

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
FIFTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE  
30th Day**

Wednesday, March 27th, 1963.

The House met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

**QUESTIONS RE FURTHER BILLS**

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Premier. With these 13 bills which have been brought down this morning, does that complete the list for this session, or will there be any additional legislation?

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I believe there are two rather short ones on the white paper will be brought for first reading tomorrow I should think. One is leave to introduce a bill to amend the Dental Profession Act which is a very short bill and the other is a bill respecting the superannuation of employees in tuberculosis sanatoria and hospitals, which we have hoped might get through this session. But with those, unless there is something quite unforeseen at the moment, this would complete the proposals.

**ROYAL ASSENT**

**Premier Lloyd:** — Before the orders of the day may I inform the legislature that His Honor, the Lieutenant Governor will be here this afternoon at 5 o'clock, I think it is, in order to give assent to a number of the bills which the legislature has already passed. Secondly, later this afternoon, or later today there will be placed on the desks of all the members this year's copy of the Saskatchewan Economic Review. This is the statistical report on the Saskatchewan economy prepared annually by the staff of the planning board and contains a great deal of very useful information with regard statistical measurement of activities of the province.

March 27, 1963

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF EXPROPRIATION

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd** moved:

That this assembly recommends to the consideration of the government the appointment of a committee composed of members of the assembly, to conduct an inquiry, following prorogation of the assembly and during the inter-sessional period into all matters relating to the expropriation of lands by public and private authorities.

That the said committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses under oath; to receive representations from persons employed by public and private authorities empowered to expropriate land, from interested persons and from members of the general public and for this purpose to hold meetings or hearings away from the seat of government in order that the fullest representations may be received without inconveniencing those desiring to be heard.

That the committee have power to engage legal counsel and such advisers and assistants as are required for the purpose of the inquiry and in addition, if considered necessary or desirable, to request the assistance of staff employed by the departments of the government.

That the said committee do submit a report together with a draft bill to the government on behalf of the assembly, on or before December 31, 1963, in order to facilitate action being taken upon any recommendation it may desire to make arising from its inquiry, the said report to be submitted to the assembly not later than the tenth sitting day of the next ensuing session of the assembly.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think the order paper is to a very considerable extent self-explanatory and doesn't need much support by words of further comment.

It provides or proposes that we will establish an inter-sessional committee to inquire into all matters relating to the expropriation of lands by public and private authorities. All hon. members will be aware that expropriation procedures have been an established part of procedure both for the public and to some extent private authorities for a considerable period of time. As the

activities of various kinds grow, the need for land for public purposes, the need for easements for public purposes, indeed also as the activities of some private authorities extend, there is more and more the need to acquire property and more and more the possibility that expropriation may have to be called into being to acquire it.

The government, some two years ago I think it was, indicated that this matter was receiving consideration and as we began during the last 12 months or so to consider the necessary changes, it seemed to us a particularly appropriate subject to which a committee of the members of the legislature might give their attention during the inter-sessional period.

The procedure which is being proposed is one which parallels closely the procedure that was used in the enquiry with regard to the extension of privileges or opportunities or activities in the liquor licensing area.

The resolution which is before us will have to be followed by another resolution naming the members of the committee. This will obviously require consultation with the members of the opposition with regard to whom they would like to have represent them on this committee. It will be noted that the committee is to have the power to engage legal counsel and other advisors and assistance and to call on staff of the various departments of government for their assistance. The committee will be asked to submit a draft bill by way of report some time during 1963, if at all possible, and obviously the hope would be that we might enact a satisfactory legislation in the session of next year, legislation which will have received the careful attention of not only provincial government but local government as well, which will have had — there will have been an opportunity for private individuals and organizations to make representations regarding it. With these words, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by Mr. Walker, resolution no. 1 as it appears.

Debate adjourned.

## SECOND READINGS

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull** moved second reading of Bill no. 50 — **An Act to amend the Larger School Unit Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, bill no. 50 refers to the Larger School Unit Act, and the main points of amendment in this bill refer to forms of election — form here meaning procedure and other administrative matters referring to elections. These amendments also refer to the term of office of unit board members and the proposition here is that the term be increased by one year, from two years to three, with the usual type of roll-over of one-third of the members each year. This amendment comes — I should say that all these amendments come by way of recommendations from the Trustees' Association.

