for certain the member for Souris-Cannington wouldn't know anyway.

Mr. Speaker, in the larger cities, organizations go further into the wards and the polling subdivisions called precincts. The ward or ...

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member may be following some argument to support his debate in this particular bill and it's not my intention to interfere with what he assumes to be the logic of his argument. However, it is my responsibility to keep the debate on the subject of the bill before us. I've been listening to the member rather closely for quite some time. Several times I've been on the verge of rising to tell the member that he should adhere more closely to the principle of the bill. Adhering to the principle of the bill doesn't mean that the member every so often mouths the words, Bill No. 105, and that automatically makes him close to the principle of the bill. I've been listening to the member and the member has been dealing with constituency organization and structure whereas the principle of this bill deals with the nature and amount of grants to a third party. I'm going to tell the member for Swift Current that he must stay closer to the subject which is before us, which is that principle — the principle of that bill. I can't allow the member to go on with some dissertation on political party structure at the community level and say that it's related to this bill.

MR. HAM: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for drawing that to my attention. I had a great deal of information here which I thought would be directly relevant to the ramifications of the bill but I'll have to sidestep some of it. I think, Mr. Speaker, since Bill No. 105 is an attack on a new party in this legislature, that perhaps I should for a few moments relate (as I have previously but in more detail) that the NDP or CCF Party faced the same sort of an attack by the Liberal Party in the 1930s. The history of the CCF Party, with respect to its present day position in this legislature, would be relevant to Bill No. 105. I wish the fellow next door wouldn't shake his head; I hear it rattling.

Mr. Speaker, of the several new or third parties of Canada, only the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation can be described at present as a national party. The broad outlines of the formal structure of the CCF organization are similar to those of the old parties. I think that's significant, Mr. Speaker. The CCF was structured on the parallels of the old-line parties and they used old-line party phrases. If one of these old-line parties, being the Liberal Party of the depression years, had decided these people, the NDP-CCF of those years, were espousing causes that were considerably more radical than anything else that had been heard, then perhaps they should have brought in a bill and eliminated their position in the legislature. The greatest differences are in the way in which the organization works. Some of the major differences in structure and operation may be pointed out.

The CCF regards itself as a movement as well as a party. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current, in our initial announcements to sit as independents, viewed our future with respect to politics as our being a movement and not a party. We now believe we are a movement and a party. As a result of declaring ourselves, under the law of Saskatchewan, a political party, we are now having those rights removed retroactively.

As a movement, it has a sense of mission which the older parties lack. The mission is the achievement of democratic socialism, holding as it does that the democracy in the old parties is a sham (and it's ironic, Mr. Speaker, because the introduction of Bill 105 makes them, in my opinion, no better with respect to political sham than the parties they continue to accuse over the years of being that way). Being unable to rely on habitual support from the voters, unceasing efforts are made to educate the electorate away from the unthinkable alliance with the older parties. Mr. Speaker, they are an older party, and I guess we're the new movement or cause. The very party that faced these problems in the past is trying to quash the views of a new movement through Bill 105.

Since socialism obviously cannot be achieved merely by voting for it, there is great emphasis on research in the political, economic, and social problems. CCF organizations are presently more directed toward these aims than to winning elections. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this information I've received is somewhat outdated, because I think probably conditions and times have changed, and since they have changed they have seen fit to bring in this onerous Bill 105.

The basic unit of organization is the local CCF club with social and educational as well as political purposes. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this continues today, but I believe the result of the introduction of this kind of legislation is going to take away from this closely knit group of supporters and workers that the NDP have had for so many years, many of whom were from minority groups.

The one or more clubs in a given constituency form the constituency association.

Candidates are nominated by convention and composed of members of the association. The provincial and national organizations, built on the constituency association, have careful constitutional provisions for ensuring that the rank and file of party members will be represented and heard. And I don't know, Mr. Speaker, that the rank and file of the NDP today have been telling, or whether members that represent those constituents in the legislature have heard the hue and cry from members of their own party as to whether Bill 105 should be proceeded with, introduced, or removed, or die on the order paper.

