

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

November 21, 1977.

EVENING SESSION

**ADJOURNED DEBATES - POLITICAL ARRANGEMENT – ALLOCATING OF SEATS IN
THE ASSEMBLY (CONT'D.).**

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — When the clock arrived at 5 o'clock, I was saying that we are faced here today as we were last week with a matter that should be of the gravest concern to every member of this House. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter because of its great concern that must be cleared up once and for all. And only a complete withdrawal of all allegations, and I say all allegations, not just the letter, and an apology to this Assembly and to you and to the people of Saskatchewan, is acceptable as far as I'm concerned. I will, in a minute, give you an example of why I say that, and I will do that in just a minute.

You know, Mr. Speaker, society learns by example. And the example of disrespect for rules and the law-abiding Conservative caucus opposite, sets an example of the worst possible kind. People who debate that who vote to make the laws of this land should not lead in setting that kind of example. All across this country, people are saying that we need more respect for our institutions. They are saying that our institutions are under attack and we see now by the example set by the members opposite in the last several days, that the Conservatives are part of that attack. Mr. Speaker, what a contrast. What a contrast between these new Tories and those of old. Never was there a man who showed greater respect for parliament and the institutions of the parliamentary system that the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker. Now I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up in the community in Saskatchewan of Hudson Bay, I heard much of this man, I heard from him and about him. And I grew up and I went to school and I learned to disagree with many of the things that he talked about. And I do today. But never did I then, and neither do I now doubt or never have I lost the respect for his defence of our system of our government in these institutions.

I ask this House, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Tory members opposite, would he have condoned their type of action? Would he have forced a member of his own caucus to sign such a letter which was clearly meant to create doubt and suspicion and show disrespect for the Chair of the Speaker? Would he have anything to do with the provincial Conservative Party or a provincial Conservative Leader that could even think of showing this kind of disrespect for our parliamentary system? I think not. Tories think that this Legislature is a joke. I want to put on the record of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that I don't believe that the people of Saskatchewan think that, and I know they don't. The people of this province want this Assembly to work and they expect, and have the right to expect, every member of this Legislature to make it work. And they don't expect cynical political opportunism to replace the rule of law and orderly procedure. And every member of this Legislature should agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, this place is not a joke and while Conservative members opposite call press conferences to announce that they won't smoke or slouch or read, there are issues that need attention. Attention in this Assembly is where those issues need to be talked about. And they can only get an adequate and fair attention if the process of this institution of government, the institution of the Speaker, has the respect of every member of this House, and I mean every member. It's interesting the kinds of things we

have again witnessed here today. An offer of a withdrawal. And on the outside, and I say this, because I think it is important on the outside, it looked like a noble thing to do. But was it really what the member meant? Was it really what he meant or was it again an attempt to try to make a joke of this institution. I was listening, I was listening, we'll see how sincere it was. I was listening to the eighteenth hour today on which there was a news report and I have here a transcript of that news report and if you look at it, it tells a very interesting story about the seriousness of that withdrawal. Mr. Speaker, after the debate in this House this afternoon, I assume the interview took place in the hallways of this Legislature and the reporter on CKCK radio said that after offering to withdraw the letter, Berntson said in an interview, outside the House with me, that he still believes a deal was made. The reporter, Mr. Speaker, asked the question, "Do you now say that no deal was made?" The member said, "I can't say that," and the reporter said, "Why can't you?" And the member, Berntson said, "Because only they will know for sure, I guess." And the reporter said, "Well you obviously felt when you wrote the letter that a deal was made, you're changing your mind now?" And the response was, "I'm suggesting and I have suggested before, that in light of past activities such as the two by-elections in February, and the by-election in Pelly, they worked hand in hand together, and there is no reason to believe they would not do the same thing here."

Mr. Speaker, a member asked what time this was. This was on a radio broadcast on the eighteenth hour at 6 o'clock this evening. After the Liberal, Mr. Speaker, supposedly in great sincerity, having a great change of heart, offered in this House to withdraw that letter. Mr. Speaker, that withdrawal, or offer of that withdrawal, was a fraud. It was a false offer to withdraw. Now, Mr. Speaker, it may not be contempt in the face of Mr. Speaker, but it is a contempt outside the face of Mr. Speaker. I think that is completely and totally unacceptable to this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — . . . to offer to withdraw that damning letter, that letter which tries to cast disrespect on the institution of the Chair of the Speaker. Then in the same voice and minutes later to go out into the hallway and say it's okay, even though I withdrew it in the House and everything we tried to do and everything we tried to say by innuendo and otherwise we still believe. What kind of a withdrawal is that?

Mr. Speaker, those Conservative allegations and they belong to each and everyone in that caucus, which have not been supported, which cannot be supported just as other allegations which they have made in this Legislature before, must be cleared up and every Saskatchewan citizen must know that they have been cleared up, because some of the damage has been done, it has been done as those Conservative members have wanted it to be done therefore there has to be some action done by this Assembly. If the Conservative caucus has any purpose at all other than to gain power by any means whatsoever, then they should each and everyone every one get up in this House, and they should apologize. They should each and every one get up in this House and they should withdraw every allegation made against the Speaker and this institution. They should each and every one get up in this House and clear up the innuendoes that they have been making, they should humbly show some respect for the rules of this Assembly and commit themselves to make some positive contribution rather than simply trying to create cynical, political opportunism for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite won't do it, then it is an obligation of this Legislative Assembly and the members in it to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion.

