

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

December 19, 1977

EVENING SESSION

The debate continues on 'Committee Branded Kangaroo Court.'

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the sub-amendment of the Premier's again it seemed to me what the sub-amendment was designed to do was to give to the Conservative caucus a sort of graceful exit from the difficult position that they are in in consequence principally of the error upon error of judgement by their chief strategist, the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). I find it really fascinating in all of this that I am still of the mind that it was the member for Qu'Appelle who drafted the letter which Mr. Berntson wrote. The language is so clearly his and the sort of way in which he expresses things is so clearly his. We saw that in the remarks he was making just before we broke. His words again were sort of dancing about in confusion, trying to fasten on some thought that kept alluding the words.

What the member for Indian Head-Wolseley was attempting to indicate to the members to my left, if the member for Qu'Appelle would listen was that there were two things that were troubling us with the Premier's amendment. One was that there was no requirement for the Conservative members who have been held by Mr. Speaker to have been in breach of the rules now on a number of occasions, to apologize to the members of the House for their breach. That was one consideration. These are not findings made by any of us. These are findings made by Mr. Speaker, on the advice of the Clerk and no one but no one can fairly challenge the way in which Mr. Speaker made those decisions. He took both matters under consideration. He considered them carefully and he came to a considered decision. The first one was that the letter itself represented, in Mr. Speaker's opinion, a prima facie case of breach of privilege of the House and then that was referred. That was Mr. Speaker's decision. The next decision was that these remarks, uttered by the member for Thunder Creek and the member for Qu'Appelle that the work of the committee was a 'kangaroo court' was again a decision of Mr. Speaker's, in respect of which I rather expect Mr. Speaker took the Clerk's advice. No one can fairly impugn those decisions. Now, that being the case, the Premier, as I say, moves a sub-amendment to give the Conservative caucus a graceful way out of a difficult situation which the member for Qu'Appelle has led them into. And then he sort of rises and kind of closes the door on that graceful way that the Premier gave him to come out of it. Our concern, as I said, was it didn't require from the members an apology and some of us were concerned that it ought to go that far to ask of them some apology. Secondly is that the sub-amendment indicates that the committee ought to be suspended providing we receive the withdrawal from the member for Thunder Creek and the withdrawal from the member for Qu'Appelle and an acknowledgment from the member for Souris-Cannington that the letter that he wrote was without foundation. What we are concerned about is again what assurance do we have that those members won't rise in the Assembly, as the member for Souris-Cannington has done before, and say 'we withdraw' and then sort of promptly go out and repeat and resurrect the very thing they withdrew inside the Assembly outside the Assembly. That's why the member for Indian Head-Wolseley has suggested that the Committee of Privileges and Elections now sees with this question not be suspended but that it be adjourned, it be adjourned in effect sine die at the call for the chairman of the committee in the event that what is withdrawn in the House is again resurrected outside the House.

The question is whether the Conservatives are sincere in their withdrawal in what will I hope become withdrawals. The withdrawal by the members for Thunder Creek, Qu'Appelle and Souris-Cannington or whether they aren't sincere. If they are sincere in saying, "look", the member for Souris-Cannington, "I made a mistake. I am sorry I withdraw unconditionally" — good. The member for Thunder Creek says, "Look, I withdraw my remarks. The Speaker has found it's unparliamentary. It breaches the privileges of the House, I withdraw" — good. If the member for Qu'Appelle does the same thing and all three of them do it earnestly and sincerely that's the end of the matter. But if they leave the Assembly, go outside the Assembly and merely repeat again the charges which they will require to withdraw in the House. That really is not very satisfactory and they shouldn't be permitted to do that and that's why the member for Indian Head-Wolseley has suggested that the committee's work ought to be adjourned instead of suspended so that those things won't happen. The committee could be recalled at the behest of the chairman. What we're really asking there, simply is two things; one, is that the withdrawals go forward in sincerity and secondly, is that the rules and the laws of the Assembly not be breached subsequently. And as it is, the committee will still be in existence, at the call of the chair to deal with them, with their subsequent breaches in respect to the question. So that's the position that was intended by it.

