

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

November 17, 1977.

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

QUESTIONS

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Many of us have been following with interest the Premier's speaking engagements in eastern Canada where he is talking about national unity and, indeed, I think it is fair to say that many of his comments on those speaking engagements have been well taken and others have not been and I will be dealing with that at a later date. But I wonder if the Premier would agree with me that in addition to stating quite properly the position of the government of Saskatchewan and your party to the rest of the people of Canada that it is also your duty as Premier to undertake a system of education of the people of Saskatchewan and to indicate to them the implications that would arise and affect this province if Quebec did separate at a later date, that indeed you have a duty to bring about an understanding by the people of Saskatchewan to appreciate all of these implications that are involved. Would the Premier be prepared to do something along those lines in addition to making speeches in eastern Canada and out of this province?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct in saying I have made a good number of speeches, many of them outside this province but many of them inside this province. In the last two weeks or so I have made a submission to the Task Force on unity which sets out in a relatively comprehensive way the views of the government. I have spoken to a university women's group in Regina. I have spoken to other groups, to a combined service club group in Swift Current. I think those would be the last two week's offerings as well as some comments during political speeches which I will not detail to hon. members — speeches to political groups.

Yes, I acknowledge the obligation to attempt to advise the people of Saskatchewan of what the issues are and what the implications of separation might be in a general way, so far as I know them and what things may be necessary in order to preserve Canada strong and united. I think that this is not an obligation which devolves only on the government of Saskatchewan but devolves on every member of this Legislature who is able in his capacity to speak out and to say what he believes ought to be done, and to say what he believes the consequences either of separation or of a renewed Confederation would be. I know that some have attempted to dodge this responsibility by calling for plebiscites or referendums or the like. Nonetheless, I think this is unsatisfactory and I think the time has come for all hon. members to stand up and say where they stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of those statements, I wonder if the Premier would be prepared to join with me and the member for Nipawin if he should be willing on a non-partisan basis to go around this province between the time that this session adjourns and the next session in the spring commences and talk about national unity and explain again on a non-partisan basis to the people of Saskatchewan what really is involved and what the implications are. I believe very

strongly that this issue transcends political in-fighting. In order to get away from that I would suggest to the Premier that it would enhance the images of political parties and of politicians if we could get together on a non-partisan basis, go across this province and explain to the people of Saskatchewan all of the implications that are involved. They would then have a better understanding of the situation and be able to react to it not out of emotion but out of intelligence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I am intrigued by the hon. member's suggestion and I do not reject it out of hand. I invite all hon. members to look at my contributions to this debate and see whether or not they can find anything of a very highly partisan nature in them. I believe they might equally have been addressed to their respective audiences by a member of any political party in western Canada. They have a western Canadian bias but that would be expected because I attempt to represent the views that I believe are held by people across this province. I agree with the hon. member that the views held across this province — there are differences of views but the splits do not come along party lines. This is not a party issue in our province.

I would like to think that perhaps we could do more if all three of us were out there individually, since we could cover three points rather than one in speaking equally impartially, speaking in a way in which our speeches would be, at least in part, interchangeable. I am not sure this would happen. I would have some fears that a joint meeting might be used for partisan purposes by one or other of us (and I do not exclude myself). You can see that this would do substantial damage to the cause of national unity. I can see in instances where I think our basic institutions have been brought into question for what I would have called partisan purposes. There may well be other instances in the future and perhaps in the near future.

MR. MALONE: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am prepared to give such an undertaking to the Premier that there would be no partisanship shown by this party or myself in such an arrangement, providing he gets the same undertaking from the member for Nipawin. Would he be prepared to consider arranging such a tour of this province at the time that I suggested, so that we can appear on a non-partisan basis to discuss this issue rationally and by so doing create a better understanding within the people of Saskatchewan as to the issues?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to consider this with the other leaders. I know members opposite will not think I am being unduly punctilious if I suggest that any agreement that we have on this ought to be in writing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier. I can understand why the Leader of the Liberal Party needs help to get crowds and doesn't want to go out alone, but my question is: It is a matter which was raised in the last session, and that is the capability of the province to make an economic assessment of the implications of separation. You indicated in your reply, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Liberal Party, that we should be able to talk to the people about the implications and the general consequences of the separation of Quebec. Do we have an agency in government, or do we have individuals who have now been delegated or given the responsibility of doing an economic assessment, an economic impact, or a social impact of separation, and if so can you give us the name of those individuals, and

it not, is the government considering the establishment of such a body?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the group which would do this in its narrow economic aspects with the Planning and Research Branch of Executive Council. I think the amount of work that has been done to date will be relatively minimal. I think that the reason for that is rather clear in that it is rather difficult to do economic analysis unless you know what the proposition is. We have done some summary work and I concede it to be summary on Sovereignty Association, and reached the conclusion that with respect of that our level of trade with Quebec was such that we ought not to be called upon in order to preserve that trade within a common tariff to continue what we think are the disadvantages of a common tariff. I accordingly have in April last expressed the view that Saskatchewan would not be in agreement with the Sovereignty Association proposition if it involved a common tariff (I had to define that since Mr. Levesque had not). That view has now been exceeded to as agreed to by the premiers of Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia, so far as their province is concerned, and my understanding is that Premier Davis has said substantially the same thing. I have not examined his statement. I joined with the other three western premiers so I know what they said.

With respect to straight separation, some of our preliminary work will be useful in assessing that. The key questions there are questions with regard to transportation corridors; whether or not there would be free movement of Saskatchewan produced goods to the Atlantic through the St. Lawrence Seaway and the rest and through the railway system in the winter. I am afraid one can only speculate on what the arrangements with respect to separation would be. We can obviously make some studies based upon speculations. I think that people should understand that they will be very far from definitive.

MR. LANE: — Final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will take the member for Nipawin.

COST PRICE SQUEEZE

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I address this question to the Premier. In view of the cost price squeeze being faced by actually everyone in the province of Saskatchewan, but most especially our agricultural community, farmers and ranchers, and in view of the anticipated slow-down in Saskatchewan economy this winter as a result of poor agricultural products, will your government bring down a mini-budget in this fall session of the Legislature to first of all alleviate the immediate cash problems facing smaller farmers and ranchers; secondly, to alleviate the immediate cash problems for the small businessman; and third, to stimulate the economy through a winter works program?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we did not have in mind bringing at this Session any such proposal for massive government intervention in the economy.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. At the very least will you instruct Sask Power and Sask Tel to reduce their rates to alleviate the burden on farmers and small businessmen over these winter months when they are going to be facing a very serious problem, and the senior citizens, and furthermore by reducing those rates thereby in a minimal way stimulating the economy?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Sask Tel, I think it is simply not credible to suggest that a small decrease in telephone rates is going to provide any significant measure of relief to anybody. With respect to Sask Power, while the sums involved will necessarily be larger, we continue to adhere to the belief that the corporations ought to operate on a generally break even basis, and that they ought not to be used as a method of significant social subsidization. If there are people in the community who need additional assistance from the government, that makes sense that they ought to be provided with that. It is our view that this ought not to be provided primarily by below cost power, or below cost telephone, or below cost insurance services, or other services rendered by Crown corporations. We fear very much that if this were done, then the many, many critics of Crown corporations in the community would simply mount arguments based upon their being run in a bad business way, and I've heard those sorts of arguments. On that basis, these very people who are calling for cuts in rates would in the next breath, call for the private ownership of those corporations as they are calling for the private ownership of other Crown corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Would the Premier not agree that both Sask Power and Sask Tel made significant and substantial so-called profits last year, and further that they are budgeted to make so-called profits this year which are in effect, taxation of those people in accordance with how they use the utilities, and would the Premier not agree that a reduction in rates by at least the amount of the anticipated profit in those organizations, would in a very small measure, and I agree, a small measure, assist the farmers and small business men, and senior citizens in our province who are so dramatically hurt by the tremendous increase in rates in those two organizations? Furthermore, would the Premier not agree that that would, in a small way, stimulate the economy over the winter months, since the use of gas, especially for heating homes, is primarily used in the farms and the homes and small businesses in the winter months?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think a number of points should be made. It is true that each of the corporations is budgeting for a small profit. With respect to telephones, the profit is almost totally derived from the carriage of long distance calls, and the great bulk of it is derived from the carriage of long distance calls which neither originate or terminate in our province. We haul a good deal of long distance calls and accordingly we do not make very much profit at all on the delivery of domestic telephone or residential telephone services, — very little indeed, and comparatively little with respect to in-province long distance calls. We are in the happy position of being able to charge for our long distance rates, the amounts charged by other utilities across Canada, and on that if we charged the Bell rates for long distance, we can't help but make money on long distance. We don't charge the Bell rates, or the private enterprise rates that are charged in Ontario or British Columbia, on domestic services, and accordingly we don't make those profits. We operate that utility with respect to domestic service primarily on a break-even, and with respect to its long distance service, on a profit basis. Excuse me, I come to power and gas.

With respect to natural gas, I'm surprised that the honorable member would suggest that we ought to encourage the additional use . . . I didn't think that the question was worthy of a lengthy answer either, so let me say two quick things. It is simply false to say that we make a large profit on power. Not true; false. With respect to electric power, a simple reading of the financial statement will show that that is not true. the last year's annual report will show that it is not true. With respect to natural gas, some profit has been made. We have distributed natural gas at a profit. I suspect that natural gas rates

will be controlled in the future, and I suspect that those profits will not be repeating themselves. It is clearly difficult to predict with precision how much natural gas you are going to sell, but the burgeoning economy and the large consumption by industrial users has indeed meant that we have produced a profit. We don't know whether this will continue because of the difficulty with the economy in the rest of Canada.

MR. MALONE: — In view of the Premier's reply to

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Could I hear the member's point of order?

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, are you recognizing the member for Regina Lakeview, or are you recognizing me?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

Could I hear the member's point of order?

MR. COLLVER: — If you are recognizing the member for Regina Lakeview or myself for a final supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take the member for Regina Lakeview for a final supplementary.

MR. MALONE: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, in view of your answer to the member for Nipawin's question about no mini-budget at this Session, and in view of the complete silence in the Speech from the Throne as to any methods or anything at all to do with the economy, I'm wondering if the Premier would be prepared to advise this House when he expects the Budget to be brought in, and also give consideration to bringing a budget in, not in March of next year, or February, but in January of next year, to deal with the economy and to have substantial tax cuts to bolster the sagging economy of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think we perhaps do not have the same measure of pessimism about the Saskatchewan economy as members opposite. We do not have to suffer the rates of unemployment or the rates of industrial stagnation that are being suffered in other provinces of Canada and essentially ourselves and Alberta have been sheltered. We are not saying we can be continued to be sheltered, but we think that the situation is not such as to call for extraordinary measures calling for mini budgets, something which I think has not happened in the history of Saskatchewan. We believe that the economy will proceed in a way which will be, in general compared with other provinces, satisfactory until the Budget is introduced during the second portion of this Session.

AMOK ENQUIRY

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — I should like to direct this question to the Minister of the Environment. I wonder if the government knowing full well, Mr. Speaker, that it will more than take all the question period for the first . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Would the minister comment on the fact now known by opponents of the AMOK Enquiry, that the government ask the AMOK Enquiry not to bring down its report before the NDP Convention which starts this weekend because they anticipated that they go ahead which the government has rigged by deliberately delaying the groups that were opponents to AMOK, and by underfunding the groups who were opponents of AMOK, that the government knew the results, knew there would be a go ahead and, one, asked the Enquiry to bring in the report after the NDP Convention and secondly, (I am drawing to the end, I think another 12 seconds Mr. Speaker will handle it) ask the Enquiry at the request of AMOK to bring in its report before the sixth of December because AMOK said that they would lose their ability to construct a road this year if the report were not in by that time.