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I hate to rise in the House to speak on a debate that irks me to have to enter into, (microphone problem) that we have to debate such a matter. We have what we call in this House parliamentary immunity which protects us from our statements within the House from becoming slander cases and being brought before the courts. I think with this parliamentary immunity comes something we must have in this House, and that is, protection from statements which are erroneous, which are made perversely, intentionally, with malice beforehand, then are repeated outside. We have seen cases of this before, it's happened with the hospital debate, when we come out with absolutely no proof to the allegations if they are made. They are made with one intention and that is to defame this House, to defame Mr. Speaker, and defame myself, because I am a member of this House. I don't think we can allow this. This tactic was used in the 1930s by Adolf Hitler, it's called the big lie tactic, you take a big lie and say it long enough, people believe it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — If we have no protection in this House, then I can get up in this House and make allegations of any sort that I know to be untrue, and keep doing this day after day. We are making a farce of this institution. My friends, I can't sit in an institution that we are going to use just for political purposes; if this doesn't have any more purpose of sitting in here, if we can't respect the parliamentary system, we should resign and get out of here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say this member, if he made these statements must have proof. If he has proof bring it before us, if he has not proof, it is not good enough for me to have him come up and say that I withdrew the statements — come out a half hour later and say they are true. That's not good enough. I want him before a committee, if he's got proof I want to hear it, if he hasn't got proof, I want him out of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is fair to say that from all silly, stupid and childish situations comes some good, because nothing could demonstrate more clearly the inability of a group of men to have responsibility for legislating the affairs of this province than could the people who sit to my left, than the episode which they have brought before us in the last couple of days.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, when you reflect upon the major issues that have been raised by the Tories since this Session of the Legislature began, the Eighteenth Session. We have had issues like, gum chewing, reading newspapers, smoking, slouching, and reading speeches. It is interesting even, Mr. Speaker, to reflect upon the member who was a member of our caucus at the time, the member for Thunder Creek when, he reflected upon the Leader of the Tory Party when he chose to rise and speak without notes, during that long pause of a year or a year and a half ago, when he said, "Mr, Speaker what happened to the tradition of the House that when you are on your feet you speak," as he spoke about the leader that is now the leader of his party.

We have had allegations about hospital cleanliness that have been made without substantiation, which have resulted in motions by the people who put those very allegations of indicating that they didn't even support what they had said in the first place. We have had a party that backs out of a three party agreement. We all recall the incident when that arose in the House. We have had the allegations that were raised last Thursday, Mr. Speaker. It is interesting to reflect upon all of those very significant things, on the one hand, then to reflect upon things such as integrity and honesty, willingness to accept another man's opinion, willingness to recognize an agreement that is made among gentlemen, a willingness to accept the tradition of the House, the tradition of the parliamentary procedure — lessons that Grade Eight students in Saskatchewan would recognize readily as being significant parts of their history lessons that apparently the people who sit to my left know nothing about.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Most of them didn't get their Grade Eight!

MR. PENNER: — Well, most of them reflect an intelligence when it comes to speaking in the House that suggests that. I was amazed at my colleague, the member for Eston-Elrose when he spoke the other day, when he made reference to things that either he had not read or that he chose to mislead the House about. I rather suspect that it was a matter that he hadn't read, when he said things about the letter that had been written which clearly went counter, Mr. Speaker, to what was in the letter. I can't help but feel, and I felt it as I went home and I am sure other members felt it as they went home last Thursday afternoon, that the whole business of the parliamentary tradition was attack. You were attacked, Mr. Speaker, but the whole thing that underlies why we are here, was under attack by people who will stoop to do anything in order to try to gain some kind of political advantage. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the long history of this province, there has been no greater political difference shown than the difference between the NDP and the Liberals in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PENNER: — Now the Tory groans in the background, because the Tory doesn't understand the political history of Saskatchewan, he doesn't understand the kinds of basic philosophical differences that have existed between the members who sit opposite and the Liberal Party. Yet despite those kinds of differences there is a recognition that a man is worth something, that his word is worth something, that's the kind of basic understanding of man and what motivates man to do what is good for man that the Tory by what he has said obviously has not yet learned.

Mr. Speaker, I am please to support the motion. I think that what happened this afternoon in terms of the so-called withdrawal and the remarks that were made outside the House indicate that's not satisfactory and that indeed this matter for the sake of us all — when I say us all, I just don't mean the members sitting here, but I mean the people of Saskatchewan, the people who have some degree of understanding of what the parliamentary procedure is all about, deserve to have this matter put before an inquiry and to have those who make the allegations substantiate them, or resign Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to support the resolution.

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — I find this debate to be a rather sad, and degrading experience. But it is an affair that I feel must be resolved, if the rule of law in this province is to go unchallenged. You see, Mr. Speaker, as all know with any knowledge of legislative proceedings, all of us know the Speaker is the guardian of the law in this

Legislature. A slur to the Speaker must be withdrawn completely by all who had a part in it, if the rule of law in this land is to be upheld. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because it is only by our example of our respect for laws, that the laws of this land will be respected by the people as a whole in this province. And these Conservative members opposite have shown a complete disrespect for the law of this Legislature, by their disregard for the office of the Speaker. If we in this Legislature will not abide by the laws, if we must cast aspersions on the guardians of the law in this Legislature, then we need not expect the citizens of this land to follow the laws that we make. But you know, I think what bothers me as much as anything, what has been mentioned so many times, is the childishness of the whole affair.