Many matters, which in older parties would have been settled in caucuses by party members of parliament and of legislative assemblies, are dealt with by the CCF by representative association conventions. Obviously some of that has changed, Mr. Speaker. It is now convention. I think probably it would be interesting for the media and for anyone else, for that matter, to attend an annual NDP convention, to find out whether there's any response or reaction to Bill 105 or to listen to how they explain away the reason for Bill 105, especially to the minority groups within their party. The central offices of the party both . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They'd grab me around the neck? I see. Mr. Speaker, I should maybe revert back to my one party system portion of my speech and explain how the one party systems function. The central offices of the party both provincial and national are on the whole more continuously active than those in the older parties. I don't think that would be true today, Mr. Speaker. I think that all three parties have active offices. In addition to preparing for and conducting elections they are extensively engaged in research, the production of party literature, and the distribution of it to local clubs for dissemination among their members and the public. They organized lecture tours of summer schools for educational and party principles.

I am going to leave the CCF for the moment. I don't believe the original supporters of the CCF could believe that the offspring, the NDP, would go so far as to bring in legislation of this nature . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm leaving the CCF right now.

During my introduction of the amendment last night, when I read the introduction to the amendment, I referred to the attack by the bill on civil liberties. And I would like very much to spend a few moments on civil liberties in the provinces.

Acts, judicial review acts, bills of rights, human rights legislation and language rights, freedom of religion and the establishment of the ombudsman as well as legislation on provincial constitutions such as legislative assembly acts – these are all enactments dealing specifically with basic human freedoms. But beyond these statutes one could certainly mention legislation on the creation of courts, labor legislation recognizing the rights of unions to exist and to represent employees, legislation on minimum hours of work and other statutes in the field of labor law.

The focus, however, will be on the mainstream of human rights legislation in the provinces. And even in this area discussion can only be general. It should be noted that none of the legislation mentioned above is in any way entrenched in provincial constitutions. In other words, every one of the human rights acts is an ordinary Act of the legislature subject to change or repeal by ordinary legislative process.

Isn't that interesting – subject to appeal by ordinary process of the legislature. That is exactly what's happening with Bill No. 105 and The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.

The only part of the provincial government machinery and constitutional structure which is beyond provincial legislative control is of course the office of the Lieutenant-Governor. In very special circumstances he should act as a protector of human rights by refusing to sign legislation which is detrimental to the traditions of constitutional freedom or by reserving the legislation for consideration of the federal governor in council.

I wonder if the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current shouldn't appear before the Lieutenant-Governor and ask him to refuse to sign the bill when it is passed. As a protector of human rights the Lieutenant-Governor has the option not to sign legislation which is detrimental to the traditions of constitutional freedom.

Although present day lieutenant-governors have little independent discretion, the office of the Lieutenant-Governor could be an ultimate weapon against the flagrant abuse of civil liberties by the province. This is a prime example of the abuse of civil liberties against two individuals who are a minority in this legislature who are being attacked by a bill.

With few exceptions, however, it has been the Canadian tradition to uphold the doctrine of parliamentary supremacy. There will be abuses during such times as the Duplessis regime in Quebec and restriction of freedom of the press by the Alberta government in the early years of the Aberhart regime. In fairness, however, these have been exceptions to what has been for the most part a healthy respect for freedom of expression, freedom of association and freedom of speech within provincial constitutional spheres. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat that. This is a fairly recent edition entitled, *The Practice of Freedom*. The Government of Saskatchewan, as well as the official opposition, have decided they are going to vote against what has been traditional and democratic. It doesn't seem to matter how many constitutional experts throughout the world have spoken out against Bill No. 105. They have seen fit to suggest they're wrong; we're going to do what we think we have to do here because we want to eliminate these two people.

In fairness, however (excluding Saskatchewan, I'll say), there have been exceptions to what has been, for the most part, a healthy respect for freedom of expression, freedom of association and freedom of speech within the provincial constitutional sphere.

Without going into detail about the institutional structure of the provinces, it should be pointed out that the passage, in all provinces, of an election Act which ensures that there will be elections at least every five years, which recognizes the right of people to freely and openly stand as candidates for a seat in the Legislative Assembly, and which ensures the right of an opposition to exist, is fundamental to the recognition of human rights. I guess to a great degree, Mr. Speaker, we are a form of opposition, although I don't know that we are serving quite the same purpose, or should be serving quite the same purposes as the official opposition in this legislature.