BAYDA COMMISSION

HON. N.E. BYERS (Kelvington-Wadena): — With respect to the time reporting, Mr. Speaker, when the Bayda Commission was established in January, 1976, the government indicated that they would like a report around November 1, however, there was some flexibility permitted here. The Bayda Commission had not set up their work program at that time, and they did set up an enquiry that had six phases, the final phase being the public hearings which I think are one of the most extensive that have ever been held in this province to cover both northern communities in Saskatchewan and the South and therefore, it became clear that as the final phase of the hearings was covering so many communities and taking so much time, it was simply not possible for the Commission to report by November 1.

STATEMENTS

DAILY HANSARD

MR. SPEAKER: — I have two statements I wish to make at this time. I would like to

advise all hon. members that the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan now will have a daily Hansard.

Formerly, the debates were transcribed within 24 hours but the edited final copy was not published until several months after prorogation. This system produced an historic record but was of limited current value to members, public servants and the public in general.

On November 22, 1976, the Legislative Assembly agreed to the principle of implementing a daily Hansard by the fall of 1977. New equipment has been purchased and new systems implemented so that the debates and proceedings can be published within approximately 24 hours after the debate in the Assembly. The debates of one afternoon will be on the member's desk by 2 p.m. of the next afternoon. The debates of that evening will be on the member's desk by the next evening. The members and the public will now be able to follow the proceedings of the Assembly on a daily basis.

This new system will mean that there will be some changes for the members as well. Members will no longer be requested to edit their own transcribed speeches. The Hansard Editors will edit all of the debates for spelling, punctuation and grammar. It must be remembered that due to the new time constraints the Hansard Editors will not be, "polishing" the speeches as much. The debates and proceedings will now be much closer to the direct verbatim record than ever before.

Any member upon seeing an error, any errors, or misquotations in the debates may rise or may raise the correction in the Assembly before the Orders of the Day. Such a correction will then appear in the debates for that day. Since the debates will be delivered to the hon. members' desks and offices on a daily basis, I remind all members to keep these published copies as there will be no longer any special bound copies of the debates at the end of the session.

POLITICAL ARRANGEMENT – ALLOCATING OF SEATS IN THE ASSEMBLY.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yesterday in my office at 2:45 p.m. I received a letter over the signature of the member for Souris-Cannington.

Of concern to myself and the Speaker's office were references to a political arrangement made between two political parties with the knowledge and approval of the Speaker and the Speaker's office to deprive a third party of its parliamentary rights. Specifically in paragraph four:

The deal obviously made by the majority NDP Party with the Liberal Party has now been extended to the Legislative Assembly.

And further in paragraph five:

We have now been provided with a typed floor plan indicating that as part of the apparent deal between the NDP and the Liberals, the Liberal caucus has been allocated those seats in the Legislative Assembly which should be allocated to the Progressive Conservative caucus.

Due to the equality of numbers of members in the opposition parties and in the absence of practice or precedent, I have arranged and held meetings with high representatives from each political party in an attempt to determine the fairest path to follow.

November 17, 1977

Those meetings held on October 21st, 1977, and November 15th, 1977 were supplemented by further meetings with the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the Deputy Premier and House Leader and a telephone conversation with the Leader of the Liberal Party.

I categorically deny that any deals were made with my approval.

I clearly understood, as a result of the meetings held, that no agreements of any type were obtained.

The seating plan in the Legislature is established by the well-known practice of parties making their nominations known to the Speaker. In the event of conflicting views the final decision is made by the Speaker.

While it is unnecessary for me to give my reasons for the final seating plan we have here today, I will say that I view the seating to be secondary to the equal treatment which I hope to provide to the Leaders of both Opposition parties.

I refer all hon. members to May's Parliamentary Practice, 18th Edition, page 157 which states as follows:

Alleged breaches of privileges or contempts committed out of the House or in the precincts of the House but not in its actual view may be brought to the notice of the House (1) by a complaint from a member, (2) by a communication from the Speaker, and (3) by a petition, or (4) by a report from a committee.

The letter, in my opinion, implies that I, as Speaker of this Assembly, have been part of certain deals made between other members and parties in the Legislative Assembly regarding proceedings about to take place in the Assembly.

I hereby communicate to this Assembly that in my opinion this matter constitutes a prima facie case of a breach of privilege. It is not my function to decide the question of substance whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed and I therefore leave the matter in the hands of the Assembly to deal with as it sees fit.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. Mr. Speaker, you have dealt with the effect of the letter referred to by the Member for Souris-Cannington and its effect upon you yourself. I rise to bring up a matter of privilege to all members of the Assembly and I would like to move a motion at the conclusion of my remarks in relation to privilege. I will read that motion now and move it at the end of my remarks.

That a letter of November 16, 1977 to the Speaker of the Assembly from Mr. Eric Berntson, MLA Souris-Cannington be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to determine whether the allegations contained therein breach the privileges of any members and if so what action ought to be taken in respect thereof.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to move that at the conclusion of my remarks. As you know, a motion of privilege does not require notice.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain first of all very briefly the reason for the motion.

Rarely, Mr. Speaker, have I seen a deliberate attack on the integrity of members of the Assembly as is contained in the letter referred to by Mr. Speaker. Rarely have I seen a letter delivered to the press, and allegations made without an opportunity to enquire or without any proof laid on the table. By going to the Select Standing Committee on Elections and Privileges, members will be under oath, be required to demonstrate the cause and the reasons and the proof of those allegations. The Leader of the Conservative Party, the Leader of the Liberal Party, the Attorney General and all members under oath will be questioned as to whether any prior deals, discussions, arrangements have been made.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I have been lectured publicly in the press by the Leader of the Conservative Party about the decorum in the Legislature, about the honor and the dignity of the Assembly. Then, Mr. Speaker, in the next breath the Conservative Party starts this Assembly off with a lie. They lied last year to start off this Assembly and they are lying again this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, when I say a lie, I mean a lie. I think this is the Eighteenth Session of the Assembly that I have sat in and to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I would make an arrangement with that political party is an insult to me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — I neither agree with their philosophy nor their actions and I have dedicated some 25 years of my life in battling them.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has been the opposition in this Assembly and the government of this province because they opposed all that the NDP and the Socialists have stood for in this province since 1944. We have done so proudly. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in this session the potash debate was a good demonstration of the hostility and the opposition of free independent liberally minded people in this province to the actions of that government. Any suggestion of an arrangement or a deal is enough to really disturb me.

I want to talk about deals, Mr. Speaker. In this letter he says that “Progressive Conservatives by popular choice of the people of Saskatchewan are the opposition.” Mr. Speaker, I want to tell him that the only reason that they’re equal numbers is because of a deal that they made with two Liberal members.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the sell out by those two members of their constituents and their electors they wouldn’t be equal here. I also want to say that the one member who signed this letter was one of those members, with the Leader of the Conservative Party, that has gone to visit members of the Liberal caucus and offered them a deal. I challenge the member for Souris-Cannington to deny that he hasn’t visited or that the leader hasn’t visited members and asked them to sell out their constituents, to sell out their voters and join their party!

Mr. Speaker, the members here are willing to give chapter and verse. That is the reason that today there are equal members in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, what really bothers me about this whole thing, what really bothers me is that it’s like a sulking child among sulking children. The Leader of the Conservative

November 17, 1977

Party wants to be the official opposition so bad that he doesn't want to wait for the people of Saskatchewan to make that decision; he doesn't want to do anything. He spends and devotes his time, Mr. Speaker, to attacking the Liberal Party instead of attacking the government and providing reasonable alternatives to the day. Listen to him laugh. Oh! Now there is a little decorum here. Don't laugh or chuckle.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this letter is a lie. I want to say that no member of the Liberal Party, including the leader, had any prior discussions with the Speaker, or with the NDP, or with the Conservatives, before the meetings called by Mr. Speaker to decide on the operation of the Assembly with two equal composition parties. The Leader of the Liberal Party went there without even a knowledge of what the agenda was. When the meeting was concluded he did not speak with anyone or any of the other political parties about the subject therein.

He then did not speak, on the second meeting held two days ago, the Leader of the Liberal Party did not speak to either the members of the Conservatives or of the NDP, nor about the operation of the Assembly itself, but left the decision to the Speaker, where it rightfully belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I think, and I challenge members of the Conservative Party to substantiate those kinds of charges and those kinds of allegations. First of all about the Speaker, because what they have really said is that this whole Assembly is a farce; that the Speaker is part and parcel to a dirty, rotten deal. That's what they have really said.

Mr. Chairman, I challenge the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) to stand on his feet and tell exactly what he is referring to in that letter. I hope that every member of this Assembly will vote for this motion, so that we can stand under oath the member for Souris-Cannington and ask him to explain the reason and the cause there is of this letter.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have an opportunity to wind up the debate, and I am really looking forward to responding once again to the suggestions and comments of the members from the Conservative Party. I want to hear all party members from all parties speak on this particular resolution, because if the Leader of the Conservative Party wants to talk about decorum and dignity of this Assembly, then he had better stop making false and deliberate accusations against the honor and the integrity of members of this Assembly and of Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, as I say, I will have an opportunity at the conclusion to wind up the debate. I want to hear the participation of all members and most important of all I want to hear the participation of the member for Souris-Cannington. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I so move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I have a point of order.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to me that the accusations which have been made against the Liberals and the NDP in this House have been made by one member. And surely that one member, who no doubt had a lawyer prepare that statement, can't now come before the House and have someone who wishes he were a

lawyer defend him on that statement. We should be hearing from the member for Souris-Cannington.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think I can handle this one without further consultation with lawyers or without. I think the point of order is not a valid point of order and the member for Souris-Cannington has the right to speak at any time. Order! The member for Souris-Cannington has the right to speak or not to speak as he sees fit. I think the member for Wascana was issuing a debating point rather than a point of order.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Speaking on a point of order, having just made the rule that the member for Regina Wascana was speaking on a debating point, you have therefore ruled that he has participated in this debate and has no further right to participate.

MR. SPEAKER: — If the member for Qu'Appelle wants a ruling on it, I will say that the point of order was a fallacious point of order and consequently is not accepted by the Chair, and I will accept whoever the next debater is.

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, this is a brand new session of this Legislature. I was very interested indeed this morning to listen to the Liberal party hoping to gain something new which they haven't had for some time and are not about to have for some time. This initially began with a letter which came under the signature of the member for Souris-Cannington on behalf of the PC caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you of the occasion last year, one of the few occasions, when I stood in this Assembly on a point of order during the question period. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will remember that particular case. At that particular time, Mr. Speaker, arising on the point of order, I suggested that anyone in the galleries, and certainly to the ladies and gentlemen of the press, it was very obvious that that particular question period sounded like a rehearsal. At that time nor do I know now, Mr. Speaker, insinuate in any way your position or you as an individual in this play-acting that is bound to take place in this session.