When I entered politics, I expected to take knocks for my philosophical beliefs. I knew that I'd get it in the neck here and there, and I expected to take it and I think I have taken it. I expected there to be give and take without crying over attacks that are made, or imaginary attacks that would be made. And I thought all members would be men enough, adult enough, to be able to do the same but here what have we got? Sheer nonsense and crying over some supposed slight. I find the whole matter much beneath my dignity. I want the people of Saskatchewan, yes, the people of Saskatchewan, must know of the pettiness of the Progressive Conservatives in this place. Have they shown any concern about looking after the policies of the people of Saskatchewan? No. They sent a letter saying we haven't had our proper place within the Legislature. Where do I sit? Not, do I look after the people of this province. Now, if there had been more members and if the Speaker had ignored that fact, then one could have accepted that they had some cause for dismay. But no. If they don't get everything they want, then they are just little children who cry and throw tantrums; they send letters. Because they don't get what they want they cry; because they can't get sitting next to mommy – they cry. Do they look after the peoples' interest in the province? No. Where are my offices, Mr. Speaker? Who speaks first, Mr. Speaker? Who gets the first question, Mr. Speaker? Just like a little child says, I want my candy first. What childishness, what nonsense. If we can't have our way, like little children again, say those members opposite, we will call names, we will cast aspersions on the members of this Legislature — in this case, the Speaker.

As I have said before, this whole debate is beneath my dignity. I had expected more of people like the members for Rosetown-Elrose, Souris-Cannington, Estevan and yet I know the member for Rosetown-Elrose to be an intelligent man and I know that he can read. That's an honor. And yet he said, we're not arguing where we're sitting in this Legislature and you can read it on page 22 of the last day's copy of Hansard. Not arguing over seating – then he didn't read the letter by the sound of it. If you didn't know the member for Rosetown-Elrose, you would say that he was foolish, that he was half-witted. But I say that that is as close as that hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose will come to a complete repudiation of his leader, and the childish headline hunting tactics that is shown by that leader in sending and instigating that letter. But then we read in the Leader Post that the Progressive Conservatives had considered walking into the Legislature and taking over the seats next to the Speaker invading the Legislature, Mr. Speaker. Would they have attacked the members of the Liberal caucus next? Just like a child again who pounds at someone when he can't get the other child's toys.

I want the people of Saskatchewan to notice what goes on in this place and I hope that they take a good accounting of it. I'm tired of the childish self-interest of the Progressive Conservative Party that they have shown in this place. This childish self-interest should

show the people of Saskatchewan what would happen should the sorry day ever arrive, that those people should form a government in this province. We know who would come first, it is obvious by what they have done. I am tired of this Assembly being made a platform for sick childishness. Mr. Speaker, I call on the Conservatives to get on with the business of this Assembly, the business of the people of this province. Show that you are worthy of the position to which you have been elected. Mr. Speaker, I shall be supporting this motion.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments to make.

I would like to begin by saying that when I was elected to this Legislature, I came I suppose with some degree of optimism about the kind of effort that could be put forward in this Legislature to produce better legislation and hopefully over a four year period convince the majority of the people of Saskatchewan that the province would be better off without this NDP government. I must say I had mixed emotions when the Tory caucus proved successful in seven constituencies in the last provincial election. And I say mixed emotions, because I've welcomed the three new non-socialist members to the Legislature that were there because they had defeated NDP members of the Legislature. I had some reservations about four of the Tory MLAs who arrived by winning Liberal constituencies in Saskatchewan, but at the same time I expected them to have in the long run, the same set of goals that I did, in one sense anyway, and that was bringing about better government to this province. I can say that it wasn't long after I sat in this House as a new member that I began to be disappointed by my pseudo allies, I suppose. We found that four out of the seven that were initially elected has probably spent some considerable portion of their time campaigning hard against the Liberal Party – certainly much harder against the Liberal Party than they had against the New Democratic Party in 1971. We find today, that probably six out of the eleven, or five out of the eleven that sit in this House today, worked very hard to bring about the demise of the Thatcher government in 1971. So I have been put in a position where I can't, at least on a regular basis, count on their support in a general attack on the government to try to bring it to some sense and bring up worthwhile alternatives for the people of Saskatchewan.

The people that we've seen in this caucus tend for the most part to be a say-anything do-anything bunch, generally speaking, bereft of principles. There were, however, some bright lights in the Tory caucus, speaking relatively, of course, and I had some small degree of admiration for the principle and certainly the bravado of the member for Rosetown-Elrose and I still to some degree count on him as an ally in a sense, in this Legislature.

I had a certain amount of respect for the member for Souris-Cannington and the member for Estevan, given their past situations and both of them, I think, ended up in the Conservative Party for, in their own minds anyway, legitimate reasons. The same may to some degree be said of the member for Swift Current. However today we find only one member of that caucus anyway in this entire debate who has said anything, I think, that resembles cool rationale, and that's the member for Rosetown-Elrose, who doesn't always speak with cool rationale. That member said that it makes little difference where he sits in the Legislature, and certainly insinuates that what you say is certainly far more important than from where you say it. I find that the Tory caucus that I had so often hoped would be of some assistance to our party as an opposition party in this Legislature, and ultimately to the people of Saskatchewan, that I had hoped would be a benefit, is really of no benefit at all.