It is a liberty not enjoyed by the overwhelming majority of the world's population. That, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly scares me, that we're on the road to stifling civil liberties in Saskatchewan. We live in an era in which the number of constitutional democracies is continually shrinking. Thus the right to be organized in an opposition and the right to participate freely in debate in the Legislative Assembly and the electoral process is fundamental in judging whether a constitution is within the framework of a liberal democratic model. It is fair to say that in every Canadian province this criteria is fully met.

Three of the provinces in Canada – Quebec, Saskatchewan and Alberta (and this is interesting, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan) – have bills of rights though in Quebec it is called the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms. Every province, with the exception of Saskatchewan, has either a human rights Act or a human rights code. Saskatchewan has set up a human rights commission charged with the responsibility of administering The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act, the Fair Accommodation Practices Act, and The Fair Employment Practices Act. An examination of bills of rights as compared with human rights shows that the basic distinction is that the traditional bill of rights is usually concerned with freedom of speech, religion, association and other traditional political rights, whereas the human rights acts or codes are mainly concerned with prohibiting discrimination with respect to, for instance, employment and accommodation.

As a matter of the enactment of non-discrimination provisions being more essential than the drafting of traditional bills of rights, which protect the basic freedoms of political participation, undoubtedly many of the rights of political participation are to some extent contained in other statutes such as election acts. However, three provinces have felt it necessary to make specific what one might call the traditional freedoms. It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, in this dissertation that the value of some of this legislation be examined.

When Peter Lougheed came to power in Alberta in 1972, the first bill which he placed before the legislature was the Alberta Bill of Rights. This bill is shaped very much along the lines of the Canadian Bill of Rights. It has a long preamble, referring to the federal bill, restating the fundamental respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms inherent in the Canadian democracy.

The Alberta bill then goes on to recognize the classic political freedom such as the rights to freedom of religion, speech, assembly, association, freedom of the press and the freedom of the individual to equality before the law.

The main thrust of the legislation appears to be no. 2 which provides that every Alberta law shall be so construed and applied as not to abrogate, abridge or infringe the rights and freedoms herein recognized and declared.

This closely follows the federal model in that it provides guidelines to the courts in the interpretation of provisions against the federal Bill of Rights, whereby a provincial enactment can be passed which operates without being affected by the Alberta Bill of Rights.

The first province to pass the Bill of Rights was Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan statute differs in an interesting way from the Alberta bill. It provides for freedom of conscience and religious association, freedom of expression, freedom of association and the right to membership in a professional association, freedom of the press and the right to own and occupy property.

The member asks, what has that to do with Bill No. 105? That has everything to do with Bill No. 105. Is that the minister of ill health over there?

For the benefit of the minister of ill health, I will repeat the statement that I just referred to here – freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, freedom of expression, freedom

of association. For the benefit of the member for Saskatoon Buena Vista, we have a bill in this province that allows two members or more of this legislature to sit as a party and be recognized as a party. You took it upon yourselves – you and your cohorts – to introduce a bill to eliminate this party. So perhaps from now on you'll remain awake and you'll find out what's going on. It's only been nine or ten days of debate now.

And on the other hand . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, what debate is right. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I intend to sit down to let the members who have been so vocal in this legislature over the past several days, get up and go. That's a promise.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Right now?

MR. HAM: — Right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on Bill No. 105 which is before the House. The members from the opposition, both the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current, have made extensive remarks with regard to this bill and have indicated to us on numerous occasions that the bill infringes on their religious rights and their religious freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, if you have a look at Bill No. 105, there is absolutely no impingement at all on the rights of an individual to the freedom to speak in this House. I think there was a good indication that the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current have clearly indicated there is no impingement on their rights to speak whatsoever.

This particular bill addresses itself to a problem that has occurred and as the member for Nipawin indicated, it has occurred because of actions taken by those two members. The bill addresses itself to a particular problem that we have incurred in this House, and that is whether or not members who leave a particular political party and did not go to the people in the last election in which they participated should be entitled to public funds. I thought the member for Nipawin had ample time in 38 hours of speaking to this bill.