I want to tell you Mr. Speaker, that after that particular event, the play-acting stopped in this House and everybody in this House knew that it had stopped. If you take a look at the question period today, Mr. Speaker, we have again the same situation again taking place. All the members opposite like to yell Order!, because it is very clear, not only to them Mr. Speaker, but it's very clear to the people of Saskatchewan that the life of the party opposite depends entirely upon keeping that party healthy. Everybody in this province knows that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not one to be involved and you know that, so do the members here, so do the members opposite, when once again we are all involved in chintzy little affairs in this House. I have not been involved in chintzy little affairs, nor will I at this time. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to sit in this caucus and have the government sitting there, and I can assure members opposite that the only way that I would be sitting there would be in a coffin.

You know, speaking about deals, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members have mentioned about deals, enjoining members of his caucus, I suspect that there is more than one

person in this House who can be talking about deals, that Liberals have attempted to make in this House as well.

MR. MALONE: — Shut up!

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Speaker, I resent the Leader of the Liberal Party yelling out at me at this particular time to shut up. I think I have a right, Mr. Speaker, to speak on this motion and I think a statement like that is not befitting a leader of a political party and I think, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party would perhaps feel a little regretful of that a little later on.

Mr. Speaker, as this session commences, we have been assured, and I as an individual, and the caucus here, are greatly disturbed by the fact that the decisions and the actions of this House may definitely effect the status of the Progressive Conservatives' caucus. There is no question about it. The member who has moved this motion claims that because two members defected from his party, or that particular party, then therefore they should not be legally counted in this House. That's what he said, Mr. Speaker. Exactly what he said. In his one breath what he is insinuating that perhaps they shouldn't even be considered as members of the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the member for Qu'Appelle really meant that particular statement. Mr. Speaker, no official opposition exists, as I understand the ruling, no official opposition exists, simply because of numbers. And I think that I am correct in stating that to this House. My party has not cried for official opposition status. That is what we are asking for Mr. Speaker, that there should be a general equality not only as it exists in the number of seats, but . . .

MR. MESSER: — Read the letter.

MR. BAILEY: — I read the letter, I read the letter carefully this morning. In the strictest sense, Mr. Speaker, it becomes very clear that if you look at the number of so called inner party agreements, personally, we're not arguing over the seating, we could have argued at this particular time, yesterday could have been the time to argue over whose to sit in the official opposition seats. But, Mr. Speaker, let's look at this. Surely there should be some consideration of the fact that we are in fact 11 members in each caucus. If you look at this, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition allows opposites, still belongs to the Liberal party, the Conservative party is up on the third floor. Fine, fine.

The first question, and that's very important Mr. Speaker, as we saw today in the some 25 minutes, approximately 15 ½ minutes which I kept track of, belonged to the Liberal party. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker perhaps we should remind the Assembly and remind everyone here, that when the member for Wascana rose to insist, to insist that it should be the member for Souris-Cannington should speak at this time, what he is trying to do Mr. Speaker, is to prove to this Assembly that members of this caucus are not honorable people. He is trying to say to which the leader of the Liberal party agrees. What he is trying to say is that members of this caucus are not deserving of being MLAs. That's an insult to the people and he is referring to myself, that's an insult to the people of Rosetown-Elrose constituency and I am very proud to represent them.

Now Mr. Speaker, if this continues in this particular session, that we are still going to be considered as the third party in this House, as obviously we are, Mr. Speaker, then I think the people of Saskatchewan are truly going to say that there has been unfair treatment because of the equal status within this House.

Look at it, Mr. Speaker. The seating position for to the Speaker in the Assembly has been left the Liberals, same numbers, same numbers as the Conservatives. As I understand it, the first to reply to the Speech from the Throne, will go where - to the Liberals. I understand that there will be no decision as to who will be Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, that traditionally falls to the Liberals. I can see by today, Mr. Speaker, that when we come to the most lively part of it, of today's discussion, which is the question period, that the first question of the day is going to go to the Liberals. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's incumbent I think upon this House, and everybody here, that we will in fact have something then. The whip's office opposite, of course, goes to the Liberals as I mentioned earlier. The lounge goes to the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, I believe that at this particular time, that there's a case in point to be had when opposition parties are of equal numbers. Even, Mr. Speaker, being able to watch the situation in the debate as televised in the House of Commons, the third party in the House of Commons today, is receiving more recognition at the present, it certainly would appear to me at least, that we are at the present time here. Now the Liberals, of course, Mr. Speaker, complain that the position that they are in at the present time, is because two members have left them. What they didn't say to this House, and what they didn't say to the press is, that because of their faltering position, they lost two former seats that they had. I didn't hear anybody make mention of that. Where are Saskatoon-Sutherland representatives, and where is Prince Albert-Duck Lake? They didn't mention that. I would suspect that we now have before us, Mr. Speaker, that two more members of the Liberal caucus have declared their intentions that they too will be leaving. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not criticizing them for doing so — not at all; they are very worthy men to be seeking federal nominations. No way will I dispute that, but I think that on those grounds, let's not blame the Conservatives for making some kinds of deals to put them into equal status positions we are in. Mr. Speaker, all we are asking for, all this caucus is asking for at the present time, is that we no longer be treated in this Assembly as the third party in this House, that we have treatment of an equal nature with the honorable members to my right, the Liberal Party. I think it is becoming to this House, in the stature of the high place that this Legislative Assembly holds in my mind, that we should in fact be recognized in all ways as an equal with the members to my right.

Now I'm not saying, Mr. Speaker, that at all times it is possible to do that particular thing, but I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come in this Assembly that we should be treated as equals, that we should no longer be considered as the third party, and Mr. Speaker, I fail to see that at any time we in this party have made any accusations that you have been involved in any deal whatsoever. You reassured us that you hadn't, and we knew from the beginning that you had not been involved, but it is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the point has to be settled now, once and for all before this Session starts, that we will be third party no longer in the Legislature. I hope that all members of the House will recognize that; I hope that the government opposite will recognize that, and I hope that the Liberal Party will also recognize that. If they want to measure up as they say, or be told to shut up when you're speaking, Mr. Speaker, it gives you some indication of the very nervous position that they are in at the present time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — I just briefly would like to table a copy of the letter which I received in my office. I have the original in my office and this is a photocopy of it taken yesterday, and I have two or three extra copies of the statement which I just made. I would remind the members, when conducting this debate, to stay within the terms of the motion, namely the letter or its contents to which it refers, and not start for example, discussing some other committee of the House which is not operating at this point, or is not the subject of discussion at this time.

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — I am waiting for the Liberals to join in with the hooting and hollering from there because what is said in the letter in terms of the NDP's and Liberals' dealing has become obvious to everyone in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It's not only obvious to members of the House and people who sit up in the galleries, it's obvious to everyone in Saskatchewan. I speak from experience; I saw a deal happen here last year. I saw that deal. And, Mr. Speaker, I read that letter and I tell you now, Mr. Speaker, I go on record for what it's worth, that I concur with its contents. I say, Mr. Speaker, and I ask any of those people sitting opposite or their friends here to our immediate right, to show us one place in that letter where it says that Mr. Speaker concurred in the deal. What it said was, that after numerous meetings and no agreement could be reached, the implication was obvious that Mr. Speaker had not come to a decision on this. Only today was the first time we heard Mr. Speaker talking about what sorts of decisions he was going to be making in the House. It became obvious then, that the matter had been left to the NDP and their colleagues to my right, and that they had made a deal, and I see that deal happening now. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't ever, and I don't intend to and I hope you don't construe the comment because that is not the way the comment is to be construed. I never challenged the Speaker. I never indicated nor has any member of our caucus indicated that the Speaker was involved in a deal, but I tell you that the members of this press are certainly going to question the fortuitousness of the motion from the Liberal member, Mr. MacDonald. He just happened to have a motion ready, and I ask the members of the press if they think that it was fortuitous, and I make no reference to the Speaker. We have not, and the letter did not say, that the Speaker was involved in a deal.

MR. LANE: — Well had you discussed it with Mr. MacDonald? I ask the honorable Attorney General.

SOME HON. MEMBER: — No.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, the seating arrangement in the House where our wives sit, where the Liberal wives were asked to sit, and our wives were shoved in a corner yesterday, and where the Leader of the Opposition parks, and who has the whip's office, and who gets the first question, and who leads off in the Throne Speech Debate, and where the two respective opposition parties sit — these are all chintzy little matters but added into one, it is a design we say, by the NDP, to prop up an ailing Liberal Party, and make it look to members of the press that they are the official opposition when in fact, the people of Saskatchewan have clearly said in Saskatoon Sutherland where the Liberals came in second, in Prince Albert-Duck Lake where the Liberals came in third, in Pelly where the Liberals came in third, that they have lost all confidence in the Liberal Party, and in addition to that, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have two other members who saw the failings of the Liberal Party; who saw that they were no longer relevant and have joined our caucus, and we welcomed them. We welcomed them both, and in addition to that we have now, and this is the point that we wish to make, Mr. Speaker, why we claim to have official opposition status, or at least be treated fairly in the confines of this House. We have two members now in the Liberal caucus who have sought and won the nomination for their parties in a federal riding. Now what possible reason could they have to sit in these Chambers except that they still want money, and that they want to use these Chambers as a sounding board to kick off their federal election campaign? Money and publicity. We heard the member for Wascana say from his own lips last year, "Of course the only reason I'm here is to get press". We heard you say that. You're not going to deny that surely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Rosthern with his memory will remind you. Now, Mr. Speaker, I tell you and I challenge those people over there instead of heckling to rise to their feet and to indicate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the honorable member is suggesting that I sit here as a member for the reasons of money and publicity, and Mr. Speaker will recognize that I'm sure, a matter of privilege, and I would ask the member who made the remark to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! If I could have a moment please.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): —I, in fact, took the view that it was such a shallow and stupid statement — well, shallow and stupid is a complimentary way to comment on that kind of vilification that I didn't think it was the sort of thing that I would even glorify by rising to make a comment upon it. I think the member well knows the motivation of — I believe all members in this House, is to serve the people of Saskatchewan and I too ask that the member be required to withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

I would think that what the member is doing when he rises, the member for Regina South, is denying the allegation which is being made about him by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, and I think it is not proper for members to make allegations against other hon. members. That is the rule under which this House is supposed to operate, and I would caution the member about making remarks of that nature.

Further to that point, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland suggested that members were not being treated fairly in the House, and since I have a hand in treating members of the House, I look upon that as a reflection. His citation was that two members are sitting in this House, and consequently I am not treating some other members fairly. I would just take this opportunity to remind the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, while the departure of two members of this House into another jurisdiction of politics may be imminent, it has the same degree of immanency as the member for Nipawin becoming the Leader of the Opposition, so I don't think there is a point of debate there. I think it's a reflection to suggest that because that because they are going to depart, I should somehow treat the members differently.

I would ask the member to continue his remarks.

MR. LANE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might, I was on my feet to speak to this point.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is the point?

MR. MERCHANT: — Is Mr. Speaker not going to ask the hon. member to withdraw a comment made about two hon. members which draws the motives of all hon. members of this House into disrespect?

MR. SPEAKER: — I have cautioned the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) to modify his remarks to the extent that he is not making allegations about other hon.

members. I think that is understood that he is in that position now, that he should not be making allegations about any members in the House, because he has to accept the members' word of why they are here, and not question that word unless he has substantial evidence to the contrary.