Now, I say some of us have some concern with the Premier's sub-amendment, it didn't go quite far enough but it did offer to the Conservatives some graceful way out of the dilemma. All of us are desirous, no doubt, of getting on with other business. On the one simple condition that those members acknowledge that what they did was improper, that it was a breach of the rules by withdrawing their comments and by doing it sincerely without the intention of going outside the House and simply repeating again the charges anew. That's the position we face.

Now, that, Mr. Speaker, is all the comments I want to make with respect to the sub-amendment, I don't know what the Premier now intends to do with it. And how the member for Qu'Appelle once again misconceived the position as stated by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. I wouldn't be at all surprised if the consequence of all of this isn't going to be that the member for Qu'Appelle will cease to be the sort of house leader and chief strategist of the Conservatives. It's interesting to see the way in which he led them into this battle to begin with, the way in which he was first drubbed, then the matter went to the committee and then I guess his strategy was to call it a 'kangaroo court'. And he failed again in that respect. That was his second large blunder. Then the Premier offers him a nice, graceful way out and he hasn't got the sort of understanding to see that is was a graceful way out. It appears to us at this stage, that he's about to lead them to the third mistake and that is not to accept the sort of graceful condition he was given. And as the member for Indian Head-Wolseley says, the person who's caught principally in this piece is the member for Souris-Cannington and I don't know why he simply can't rise in the House and say, look, I made a mistake, I regret it. There could have not been a deal without necessarily involving the Speaker and the clerk. That I withdraw the letter, that I say that there's no foundation to the letter, that I offer my apologies to the members. And I think that would have disposed of it before and would dispose of it again, providing he is prepared to undertake not to simply go outside the House and repeat the allegations.

So with that Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain what position the government is going to take with respect to the sub-amendment of the Premier's. But if, in fact, that sub-amendment stands, we will be moving an amendment to it to have the committee not be suspended or not dissolved but merely to be adjourned so that it may be recalled in the

event there is any additional breach with respect to this particular subject matter, and, not as the member for Qu'Appelle has misconceived the situation to somehow gag and blackmail them, which is just total utter nonsense.

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, before I get into my comments with respect to the matter at hand, I'd like to indicate a press report that came to my attention over the supper hour given by the Premier of this province. Premier goes before the press and quite unabashedly says to the press: "That in order to avoid any more hassle on this whole regard he handed an olive branch."

Now, here is the Premier of the province, whose desk-mate — write it down, Attorney General, write it down, — whose desk-mate gets up and makes a motion to censure some Conservatives. In feeling of the season, the Leader of the Conservative Party gets up and he gives an amendment which would allow the matter to be resolved with everybody eating a little bit of crow. And then the Premier comes back in and moves a sub-amendment, — don't forget now Mr. Premier, I urge you, I remind you of this that the motion was moved by the Attorney General, he handed the olive branch, the Premier handed the olive branch. He comes back in with a sub-amendment that would make the PCs grovel in this House. And I tell you would we grovel before the Premier? Never! Will we grovel before the Attorney General? Never! Never as long as you live, in this House!

When the Premier said he hands out olive branches, I suggest to you, Mr. Premier, the olive branch he handed out tonight was the same kind of olive branch that was handed out at Munich some years ago. We know what was behind that olive branch. Now we come here in this session ready to deal with the matter of Bill 47, we came here ready. Well, if I were the members to the right, I wouldn't do too much laughing because out in the boonies you guys are getting it in the neck, bad.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker there's a substantial issue to be dealt with in this House. What's the most important issue as far as the government members are concerned? The Berntson letter . . . that rises above Bill 47, why? Because it's a convenient red herring. And this, the members to my right are only too happy to jump on the bandwagon and deal with the red herring because they've caught themselves in a position that they are embarrassed about, they've talked about the same things over and over. We get these redundancies and repetitions and the same garbage coming out. They refuse to come out and clearly put their position on the line as we have and then stand by it and I can understand why. Tonight, I'll have something to say about the member for Regina South and his principle, and so forth.