The problem that this bill addresses itself to, and it's a fundamental principle, Mr. Speaker, in a democracy. When you go to the people of the province or a constituency, you put a platform before the people. Certainly there is an argument, Mr. Speaker, as to whether you are elected as an individual, or whether you are elected as a member of a political party. I am not going to get into the debate as to whether you are elected as an individual or whether you are elected as a member of a party.

I do want to tell the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current, that there is no doubt in my mind that the people vote on both. They vote for you as a member of a party and for the platform which is put before the people; they vote for you as an individual.

I think we had a good example of that in the last provincial election in which many of us took part. . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — All of us took part.

MR. ROLFES: — I guess all of us took part. Well, I guess when you look at the member

for Nipawin, maybe he didn't take as much part as he should have.

But, I think the fundamental principle which we must address ourselves to here today is: should two members who went before the people of this province, as members of the Conservative Party, who now have changed course, and have left the Conservative Party (that is their prerogative) to form an entirely new political party whose aims and objective have never been put before the people of this province, should they (because at their own whim they formed a new political party) be entitled to public funds in order to further their own objectives and platform which have never been put before the people of this province?

My answer to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is no they should not. If the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current wish to put their objectives, their platform before the people of Saskatchewan as the Unionest Party in the next provincial election, and should they happen to be elected, I would support them, as members of this House, for public funds to further their objectives and their programs, because they have put those before the people; and the people have answered, yes.

In this particular example they have not put their objectives before the people. I know the member for Nipawin has said, well if we join the Liberal Party we would be entitled to the funds. Naturally, if you follow my logic on it, then that makes eminent sense, because the Liberal Party put their platform before the people; a certain percentage of the people voted for it, I am not sure what the percentage was anymore, I think it was around 13 per cent of the people, said yes to the Liberal Party. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, they voted for the Liberal Party. Therefore, if any member on that side should see fit to join the Liberal Party, I think they would be entitled to the funds, for the simple reason that the platform and objectives of the Liberal Party were put before the people. So I say to the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current, if you wish to put your objectives and your platform before the people in the next election, whenever that should be, then I think you would be entitled to some funds. The member for Nipawin has already indicated that he has no intention of running in the next election, therefore I would assume he will not test the people on his particular program and platform. I think he knows what the answer of course would be.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The party will.

MR. ROLFES: — The party will, and if your party elects some people and they become the third party in this House, I am sure we will deal with that situation at that particular time. I am certain that the member for Nipawin at that time will be able to put his case before the people at that time. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the member for Nipawin that this particular bill has nothing to do with the two individuals involved, nothing at all. The principle that I espouse to is this; you, Mr. Speaker, as an individual or as a party must put your platform before the people and if you are accepted by the people and become the third party in this House, then I think you can legitimately ask for funds to support your political party. But until you do that I personally feel that you are not entitled to any funds from the public purse, so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will support Bill 105.

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words during the debate on these amendments. I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I support this bill. I believe it is the right course of action for the government to take. Further, I believe it is what the overwhelming majority of Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, would have us do if they were here to instruct us today.

This is a difficult time for Canada, and for Canadians such as myself who love this nation, because at the present time, Mr. Speaker, we see a separatist movement in Quebec which has had as its aim the removal of much of French-speaking Canada from confederation. We see separatist sentiments expressed in other parts of Canada and now even here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, at a time when our nation could benefit most from the western voices speaking out in favor of one united Canada. We have those in our midst who advocate the demise of confederation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make my sentiments clear. I am a Canadian citizen. I always have been and I hope I always will be. I am proud to be a Canadian citizen and I will resist, with all the energy and the resources I have within me, anyone who tries to take that citizenship away from me. What is more, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Canadians have the right to resist a threat to the survival of their country. It does not matter in the final analysis whether that threat should come from a foreign power invading our borders or from a group already within our borders. I think that we all should do our best to keep and maintain our confederation of Canada.