MR. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, in terms of what you say about it reflecting yourself, if that was the implication I regret that it was, because it certainly had not indicated that you were dealing unfairly. I had indicated that there was an apparent appearance at times of unfairness . . . certainly we bring it before Mr. Speaker. Now in terms of the two members that I referred to. I believe I said what possible motivation could they have for sitting here other than two things. Now these members, Mr. Speaker, sit here and say the most disgusting things about the Conservatives, in company with their friends across. They say thieves, liars, crooks, perverts. They say all these things, and yet they are so sensitive when somebody comes close to home over there, Mr. Speaker. I am surprised. I think the term of their fearless leader in Ottawa "cry babies" can aptly be applied, Mr. Speaker, to them right here.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! It would appear to me that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland is now putting words in the mouths of the two hon. members to whom he referred, about the Conservative Party, and I need not repeat all of those words but it started out with thieves. He is saying that those members have said that. Now that is definitely a point of privilege, and had those members said that, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland should have risen on his feet immediately and said that the member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron), or the member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant), or whoever, was questioning the member's privilege in this House of being regarded as an hon. member. I didn't hear them say that today. Consequently I didn't hear the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland rise and challenge them. So I think the member has no right to put words in other members' mouths.

MR. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — The point that I was simply trying to make was that the member for Regina Wascana was nominated by the Liberal Party to contest the next federal election. He was nominated on November 9, 1977, and is in fact now campaigning for federal office. And the member for Regina South was nominated by the Liberal Party to contest the next federal election on November 3, 1977, and so in fact is now also campaigning for federal office. I say that these two members owe a duty to the constituents of their respective seats to resign immediately and to have a by-election called for better individual representation, and if we look to the federal Elections Act it would indicate that the Liberal Party in the provincial Legislature has only nine full-time MLAs, while the PCs have 11. You cannot serve two masters. Therefore, I was simply asking, Mr. Speaker, that they resign.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I believe the motion before the House is quite clear. We are dealing with a letter which has been specified in its referral to a committee of the House, and dealing with nominations of members that sit in the House is not directly relevant to the subject under consideration. I don't know whether the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland was saying that the members for Regina South and Regina Wascana made those comments about the Conservative Party in the House or outside the House. If they made them in the House then he should have risen and had them retract them at that time. If they made them outside the House then he has a remedy outside the House, if he thinks he should take it. I am saying at this point, the point I was making with the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland was that he can't go around putting words in other members' mouths and he should withdraw those comments if in fact they didn't make them in the House, and I am not aware of their making them.

MR. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the letter, we had clearly before us . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Withdraw!

MR. LANE: — What are you talking about. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I simply said is that I've heard from time to time members of this group and members of that group shouting insults. Mr. Speaker has heard them also. A member across has said just now "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I heard the word 'liar'."

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think if the member heard insults being shouted, or being made by a speaker on his or her feet, then the member should rise on a point of privilege. I can't listen to every whisper or shout that I hear in the Chamber and be on my feet challenging that, and I think that would be improper for me to be doing that. I am saying that the member may acknowledge my ruling; he may say, I agree with your ruling, but it appears more genuine to the Chamber if the members say 'I retract' those comments.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the ruling. I find it hard to put myself in a position of retracting what is perfectly and abundantly clear and obvious to every member of this House, that we have heard these comments, not over the Speaker, no not over the Speaker, but from these members in their chairs.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will give the member one more opportunity to withdraw the remarks.

MR. LANE: — I withdraw the comment, Mr. Speaker, if the comment that you had understood me to make was that these two members have shouted these things at us, I withdraw that comment. That's all I can say, Mr. Speaker.

HON. E. KRAMER: — Point of order, he can't qualify — withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: — I don't think that was a qualified withdrawal. I accept it as a withdrawal.

MR. LANE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now Mr. Speaker, the question before us is whether a letter over the signature of our member for Souris-Cannington has in any way slurred the office of the Speaker. I believe that is the question. I believe that. And it is going to be interesting incidentally to note how the members opposite, whether they do in fact leap into bed with the members to my right and support this motion, and I suspect we all know the answer right now, and I say that all that letter tried to do was to point out - (i) that in some respects which I have just indicated by my reference to the two members to my right, in some respects we must be perceived by the people of Saskatchewan as being the official opposition. But if not, at least we have equal numbers, and we should in this House be given equality. We should not have the Liberal's wives sitting on opening day up front and paraded out, our wives shoved in the corner. We should not take this second place in terms of seating arrangement to the Liberals. We should not let the Liberals have the whip's office, we should not let the Liberals have the official caucus rooms, we should not have the Liberals be given the first reply to the Throne Speech. I

invite members of the press to see if this isn't exactly what has been developing, and it's exactly the way it has been evolving. Now the Attorney General shakes his head. But we will watch to see whom he supports. We will watch to see whom he supports when this motion comes forward for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, while we do not and have not, and I challenge anyone in this House to see where in that letter they see that the integrity of the Speaker was attacked. We do ask Mr. Speaker in his fairness and in his benign wisdom to grant us in this House the equality which we deserve. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Let me respond to some suggestions by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) and the member who just spoke.

I wouldn't expect the member who just spoke to understand this because he is such a novice, but I would expect some members on that side to understand it. The matter of seating in the House is a matter for the Speaker to determine. It isn't a matter that the NDP determine. The aspects with respect to rulings between Liberals and Conservatives in the House are matters again that the Speaker has to deal with, not matters that the NDP determines.

MR. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Point of order. Am I given to understand that Mr. Speaker had given any ruling before today's date? That's what I understand from the member's remarks. I understand that there was no ruling before today's date.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, the point is this. The letter that was written by the whip begins with this first sentence: "The final decision by the New Democratic Party in the matter of recognition of the Progressive Conservatives, etc., etc., is not acceptable to our caucus." What decision is that? That is not a decision that is made by the New Democratic Party; it is not a decision that is made by the government; it is not a decision that is made by members opposite. It is a decision made by Mr. Speaker. Now I ask you to read the letter if you want to join the debate. I ask the Member for Rosetown-Elrose as well to read the letter before he joins in the debate. He said, imagine, he said, "we don't seek official status, but we only seek some better recognition of what we are." That's what he said. Well, read the letter. The letter says — having said we don't seek official status, the letter says in fact, quote: The Progressive Conservative caucus is, and should be, the official opposition in the Legislature.

Now he says, We don't seek official status. In fact the PC is, and should be the official opposition in the Legislature.

Then he goes on to say: We are not arguing about seating.

The letter says this and I quote:

It was our intention today as indicated by the floor seating plan submitted to the Clerk's office, November 9, to take our rightful place in the Assembly to the immediate left of the Speaker.

Now we don't seek official status. We don't seek official status. We are not arguing about seating, he said. However, we have now been provided with a typed floor plan. We are not arguing seating as part of the apparent deal between the NDP and the Liberals, the Liberal caucus has been allocated those seats. We are not arguing about seating in the legislative Chamber which should be allocated to the Progressive Conservatives. But we don't seek any official status, he argues.

What he should have done is read the letter before he entered the debate. The draftmanship of the letter - what is most sad, Mr. Speaker, about this letter, is that once again we have a demonstration before us of an attitude that has infused the House an issue that is narrow and petty and stupid, having been raised again by the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver). As my colleague indicated at the outset of his remarks in respect to the debate, this, I think, is the second time that we have had to deal with an issue of this kind of variety raised by the member for Nipawin. It's instructive, the letter is, instructive in the sense that here is a member, and I refer to the member who wrote the letter, who has I think gained the respect of certainly members here and I think members opposite as well . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who are you . . .

MR. CAMERON: — The member who wrote the letter, Mr. Berntson, who is in fact an hon. member. All members know that. What is interesting is what would drive a person of his obvious fair mind and obvious honor to engage in a practice which can only be described as shoddy and it is shoddy. What would account for the fact that he being an honorable man, knowing this letter to be inaccurate, knowing it to be a shoddy, petty little performance would deliver it to Mr. Speaker? I'm afraid it's instructive, Mr. Speaker, in two sense. One is that the draftmanship of the letter is, I think, clearly that of the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). It has that sort of disjointed and illogical kind of sequence to it, that kind of a low road, petty tone to it. The authorship of the thing I think is fairly apparent.

Again, the question is, what would drive the member who signed the letter to in fact sign that sort of a letter given that kind of draftmanship? I think what is apparent, Mr. Speaker, and I make this point in all seriousness, what is apparent here is that some of these men, men such as the man who signed this letter, honorable people, are becoming somehow infused with an attitude of narrowness and pettiness, almost trickery, that kind of thing. An attitude that stems, I submit to you, from the member for Nipawin. That is the kind of leadership attitude that he slowly is casting over these people. Some of them, I think, in fact I marvel how he can get away with it in terms of some of them. Now the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) and the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) are strong minded men and it surprises me that they would put up with this sort of an attitude in their caucus and put up with these kinds of narrow little petty tactics.

The thing that characterizes this attitude, Mr. Speaker, is a meanness and it is a narrowness and a kind of a nastiness, that's the attitude there. Draw on these little things and try to make big issues of them and in the process slander members here and members on the other side and what is most regrettable is slander the Speaker in the process. By reason of that, Mr. Speaker, I have the firm conviction that the member for Nipawin is not likely in the history of this province to rise beyond the position in his public affairs that he now holds. It is that kind of attitude that he has, that he is infusing his members with displayed again and surfaces in letters of this kind that are leading. I think, more and more people to the conclusion that he is not likely to advance beyond the position he currently holds.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly before seeking a federal nomination to determine whether or not if I did receive that nomination, I was in any way disentitled from sitting in the Assembly. I drew from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly a written opinion that said in effect there was no impediment to my remaining a member of the legislature of being nominated as a federal candidate. Since I referred

November 17, 1977

to the letter, Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to table it. So may I say in response to the member for Sutherland (Mr. Lane) that I do in fact have a written letter of opinion from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly indicating that I have every right to be here and intend to remain here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Just by way of final comment, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the members will in fact support the resolution and bring the member and his letter before the committee so that he can bring whatever evidence he has of the deal he refers to and the shoddy practices that he alleges in the letter and demonstrate to the fact committee whether or not in those allegations are true. I hope what it will do in the longer term is to show members, show some of these members in particular, that you just can't fire off these kinds of misses that slander people in the process, that interfere with their privileges as members, that call down this institution. It is a lesson which they have to learn, that you are responsible for what you say and do here. And if, in fact, you make allegations of this variety, bring members into disrepute, bring the institution into disrepute, bring the Speaker into disrepute, then you had best have some pretty good evidence for those allegations before you make them. And we will see what kind of evidence they have here.

So, as I say, I hope that members will support the resolution and I hope that we can call a committee meeting and we can have these people come before the committee under oath - if that is the procedure - and explain the allegations they have made in the letter.

Now what kind of an attitude and an approach would start off this session with this kind of petty poison again, and that's what it was bound and almost calculated to do. And what is so offensive about it is that it comes from the member for Nipawin who always is so pious in his platitudinous approach to the decorum and rules of the House. He is the most offensive . . .

MR. COLLVER: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that - I think the member referred to the member for Nipawin and I don't believe any of these have been issued from me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I believe the member made reference to the letter coming from the member for Nipawin. You did not?

MR. COLLVER: — No.

MR. CAMERON: — I don't suggest that the letter came from the member for Nipawin. I suggest that the letter was written in the spirit and attitude that the member for Nipawin holds and has infused his caucus with. That is what I said.