Tonight if anyone handed an olive branch it was the PC Leader. He handed the olive branch, he handed a way out and I know the Attorney General, I've been able to tell by the look on his face, he wants a way out. That was given to you tonight, everybody would have to had to eat some crow but we could have gotten on with the people's business. Bill 47 is only one matter that's of urgent importance and which should be dealt with. That's only one. There are lots more things. But did the Liberal Leader want to accept that? No way. He didn't want to accept compromise or reason. Did the NDP Leader accept that? No way. What they wish to do, Mr. Speaker, was to put the PC Party in Saskatchewan into a parliamentary strait jacket. They wish to gag the PC Party to throttle the PC Party and will we cower before that or grovel? Never! Not as long as you live, you won't see us grovel on that count! Not a bit. Now, in terms of the parliamentary strait jacket, the member gets up and says. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley says that what we should do this, let's put the committee, (the committee that was called by another name but now could be titled under sub nomine, the Committee to censure the PCs

when and if the Liberals and NDP choose). “Let’s hold this committee in abeyance for awhile and then when we feel that we need to strait jacket the Progressive Conservatives, if we feel that we need to oversee the PC’s activities or, (as he originally said,) investigate into the PC Party, if we want to muzzle them and silence them and stifle them, then the committee will be right there ready to go and away we go, we can call whatever evidence we feel would be fine to prove whatever point we wish to prove that day.”

Let’s talk about the members on the committee, let’s talk, for example, about the member for Regina Centre (Mr. Shillington). Here is a lawyer, here is a member who would come before the press before he has heard — and a member who incidentally is sitting on the committee — who would have the unabashed audacity to come before the press before he has heard one iota of evidence and say the PCs apparently don’t have any defence. They have yet to lay out the charge against the PCs but from Minton and try to make over members, by position of our superior voting power, grovel before members of this House.

MR. MacDONALD: — Where’s the evidence?

MR. LANE: — Oh, now the member says where’s the evidence? I’m glad you brought that up. I’m glad you brought that up. Where’s the evidence? A motion is laid before the committee saying by the Conservative members on the committee before they walked out calling it a ‘kangaroo court’ I believe, saying, let us bring our own evidence, let Berntson, the member for Souris-Cannington, have his own lawyer, let his lawyer cross examine the witnesses who are brought by the other members of the committee, let us cross examine those witnesses, let us bring our own documentation and proof. Did they let anyone do that? No, Mr. Speaker. They said, we will invite the member for Souris-Cannington to come and observe at this trial, then he can prepare a defence (which he will never be allowed to give), but he can observe. Now, the Attorney General knows better than that. Don’t, Mr. Attorney General, ever come in this House and pass yourself off as a defender of the faith if you say that a person charged with some offense is allowed to come into this House and ‘observe’ before a committee which has a charge against him. When have you defended a client and done a good job by letting him ‘observe?’ I haven’t been able to I’ve never been able to. I’ve been able to obtain a fair trial, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest the Attorney General is in much the same position he takes it upon himself at that point to say, the PCs don’t have any defence. This is a member who is sitting on the committee. But the Attorney general says these are all honorable men and I agree these are all honorable men who are sitting on the committee. Others, both on the immediate opposite side of the floor and members to my right rose up and condemned the letter and made it absolutely clear what their position was with respect to Berntson’s allegations in the letter, and then they said in the committee, and of course the Attorney General would have us believe that these are all honorable members, and we agree they are all honorable members, Mr. Speaker. And then the member for Regina South today, gets up in this House, the hon. member, and says, there must be sanctions and deterrents for this kind of behavior. It appears that the member for Regina South, although he has not been appointed as a hanging judge yet (he may be after he fails in his election), it appears that he has rendered a decision and would at the same time, as the Attorney General would have us believe, he is an honorable