We had hoped in the first instance that we would have at least their participation in the potash debate, so that some common sense might be shed on the entire issue and they were silent on that issue – a most major issue in this House, so I find myself sitting here looking at a caucus whose only purpose for being here is some perverse desire for power in this province with perhaps a few exceptions to the members whom I have mentioned. Even those fellows are being dragged down by the members of their own party who are here with illegitimate concerns and desires. The member for Souris-Cannington who I said I had some considerable respect for, and who, I believe has very gullibly signed his name to a letter he did not write and which was forwarded over his name to the Speaker of this Legislature and to the media. I find now that this member has his back to the wall; his caucus colleagues probably ill appreciate the pains to which he has gone to make a somewhat illegitimate political point for them. They talked him into standing up and withdrawing his comments in this Legislature and yet when pressed outside the Legislature by members of the media, continues to be loyal to the kind of cause that they put him up to putting before the public. I have nothing but sympathy for the member for Souris-Cannington because he will certainly find that the loyalty that he has displayed to his caucus will undoubtedly not be there in return when he faces the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The other members of this Legislature that sit in the Tory caucus that I expected would be here to make some legitimate contribution to the workings of this Legislature, have for the most part, remained silent during this debate. I must say that I am certainly disappointed that their motives and perhaps their lack of principle will not allow them in the first instance to stand behind a member of their own caucus and who they have put up to no good, shall we say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, I would never want to use words as strong as ‘betrayal’ or ‘deserter’ because only the member for Souris-Cannington would know to what extent those words are true. However, I was at one time earlier today, in perhaps a bit of a magnanimous mood as the word has been going around, and I felt — well if the member for Souris-Cannington was sincerely sorry about what he had done and perhaps in another way at this moment he is.

We all know that the member for Sutherland, by his own admission worked very hard against the 1971 Liberal government, so we don’t count on his remarks with much credence. The member for Souris-Cannington went outside of this Legislature after he had convinced me that he had some sincere desire to apologize to the members of this House, by way of withdrawing his letter condemning members of this Legislature and the Speaker. He went out of this House, and for reasons that perhaps only the good Lord knows, completely contradicted himself in the media. I have little charity left in my soul at this minute. We all know how much damage that statements and issues like this Tory caucus has taken to the media can do, not only to the Speaker, but particularly to members of this Legislature, and I must say that I am offended that any one member of the Kindersley constituency might possibly consider that I would enter into negotiations with members of the NDP party opposite.

That he would not, in spirit, withdraw his letter to this Legislature is condemnation enough of his attitude and his principles in this Legislature. That he should be called before a committee to account for his actions is the only course of justice open to this Legislature as an institution, and I will certainly be supporting . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — I'll leave you something to talk about if you get another chance to speak, Mr. Attorney General. I didn't want to rob you of your entire speech. I feel that the only option open to the members of this Legislature, and certainly members of this caucus and myself personally, is to see that these members are brought before the committee to give evidence, probably which doesn't exist, perhaps only in their mind, but to give evidence backing their allegations.

I will be supporting the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E.L. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take a great deal of time in the Legislature this evening, but I feel I have a few words which I would like to contribute to this debate . . . to clarify the situation, the member for Arm River says.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I witnessed this afternoon one of the most interesting operations in this House that I've seen for a long time. The Conservative caucus spent last Thursday, at great length, with three or four of their members defending the letter which they had sent to Mr. Speaker, and saying that it indeed contained no allegations which in any way reflected upon the Office of the Speaker. Having had a weekend to think it over, the member for Souris-Cannington rose in his place and withdrew categorically, the letter. Then I think the Conservatives, and perhaps some people outside of this Legislature, wondered why members on this side of the House were not prepared to accept that particular withdrawal. I think, Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney General pointed out to you on a point of order, on page 24, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland had said, and 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. So while one member of the Conservative party is withdrawing categorically what he had said in the letter, another member stood on the record, Mr. Speaker, categorically in favor of what was said in the letter. Now the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland also said, following that, and I ask any of those people sitting opposite or their friends here to our right, to show us one place in that letter where it says that Mr. Speaker concurs with the deal.

It wasn't hard, Mr. Speaker, for someone who at least had reached the second grade, which obviously the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland hadn't, to read the first paragraph. It says and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

The final decision by the New Democratic Party in the matter of recognition of the Progressive Conservative caucus as one of the official opposition parties in the fourth session of the 18th Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan, as outlined by your office . . .

And if I can quote, leaving out the middle part (the final decision by the New Democratic Party, as outlined this morning by your office). Now surely, Mr. Speaker, nothing could more clearly convey the meaning of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, than that your office had carried out the decision of the NDP caucus and that you, Mr. Speaker, were not acting in an impartial way. Yet the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland said, 'I go on record for what it's worth and I concur with its contents.' 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.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know, I must admit and I say it with deference with the Attorney General sitting in front of me that I have always had a certain amount of respect for lawyers. I have also felt, Mr. Speaker, that it took a certain amount of intellectual ability to get into law school, and a teeny weeny bit of intellectual ability to get through law school, but the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has convinced me that if you can get into kindergarten you can get through law school.