It is therefore, I believe, up to all of us in government, whether at the federal or at the provincial level, to decide how we will meet the challenge of those who are out to separate it. In some countries, Mr. Speaker, they would take away their civil liberties and deny them a freedom to express their views. No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the Canadian way. Our best defence in preserving the sovereignty of our nation is not in taking up arms to meet this challenge. It is not in becoming hysteric and acting too quickly and unwisely. Our defence of Canada must be based upon the preservation of all our freedoms for all Canadians regardless of how wrong their ideas may be. That is one of the great attractions of our nation. Canadians are free to express their opinion openly and without fear, and no government should ever infringe upon that freedom. But, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this bill does not limit, in any way, the rights and liberties of any members of the Assembly. It is a bill which will remove some of the possibility for abuses under the Act; and I believe the amendment should find good support on both sides of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard an opinion expressed during this session, from one corner of the Chamber, that it is quite all right for an elected politician to switch his political allegiance after he has been elected; that there is no legal restriction and therefore, no restriction at all on a member doing just that; that it has been done before and it will be done again, and that makes it quite O.K. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think anyone who asks us to accept that is asking us to look too closely at the formalities, and not closely enough at the moralities.

I am no political scientist, Mr. Speaker, nor am I a legal scholar, nor a learned intellectual. I have never claimed to be, but I do have a very definite and strongly held opinion on the subject of how elected politicians should conduct themselves once elected. I believe that when someone decides to enter public office he should be honest with the electorate and with himself. When you ask your constituents to commit their support to you as a candidate, then you must also undertake a commitment to them – a commitment to represent, until the next election, the platform and policies which won their support at the polls. And, Mr. Speaker, that commitment to one's constituents should last longer than the closing of the polls on election night.

Just before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this. I sincerely hope that the next provincial general election in Saskatchewan will see a full complement of

MLAs returned to this House who will advance the cause of national unity in Canada. If, however, there are some members returned who have campaigned and won election on the issue of destroying Canada, I would consider the Assembly bound, Mr. Speaker, by the wishes of their constituents, to regard them in every respect as a political party. But, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, at present that is not the case. And for those reasons I have given you, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for the bill.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, it seems that government members have joined the filibuster, putting up two in rapid succession. One comment made by the member for Weyburn, which I think can't go unchallenged, is the comment that he (and he was very careful to say, he as an individual) supported a strong western Canada. I think that's fair; I think he probably does. I wish he would convey that message to his Premier and his cabinet because obviously they don't. They refuse to co-operate with other provinces in negotiations at the federal level, and I think that the member for Weyburn . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pay attention to me; I may ask questions.

Over the last several days, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed what I think is probably a record in stretching a 20 minute speech into 40-odd hours, or a 20 minute point, I should say. It took two speeches.

I am particularly offended by this bill. Any bill that has a retroactive nature to it I find rather abhorrent. I am particularly abhorred by the fact that this party would bring in this type of bill. I felt that way when the bill was introduced because this party has set itself up as the champion of human rights and civil liberties and at the same time . . . Talk about straddling the line, the Minister of Environment knows full well this is the party that sets itself up as the champion of civil liberties.

The Minister of Agriculture (and the court records will show) some months ago instructed his deputy minister, to go to the R.M. of Whiska Creek to take care of the Hutterite problem by instructing the R.M. to zone them out of business. Is this the way the champions of human and civil rights should properly act?

We see these same champions, the Minister of Highways, denying the right of an individual to have a driver's licence. We see this government make a mockery of freedom of information legislation put before this House; and freedom of information is fundamental to human and civil rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — We also see the Minister of Telephones take a perverse delight in denying the people of Saskatchewan the right to freedom of communication by scrambling TV signals in Saskatoon.

I am abhorred by retroactive legislation and as the member for Nipawin has said many times in this debate, the principle of this bill boils down to whose ox is being gored. Whose ox is being gored? I think (and I'm going to touch on that at some length a little later) the separation and the break-up of Canada is serious business; one that deserves to be taken to the people of Saskatchewan. Movement to break up this country and funds to support it should not be condoned or allowed as a result of sloppy legislation. And I'm going to tell you how that legislation came to be in a little while.

This legislation, to a large extent, was designed in those two chairs by the Attorney General and the member for Nipawin. The people of this province, as in all other provinces in Canada, expected all serious political parties, all serious political movements, to be taken before the people for support prior to granting such parties additional tax dollar financial support. With political freedom comes political responsibility to represent and respect the views and wishes of the electorate. To abuse those responsibilities because of sloppy legislation is to treat our hard-fought, deeply rooted democratic responsibilities in a most irreverent and cavalier fashion.