**March 27, 1963**

Another amendment has to do with separate schools and the appointing of qualified teachers and some discussion arose as to the wording of the act as it now exists. There is no change in principle here. It is a matter of clearing up the working to the satisfaction of the separate schools trustees and the Trustees Association.

Another part of bill 50 deals with the power of the unit board to enter into agreement with senior government and the last amendment deals with the school grants as related to units. Members will recall that in the School Units Act there is a section that deals with the grants formula as related to the school unit We are proposing amendments here that reflect academic competence in the staff, and at the same time we have adjusted the grant formula so that we can give greater recognition than was formerly given to the principle of equalization.

With those general remarks as to the nature of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, I now move the second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull** moved second reading of Bill No. 51 — **An Act to amend the School Grants Act, 1960.**

He said: These particular amendments as related to The School Grants Act, 1950, have to do with two jurisdictions of school administration. The amendments as they appear on the advanced copy actually refer to the smaller districts which have less than 20 teachers and the other main jurisdiction is the non-unit, or the non-unit urban area, I think is the term that is used, which refers to the cities and the larger towns.

The effect of the amendments is to increase the amount of grant to allow these areas to share in the extra amount of money that the government is proposing to inject into the total budget for school grants. And the same principles that I outlined before are followed through here. We use the same degree of weighting for academic competence, giving those districts that hire the best qualified teachers a little larger share than they would earn if they did not hire the best qualified teachers, and at the same time to increase the weighting so that we do not lose sight of the equalization principle.

With those words I would now move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

March 27, 1963

**Hon. Mr. Brown** moved second reading of Bill no. 61 — **An Act regarding Industrial Development.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is much that could be said on second reading of bill no. 61, the Industrial Development Act, and quite frankly I had a very good speech all prepared which I was going to use but in the interests of saving time I am going to make my remarks very brief. Some indication of the principles involved in the bill, and what the bill is designed to do with respect to assisting in the economic development of our province has been given previously in the house, particularly by the Provincial Treasurer when he brought down his budget.

I noticed that the press were kind enough to write a very good review of the provisions of the bill and it appeared in last night's paper so I don't think there is much more I need to add at this time. There will undoubtedly be a number of questions arise which members will want to have answered and I think these can be dealt with in committee. I would just point out that the bill generally provides under three parts, three measures designed to assist us with the work of industrial development in the province.

The first part of the bill provides for the establishment of an industrial advisory committee to advise the government on various problems involved in industrialization matters.

The second part of the bill provides for the establishment of Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, which has already become known as SEDCO. This is the corporation which will handle loans and advances to new manufacturing industries, will be authorized to purchase and lease buildings to new industries, and this sort of thing and part three is the part of the bill which provides for the payments of grants for various purposes through the corporation to new and expanding industries in the province.

I might just add that knowledge of the bill has already become fairly widespread and I have had the odd telegram or the odd letter come into my office already from outside of the province asking us for some information and detail with respect to the legislation and the programs which are involved, and the level of assistance which might be available to new industries wishing to locate in Saskatchewan.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I think the bill can be much better discussed in committee and I would therefore move second reading.

March 27, 1963

**Mr. D.G. Stuart (Prince Albert):** — Mr. Speaker, along with the hon. minister there are some speeches we might like to make and a little more research we would like to do on it so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Hon. Mr. Williams** moved second reading of Bill no. 62, — **An Act to amend the Rural Telephone Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, any time a new act is brought in it is usually necessary the following year to make some amendments and in the case of The Rural Telephones Act, which was re-enacted last year we find some changes desirable this year.

The most important amendment we have is one which reduces the cost to a new subscriber. Members will recall that the act at the present time makes a 100 percent charge against a new subscriber. We have had some complaints that it has been too high and the amendment will provide that he will pay half the entire construction cost and the other half will be averaged on newly taxable lands. We have had meetings with representatives of the rural telephone association and they are in complete agreement with this change.

A number of other minor details, one is that excess charges can now be charged against other than farm property, for instance a filling station might be on the line, or something of that kind.