member, would sit there unbiasedly and without prejudice on the committee and rule fairly on the member's case from Souris-Cannington. The Premier of this province gets up and says, let's talk about the justice of the matter. Well, I tell you Mr. Premier and Mr. Attorney General, if we are ever in a position to be sitting over on that side of the House (which will happen in 1979) hopefully we will never use our position of power to be little, little olive branch-bearing members and if he thinks about it fairly for one moment, when I was allowed to get in and cross examine the evidence to see. There are reasons for those rules. They are called "natural justice", a matter which . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I would refer the member to . . . Order! I refer the member to May's Parliamentary Procedure, 17th edition, page 459:3 Unreported evidence taken before a select committee. — It is out of order to refer and debate to evidence taken before a select committee until the committee has been laid before the House.

MR. LANE: — I wish to co-operate with the Speaker. Where did I refer to any evidence?

MR. SPEAKER:—The member is referring to the operations of the committee, and the committee has not brought any report before the House.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to co-operate in every respect. My comments were directed in this fashion; I would put it for your consideration — that I referred to evidence before a committee, committee per se. I did not refer specifically to any hard or real evidence that has come before the committee to this point in time. I'm not challenging or bringing evidence. I'm referring to evidence before a committee in the general spectrum and I don't think that, with respect, Your Honor, that that would be what the rules of Beauchesne refer to. I was very careful in fact, not to specifically refer to any of the evidence and I will continue not referring to any specific evidence. May I proceed?

Now, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley asks, "What evidence? What evidence indeed, Mr. Speaker, when you are not allowed to present your case, when you are not allowed to bring your lawyer to cross examine those witnesses. What evidence! I say, allow that committee to open up, allow that committee to open up and allow it to bring evidence. Oh, and the member for Regina South — he who would stand on principle in this House, this man who would stand on principle, who would give these speeches filled with sophistry about the principle of this committee and the principles of this House, who doesn't have the political courage or the personal backbone to allow a gentleman who is accused of an offence to be given the full particulars of that particular charge, and then be allowed to meet it in the normal basic ways that we are allowed to meet it every day in our . . . Don't talk to me about principle because anyone who would talk about principle from your position would commonly be observed in our society to be a plain and ordinary jerk!

Now, in terms of the withdrawal of the letter — the letter deals with two things, Mr. Speaker and in your own words the member Mr. Speaker has dealt with the fact, and I would quote to you from page 83:

The member has made an unqualified withdrawal and I would be the first one to admit that any member of this House, including myself occasionally makes a move in the wrong direction and wishes later, at a later point to change direction and usually has the opportunity to make the change without any personal embarrassment. This is the usual thing.

This is not the case. I think the member in making his withdrawal is subjecting himself to some small amount of embarrassment at this time, and some of the members may say that this is justified, but that is beside the point. I recall the other day in debate, without wishing to take part in the debate, that one of the hon. members and several of the honorable members were calling for a withdrawal. I would refresh Mr. Speaker's memory when a member, the Leader of the Liberal Party called one of the members in the House a liar, withdrew it and then later went into the hallways and the corridors and said to the press, and I repeat this of course, that the member is a liar. That's the way I understood it.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. I never went into the hallways after making the statement in the House unconditionally withdrawing my remark. I would ask the member to withdraw that statement.

MR. LANE: — I understand he did it before, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I amend and I withdraw. He did it before.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! I would ask the member to unconditionally withdraw the remark that he made.

MR. LANE: — I unconditionally withdraw the remark Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE:—Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm really proud of the member for Regina South. He's huffing and puffing — if somebody would hand him a teddy bear and tell him to shut up we could get on with the business of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the . . . your comments that . . . I would remind the members that there are two parts of the letter. One is a political charge which is fair politics. I hope I quoted you accurately, Mr. Speaker. One is a political charge which is fair politics, and that is I presume, the deal alleged between the NDP and the Liberals — the deal which has been ongoing we say for some considerable length of time of which there are mountains of evidence for those who wish to open their eyes and see. Then there is that other part, and it goes on and I'll paraphrase, that more or less challenges the Chair.