Now, what I was saying was that the reason I find it particularly offensive coming as it does in that sense from the member for Nipawin is that he has so often lectured us in his pious way about the rules and the decorum and the great institution we have here, then he is the first to breach the rules in these kinds of offensive ways. Now you simply can't have it both ways. I hope, Mr. Speaker, by way of my last comment, is to say that

members will, in fact, support the motion and bring the letter and the author of the letter and other people who may have something to add in respect to is before the committee and get to the bottom of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this. First I would like to make a couple of opening observations and to express my regret that we have reached a point in this Legislature where we should take our time and the money of the taxpayers and discharge our obligation to our electors in carrying on a debate of the level and quality of some that I have heard this morning. I think, however, that the public and ultimately this Legislature will deal with the allegations of the quality and probity of some that we have heard this morning. I am sorry that we have reached a point where we must attack the motives of members who are sitting in this House, specifically identifying two members and then sully their motives.

But I will turn now to the issue before us which I think is an important issue. We have heard suggestions that the letter from Mr. Berntson somehow was directed to the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party and the way in which they are collaborating. I should advise the hon. member that the hon. J.E. Brockelbank, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, is not where you find the Leader of the Liberal Party and now where you find the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

If your allegations were against the activities of our party, perfectly sound to give them to the press, perfectly sound to direct them to us or to whomever you like but not to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Let me make clear that this letter was directed to the Speaker and set out two very clear statements.

1. The deal obviously made by the majority NDP with the Liberal Party has now been extended to the Legislative Assembly,

2. (and referring to the floor plan and the rightful place in the Legislative Assembly immediately to the left of the Speaker, as is alleged by the members of the Conservative Party.) However, we have now been provided with tight floor plan indicating that as part of the apparent deal between the NDP and the Liberals, the Liberal caucus have been allocated these seats in the Legislative Chamber, “as part of the apparent deal!” That is the statement.

Now, I think all hon. members know that this floor plan is not set by the New Democratic Party, not set by the Liberal Party, not set by the Conservative Party but set by Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, and the Clerk deal with the matter of seating and no one can deny that. We all received correspondence with respect to that and it comes from the Clerk, acting for Mr. Speaker. To say that the Clerk and Mr. Speaker as part of the apparent deal between the NDP and the Liberals have allocated seating to the Conservative Party which they do not like is a clear precise reflection on Mr. Speaker and his staff. Clear and precise! There is no way that I am prepared to believe that members opposite do not know that the seating plan is set by Mr. Speaker. I believe that they know that. I believe that they stated that they were dissatisfied with the performance of Mr. Speaker, and that’s why they sent the letter to Mr. Speaker. It is not

November 17, 1977

credible that they would send the letter to Mr. Speaker if they were simply dissatisfied with the performance of the members of the Liberal Party and the members of our party. They say clearly, "as part of the apparent deal, you Mr. Speaker, did not discharge your responsibilities in the way that you are called upon to discharge them."

I say that is an allegation which should be either unqualifiedly withdrawn or should be proven to the hilt!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I say that the place to prove that is in the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections where all hon. members will have the full opportunity to give us more details of this so-called deal in which the Speaker is involved which led to this seating plan with which you are dissatisfied.

Now I want to remind hon. members that when Mr. Speaker the member for Saskatoon Riversdale takes his seat as Speaker, he gives certain undertakings to this House, in the ancient language of the Speaker. He says:

Members of the Legislative Assembly, I beg to express my grateful thanks and high humble acknowledgement of the high honor the Assembly has been pleased to confer upon me. While I leave the floor of this Assembly to take the Speaker's Chair, I feel that I also leave all political partisan feelings in order that I may discharge with impartiality to all and to the best of my ability the various and important duties pertaining to the high office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Saskatchewan.

That's what this man says. Part of his duties that he says he will discharge with impartiality to all and to the best of his ability is to set a speaking plan with impartiality to all. Members opposite in the Conservative Party are saying he is not setting that seating plan with impartiality to all and to the best of his ability but rather as part of a deal between the NDP and the Liberals. That is what they have said, that is what they have written to the Speaker and that is what they have said to the press.

Now I, Mr. Speaker, have been going about this province in the last year talking about the Silver Anniversary of the Queen, and in the course of so doing have been talking about our system of government, have been talking about the parliamentary system, have been talking about this method by which free men govern themselves. I said the same thing when the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association tour came to this province, that our system of government was a good system of government and ought to be held onto dearly by all people who believe in freedom.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I believe that this is true. I believe that our system of government depends upon people respecting the institutions of government, respecting the place of the Monarchy and the Lieutenant-Governor, respecting the place of Mr. Speaker — respecting the place of Mr. Speaker being an impartial chairman in this House.

No man is perfect. I do not say that I discharge my responsibilities with perfection. I do not say Mr. Speaker discharges his responsibilities with perfection but I do say that he discharges them to the full extent of his ability to discharge them with impartiality to all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I say he does that. I say when members opposite say this is not true and say that he is part of the deal between two parties which excludes a third party . . .

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what we just heard over there on that side of the House was statements attributed to a letter which were not there. We would ask the hon. member to quote directly and accurately, not to quote things that are not in the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that is barely a debating point.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I would be delighted to . . . the hon. member was obviously not listening. The deal made between the majority NDP and the Liberal Party has now been extended to the Legislative Assembly, statement number one.

2. With respect to, and referring to our rightful place in the Assembly, however, we have now been provided with a tight floor plan (which everybody knows came from the Clerk and the Speaker) a tight floor plan, indicating that as part of the apparent deal between the NDP and the Liberals, the Liberal caucus has been allocated those seats in the Legislative Chamber which should be allocated to the Progressive Conservative Party caucus.

That is what it alleges, “as part of a deal.” This plan which came from the Clerk’s office and the Speaker’s office “as part of a deal” sat you in the wrong seat. Now there is no doubt that that is clearly and with precision an allegation that Mr. Speaker did not discharge with impartiality his duties. And you sent that to Mr. Speaker, Mr. Berntson the whip of your party, sent it to Mr. Speaker. You gave it to the press before Mr. Speaker had any opportunity to reply, before Mr. Speaker had any opportunity to reply!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — You knew that Mr. Speaker would be tied up with the proceedings of the opening, when you knew he would be in the line, you gave it to the press to get the first leg in. That Mr. Speaker, may be acceptable conduct to the members of the Progressive Conservative caucus.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Point of clarification?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that the member might seek his clarification at the . . . Is he asking the Premier a question?

MR. KATZMAN: — He just stated that you were involved in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Does the Premier wish to . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — I said I knew Mr. Speaker would be involved at 2:45 p.m. yesterday in proceedings dealing with the opening of this House at 3:00 p.m. yesterday. I don’t have to be very bright to know that!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — It may have escaped the knowledge of the member for Rosthern

November 17, 1977

that we open the House at 3:00 p.m. It may have escaped the member for Rosthern that we involve the Speaker in the opening of the Chamber. I will leave that.

I want to come back to the point that I wish to make that Mr. Speaker's office has been attacked. Mr. Speaker's office has been said that it is part of a deal between two parties of this House and not the third party. Mr. Speaker's office is fundamental to the discharge of our responsibilities as members of this Legislature; indeed Mr. Speaker's office is fundamental to the proper discharge of the whole parliamentary system. This cannot be allowed to pass without comment and without full explanation. That explanation should be made in the committee, the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. I know that members opposite will want to place their evidence under oath of this dastardly deal that they are alleging. I know they will want to have that full opportunity to say just what evidence they have that Mr. Speaker is involved as part of this deal. I call upon them therefore to vote for this motion and give your evidence under oath that as part of a deal between our party and the Liberal Party Mr. Speaker set out a seating plan which was unacceptable to you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I want to put before you and the Legislative Assembly some background to this letter but before I do that I want to comment on an article in the Leader-Post where the Attorney General has implied that I perhaps broke an agreement made just the day before.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that anyone at the meeting will agree that there was no agreement. There was perhaps an understanding that some minor concessions would be made providing there was a statement issued by Mr. Speaker to set out the ground rules. The Attorney General in fact was party to that understanding. The only solid agreement that came out of the meeting as I recall it was the fact that the Leader of the Liberal Party would agree to nothing, no concessions. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the letter was to have the ground rules set out. They were not in any way intended to slight your high office, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have always supported your office, I support your office now and I will continue to support your office.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I think that I should say a few words in this debate. I must say that I regret that it has been necessary to waste approximately two hours today dealing with this matter that is so petty, picayune and really a garbage matter. Particularly on a day like today which we have traditionally set aside to honor those who have sat here before us and who have died in the past year. Unfortunately this matter had to take precedence. I am as well reluctant to really talk too much about the matter because by doing so you dignify the spurious allegations that have been made by the members who sit to my left.

Unfortunately, however, I think that these matters have to be dealt with in this House. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Liberal Party put a great deal of value in such traditional things as honesty and integrity. When those values are attacked by the members who sit to my left who are now smirking and laughing because we talk about such basic values as this, that we are going to react. We are going to say categorically where we stand, what we are and what we believe in.

I want to say Mr. Speaker to you and to the members of this House and to the members who particularly sit to my left, that there have been no deals in the past, there are no deals now and there will be no deals in the future. I want to say to the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) wherever he has gone to, that there was no deal last year as you referred to. I say to you, Mr. Member, that if you continue to say that you are continuing to say a falsehood. I say to you, Mr. Member, that by saying those things again today, in my view makes you, Sir, a liar.

Mr. Speaker, as well I want to say to the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) who is out of his chair as well, that the contents of that letter that was sent to you which indicates that there was some deal arranged between ourselves and the New Democratic Party is a lie, and that the person who made those statements, who is now scurrying back into the House, is indeed a liar.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that unless those allegations are proven or withdrawn that my remarks are going to be apropos and that we will go from now into the future knowing that these two gentlemen that I have spoken of are indeed as I described them. We can consider any further comments that they make to this Legislature and to the public of Saskatchewan in that light.

Let me just say one other thing, Mr. Speaker. Indeed there was an attempt to have a deal made in your office at the first meeting that was attended by yourself, by the Attorney General, the member for Nipawin and myself. But the proposed deal came from the member for Nipawin. The proposed deal from that member was that if he was allowed to sit in these benches here, that he would be prepared to accommodate the Liberal Party in other areas in other ways. I say to the member for Nipawin that we didn't accept your deal or your offer of a deal, and I see he has left the House as well, any more than we accepted or proposed any other deal. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the only person who tried to make any deals was that particular member.

I repeat once again, Mr. Speaker, there have been no deals made, there have been no deals sought, there are no deals now and there will be none in the future. Anybody who suggests to the contrary, Mr. Speaker, in my view is a liar.

May I suggest as well, Mr. Speaker, that the members who sit to my left, above all will want this particular situation cleared up. I suggest that we will see from them how they vote on this resolution, just how much they want it cleared up. If they have nothing to hide they should be noting for the resolution. If they do have something to hide, Mr. Speaker, I think we know how they will vote and that will be against the resolution. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, that all members vote in favor of this resolution so that this matter can be cleared up at any early date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I believe the hon. member has just referred to me, not once but twice as being a liar. I am asking him at this time if he wishes to withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am concerned about the use of that type of language in the House. I am not sure in which context the member referred to the member for Rosetown-Elrose or in fact to the person who wrote the letter. I would think that the use of that word at this time is probably inappropriate with relation to the matter that is under discussion, the

motion. I think the decision will be made by the House whether they want to refer the matter to the committee or not. If they do then the committee will make the decisions about the truth or the untruth of the matter.

With regard to the other reference the member for Lakeview made about the member for Rosetown-Elrose. I am unaware of the context of that and I would ask the indulgence of the House to check the record on it because I want to see what was actually said there.