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the Conservative Party got into law school but he couldn't get out of it. That shows, Mr. Speaker, when you compare what the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has said, something of the calibre of the leader of the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, the member of the Conservative Party also likes to spend a great deal of his time passing himself off as a great accountant. I think it would be very interesting if some of the members of the press, when they are not contributing to the Conservative Party, would spend some of their time looking into the accounting background of the Leader of the Conservative Party as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I look at that group across the way . . . well, he claims to be an accountant, the member for Regina South. The last time we had a Conservative government in this province was the Anderson government, and it was a mixed bag too, Mr. Speaker. It was an alliance of a few true Tories, all three or four of them, some cast-offs from the Liberals and a few unfocused progressives. The member for Kinistino this evening, speaking on the French network said, 'You'd have to die twice to forget what that government did to this province.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, the kind of activities carried on in this Legislature by the members of the Conservative Party can only be drawn as a parallel to the gerrymander that was engineered by the Thatcher government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, both parties, the Thatcher government and this Conservative Party in this House, have shown time and time again their total disrespect for the office of the Speaker, for this House and for the traditions of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we all stretch the rules on occasion, but this letter which was sent by the member for Souris-Cannington offends the very roots and foundation of our parliamentary system. First of all he states in the opening sentence that the Speaker has conveyed a partisan decision made by the NDP, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, it opens up to the public the accusation that the Speaker is being an errand boy for the government of the day. It has since been withdrawn but it was said and concurred in by three or four of the members sitting opposite in the Conservative caucus and they haven't withdrawn. They repeated it, as the Attorney General says, tonight on the eighteenth hour, which is typical of the Conservative Party and typical of their leader who doesn't have the guts to stand in this House and defend his member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

November 21, 1977

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Conservative Party, in my view, should not even be sitting in this House as a member, much less as a leader of a party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Secondly, Mr. Speaker, that letter was given to the media and you can obviously see the intent of the Conservative Party here. They didn't care about the rules, they didn't care about the issues. All they cared about was their 30 seconds on television before Mr. Speaker had a chance to reply to the letter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, the letter runs contrary to an agreement, a gentleman's agreement, an understanding and a consensus, call it what you like, between all three parties which was made before this House sat, on the conduct of the House and that doesn't bother the Conservatives at all. They aren't interested in understandings, consensus, gentleman's agreements, or their word. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Not even written agreements.

MR. COWLEY: — Fourth, Mr. Speaker, the letter stated that the Tories were seriously considering that they take the seats they wanted, regardless of what the Speaker might decide.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Storm troopers.

MR. COWLEY: — Storm troopers, the member for Humboldt says.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Wear your little swastikas, eh boys!

MR. COWLEY: — The member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) says, wear their swastikas. They has as much trouble spelling that as they do Switzerland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the public of this province should take a look at the record of the Conservatives in this House.

First of all we have the leader of the Conservative Party, the member for Nipawin, petulance over decorum. Then he made a spectacle of himself trying to speak without notes and he lasted about 11 seconds. Next, it was their ignorance of how to use the question period. Last year, two years ago, was the faux pas over the opening of the House and this Legislature. Then they blundered into (perhaps fell into is a better description), the filthy hospital issues and came out with egg all over their faces. This year it is the letter and where their wives sit.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a record of leadership, this is not a record of a real leader, it is a trial of confusion and a litany of childishness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest the people of this province cannot count on

the calibre of judgments that have been offered by this Conservative Party opposite.

I want to suggest to the members who are sitting here tonight, without the benefit of their fearless leader who has run out of this House, that they cannot afford this kind of incompetence either.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is and it will be the Achilles heel of any Tory government, and I suggest to the members of the Conservative Party opposite that whether you are going to be the government, or the opposition, or the third party (and I suspect it is the latter) if indeed any of you are here in the next session . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — . . . that you had better deal with your Achilles heel now.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether there is one member of that Conservative Party opposite who can, in all honesty, rise and defend the integrity and fearlessness of his leader. I doubt if there is one, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I listened to some of the statements made by the Leader of the Conservative Party and I can say on a couple of these things comments without feeling hypocritical myself.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. COWLEY: — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — I have listened with interest to some of the debate this evening and I am having some difficulty tying it into the resolution which is before us. The motion has to do with sending a certain letter to a committee. I wonder if members could be relevant to the motion that is before us. I think there are several members who have had a go at the motion this evening who have strayed a bit from the relevance of the resolution.

MR. COWLEY: — Thank you Mr. Speaker. I certainly want to be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about this letter because I think in part what we are discussing in this letter is not only what is in it but what we feel are the motivations behind this letter, and why and how this letter came into being. There have been other members who have said (and they were in order, Mr. Speaker, and I trust I will be) that they are somewhat sceptical that the member for Souris-Cannington actually wrote the letter but rather that he signed and delivered the letter, as he says, on behalf of the Conservative caucus. One wonders why the Conservative caucus, which talks so much, and indeed I suspect the member for Souris-Cannington does as well, about law and order, about decorum in the House, about the appropriate and proper way of carrying on our business in this House, would be so hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, as to put this letter on the record to Mr. Speaker, which indeed calls into question the whole office of the Speaker.

I think, Mr. Speaker, one has to look at some of their other actions to understand why the Conservatives have taken this particular action. You know, Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest in a similar sort of circumstance to the Conservatives issuing, just before this Session came into being, a press release saying they weren't