Now, if the member for Souris-Cannington had gone outside the hall and said, yes, I think Mr. Speaker is biased and bigoted and prejudiced after having withdrawn those remarks in the House, then of course there would have been some basis for the motion in the first place. He went outside the House and said, yes, I believe there was a deal, or words to that effect. They were quoted before by the Attorney General. Now the Attorney General, with the use of a little bit of sophistry and a little devious reasoning and a little twisting and misleading, and a little bit of this and a little bit of that, would have this House believe that in fact, he went out and said the former, that is that he impugn the Speaker's Chair. That is pure nonsense and pure hogwash and there is no need to deal with that any further.

In terms of respect for institutions, well we don't need to say anything about that. Biggar . . . the member for Biggar, the member for Lloydminster . . . I wish the member for Biggar wouldn't shout because his record insofar as respect for institutions and his comments on the Supreme Court are very interesting. And the member for Lloydminster, and the member for Yorkton — their comments on the Supreme Court. Withdraw the letter? Why should the member from Souris-Cannington withdraw the

letter? He withdrew any allegations against the chair, anything that impugned the office of the Speaker. He made that clear. If the same thing . . . (he withdrew the letter he indicates to me) . . . it's the same thing as when one of the Liberal; members or one of the NDP members makes a comment that the Speaker asks them to withdraw, does the Speaker then ask him in addition to withdraw, to apologize and to grovel? Well, if he did that would certainly set a precedent in this House. Well, the member for Kindersley says what do you do? Where do you go when you go outside? I would suggest that maybe what we have to do if we are going to follow your pattern, and certainly your pattern would be the last I would care to follow in the province of Saskatchewan now, is make my comments outside the House first and come in and withdraw. We have more backbone than that.

In terms of withdrawal of the letter, Mr. Speaker, once again — if anything needed to be withdrawn it was the comments that would impugn the Chair, and in Mr. Speaker's own words, "I think the member is right," and I said that. That is the basis of the motion and it's been removed. It's been removed as far as I am personally able to observe, and as far as Mr. Speaker is personally able to observe. He surely was the person of any member in this House who would have in any way, had his privileges breached. I say, its on record and there is no way you can deny it. Don't come running with your olive branches and your hypocritical comments and your misleading stance. Look into Hansard and see whether he withdrew it and whether the Speaker then went on to say these words:

As far as I am able personally to observe, but I would remind the member for Qu'Appelle that the results of the debate have not been removed, at least from my thinking, etc., and I will call the debate,

He then goes on to say or did he say it previously, I believe he said it previously, that he had unqualifiedly withdrawn it. Now, I remember a statement made in the House last year by myself. I remember that I withdrew that statement and the Speaker took the withdrawal of the statement. I remember then the Attorney General standing up and feigning as only the Attorney General can, and feigning his sincerity in the House, and how this was a serious issue and it had to be dealt with, and after my withdrawal and apology, calling in a person to testify before this House — a person who at the time . . . we let it drop who — a person at that time had indicated that hospitals has stopped doing high wall cleanings, ceiling cleanings, and who in many respects indicated that staff cutbacks were to the point where they were embarrassing. The Attorney General then, of course, got up and said there were some things that were not to his liking in this gentleman's report but then went on to give a political statement the likes of which have never been known, in which there was not one ounce of fairness or honesty. All of this followed an unqualified withdrawal and an apology.

Now, should we apologize, should we grovel before this House? If that is what is required, and if that is the level that politics has sunk to in this province then, Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry, sorry day. I ask when we come into this House that we be treated as other members are, that ideas while not always perhaps as accepted by members across the way — and, Mr. Speaker, I say this in sincerity — what first of all interested me in that party that forms government is people and gentlemen like the member for Weyburn, with true sincerity, with true feeling and genuine dedication to a cause, not the kind of people who have seized control of that party like the Attorney General who would get up and belligerently come after our party for taking donations from the big oil companies, the big corporations and then not discuss at all when we table the documents about the