The people of Saskatchewan have a democratic right to express their views about the acceptability of all political parties, be they unionist, communist, socialist, liberal, whatever. We do not support the abuse of those democratic responsibilities, and stand firm in defence of those proven and cherished democratic responsibilities.

As I said earlier, the principle of this bill (as the member for Nipawin has said) depends on whose ox is being gored. If we take a look at the legislation as it existed, in 1975 there was no provision for a third party in this legislature. But there was a significant third party influence in this legislature. If the member for Shellbrook would put a button on his lip he might get the message of what's being . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Will you second the bill?

MR. BERNTSON: — I'll get to that. In 1975 there was no third party in the legislature . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I wonder if the members could bring themselves to order so that we can hear what the Leader of the Opposition has to say, and not prolong this debate unnecessarily because of interruptions.

MR. BERNTSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 1975 there was no third party provision in this legislature. There was however a significant third party influence; it was a legitimate third party influence that had been to the polls and received almost 30 per cent of the popular vote and seven members. For that reason, the government of the day in its wisdom decided that we should have some provision in this Legislative Assembly for a third party, and I am sure that it was a well thought out amendment they brought in at that time.

I am sure they checked with other jurisdictions where there had been some significant third party influence for some time, and I'm sure that's true. I am sure, for instance, they checked with Quebec. Quebec, with some 127 seats, has had a third party influence for some time. The requirement in Quebec is that it should have 12 members elected or 20 per cent of the popular vote in the last general election. I am sure, for instance, they checked with Ontario which has 110-115 seats. The requirement there is likewise 12 members, elected in the last general election. I am sure they checked with British Columbia, where I believe they have 57 seats, and the requirement there is 5 seats for third party recognition. I am sure they checked with Manitoba, where they have had a third party influence for some considerable time, where they have 57 seats, and the requirement there I believe is 4 seats for third party recognition.

I am sure, based on all of that plus a few clear thinking individuals (I know there are only a few over there), they decided in their wisdom that what we should have here is third party recognition based on approximately 10 per cent of the capacity of the House, which is what it is in all other jurisdictions where third party recognition is legislated.

They came up with five members for third party recognition in Saskatchewan. And I think it was sound. I think it was a good, sound amendment. I supported it, as did all members of this House.

Then we get to The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act last spring. The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act was, I think, assented to on May 4, 1979, somewhat after the last election. It was supported by all members in this House, I believe, at about 1 o'clock in the morning on prorogation night. It was supported (as I said) by all members of this House. Now we are going to get back to whose ox is being gored. That legislation, although not assented to until May 4, 1979, was retroactive to October 18, 1978. Retroactivity then was not a bad thing to the member for Nipawin or the member for Swift Current because their particular ox wasn't being gored – retroactive legislation (if that is the principle we are talking about).

The other provision which I would like to talk about just briefly is the provision in The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act that says:

For the purposes of computing the amount of an allowance payable under clause 1(a) or grant under 1(b), which is dealing with the third party, the leader of the third party is deemed to have occupied that position from the polling day on which he was elected a member . . .

Clearly, by that section in The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, the intent of the Act was that that member should have had his party to the polls in the last election. Either that, or it wouldn't have been there. And you can't have it both ways. You can't say I am going to be a party today, but it is effective two years previous. You can't have that, and say I am legitimate and rightly deserving of public funds to promote this cause.

There are a couple of other areas which I would like to touch on briefly. The member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current have indicated they will be running parties, running candidates in all four western provinces and the territories. It seems the taxpayers of Saskatchewan should not rightfully be the only people to fund such a movement and to pay research for such a movement. I think that is wrong. The member for Nipawin has spent some considerable time in this House expounding on the denial of rights and privileges. Is there a right to free speech taken away? I think not. Is there a right to political activity taken away? I think not. I think, further, it is protected under The Elections Act. They are a registered political party with the chief electoral officer. Is their right to freedom of assembly taken away? I think not. Is the right of the Unionest Party to participate in future by-elections or elections taken away? I think not. Again they are protected under The Elections Act; they are registered with the chief electoral officer as a political party in Saskatchewan. This means quite frankly, that the only right – if it can be called that – taken away from the Unionest Party with this bill, is the right to money. I don't think we inherently have the right to money; I think that has to be earned. I think a political party earns it at the polls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — Having said that, and it is not my intention to unduly prolong the question on this particular bill, I am still abhorred and offended by retroactive legislation. In committee of the whole, I will be advancing two amendments, one dealing with the retroactivity. My amendment will simply amend section 89 to read:

This bill will come into effect on day of assent.