going to smoke in the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the way in which the press reported this as a straight news item. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I tend to be something close to a chain smoker. (I am not particularly proud of that – it just happens to be a fact.) I would like to get rid of it but I haven't and if I had sent before the press and issued a statement that I was somehow sanctimonious and holy and not going to smoke in this House, and the press, knowing me as well as they do, had accepted that and reported it sort of straight and level, I'd have wondered about the press. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I have wondered about the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) and I have wondered about the press. The only word that sort of pops into my mind is 'hypocrisy'. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that's where it is at. I think the Conservative Party in this particular issue, and in some which I have outlined before, have shown the rankest kind of hypocrisy in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — They take one issue in this House, the debate goes on, and they have shown, almost without fail, that their charges are totally without foundation. Yet, outside this House and in the press of this province, they end up as being the defenders of some kind of sanctimonious position. Mr. Speaker, I for one am getting very tired of this. I am tired of the Conservatives being shown up for hypocrites in this House and outside this House, thundering off as if they have some kind of a halo around their heads.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am not prepared to allow the member for Souris-Cannington, or indeed if all his colleagues stand in their place, for them to withdraw their remarks and have this motion struck from the books. I think they have done that time and time again. They came into the House on a fundamentally weak position, they have been exposed in this House by members on this side of the House, they have withdrawn, they have run away, and then they went out in the corridor and said the same thing they were saying in the House, that they couldn't defend here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, there are 18 to 24 months (somewhere in there) between now and the next election. I don't care how much money the banks and the press of this province give to the Conservative Party. I don't care how many lies the Conservative Party tries to spread, I am dedicating myself in the next 18 months to telling the story of the incompetence, the hypocrisy of that party opposite and there won't be one over there in 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I have never in all the time I have sat in this Assembly seen an individual or a party attacked, drilled, criticized, vilified as the member for Souris-Cannington has been this evening and not one single party member in his party would stand up in defence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — What really bothers me is that Dick Collver, or if you want, Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin, is not even here tonight when he knew that this

particular resolution would come to a vote. Mr. Speaker, he sat here — can you imagine the member for Thunder Creek's father standing in this Assembly and letting a member be attacked to the degree that that member was attacked without getting to his feet? Mr. Speaker, that is a sign and the sign is indicating the truth and veracity of what has occurred in this Assembly in the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party has made fools of the press, made fools of them. I tell you in all honesty when I watch some of the reporting, made fools of them. The party has no respect for the Legislature, they walk out in the corridors and issue a letter or a press statement and I have heard them say, "It doesn't make any difference what you say in here just mouth off in the corridors." And you have got a front-page story where rural Saskatchewan did not even have the reporting of the Throne Speech of this province. Then the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) says, "Why are we debating this, why are we wasting our time?" The members of the Conservative Party sit and worry where their wives sit, where they sit themselves. Someone reported, sulking "like children," as I said.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad day in this Assembly and I say this in all honesty. I had hoped that this resolution this evening, that I could have stood up and withdrawn that resolution and I say that in all honesty. I have been listening to the member for Souris-Cannington today and I felt, first of all, he was tricked. I know the member for Souris-Cannington. He signed the letter as the whip of the caucus of the Conservative Party. There is no question that the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) wrote the letter and it will be interesting when we get to the committee and ask who originated and drafted the letter. It will be interesting, Mr. Speaker, as to who wrote the letter, but what bothers me most, is that he was tricked and doped and I thought he stood up with some genuine degree of apology to the House. Then at 4:30 he withdraws the statement and at 5:00 o'clock he refuses to withdraw it and says that it is the truth. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, and with all due apology, did he lie at 4:30 or did he lie at 5:00 o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think I cannot allow the member to ask a question which contains an unparliamentary term and I would ask the member — it's a dilemma no matter which way it's answered and it casts aspersions and I would ask the member to withdraw the use of the word.

MR. MALONE: — On a point of order. Surely, surely it is up to the member that is being referred to to get on his feet and ask for a withdrawal. If he is going to sit there like a lump and not get up and ask for a withdrawal surely you are under no obligation to do so on his behalf. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think that silence in this case can be construed as guilt and surely it is not up to you to determine what is going through the mind of the member who is being referred to.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw. I will merely ask again the question. If it makes your decision easier I will be glad to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: — There was a point of order raised by the Leader of the Liberal Party. I recall this afternoon that the Leader of the Liberal Party made a citation to me, Citation 156, and in Citation 156 it says:

The proper time for interference is when the offensive expressions are uttered and not afterwards and it may take place either on the Speaker's

voluntary motion or on the call to order of the members assailed or some other member or the general call of the House.

I took it upon my authority to bring the member to order and I accept the member's withdrawal.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, may I say again, was he sincere at 4:30 or was he sincere at 5:00 o'clock? Was he being truthful at 4:30 or was he being truthful at 5:00 o'clock?

Mr. Speaker, what really bothers me is that this particular problem was a planned strategy . . .

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I think that the innuendo is there and in any language I think that I would ask the Speaker to ask the member to withdraw it as being unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I agree the member was improperly addressing the House before but I don't believe he was later.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — May I rephrase the comments I made and could the member tell me what did he mean at 4:30 and what did he mean at 5:00 o'clock? I happen to know . . .

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I am sure that if the members of this House got a true transcript of the press at 5:00 o'clock they will find that the comment was, 'between parties certainly'.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I will read the exact words of the member for Souris-Cannington, the exact words that are on the record. Question: Do you now state that no deal was made. Answer: I can't say that.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What does that mean? That means no.

MR. MacDONALD: — Why can't you? Because only they will know for sure, I guess. Question: Well you obviously felt that when you wrote the letter there was need, are you changing your mind now? Answer: I am suggesting and I suggested before that in light of past activities such as two by-elections in February and the by-election in Pelly they worked hand in hand together and there is no reason to believe that they wouldn't do the same thing here.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of life today and in public affairs in Canada is that there are many people who vilify people who stand for public office. They stand up and vilify them. What bothers me is this was a deliberate planned strategy of the Conservative Party to destroy the public confidence of people in public life. I have watched people who stood in public life lose their lives including the father of the member for Thunder Creek because he devoted his life to public life in this province. I have seen people go to the poorhouse because they had devoted their life to public life. And they have some idiot stand up here and attack their integrity and their honesty. I say to you, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wonder who the member is

calling ‘some idiot’.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, if the shoe fits, wear it. Let me go back again, this is the third time in less than 12 months that this House has faced the question of honor, integrity, devotion to Saskatchewan of members of this Assembly. Never before in 20 years, or 20 sessions or 18, has this ever been brought forward before. Never before. First of all we had the attack on the honesty of the word of the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter), then we had the filthy hospital debate. Mr. Speaker, what it really boils down to is a question of leadership, because believe me this resolution could never have been proposed or the letter ever written without the consent and the approval of the member for Nipawin. Mr. Speaker, that is unfortunate because believe me never will the people of this province elect a Premier whom they can’t trust in this Legislature in his personal affairs, in the affairs of the public of this province. Mr. Speaker, that is unfortunate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I want to review very quickly, I think enough has been said and I am embarrassed to stand up here tonight and make this kind of a defence . . .