donations that come from the big booze companies, from Seagram's, from Hiram Walker's, from London Winery, from Labatt's and the list goes on. That is the kind of political opportunist and hypocrite who seizes control of that party now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we attempted earlier in this day to put before the House, through the leader of our party, a method of ending this hassle that is preventing this House from dealing with the issues that are pressing and are current to the people of Saskatchewan today. If those members believe that they can take advantage of our good graces and think we will back off and cower and grovel, I say, never! You won't live long enough to see it.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, this afternoon our Premier moved a sub-amendment which I felt allowed the member for Qu'Appelle, the member for Thunder creek and the member for Souris-Cannington to withdraw and apologize gracefully. That amendment, I felt, was put forward with honesty and sincerity. I supported that amendment. However, Mr. Speaker, in light of the remarks of the member who just sat down, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, who I thought disgraced this House and disgraced the people of Saskatoon-Sutherland who elected him by the remarks he gave. I can't support . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — . . . the Premier's sub-amendment and I ask all members to vote against that sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — I say the Premier would be proud of my stand and all members who vote against that sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about this particular subject. I can't recall ever being angrier in this House than I was this afternoon. I was particularly angry with the amendment that was suggested .Why? Because in my view what had happened was that we had a case, the Berntson letter, in which a member was found guilty, not by the committee, he was found guilty by the Speaker of a breach of privilege.

MR. COLLVER: — On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker

MR. ALLEN: — Sit down! Oh, you and your points of order, what's going on here?

MR. COLLVER: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am waiting for Mr. Speaker to advise me, not you. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, am I recognized on the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: — What's your point of order?

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, the member has suggested that you ruled as to whether a breach of privilege occurred in the instance of the Berntson letter. I suggest that you suggested there was a prima facie case, you did not rule that there was a breach of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member is making a debating point.

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. It seemed to me that the amendment this afternoon, the effect of it would have been this. We had a committee set up; this committee was charged with being a ‘kangaroo court’ by two members of the Conservative caucus. We felt that that was unparliamentary and that these charges or words should be withdrawn and a motion was brought in to that effect. What was the effect of the amendment. The effect of the amendment was that these guys get up and withdraw their remarks but it also does away with the committee. Now I didn’t think that anything to do with the committee should be allowed in that particular motion. However, that was ruled on and I guess I haven’t got too much to say about it but I want to say I am not going to vote for that amendment. Why? These guys are laughing at us and they are not just laughing at us as individual members, they are laughing at the whole bloody institution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:—Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — They think that they can get up in the House and say anything that they like basically and then they don’t have even the good grace, as other members have done — someone mentioned the Supreme Court — I remember our member the other day got up and unqualifiedly withdrew. He had the good grace to do that. Now, I just cannot believe what’s happening here.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) said something about grovelling. When you make a mistake is it grovelling to get up and say, I’m sorry, I made a mistake? That’s all we are asking, that was all that was asked in the original resolution.

MR. THATCHER: — Tch, tch.

MR. ALLEN:—Oh, tch, tch yourself, you creepy. . . look, look, he’s laughing

AN HON. MEMBER: — It’s a big joke with him.

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what is happening in this House. We have a group of people who think that by intimidation they can frighten everyone; they think that they can go out in the halls after they retract something in here and make the statements all over again and the public will buy it, they think that because the public is buying it or something, we don’t have the courage to stand up and make them account. for their actions. Well, I’ll tell you, the rest of these guys might not have the courage but I will stand up. I’ll tell you something else, when the committee comes back with its report, if that report doesn’t deal with the member for Souris-Cannington, if he is still in the House the next day sitting here without at least a suspension of some kind, I will not vote in favor of that report.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That’s called ‘walking tall’ Bill.

MR. ALLEN: — Now, why do I say that? I say that because I, as an individual, have no recourse if this kind of action is allowed to take place. We live in a privileged situation in this House. You do things outside this House you can be brought to a court of law. Inside this House it is up to the House to decide and if you think I’m going to let you guys jump all over me as an individual member you’ve got another thing coming. That’s all

I've got to say.