It is proposed in certain sections of the act to change the requirements of a secretary of a company from providing long lists of unnecessary information in resolutions. Now it will only be necessary for him to post up in his office a notice of a resolution which is necessary for only small loans. If it is for larger loans, of course, the individual members should be notified and the amendment will reduce a lot of work insofar as the secretary is concerned.

Now I think with that explanation I have probably mentioned the most important sections of the amendment and with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move that bill no. 62 — An Act to amend The Rural Telephone Act, 1962, be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Assembly, according to order, resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

During the consideration of the supplementary estimates, Mr. Speaker was called to resume the Chair, and the Chairman reported as follows:

**Mr. E.A. Johnson (Chairman):** — Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the supplementary estimates, Mr. Thatcher used the phrase ‘socialist dishonesty’ in discussing certain actions of the government. I asked that this be withdrawn unconditionally, which the hon. member refused to do.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would ask the Leader of the Opposition if he is prepared to withdraw the statements which according to all our rules are unparliamentary. Is he prepared to withdraw the statements?

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to withdraw them. I have impugned dishonesty on no single member. What I said was that this putting \$2 million in last year’s estimates, would make the 1963 budget look \$2 million better in an election year. And I say that that is dishonest. And I don’t see why I should withdraw it.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member accused the government of dishonesty.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — No I didn’t. I said this is socialist dishonesty . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Premier Lloyd:** — That being the case, while he did not mention any specific member, he did in fact mention all members and that is the most unparliamentary statement and one which I submit cannot be tolerated.

**March 27, 1963**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would have to say that a statement implying dishonesty, whether it be singular or collectively, is still out of order, and if the statement was made accusing the government individually or collectively of dishonesty, it is an unparliamentary term which is not allowed to be used. It is an unparliamentary term. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to reconsider and withdraw the statement so that the house may resume rather than get into any undue wrangle at this time.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, with regret, I cannot withdraw. I believe that it is true.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition said this is socialist dishonesty. Does this necessarily refer to this government? There are millions, unfortunately there are millions of socialists in the world.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am once again asking the Leader of the Opposition to reconsider his statement because he would leave me no alternative than to name the hon. member, which is a thing which I would absolutely regret. And I do not want to have to do that. I feel that all members have a right to debate and to discuss freely in the house but at the same time the rules of the house must be followed and there are ways and means for any member to express their thoughts and opinions without contravening the rules. I would once again plead with the member for Morse, (Mr. Thatcher), The Leader of the Opposition to reconsider his refusal to withdraw the statement so that the committee may resume their discussions.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it has been normal procedure in this legislature whenever we deal with estimates to deal with the supplementary estimates, to deal with amounts that have been spent . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! We are not debating the procedure . . .



**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — I understand, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! . . . that is not before the house at the present time.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, can't we just be common friends and find that this house accused its government of dishonesty. That has been done thousands of times during the years, Sir — political dishonesty, moral dishonesty, and all these expressions — I've used them not 24 hours ago on the floor of this house. But if I attacked an individual then I'm guilty, not accusing the government of doing anything.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Either individually or collectively, they are still against the rules of parliamentary procedure and I am asking the Leader of the Opposition to reconsider his stand because I think it would be the best for all concerned if he would do so.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, may I then be glad to associate myself with him. They are guilty of the same crime that you are trying to convict him of now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I am asking the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I am not prepared to withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order. Sit down will you please.

**March 27, 1963**

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Do you deny me the right to speak on a point of order too.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I was directing my remarks to the Leader of the Opposition. I did not quite catch his remarks myself.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, because I believe the government has been guilty of dishonesty with this \$2 million item, I said they were and I am not prepared to withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Then you leave me no alternative than to . . .

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — I realize . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . than to name the member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher), so I hereby . . .

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Are you going to deny me the right to speak on the point?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No you have not at this time.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — You deny it to me?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I do.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Gang rule.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Or I shall have to take the same action against the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker). The member for Saltcoats realizes that he has no right, if he will follow the rules, to rise when the Speaker is on his feet. I have asked the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw his statement, he said that he refuses. It leaves me no alternative than to name the member from Morse.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Very well.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, I am afraid you will have to name many other members on this side of the house as well.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I cannot help that, I have to follow the rules of the house. I am here to follow the rules of the house and I have no alternative. So, I hereby have to name the member for Morse, (Mr. Thatcher).