MR. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Sit down!

MR. MacDONALD: — Yes, sit down, you would like that the member for Saskatoon. ‘I concur in that letter’, and believe me you do. That’s what bothers me. I had hoped that you would stand up . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I wonder if the member would address his remarks through the Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, let me review very quickly the observations of those colleagues. What bothers me, it was not only a conclusion of the member for Souris-Cannington, then the member for Rosetown-Elrose got up and said, “Yes it was a deal,” that the deal went on last year. Then the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland said, “I concur that it was a deal.” Then the member for Qu’Appelle got up and said, “It’s a deal,” a traditional deal. Mr. Speaker, they went on and on and on.

There are two or three things which are very obvious. One, not one single member offered one shred of evidence. Is that what people who get elected to public life in this province are going to be subjected to, that you can get up and tell the big lie, you can get up and tell the big accusation, you don’t have to substantiate it in any way shape or form. You just need to get up and say what you like, say it in here under the immunity of the Legislature which is really bad, then turn around and shrug your shoulders.

Let me very briefly go through — first of all the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher). I got a kick out of this. He said, “Let’s get on with the business of the House.” Let’s get on with the business of the House, when they think the biggest political coup ever planned was the fact that they made such fools of the Leader Post and the other members of the media. What any honest reporter would have known was the deliberate falsehood, a deliberate falsehood. He said, “. . . get on with the business of the House.”

Mr. Speaker, then I turned to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. What does he say?

Why our wives were forced to sit in a corner. Then we came to the member for Qu'Appelle — this is the one that really got me and I wonder what the member for Thunder Creek thought. When I was a member of his father's Cabinet, there is one thing that the Premier always said. We have got to have Conservative members for candidates running or we'll never beat the NDP, because if there are no Conservative candidates, the Conservatives will vote NDP. He knows to the great extent that the Liberal Party and his father went to ensure that there were Conservative candidates in 1971 and 1967.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's Wipf!

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you about the traditional story of politics in Saskatchewan. In 1934 when all of a sudden the Conservative Party was destroyed they became the NDP. Then, Mr. Speaker, do you know that in 1967 when we formed the government, in 1971 when we lost it, there was absolutely no difference in our vote. The Liberals were absolutely straightforward, stable and steady. The difference was that those Conservatives all jumped to the NDP, from about 39 per cent they went to 55 per cent. We stayed at 40 per cent, because as Ross Thatcher always said, four out of five Conservatives will vote Socialist every time. There are only two kinds of people in Saskatchewan, Liberals and anti-Liberals. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Conservative Party today is doing exactly that. They are not interested in defeating you people across there. All they want to do is to replace the Liberals as the members of the opposition. The member for Thunder Creek said once, I read something about he had one more score to settle. I wonder if he is settling the score with the Conservative Party by joining them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — I want to tell you, if it was his father here today, his father would never accuse the Liberals and the NDP of making a deal. He would have said the Tories and the NDP have been electing the Socialists provincially and the Conservatives federally since 1934. I would like the member for Thunder Creek to stand up and deny that! Then we listen to the drivel of the member for Qu'Appelle who stands up and says, there's been a traditional deal. It goes a way back to the '30s, a traditional deal. I have never heard of such drivel.

I am going to tell you another thing that Ross Thatcher said, and maybe per se Dick Collver might listen to, and maybe the member for Thunder Creek might tell his leader. He said, if there is ever a clear cut confrontation they'll never elect a Liberal government or a free enterprise government in Saskatchewan, if it's Liberals against NDP, because those Conservatives will always elect the NDP. He said the most important thing is to give that third party option. I'm going to tell you, Mr. Thatcher, the present day, you had better think about what your father said, because if there is a clear cut confrontation between Dick Collver and Allan Blakeney and Ted Malone isn't there, God help you people. I mean that! If there is anybody that should be promoting the third party and the Liberal Party as a strong and viable alternative it should be the Conservatives. I'll tell you something, you'll do nothing but elect the NDP for the next 20 years and that's all Dick Collver will ever do, is elect the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, then I want to talk for a moment about the member for Rosetown-Elrose because that was a tragedy. I kind of respect him. He went back and said, why last year

there was a deal, you know that they got the caucus room over there. They sat in the Leader of the Opposition's office. We got the first question of the day. He said that was a deal. My God, Mr. Speaker, my God! I was always under the understanding that at that time the Liberal Party had more members than the Conservatives and surely to heavens Mr. Bailey isn't expecting the Speaker of the House to contradict The Legislative Assembly Act and the parliamentary tradition from Ottawa. Are you suggesting that the Speaker had any alternative? Go to Ottawa and sit and watch what goes on in the House of Commons. The Conservatives are the official opposition. They get the first question, they sit in the opposition desks they have the opposition offices. You go to Manitoba where there are three parties. The NDP today have the official opposition offices. They sit in the opposition seats. They have the lounge that's so important to them.