MR. A THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, you know I have sat in here and I don't like to enter the debate very often but in the last while it kind of bothers me to see what the House has got itself into. Rather than go all over the things that were said that should not have been said,. I want to compliment the Premier this afternoon when he brought that resolution in. It was a thoughtful one. I also want to compliment the member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), my seatmate. He was giving them an honorable way out. I think it was Abraham Lincoln that said, "Never back your opponent into a corner where he cannot get out honorably" They were given that chance to back out honorably and after listening to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, I just cannot put that fellow together in the right way. I don't know whether it is just maliciousness, whether it's a game play or whether it's just plain stupidity. I haven't figured it out yet. I'm still figuring.

You know I've been 18 years in this House and I have never seen the game play or ignorance. I don't know which one it is, that has been displayed in the last week in this House. It is the worst that I have ever seen. I am going to tell the Conservative Party that we had your party in this House forming the government some 40 years ago with the Ku Klux Klan involved. The same attitude — I'm telling the people of this province, it's the same attitude and if they do form the government they will be put away for another 40 years but I don't believe that they will even form the government because there are enough people in this province living that are my age that are going to see to it; they have seen a group of people here that have respect for parliamentary procedure, the kind of procedure that this country has long preserved. I'm going to tell you this House produced a lot of good government. There was something good even about the Thatcher government.

MR. ROMANOW: — Maybe the people forgot about the Conservatives.

MR. THIBAUT: — Well there are still enough living to remind those who are here. I hope they don't do like little kids, they have to touch the stove to find out whether it is hot or not.

There is a real display that I hope the press will be honest about and bring to the people of this province what is being done by the Conservative Party to this Legislature that I really love.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this debate will soon come to an end and get on with the nation's business. I would say, like the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood, I was going to support the resolution of the Premier, reluctantly, but I could see his position, he was trying to give them an honorable way out. Maybe they are too stupid to see it and I don't know what to do with a bunch like that. I can assure you I will vote against the Premier's resolution something that I could never dream of doing and I have no alternative the way it stands now. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, is the member closing the debate?

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, having just heard from the member of this Legislature that we bother him — those guys bother him, I can say to him in sincerity, that without doubt, we obviously bother all the members opposite and all the members to my right. It is apparent since the day we came in this legislature that we bother you and I

want to assure you of something else. Between now and the next provincial election we will do what we were elected to do and that is to continue to bother you with facts and the truth. We are going to lay before the people of this province our case; our case for a difference, not the same sort of pact that is put up by the members to my right but a party with a difference, a government with a difference and if you don't like that difference, then you can continue on doing the same kind of behavior that you have put on and the performance that you have put on in this Legislature for two and a half years, merely because the Progressive Conservative party has arrived here.

Mr. Speaker, the member just mentioned what a wonderful government the Thatcher government was and what good government they provided but the member forgot to say that the Premier of the province, Mr. Thatcher, also was asked to withdraw something in the Legislature and he did in the Legislature and that was the end of it. Our member for Souris-Cannington in this legislature withdrew the letter. To withdraw the charges that there are deals between the NDP and the Liberals to the detriment of the PCs — never. If you want evidence of that, let us appear before the committee, let us . . . that's fair play and I want to emphasize to members of the press corps who've never mentioned this, who've never mentioned the fact that we've asked for the right to bring evidence to the committee in a reasonable way, in a way that says natural justice, in a way that serves justice in every other tribunal anywhere in the world except this one. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite and the members to my right, in their dealing way and I'll say it again, in their dealing way, are out and I quote one or two members outside the Legislature to quote: "Get the PC's."