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What point of order?

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Well, on the point of order that you just denied me the right to speak to a few minutes ago with regard to the action which you are taking against the Leader of the Opposition. You are taking action against this man for saying what he absolutely felt was honest and correct in all sincerity, and if you are going deny us the right to say what we think and what we believe in this house, then that is just the destruction of all democracy. Quite honesty and sincerely . . .

**March 27, 1963**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! That is not the point of order at all . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification. Now that you have named me, what am I suppose to do – leave the chamber?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member has the right to stand up in his place and say why he made certain statements and withdraw from the chamber and the house shall decide, not the Speaker, the house shall decide what they wish done about the offence.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just stated that the practice of the government that it was adopting in the supplementary estimates was not a correct one and I suggested that if they proceeded with it, it was “socialist dishonesty”. I still believe that and I don’t see why I should withdraw it. I will do what you tell me now, I will leave the chamber and let the chamber decide.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! order!

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I have no alternative other than to place a motion before the legislature. It is not a matter of what the individual member believes, but I think it is a very important matter having in mind the decorum and the consistency of observing of parliamentary practices as to how members are allowed to express themselves. There are undoubtedly a great many members who feel keenly on certain things and at times would express themselves in unparliamentary ways if they were allowed to do so by the rules of the house. I believe, Sir, all of us will recall they are not rules which are established alone by this legislature, they are rules which have been established over a long, long period of parliamentary history. The Leader of the Opposition has seen fit not to withdraw what I consider to be extremely serious allegations with regard to the motives and the procedure and the integrity of this government, and on that I raised my original point of order.

The Chairman saw fit to ask him to withdraw, the Chairman of the committee and you, Sir, have also interpreted that way. I have no alternative then, Sir, except to move that

That the member from Morse be suspended for the remainder of this sitting day . . .

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! This motion is not a debatable motion. I'm sorry, it is not a debatable motion.

**An Hon. Member:** — We were told yesterday we needed a psychiatrist when we brought the same issue up . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! This is not a debatable motion. There are motions which are debatable and motions which are not debatable. This is not a debatable motion.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — If I leave the house it would be . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Do you have a written out motion to send up?

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . Walker said we needed a psychiatrist yesterday but that is all right. It's the same issue.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! It has been moved by Mr. Lloyd, seconded by Mr. Brockelbank:

That the member from Morse be suspended from the service of this house for the remainder of this sitting.

**March 27, 1963**

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, before the question is finally resolved, it is clear that “sitting” refers to this particular day.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, this sitting day.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas – 28**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Strum (Mrs.)	Berezowsky
Johnson	Meakes	Michayluk
Williams	Thurston	Semchuk
Brown	Davies	Thiessen
Blakeney	Nicholson	Snyder
Brockelbank	Turnbull	Stevens
Walker	Stone	Dahlman
Nollet	Whelan	Kluzak
Kuziak	Thibault	Peterson
		Brotten

**Nays – 17**

**Messieurs**

Klein	Cameron	Coderre
Batten (Mrs.)	McFarlane	MacDougall
McCarthy	Foley	Snedker
Barrie	Guy	Erb
McDonald	Boldt	Steuart
Danielson	Horsman	

The order of the day having been called for Committee of Supply:

**Mr. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, there was a man on his feet when you called Committee of Supply and you were in the chair. Are you going to deny him the right to speak?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! This is the day of government orders. We are not on orders of the day. There is no business before the house

It could not be properly brought at this time.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. He was on his feet when you were still sitting in the chair . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — He was out of order to be on his feet.

**Mrs. M.E. Batten (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it not the right of any member to get the attention of the Chair if he stands on his feet. If he is out of order then, of course, it is up to the Chair to tell him, but surely because it is government orders, the Premier doesn't have precedence over any other member. Every member has the same right to address the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The members have the right to, but there was no business before the house. If the member arose and said, Mr. Speaker on a point of privilege and raised a matter of something, then I would have been prepared to entertain it, but he stood on his feet and the Premier called for Committee of Supply.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word, I did not notice that the member was rising until I had called for Committee of Supply. I am not altogether certain how we can proceed since there is no business before the house, so to speak, before the full house, unless we go into one of the committees. I have no desire to prohibit the hon. member from asking a question if that is what he wanted to do. I don't know what he would be speaking of.