And secondly, if all of the arguments were valid, that approximately 10 per cent of the capacity of this House should be required for third party recognition, in 1975-76, they were equally as valid in May of 1979 when to quote the member for Nipawin:

The Legislative Assembly Act took about seven months to create and prepare, seven months of negotiations, arguments, bickering, presenting and blackmailing . . .

I wonder which sections of the Act were put up for ransom? If those arguments were valid back in 1975 and 1976, they are just as valid today in my view. I will be bringing in an amendment to section 3 of the bill asking this House to increase third party requirements for recognition to 5 members, which puts it in a proportional basis in line with other jurisdictions that have thought out this legislation as it relates to third party recognition in their jurisdictions, and with some degree of success and I think, with some degree of clear thinking and thoughtfulness going into it.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you I will be supporting the bill in anticipation that those amendments will be accepted by the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief in replying to this bill. I wanted to say that when the member for Souris-Cannington got up, I was at first shocked, because I thought he would be voting against this bill. Somehow it appears to me that he will probably be supporting the government on this one. I can understand there is a lot of emotionalism involved seeing as not too many months ago the hon. member for Nipawin was the leader of that gentleman there. I can see their high degree of emotionalism and I think we appreciate that on this side of the House. There were two points mentioned and I fail to see any connection between those two points and the bill. One was about a citizen of this province not being able to have a driver's licence. I think I know the gentleman to whom he is referring. I wish he would elaborate and let members of this Assembly know that if it's the gentleman I think he was referring to, that gentleman has a driver's licence but not the kind of licence he would want. He wants a higher one.

I think the gentleman also mentioned the scrambling of TV signals. I would just want to ask the hon. member as to whether or not he disagrees with the recent court judgment handed down. Is he simply saying that the courts are not capable of dealing with the situation? A judgment was handed down by Justice Johnson saying that Sask Tel had every right; that injunction was denied to Saskatoon Telecable. I really see no connection between that and this bill.

I wanted to say something in regard to retroactivity, Mr. Speaker. Gentlemen opposite are always harping on how they hate retroactivity. I would like to remind them that not only in this august assembly have there been retroactive bills but also there have been retroactive bills in every Legislative Assembly in Canada. I never heard any complaints, never any derogatory remarks directed against the government that put forward those bills in which there was an element of retroactivity. Why I can recall just a short while ago we had a retroactive bill in this House which gave the renter's rebate to certain individuals in Saskatoon. I didn't hear you complain about that one. I'm sure if you looked in the record, all members opposite said that was a good retroactive bill. Well, I

June 10, 1980

think any government has to be open and retroactivity cannot be ruled out by any party or any government and it hasn't been in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I really don't see any problems at all with regard to the principle of the bill. The reason is that no freedom of speech is being taken away from the two hon. members of the Unionest Party. It seemed to me that this is what they were harping on. They were claiming their freedom of speech was being taken away. It's not being taken away at all. And I agree with the hon. member for Souris-Cannington that research money is more or less a privilege; it is not a right. I do believe that you have a right to speak. Speak on your own behalf or on behalf of your constituents if you may be so bold as to presume to do so, but I think research money is not a right.

I do place a lot of emphasis on the intent of the bill. The intent of the bill was always that a political party should go into an election and present a platform. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that because I believe all hon. members will be wanting to vote on this particular bill, I will terminate my remarks and I will be fully supporting it.

MR. SPEAKER: — The question has been called. Is the Assembly ready for the question? The question before the Assembly is on Bill No. 105, second reading. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 36

Pepper	Allen	Bowerman
Smishek	Kramer	Baker
Skoberg	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
MacAuley	Rolfes	Tchorzewski
Cody	Koskie	Matsalla
Prebble	Long	Johnson
Nelson	Thompson	Engel
Lingenfelter	White	Solomon
Berntson	Larter	Swan
Pickering	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	McLeod

Nays — 2

Collver	Ham
---------	-----

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.