MR. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that this is a classic illustration of what I was speaking of before. The members get up and they are offended when we attribute statements to them. They ask for retractions and withdrawals. Then they get up and they say at the mike, as the Leader of the Liberal Party did, he refers to members of our caucus as liars, I believe was the term he used. Of course if we had a deal with the ND Party we could pass a motion to censor them and have them back us up. We ask you for your ruling . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I would ask the member to review the rules of the House. The rules of the House are quite clear. When the Speaker rises the member sits down. I would tell the member that I am unclear as to the point of order that he was making. If he could make it precisely without getting into debate on it.

MR. LANE: — My point of order is this Mr. Speaker. We ask that you ask the Liberal Leader to withdraw those statements. Now, if we had as I feel the backing of the party across the way as the members to our right do, then we could pass a motion and they would support us. But as it is we cannot do that. Therefore, we ask you, Mr. Speaker, to insist that the Liberal Leader withdraw that comment.

MR. SPEAKER: — I have told the Leader of the Liberal Party in the House, that I find that the remarks of the Liberal Leader to be inappropriate as regards to the motion before the House. Now if he wishes to withdraw them, he may. If he does not, then, I will take that into consideration when I review what the record says.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would also take into consideration the comments of the Leader of the Liberal party as it relates to the calling of myself a liar.

MR. SPEAKER: — That's what I was talking about particularly.

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I saw rather a strange sight this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier of this Province, all of a sudden criticizing comments made by members because we're deteriorated to the matter calling into account motives of individual members. Where I asked the Premier was he on his feelings about motives and traditions of this House, when we had this sham phoney debate about filthy hospitals on a put up between the members opposite, and the members here.

MR. SPEAKER: — The subject which I don't perceive to be pertinent to the motion that is before the House now.

MR. LANE: — I will be getting in because its very basic to this debate as the operation of this House and the position of Mr. Speaker. I think the Premier would agree that that is fundamental. We find it strange, we find it very strange, that we go back and we got into a similar type of debate last session that it was a sham, it was phony, it was put up.

There was an arrangement made between my party at the right and the government opposite, the press know it and we all know it. So what, so what. We went through, we went through and I didn't hear the Premier at that time saying what a waste of the taxpayers' money. I didn't hear at that time the Premier saying, oh, we shouldn't be questioning the motives of the member who made a debating point. I didn't hear it. I find that somewhat strange, Mr. Speaker. I find the selective use of the rules, the traditions of the House, by the Premier, very strange.

I note too, the statements during the heckling and the cat calling by members opposite when the member from Souris-Cannington was on his feet. As the member from Souris-Cannington made very clear his position, his position as he stated, he as a member has always supported and endorsed the Chair. I hope the Premier is now, and I hear that 'oh', from the Attorney General. I hope the Premier is now criticizing the Attorney General for questioning the motives of the member for Souris-Cannington as he attempted to do to the members in this House. I am sure that the Premier will send him a note. As he made his statement, I think it clear that the Conservative party by the letter forwarded to Mr. Speaker, made ample reference to a deal between the Liberal party and the NDP in the province of Saskatchewan. And you know what was strange, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier of this province didn't deny the deal. He said that he denied that you were involved. We denied that you were involved. But he did not deny the deal at any time, and the Premier is known for his cautious choosing of his words. I say that the Premier's statement endorses more strongly the conservative position.

Talk about deals. I think everyone knew when it was called a set-up. I believe in the press, the arrangement, the working arrangement between the House leader and the Liberal party to my right when we dealt with the hospitals last year and I suggest that that's a deal, and that's an arrangement. The reasons of course, being as we went through that sham debate, and the position then that gives cause and the reason for the position of the Conservative Party is that it is in the fundamental best political interests of the government opposite to continue to prop up a weak and ailing Liberal Party.

Reference has been made to the by-elections. We are talking about deals. And I preface again most carefully, Mr. Speaker, that a clear and fair reading of the letter makes it clear that the Conservative Party in no way says that you, the Speaker, that your Chair is involved in a deal. The interpretation put on it by members to my right, to your right, smacks very, very strange of what we went through last session, didn't we, when we went through a phony debate at that time. We know, as was made clear to us in the Prince Albert-Duck Lake by-election, that the Liberals were instructing their people to support the New Democratic Party to make sure that the Conservatives did not get successful in that by-election. That's good politics on the part of the Liberals. Their hand-picked candidate knew he wasn't getting anywhere, their masterfully chosen candidate by the Leader of the Liberal Party wasn't going to get anywhere. It was good politics on the part of the Liberals in Prince Albert-Duck Lake to support the NDP. Their membership didn't go for it, the people didn't go for it, but it is good politics, it's a deal. No question it's a deal. We looked at the by-election in Saskatoon-Sutherland. The New Democratic Party was telling their people to support the Liberal candidate. Don't let the Conservatives win this by-election. We can't have the Conservatives winning a by-election. That's a deal. The deal has existed between the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party on the federal level since when — Lester Pearson first became Prime Minister, I suggest. That's not uncommon. You people are used to it. When I was a Liberal I was used to seeing you people and the Liberals work together. It's nothing new. It is great historical tradition in this country for the New Democratic Party and the

Liberals to work together. That's a deal - it's nothing new. It is a practice that has gone on for some considerable number of years.

We know, too, that in the Pelly by-election the arrangement made with the Liberals, they would spend all their time just trying to hang on to their own party vote and not worry about campaigning, the hope again, to assist the New Democratic Party in Pelly. I digress very quickly to welcome to the Assembly the new member for Pelly, who I am sure, having now attained a seat was quite welcome to attain or take whatever assistance the Liberals would give him. It's a deal. It's a deal between the parties opposite.

Now, the members opposite attempt to deny the deal. We have seen a deliberate and conscious political effort by members opposite to publicly prop up the Liberal Party. Again, it is good politics on their part. They know full well that if the Liberal Party gets any lower that there will be a majority Conservative government in 1979 greater than Manitoba. Good politics on the part of both parties to work together but that does not deny the existence of working relationships.

Now the reason the letter was written to the Speaker, is because the issue was the role of the parties within the Assembly and the position of the parties within the Assembly. I say a matter of some concern notwithstanding what the member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) said, a matter of some concern to the people of this province. Who else can you raise the matter with when it pertains to the position of the parties in the Assembly? I agree with the Premier that the one individual responsible for the fair operation of this Assembly is Mr. Speaker. Who else? But we talk about the respect and the disrespect and I notice that the Leader of the Liberal Party has now vacated his chair as he has called attention to everyone else doing this morning, as were the other members, that he did not say today nor did the Premier say today that when negotiations went on between the Conservatives and Liberals and the New Democratic Party as to the position of the Assembly that, and I am sure the Deputy Premier will endorse when I say this, that the Conservative Party approached the negotiations with a view to being fair, prepared to compromise and the impracticability of the Leader of the Liberal Party caused the situation that we have today. I am sure that hon. members involved know that. The desperate clinging to political power, political acceptability by two parties caused the situation that we have today. Why wouldn't the Leader of the Liberal Party approach the negotiations fairly? Why did he insist hanging on to every point? For obvious reasons, he needs all the help he can get. There are no other reasons. Not a proper approach to take when we are faced, when Mr. Speaker is faced, with a totally unique situation in the history of the Commonwealth. (An interjection)

I apologize for waking the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson). He has just made his most salient contribution to debate in this House that he has made since he was elected in 1975 and we thank him for the comment. It is too bad it wasn't on his feet but we appreciate it. Times change, people change.

MR. LANE: — But anyway, we have just heard the comment now of an opportunist. I have always found it somewhat strange that one would be called an opportunist when at the same time there is no chance of winning an election. It doesn't strike me quite right, nor does it strike me somewhat logical or rational but one can expect that from the member for Gravelbourg.

So we have talked and I have given examples to this Assembly of the arrangement, the

traditional and historical arrangement that claims the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Parties of Canada and it exists in the province of Saskatchewan. Everyone knows that it exists in the province of Saskatchewan. I have given examples on the by-elections. I have given by-elections that aren't told by New Democratic Party supporters and the concern of the Premier's statements as he continuously tries to prop up the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan. I am sure that the same concerns have been expressed to him by his party members; I am sure they were expressed to him before they were expressed to me. But let's look at the attempts, and I preface this by saying that when one looks at the public record, it tempts the Premier and the members opposite to prop up the Liberal Party. One knows that it is logical in the field of politics for a party that is desperately trying to hang on to power to make deals and a party that is desperately trying to survive would make deals.

I look at the Leader-Post and I again, I preface if the members want to talk about me rather than the issue here, that's their choice, Mr. Speaker. I am quite prepared, if I am forced to defend my position because of the comments opposite and get off the topic, remember, Mr. Speaker, that it is their fault.

I think that all should recall the debates in this Assembly led by both the Deputy Premier and the Premier, telling the people and telling this Assembly how bad the Liberals were, that they were dead after 1971. I think many many members opposite recall those debates and I must admit even when I was sitting here, royally as the saying goes, getting the heck kicked out of you, that the Premier was adamant and the record is clear that his position after 1971 was that the Liberals were dead. I think I can remember the tattered remnants of the Liberal Party, I can remember the speech and I am sure the Premier remembers the same. Now, however, since the by-election, since 1971 and particularly since the results of the Manitoba election, the Premier now goes around this province saying how great the Liberals are, how we need them, how they are resurging, how they are coming on strong, that they are not dead yet, that they have got a great future in this province. That is what he says.

Now in the Leader-Post of June referring to the Premier he predicted a resurgence of the Liberal Party. Now, why would the Premier suddenly change his political posture and do a 180 where he is facing exactly the opposite direction and now working with and actively promoting and supporting the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan. I say that it is good politics for the Premier to do that. I am a little surprised at some of my former Liberal colleagues who accept this knowing their position towards the government. I can see I suppose the reasons for accepting the open endorsement of the government opposite. What is the difference between a working relationship between two parties and a very formal coalition that has existed for years between the New Democratic Party on the federal scene and the Liberal Party on the federal scene? What's the difference? None. I can give and I am sure the Premier has seen them, the Leader-Post again not always noted for its accuracy but having made the statement again that even Blakeney who seems to view the Conservatives as his main antagonists, predicts a Liberal resurge. Malone should not lose heart.

To look at another article in the Leader-Post, now here is a man whom we all know has gone around this province since he was first elected I believe in 1958 or 1960, correct me if I'm wrong, a senior man and having been in the same position for some considerable period of time, now defending, propping up the Liberal Party.

November 17, 1977

Given a period of stability, Blakeney predicted the Liberal Party strength would level off instead of continuing its decline, and repeated his view that the party will eventually rebound in Saskatchewan. How you gladdened the hearts of Liberal members throughout this great province! Headlines! 'Premier sees Liberal Party rebounding'. I think we all know that it is in the best interests of the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan, to support the Liberal Party, and it is in the great — I'm quite prepared now to shift our debate, Mr. Speaker, to the two members who have announced that they are seeking federal office.

Now the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, and a point that has been begged by all members opposite in goading the two members, that for the longest time in the history of this province, one is a federal liberal, or one is a provincial liberal. Not both; you can't be both. The facts are, that in reality, Mr. Speaker, by the words out of their own mouths we have really, four parties in this House. We have the New Democratic Party, we have the Conservative Party, we have the provincial Liberal Party, and we have the federal Liberal Party now all represented in the Legislative Assembly.

Now if there is a coalition between the federal Liberals and the provincial Liberals, that still does not justify giving them the position of being the official opposition.

As we have not yet in this province, recognized a formal coalition although we are seeing an informal one existent in this province. I may have been the only smart one in the Liberal Party at that time.