**Mrs. M. Batten:** — On the point of order, though I realize we are under strain, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to add to your difficulties but I think we should have a ruling on this. I was under the impression that – correct me if I'm wrong – any member, whichever member first stands up in this house, has the right to have the attention of Mr. Speaker. The Premier is in no better position than I am, or the hon. member from Cannington,

**March 27, 1963**

(Mr. McCarthy) that we are all exactly equal so far as the Speaker is concerned. Now we may be out of order but until we state our point the Speaker must recognize the member who first stands, and this is the member from Cannington, not the hon. Premier.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would agree that there is no business before the house officially after we disposed of the motion which was before us until the next order is called. But if any member should rise in his place and say, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, at least he would then have a chance to state what he was wishing to bring before the house. It may or may not be a correct point of privilege but at least he would give him the opportunity to get the Speaker's attention, but just to rise in his place without calling for a point of privilege when he has no other order before the house to speak on is very difficult for myself to be able to recognize the member unless there is business before the house. And if a member . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — Allow the member to state his point.

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . if the member wishes to rise on a point of privilege to say what he wishes to say, I have no knowledge what he wishes to say, I would be prepared to recognize him at this time.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I think we are enough confused now. Go ahead. The Assembly, according to order, resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

During consideration of the supplementary estimates Mr. Speaker was called to resume the Chair and the Chairman reported as follows:

**Mr. Johnson:** — In Committee of Supply, Mr. Coderre used the expression "fraudulent" in connection with certain activities of the government. I rule this unparliamentary and ask the member to withdraw, which he refused to do.



**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the hon. member prepared to withdraw the statement?

**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — May I speak on the question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You may explain your stand, as long as you don't enter the debate of estimates or the committee of supply. Just the point that is before us.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I said that the government were fraudulently handling public funds. Mr. Speaker, after checking other legislatures I find they had not used this procedure I believed that the fact that I accused the government of fraudulent handling of funds was sufficient reason for the government to prove that they have not handled the funds improperly. As far as I am concerned this is not the proper way of handling the finances of the province, and, therefore, I say that it is fraudulent handling. Now, as far as I am personally concerned this is fraudulent handling of the funds because it is not put in the proper place and I can't do anything else, and I don't think there is anything wrong with this statement, Mr. Speaker, it is no personal attack on anyone, except the procedure, and I say it is fraudulent handling of funds, I can't see anything wrong with it.

**Hon. J.R. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer):** — May I speak on a point of order. This is Beauchesne Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Second Edition, and there are many words and terms listed here as being unparliamentary. Dishonest – scandal – corrupt – (I'm not reading all of them, Sir, because I don't want to take that much time) – slander – that he is guilty of gross misrepresentations, and this type of term is definitely ruled out of order. I would suggest that the term “fraudulent” is just as strong, just as insulting a term to the house as many of the others.

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — They all fit.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

March 27, 1963

**Mrs. Batten:** — Public confession.

**Mr. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — May I suggest after a very searching and thorough review the hon. Provincial Treasurer has failed to prove that the word “fraudulent” was a term provided and that the member will have to retract the statement.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On a point of order, there is nothing suggested in Beauchesne that this is an exhaustive list of the words which are unparliamentary. I am sure that people with sufficiently evil motives can think of all kinds of words which haven't been used before in parliamentary journals, which would be a violation of the rules. The rules simply says it will be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference. These are merely examples, any word which is of this same level of odium . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — The Attorney General is an authority.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. lady probably grew up in a barn-yard, but could she . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I demand that he withdraw that statement and withdraw it now . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — On a point of order . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Attorney General said he withdraws that statement . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** — And did he apologize for it?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — He didn't say it on his feet.

**An Hon. Member:** — He's from a barnyard all right.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Oh, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to let this pass like this. Has he apologized for the statement that he made? I didn't hear it, if he did.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I heard the hon. Attorney General say that he withdrew that statement . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Was he on his feet?