What did you expect the Speaker to do, Mr. Bailey, last year? Contradict the traditions of the British Parliamentary System and then turn around and put yourself in his position today. What is he to do today? All of a sudden we find ourselves in a position that there are nine and nine — or eleven and eleven. I keep thinking that Qu'Appelle and Thunder Creek shouldn't be there. So what happens, we have eleven and eleven. So please tell me what the Speaker is to do. Is he to go to Mr. Malone my seatmate and say, move out of that office, the Conservatives are moving in. Get out of that lounge, the Conservatives are moving in? Can you imagine what the people of Saskatchewan would have said if that's fair play? All he said, and everybody, all the indications in the press that there would be fair play. From what I understand Mr. Malone is going to move the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Thatcher is going to reply to the Budget. I told Mr. Malone, for God's sake take the Budget! Don't worry about the Speech from the Throne. The Budget is the most important one. No, it was decided that he would have the Throne Speech and they would have the Budget. They decided they would alternate questions. What could be more fair? So I suppose he decided that the very first question of the session — if Dick had got up we might have even had a little bit of an issue, but Dick was still asleep when Malone was on his feet. What are we supposed to do, and what is the Speaker supposed to do, when you treat them fair. Mr. Speaker, the whole and entire argument is so unbelievable. Mr. Collver is so determined. He is consumed with passion and desire to be the Leader of the Opposition, not the Premier of this province of Saskatchewan. That's what really bothers me.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on talking about this resolution. I could go on talking about this debate. It is indeed very, very disappointing. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I say it honestly, the real guts of this argument according to the Conservatives is that there are two members here, the member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) and the member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) and pardon me, Mr. Speaker, for speaking that way, that they shouldn't be here. Can you imagine that they shouldn't be here and they were elected. Mr. Collver, he's God Almighty, says that the member for Regina Wascana who ran in an election and got elected and the member for Regina South with the two biggest majorities in Saskatchewan shouldn't sit here. You know something, Mr. Speaker, when the next federal election may be, 1979 some are predicting. You know something the provincial election may well be over before that. I want to tell you something, there are no two members who have more communication with their constituents than these two. They are knocking on doors every night. Go and phone up somebody in Tony Merchant's constituency and ask him if he thinks that Gary Lane or Colin Thatcher is a better member than he is. They'll soon tell you. In five minutes you call one of these two people and they are there. They were elected by their constituents, they are sitting here and not only that, surely to heavens, they are not naive and silly enough to think the Speaker is going to go against the law of the province of Saskatchewan and the Dominion of Canada. Do you know what the Dominion of

Canada says? That until such day as the federal writ is issued they don't have to resign; they are still members of the provincial Legislature. Surely no one with an ounce of common sense could make that analogy, and if you asked me what I thought, I would take the opposite viewpoint and say that these two members have every right to sit in here, but there are two members over there who don't; that morally, the member for Thunder Creek and the member for Qu'Appelle should have resigned because they weren't elected as Conservatives. That's what I would have said, Mr. Speaker. But I am also not naive and silly enough to suggest that because I think that, the law of the province is going to say that, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty, that there are eleven and eleven, and your responsibility is to treat them as fairly and equally as possible. And although you and I don't always agree, in fact I think I get slammed down more than most people, like I did today, but I want to say that I do have enough confidence to know that the people of Saskatchewan and the public will not stand for unfair treatment of a third party or equal parties in the opposition. At the end of this Session it will be up to the members of the gallery to make that determination. Not the good Lord Himself, the member for Nipawin, and I say that in all honesty, and I would hope that all of us in this Assembly would sit down and remember that some of us, most of us, all of us I hope, are here as members of this Assembly on behalf of the constituency they represent with a desire to do something good for the province of Saskatchewan. Really, I want to tell the member for Souris-Cannington that I'll gladly exchange seats with him and I'll guarantee that I'll do a better job from there than he will from here.

Mr. Speaker, we now come to the crunch of the matter. Do we support this resolution or do we not? Mr. Speaker, I have proposed an amendment this afternoon which I hoped we might have brought in this evening. After the comments at 5:15 outside of the House, which means that a withdrawal in order to eliminate mechanical problems of the House is all that is required, and that the Conservative Party can go on to the media and across the province and make the kind of accusations they have. This is completely unacceptable to me. I have yet to hear the member for Shaunavon as angry, as hurt as he was this afternoon, and with very, very good reason. Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge everybody here to vote for this motion, and I'm going to ask the member for Souris-Cannington to come into that particularly, and I don't care what he believes. You know that's the funny part about some people. I believe a lot of things about you fellows. I'm not going to make a public accusation about your honesty and integrity, not a public accusation here where I don't have to verify it outside of the Assembly. I am going to ask that you people vote for this particular motion and that the member go in and substantiate and clear up once and for all, whether or not a member can stand up in this Assembly and attack his colleagues regardless of what party they sit on, in relation to their honesty and integrity and their loyalty to the democratic system of this province. That's what really is at issue. It's unfortunate that he is going to have to make the decision because I know there is no truth in his statements. Mr. Speaker, if we do this, regrettable as it may be for the member for Souris-Cannington, regrettable as it may be for the Conservative Party, I suggest to you that it will never happen again, that a member will stand on his feet with a deliberate planned strategy to vilify a political party or political individuals in order to benefit his own political advancement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:21 o'clock p.m.