Mr. Speaker, we have . . . I again see the hon. member for Saskatoon Centre shaking his empty head, and he is making a little too much noise when he does that, and I'm sure Mr. Speaker will want, in due course, to call him to account as he would . . .

But again, we see in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, June 16th, the Premier indicating his full and undying support and assistance to the Liberal Party when he says that he does not intend to underestimate the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, despite its setbacks.

The Premier was on immediately after the Manitoba election where he says the Liberal Party is in difficult times in Saskatchewan but, he added 'I don't so easily write off the Liberal Party'. I think it incumbent upon the members of this Assembly to the people of Saskatchewan to contrast the stated position of the Premier, the long held views of the Premier, statements as to the Liberal Party and what harm it had done to the province of Saskatchewan. To now see an about-face by the Premier where he now supports actively, the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan. I think it indicates well, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative position, that there is a deal or an arrangement, or a working relationship between the NDP and the Liberal Party.

I say, I say as well, that is good politics; it's good politics for both parties to make such an arrangement. It exists, and I think it exists in everyone's mind.

But the letter, — the letter refers to the deal between them, — a deal not denied, and I very pointedly call that to the attention of this Assembly, not denied by the Premier of this province. He denied and re-denied a reference to the deal . . . We say categorically that the hon. member for Souris Cannington has stated categorically, his support for the Chair, past support for the Chair and his continued support for the Chair.

Nowhere does the Conservative Party say, Mr. Speaker is part of a deal. That is the same

thing that went on in this Assembly over the sham debate on filthy hospitals. Words stated, vote expressions, all for it, and I tend not to defend Mr. Speaker, but to try to back away from the public perception and the actuality that exists.

That letter says, that letter says the deal was brought into the Assembly. Any members of the Press that saw the sham, filthy hospital debate knew, knew that it was a working relationship and a gang-up again. Good politics on both parts; I'm not denying it, but it does not deny the fact that that went on.

I think the doctor was calling to find out whether the hon. member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) was going to make a psychiatrist appointment today. I don't know why he asked me, probably because I'm on my feet at the time, and I'm not sure that that's a concern about doctors that the hon. member is worried about.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate, the Conservative Party supports Mr. Speaker in the Chair. One cannot deny, however, that it is sound politics on the part of both those parties to work together. We call public attention to that fact. The Premier doesn't deny it. The Leader of the Liberal Party attempts to deny it without a great deal of success. It's clear that this matter was resolved by the statement of the member for Souris-Cannington that he intended no reflection on Mr. Speaker; that as an individual he has always supported the Chair, that he will continue to support the Chair. What more do you want? We know what we are going through, the same thing that existed in the past, the track record is obvious. I say to the members opposite that you're probably doing better or do a better service to the people of this province if you got away from the sham debates; let's get back to the business of this Assembly.

Any further criticism of the hon. member, I think indicates that you don't take a clear and unequivocal statement that he has made. I think that is unfortunate. I think it's unfair. Members of all parties would be well advised to take the word of the hon. member for Souris-Cannington when he says, that he supports Mr. Speaker and he supports the Chair. Mr. Speaker, his word will stand out no matter the comments made by other members, other parties in this Assembly.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I was reluctant to enter this debate but I feel compelled to do so by virtue particularly of the last remarks made by the member for Qu'Appelle. Once I am on my feet I can't help but succumb to the temptation to make a few aside observations. I couldn't help but smile to myself as somebody on our side of the House commented listening to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle protesting so much that there were no deals so far as he was personally concerned in the switch from the Liberals to the Conservatives. He said there were no deals, Mr. speaker, I personally think that deep down in his heart of hearts he thinks that there was a deal but little does he know how prophetic his words might very well be that there is no deal, judging by the actions of the Leader of the Conservative Party and what he does to other members in his caucus.

This is not the first time this has happened in my capacity as house leader. I recall with regret the incident a year ago when the member for Estevan and the member for Rosetown-Elrose had agreed in writing to an arrangement about the Speech from the Throne only to be totally overruled and undercut by their leader. I recall that debate which took, I think, the full six days of the budget. I said at that time that that particular incident in my nine years as an MLA (now ten years) that incident involving the member for Estevan and the member for Rosetown was unprecedented.

November 17, 1977

I was in the Legislature for four years when the Hon. Ross Thatcher was the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. Boy we had some tremendous debates, bitter debates — the Liberals versus NDP. We came out of these Chambers, at least I came out of these Chambers, at times thinking that if I ever ran into a Liberal with the late W. Ross Thatcher at that time, watch out, because I think my political convictions would spill over into some sort of physical hostility. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that in my nine years, notwithstanding the tremendous political debates we had at that time, never did we ever get ourselves into a situation where understandings or agreements — play it on the words as you want — made as among hon. gentlemen in order to get the business of the House done, that those understandings were ever broken and ever to involve Mr. Speaker and his staff as they are today.

The first time was from the member for Estevan and the member for Rosetown-Elrose. I tell you if my Premier had done that to me (I say this publicly) I would have resigned immediately from that kind of a position. That didn't happen. Perhaps it can be overlooked because they are first time members, perhaps it can be accepted.

Here we are today now debating this resolution before you which is the second time this has happened. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) says that the dirty hospitals debate was a waste of time. He may have thought it was a waste of time. I had many people telephone me during those days, not only me, but all members, wanting to know the extent of the accusation made by an elected member of the Legislative Assembly, the responsibility of the statement, that hospitals are dirty. I don't think it was a waste of time to get Mr. Hewitt Helmsing to come before the Legislature under oath and tell the people of the province of Saskatchewan his views on that operation. Now the member for Qu'Appelle may think that was a waste of time. I think to assure the people of the province of Saskatchewan that our hospitals are not filthy, that we may disagree about budgeting or health policies or whatever, but to have such a base and

crass accusation cannot be accepted. I don't believe that that kind of a debate was indeed a wasted debate.

Mr. Speaker, more particularly to this matter before us today, what is the case of the Conservative Party? The case of the Conservative Party is this: that somehow there is a deal, a political deal as between the Liberals and the NDP, one to the other, to keep one to the other, in effect alive politically. That, Mr. Speaker, I would categorically deny and do deny. Whether I as an individual would want to see the Liberal Party flourish in Saskatchewan as a political party for my own political purposes is basically not relevant. I know that in four years when the Liberals were in power, I fought almost everything that they stood for and that they still stand for, deterrent fees, giveaway of our resources . . .

MR. CAMERON: — . . . giveaways . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes, the same topic because you fellows at your convention passed resolutions saying you'd give away the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. What I say is tantamount to a giveaway. You and your leaders, you're taking that position, I think you are captive and have been for the years that I have been in this Legislature, to a policy that I don't accept. That's not relevant. Whether I believe that or whether it's true or not is not relevant. The Tory case is that there is a deal to that effect. That's not relevant. What's relevant is, the accusation in black and white that that deal imagined, that deal somehow has spilled over to this Legislature to involve you, Sir, and the office and the personnel and staff of this Legislature. This has been said over and over again, but I repeat, I quote:

The deal obviously made by the majority NDP and the Liberal Party has now been extended to the Legislative Assembly.

Nobody can get around those words. Nobody can explain those words, they are there, that's the issue. The issue is not whether the hon. member for Qu'Appelle can document for the next two hours statements that the Premier has made about the Liberals reviving or not reviving; I don't care whether they revive or they don't revive; whether I have made statements as to whether they revive or they don't revive. That's not the issue. The issue is that somehow that kind of an arrangement that involves you Sir, not you sir personally (although it is personally) but your office, Mr. Speaker's office, and Mr. Speaker's personnel to the exclusion of eleven elected members of this Legislative Assembly. That's the issue. Those are the words.

It's not good enough for the member for Qu'Appelle to get up and say, oh the member for Cannington got up and said, he supports you, Mr. Speaker. He didn't intend that to mean any slur on you. That's not good enough. Put it down on black and white. It's the first time in my ten years in the Legislature that that's ever happened.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make two other quick points before I sit down.

The Leader of the Liberal Party says this matter is a petty issue. I want to tell him and this House that I totally disagree with that assessment. Some contributions in my view have been petty, where wives come in and where wives sit and things of that nature. The issue that is before us is not petty because the issue involves the office of Mr. Speaker. That's the issue, that Mr. Speaker is a part of this deal which has been extended to the Legislative Assembly. Those are the words used and there are other words that support that entire operation.

I want to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that I totally disagree with the Leader of the Liberal Party when he categorizes this as somehow petty. This is fundamental, fundamental to the basis of parliamentary democracy. Forgive me if I may have an additional personal observation. I hear questions about law and order, law and order and we, this government, somehow don't show a concern for law and order. I'll be interested in knowing exactly what they would recommend when the debate comes at the appropriate time on law and order.

MR. CAMERON: — . . . Full time Attorney General!

MR. ROMANOW: — They'll come. Full time Attorney General, all of that, I am prepared to debate all of that — all of this business of respect for law and order — law and order by our example, Mr. Speaker, in a sense. Respect for our institutions of government, of law making, what higher law authority law-making body is there but this Assembly? What does the Conservative Party, the same party that professes such a devotion to law and order do, with respect to the 'whethers' and the statements that are made in this area?

You know, Mr. Speaker, to worry whether we smoke in Committee of the Whole or in Committee of Finance, to worry whether we have a cup of coffee in Committee of Finance or whether we read a newspaper during the course of the debate, to concern ourselves about the decorum, in the minds of the Conservative Party, are the big issues of Legislative Assembly. But the credibility and the integrity of the office of Mr. Speaker are minor issues in the judgment of the Conservative Party in the decorum debate.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a minor issue. This is not something where we can ask the people of the province of Saskatchewan to follow our lead because we are concerned about law and order and we act in a fashion lawlessly here before you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by making a second point and the last final point — how this thing could have been solved by those people who profess that they respect the institution of this Parliament and this Speaker. I invite the members to a copy of Mr. Speaker's opening statement that he read to us this morning. I am going to start on page two, it says this, quoting Mr. Speaker.

The letter in my opinion (the letter in my opinion, I want to stress that) implies that I, as Speaker of this Assembly, have been a part of certain deals made between other members and parties in the Legislative Assembly regarding proceedings about to take place in the Assembly.

I hereby communicate to this Assembly that in my opinion this matter constitutes a *prima facie* case of a breach of privilege.

That's what Mr. Speaker said. You boys are telling us how much you profess respect for that office. You didn't have to agree with this. Maybe he was in error. I don't think he was. Maybe it was an error. But he is the law and order of this Assembly. Your option should have been, Mr. Speaker, I hereby withdraw the letter, unqualifiedly, without any qualifications. That's what your option should have been. Then the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. J. G. Lane) could have gone out on the television and he could have made all the statements about how great the Premier's speeches are, about buttressing the Liberal Party, and now the Attorney General is trying to buttress up these stalking deals and the whole routine and you would have not embroiled Mr. Speaker. That's how easy and how difficult it would have been for you to have done those living proof things

that you say you believe in and law and order and decorum and the like. Not to smugly smirk and to smile and to play as if this was the whole game. You could have done it, but you chose not to. You choose not to. You continue to try and differentiate on these words.