**Mr. Speaker:** — He was on his feet.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, and all concerned, I suggest that he used most grossly improper language in this house and that he should apologize to the lady member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). In all sincerity I do. That was an awful thing to say about the lady.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. Attorney General withdrew the statement. If the hon. member for Humboldt is not satisfied with his withdrawal she has the right to say so herself, but he has withdrawn the statement . . .

March 27, 1963

**Mr. Snedker:** — He didn't have the guts to apologize.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't care what the hon. Attorney General said, I don't think he is a proper person to make any comment of this kind and it doesn't matter to me. If he feels that he can speak in an unparliamentary manner and insult the profession to which he belongs, as well as his status, that is quite all right, and we have had a lot of examples of it, Mr. Speaker. We haven't been sensitive on the point because we look at the scores and we don't get up and object. If the hon. member has suddenly become sensitive about non-parliamentary languages, certainly he is an authority on it because he has used almost every word that can be called unparliamentary.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members opposite would at least give the courtesy to the chair and to the house of being orderly while points of order are being discussed. I realize that the hon. lady was laughing and talking with her friend and neighbor and was being disorderly, but I have already apologized for making an unparliamentary reference to that. I would want to say that just because the word "fraudulent" does not appear in the lexicon of unparliamentary terms, this does not mean that it is not unparliamentary. The opening paragraph, citation 105, says it will be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary, and these examples are . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — And these, Mr. Speaker, are only examples, one has only to compare the odium of the word "fraudulent" with the other words here and if it is of corresponding odium then it is unparliamentary, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer has read some of these words, "villain" "impertinence" even the words "gross calumny" "impudence" "hypocrites" "Pharisees" "blackguard", these are the kind of words, Mr. Speaker, which are unparliamentary . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Don't give him ideas.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — And the word “fraudulent” connecting as it does a crime under the criminal code of Canada cannot help but be unparliamentary. One cannot with impunity attribute criminal actions to the members of the legislature or to the government or to the opposition, and escape having to withdraw it.

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may have a word. Might I point out to this house, that during the fall session on medicare, that it was suggested by a member of the opposition the government had “fraudulently collected taxes” which they did not, could not spend at that time, the wording of this charge was neither objected to by the government, nor was it required to be withdrawn.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — True, true.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think Beauchesne ruling makes it quite clear that those words are objectionable words. For further reference I would like to give to the members of the house, that in the Canadian House of Commons, 1960-61, on Hansard, page 878, the word “fraud” or “fraudulent” was used, which was objected to in the House of Commons and had to be withdrawn as unparliamentary. It is on page 878 of Hansard in 1960-61, in the Canadian House of Commons. I realize that members while discussing some of these matters before the house do let their tempers rise a little and I would ask the hon. member if he would withdraw that phrase, or word, because it is objectionable according to the Canadian House of Commons one of the words which had to be withdrawn in the House of Commons.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I am not trying to be stubborn, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is fraudulent handling of funds. I have checked the records, and I know that no legislature has used this kind of thing, I can't withdraw it. This is an accusation and I am prepared to go ahead and back it up. If we can have any procedure, any method that you can bring up into this house, to put them on trial for this type of handling, and I am prepared to back up this statement. I say it is fraud.

**March 27, 1963**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I cannot rule that that word is in order, because according to all the authorities which I have to go by, the word “fraud” or “fraudulent” has been ruled unparliamentary and must be withdrawn. I think that members can find other and better terms to express their feelings if they wish to, without using words which do create offence, and I would ask the hon. member to reconsider his stand and look for words which will express what he is hoping to say and withdraw the objectionable word.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Well, I could use the word “crook” or “crooked”. I am convince that I am right, this is the truth.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I can’t help whether you think you are right on this, it is a matter of rules which have been established for a long time, and I can only try to enforce the rules as laid down, and I would ask the hon. member to try to confine himself to the rules which are established in parliamentary procedure and to withdraw the objectionable word.