Now Mr. Speaker, I may be forgiven for the very last personal observation I had. I got myself involved in a situation when I was first elected to the Legislature in 1968. In the course of Committee of the Whole I made some intemperate remarks involving the chairman of the committee. They were intemperate at the time. I was asked to withdraw and I refused to withdraw because I was full of fight. I was being picked on by the Liberal government that's for sure. And Ross Thatcher, we knew how he was, he bullied everybody and he was arrogant, and I wasn't going to give in. He asked me to withdraw and I wouldn't and he referred it to Mr. Speaker. And I know the temptations. But in the end result, and I don't make myself out as any good guy, but in the end result there is a fundamental issue that you have to come to terms with. Whether you agree with what that chairman ruled, or what that Speaker ruled, you have got to come to terms of whether or not you respect the institution and the law and order that he sets out. And I did accept that. Unqualifiedly I withdrew - some embarrassment - some ribbing for a couple of days, maybe even longer. I recall the late Premier Thatcher coming to me afterwards and we talked about whether I made the right decision or not, and again this is a personal remembrance, he argued that it was a personal correct decision. I said it was easy, and it was that tough. But you don't choose that. You don't withdraw unqualifiedly, you dig in, you persist in the argument, you think you are going to sell it out there to the people of Saskatchewan somewhat as a deal, and you might, but you are prepared to do it at the expense of the Speaker in this Assembly, and for that you should be held accountable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell this House I don't relish the prospect . . .

MR. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is your point of order?

MR. LANE: — It is simply this Mr. Speaker. It is the Hon. Attorney General who makes that accusation about the Speaker, not us, and not in the letter. Now I think that should be distinguished.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that's a debating point.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, you see this is a point about the decorum. They raise the point of issue and then there is a little kind of a laugh about this thing, you know, it's all a big game. At times like this I wish we did have television in the House. I don't know how it would show, but unfortunately we don't have it.

I wanted to say, to complete my remarks, that that's the issue that's before us. Believe me, I don't relish as an individual member, being in front of a committee under oath. I'll do my best to tell the truth as I see it. But I don't like that idea. I don't think any lawyer does. I don't think any person does. But it has to be done now. It has got to be done and we have to come to grips with this question of whether or not — and I don't care whether it is the Tories that did it, the Liberals could have done the same thing, or our party, — any party has the right for political advantage, to tear down the Speaker and to tear down the institution of the Speaker and to tear down the support people that are

around him, while professing the very principles that you profess. That's the issue.

Yu know something, I'm going to, after this is all over, I'm going to tell the people of the province of Saskatchewan exactly what kind of a stunt was pulled for the second time in my ten years in the Legislature of the province of Saskatchewan. Because I conclude now, whatever comes out of that committee deliberation, what this indicates is a pattern of conduct, a pattern of conduct for which the people of the province have a right to know; a pattern of conduct, if ever the PCs should be elected to the province of Saskatchewan (and by the way don't get so smug in your arrogance that you are going to get elected, don't be assured of that) but if ever you should be, a pattern of conduct because of what it displays, is that the Conservative Party if they should be in power are not going to only run government they are going to run the Legislature, they are going to run Mr. Speaker, they are going to run over every kind of institution going in order to do the things that they want to do. That's what this indicates. And that's the inevitable conclusion of it. You didn't have to get into this. You didn't have to do this. But I say to the member for Cannington (Mr. Berntson) somebody talked you into writing that letter. Somebody has undercut you and they put you in the position now where all the responsibility is on you, leaving you out there. If you have any kind of decency and strength, it's that difficult and that easy, get up and withdraw the letter totally and unqualifiedly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, it really isn't very often that I have occasion to agree with the Attorney General, but in one of his closing comments when he suggested that perhaps it would be a good idea to have television in this House, I think maybe he is right. I think we should, because just like television has exposed some of the silly idiosyncrasies in the House of Commons and exposed people on both sides of the House Liberals, Conservatives and NDPs for behavior to those of us at one time might have thought it wasn't all that bad, but when you see it on television, you wonder - my goodness, is it really that bad. Mr. Speaker, I wonder that if we had television in this House today, would silly, ludicrous, ridiculous sessions like this ever occur? Honestly, if every single voter in this province had an opportunity to watch these sessions (and this isn't by any means the first one we've had in my short tenure in this House), but the level of it - it hardly even befits a kindergarten school. Childish, ludicrous, and for what point? You know there hasn't even been a good political point scored yet. There hasn't even been (naturally the name of the game is 'score your political points'), but you haven't even done that. What have you done? We've got maybe ten or twelve minutes left today, we are going to move into radio time next Tuesday, and what have we accomplished this morning? Well one thing we have accomplished is we have certainly reduced the level (if there ever was a level) of debate in this Assembly. Like the Attorney General I, too, have been through the business of having the chairman call me to task in the Committee of the Whole, or Finance, I have forgotten which it was, and be asked to withdraw, which I refused. Very similar circumstances to what the Attorney General describes. The House was reconvened - or pardon me, the committee was eliminate, the Speaker returned and I was asked to withdraw. You know I don't really recall what it was all about and I really don't recall what I said to the chairman. The chairman is over there, maybe he could refresh my memory. I don't think it was really all that serious. I can tell you, I didn't call anybody a liar at that particular time.

When one member today referred to another member who I think is a highly respected member by all members in the House, including the members in his own party, deliberately, and I think twice, I think the record will show, pointed him out and called

him a liar on two occasions. It wasn't a slip of the tongue in the heat of debate. It was coldly, maliciously and crudely done. That, not being enough, it had to be repeated by the member for Souris-Cannington and we think we have accomplished something in the Legislative Assembly this morning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members from both sides of the House have sort of been treating you with kid gloves this morning, that you are above all this and how wonderfully neutral you are in the institution. You and I have had our clashes in the past. My own personal opinion has not changed on the opinions that I expressed when I sat elsewhere in this House. I don't think you are above it. I have seen you biased, bigoted and prejudiced in the past and you are again today. Frankly, when you didn't call that member, ask him to withdraw the word 'liar' today, don't lecture me about what in blazes of calibre of what should be happening in this House is.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, a point of order. My point of order is — the hon. member has just accused Mr. Speaker of being (as I recall the words) 'biased, bigoted and prejudiced' in the past and today, and Mr. Speaker, that surely, if there is any attack on the office of Mr. Speaker, that has to be that. I ask the hon. member to withdraw those words unqualifiedly.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Attorney General, I believe the record will show that I have said it in the past and I wasn't asked to withdraw it, but if it makes you happy I withdraw it today.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I want to remind the members when I was down there and down there I may have been biased, I don't think I was bigoted. I rise not so much for personal reasons to interrupt the comments of the member for Thunder Creek but for reasons of the fact that I am the Speaker of the House. I don't take those attacks that he mentioned in his comments as being so much hurting me personally because quite frankly I can take it. But I take it as a direct attack on the Chair, on the Speaker's position in this House. I would ask the member to withdraw the remarks unqualifiedly.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I've said those same words before with no comment because they had no relevance, if they offend you today I shall withdraw them. I have already said that. If they offend you today I shall very definitely withdraw them.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! It is not because they offend me, it is because they offend the position of Speaker in the House. I accept the unqualified withdrawal.

MR. THATCHER: — That being satisfied, Mr. Speaker, what I would then like to suggest to the Speaker when there have been withdrawals asked for, the withdrawal you just asked for and got, was what I said actually any worse than what was said a little bit earlier? I've withdrawn but was that any worse than the term liar?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I don't stack the offences against the Chair up and measure them one against the other. I don't think members should either. I think we should deal with them one at a time. I would appreciate it if the member for Thunder Creek would not refer to that incident which happened earlier today because I have already said I am deferring my decision on that until I look at the record. I want to be perfectly clear what I am dealing with. I will say that I was perfectly clear in what I was dealing with then I was dealing with the comments the member for Thunder Creek had just made about the Chair. I made a decision right then and there to move on it. I want to check the record with regard to the Leader of the Liberal Party and his comments and I

will give a decision to the House later on.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, at the same time that you are reviewing the comments of the Leader of the Liberal Party will you review the comments of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) who also used the same phraseology?

MR. MacDONALD: — On the point of privilege, I did not suggest that the member for Souris-Cannington was a liar, I said this letter was a lie, and it is a lie.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I have asked you to review the comments of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley at the same time in the context in which they were used.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will take that under consideration. The member for Thunder Creek.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think any member in this Assembly can look at this morning's procedures as any particular asset to the House as a whole or to a party. It does make one wonder if surely to goodness this Assembly has not got something more pressing to deal with than the very silly nonsensical business that we have been going through today. Mr. Speaker, the comments that have been passed in this House, both sides of it, and the judgments that have been rendered by members opposite, have been total nonsense. Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness that on the agenda that we had passed out today there must be pressing matters for this House to get on to. We have pressing matters in the economy; and yet what are we talking about today? We are talking about the nonsensical business of a letter.

Mr. Speaker, time is approaching 1:00 o'clock or very close to 1:00 o'clock, if I may be allowed, may I call it 1:00 o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I found an item of particular . . . Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to continue. Mr. Speaker, whatever relevancy this letter may continue to have is certainly open to debate. I did find it rather strange that as the House opened this morning the Leader-Post is quoting the Attorney General as being prepared to introduce a motion referring this whole business to a special committee. The Attorney General happens to have it right there now. I am certainly not suggesting in any way, shape or form that the Attorney General or the member for Indian Head-Wolseley could have ever conferred as to the contents of that motion. I accept the member for Indian Head's opening statement that he would never ever negotiate with you.

Yet it is sort of a strange thing that the motions have a very distinct ring of similarity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — If I may quote the Leader-Post:

Romanow said he intends to ask for details of this deal. The matter is so serious it should be referred to the Special Committee on Rules and Privileges.

I don't know how you wrote it up. But if that isn't adding up to basically what the motion is that we are talking about . . . Is it possible that the Attorney General did have a meeting with somebody on this side of the House last evening? I don't know whether they did or not. But unquestionably there is a very definite similarity.

Mr. Speaker, I think from my angle where I am standing it appears to me as though it is 1:00 o'clock.

MR. MacDONALD: — Might I make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker that we stand the clock until this motion is dispensed with so that we don't have to come back to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think I can deal with this one. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley has suggested we stop the clock for a period of time to dispose of the matter . . . Order, order! The question is, is there agreement that we stop the clock? It has to be unanimous. I heard some nays. The clock is not stopped and because of the passage of time this debate is automatically adjourned. It will appear on the agenda at a later time under public bills and orders, adjourned debates.

Debate adjourned.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I have a few motions which are always tendered before the orders of the day, the procedural ones. May I have the consent of the House to stop the clock long enough to give these procedural motions?

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the Attorney General is prepared to give the assurance to this Assembly that they are in fact procedural and nothing else.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all, as the Premier has indicated they are all by leave. So if they don't like it, somebody yelled no, like they did on the other motion. Secondly, I don't know how in the world I can give anybody, especially that party an assurance that it is strictly procedural because I thought I had those kind of procedural agreements in the past. In any event, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. COLLVER: — To elaborate on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, those same papers that he has in his hand right now the Attorney General was waving and says I have a motion right here. That is why I raised the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think it is legitimate for the member to wonder what the Attorney General is bringing forward. I think there is an opportunity here if some members object to it, they rise and object to the matter, otherwise we proceed.

MOTION

RADIO TIME

HON. R. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by my colleague, the member for Tisdale-Kelsey (Mr. Messer), by leave of the Assembly that:

The matter of division of radio time arranged for the current session be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Radio Broadcasting and Selected Proceedings. The said committee to report its recommendations thereon with all convenient

November 17, 1977

speed.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:07 o'clock p.m.