The ruling of this nature does not say that member cannot express himself, or deny him the right to charge that the government should be doing things in a different manner, but it must be phrased in a proper parliamentary term. It is not a matter of trying to refuse you the right to criticize the government or anything else, but it is the term which was used to express it, and for that reason I would ask you to withdraw the statement.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — My vocabulary, Mr. Speaker, is very limited, and that is the only word that I know. I am prepared to go back to my constituency on that word.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Can we have your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! My ruling is that this is unparliamentary and

March 27, 1963

must be withdrawn. I am asking the hon. member, I am trying to give him every opportunity, because I do not want to have to exercise the authority of the Chair on all occasions. I am asking members on their honor as a member of this legislature, on their honor as a representative of their constituency, to try and abide by parliamentary ruling, and I am asking them to withdraw the statement.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — If you are lecturing me . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am not lecturing anyone. I am making the statement in general for all members, and I am asking the hon. member to reconsider once again, and withdraw this statement. I am sure that there are other ways and means he can do it just as forcefully.

**Mr. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Most of us feel the same way as the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre).

**Mr. Speaker:** — I cannot help how you feel, it is what the rules say. I can't help your feelings, it is what the rules of the house say that I have to be governed by.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — May I request that you make your decision.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have made my decision that it is unparliamentary.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — Then proceed.

**Mr. Speaker:** — And I am asking him and giving him one more opportunity to withdraw it. Is the hon. member prepared to withdraw the statement.

**March 27, 1963**

**Mr. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, I know of no other word that can be used there.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Then you refuse to withdraw.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — I am convinced that I am right, Mr. Speaker, and I want to have it proved in the courts if I can.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, then I regret very much but the hon. member leaves me no alternative than to have to name the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre). A thing which I do with much regret but it leaves me no alternative because I have to enforce the rules of the house, so I hereby name the hon. member for Gravelbourg. The hon. member has the right to stand up and make a statement and then leave the chamber.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — I'll leave the chamber.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order. I don't think it calls for applause from any one member trying to get rules of the house settled.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — Our business.

**Premier Lloyd:** — It is my business. Mr. Speaker, again and indeed with very great regret I have no alternative it seems to me other than to move a similar motion to that which I had to move a while ago. And again I think all members of this legislature need to be reminded, need to remind ourselves,



that we are not discussing at this point matters of the policy of this government, or matters of the policy of any government; what we are discussing are some very basic rules, which it has been agreed by legislature and parliaments in many places, and over a long period of time, are essential if public discussions are to be carried out with proper and adequate effect. The second thing that we are discussing is the right of members to deny and deny absolutely, the ruling of the Speaker, after the Speaker has stated his opinion and has supported that opinion by long established rules and by happenings in other and in senior jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, then I feel that I have no alternative but to move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Brockelbank:

That the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), be suspended from the service of this house for the remainder of this day's sitting.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**Yeas – 26**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Thurston	Semchuk
Johnson	Davies	Thiessen
Brown	Nicholson	Snyder
Blakeney	Turnbull	Stevens
Brockelbank	Stone	Dahlman
Walker	Whelan	Kluzak
Nollet	Thibault	Peterson
Kuziak	Berezowsky	Broten
Meakes	Michayluk	

**Nays – 15**

**Messieurs**

Klein	Danielson	Horsman
Batten (Mrs.)	McFarlane	MacDougall
McCarthy	Foley	Snedker
Barrie	Guy	Erb
McDonald	Boldt	Steuart

The Assembly, according to order, again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to revert or even to refer to any of the discussions of the house this morning. I think it is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the house has suffered some injury that will take some time to recover from that injury. I have very real doubts in what I sense

**March 27, 1963**

to be the mood as to whether or not we would be advised to continue this afternoon in an attempt to transact further public business without incurring some possibility of further injury, as I have called it, since we did this morning.

I have cognizance also of the fact that the opposition is denied the services of the Leader of the Opposition and one of the members this afternoon, and consequently I would move that the house now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas – 25**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Meakes	Berezowsky
Johnson	Thurston	Semchuk
Brown	Wood	Thiessen
Blakeney	Davies	Snyder
Walker	Nicholson	Stevens
Nollet	Stone	Dahlman
Kuziak	Whelan	Peterson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Thibault	Brotten
Strum (Mrs.)		

**Nays – 15**

**Messieurs**

Klein	Danielson	Boldt
Batten (Mrs.)	Cameron	Horsman
McCarthy	McFarlane	MacDougall
Barrie	Foley	Snedker
McDonald	Guy	Steuart

The Assembly adjourned at 2:36 o'clock p.m.