MR. SPEAKER: — The question before us is a sub-amendment. The member has already spoken to the amendment and must confine his remarks to the sub-amendment.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I will speak to the sub-amendment, the sub-amendment asks basically the Progressive Conservative party of Saskatchewan to withdraw its allegation that there are deals between the Liberals and the New Democrats which we would be happy to bring evidence up but Mr. Speaker says you can't bring it into this House and the committee says you can't bring it before the committee because you're not allowed to call your witnesses, you're not allowed to have your own lawyer, you're not allowed to (sorry) . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — I challenge the member for Nipawin as of now, to bring the evidence right now, before the House if he says it is not permitted in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. That is not a point of order

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, we would love to bring that evidence forward and it is surprising, I am sure, surprising Mr. Speaker, to see which members of the Progressive Conservative called the committee a 'kangaroo court.' Which members? Examine that carefully Mr. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley before . . . How Mr. Member for

Indian Head-Wolseley because, Mr. Speaker, we can't bring our own witnesses before the committee. This has been ruled out for us. Read the motions the members who sit across and shake their heads. The member for Weyburn who is troubled by this entire discussion, the member for Weyburn who is the most decent man in this Legislature, to be quite frank, the member for Weyburn who I know is troubled by a committee — troubled by a committee that won't allow natural justice to occur. The sub-amendment Mr. Speaker, asks the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan to grovel and we will not grovel. It asks us to kowtow before the whim of the majority and we will not kowtow before the whim of the majority. If there was only one of us in this House, we would stand up for what we believe in. We would draw to the attention of the people of this province what we believe to be true. We will not be muzzled in this Legislature. We will not be muzzled outside this Legislature, either by the Attorney General or by the Premier or by the member for Indian Head or by the member for Regina Lakeview. The member for Regina South asks us whether we will be bound by the rules. Of course we will and Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Speaker himself, accepts a withdrawal in this Legislature of a letter that we believe, that we believe . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I don't question the member to interpret my remarks in this Legislature as accepting any withdrawal of any letter. I never at any time accepted withdrawal of a letter. I thought I made that clear earlier today.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I said accepted. I should have said recommended to this Legislature that the Legislature accept the withdrawal and if that's the preferable way to put it then that's the way I'll put it and, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, although I'm not calling down the chair. I would only suggest to you Sir that at this moment in time you've asked me not to interpret your or misinterpret your remarks and yet the member for Regina Centre not 10 minutes ago misinterpreted your remarks and rose on a point of order and you said let the member continue. I challenge you, Mr. Speaker to check the record tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I wish the member would raise his points of order when they occur.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I did raise them when they occurred and you told me it wasn't a legitimate point.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I take it I dealt with the point of order when it occurred.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, of course we are going to obey the rules and of course we are going to obey what this Legislature stands for and that is basically the right of individual members to speak, the right of individual members, the right to bring before this Legislature what they believe to be true, the right to bring positive things before the Legislature and the right to call attention to negative things in this Legislature within the rules. Mr. Speaker, isn't it strange. Don't you think it's strange, Mr. Speaker, that sitting within our caucus is a member for Saskatoon-Sutherland who last year was called to task because of the term quote: 'Filthy hospitals'. Don't you think its strange that there is another member in our caucus from Qu'Appelle who is now called to task for using the word 'kangaroo court'. Don't you think it is strange that there is another member for Thunder Creek now called to task because of the use of the term 'kangaroo court?' Don't you think it's strange Mr. Speaker, that throughout the Progressive Conservative Party, members who were elected in 1975, Mr. Speaker, with more than 124,000 votes representing, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan more than 124,000 people, in 1977, a party that has won two by-elections and knocked the

members to my right out of the box in the province of Saskatchewan because the people of Saskatchewan want a real change, they don't want a carbon copy, they don't want . . . presented and the kind of listless questioning that allows the members, the Cabinet ministers across to stand, Mr. Speaker, and expound on their theories just to use up question period so that they'll get all the presentation as if they didn't get enough press already because of their standing as members, Mr. Speaker the sub-amendment, to this particular motion, a sub-amendment would ask of our party less than we are prepared to give. The sub-amendment would ask us to do away with principles that the people of Saskatchewan have elected us to stand for. No Sir. The right to draw to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan that a deal exists between the Liberals and the New democrats and such a deal exists, and such a deal exists and Mr. Speaker, when it became apparent that the letter had been misinterpreted by you, to reflect on you and the Chair, we then withdrew it and you recommended to this Chamber that the letter having been withdrawn by the member, said withdrawn, should have been accepted by the Assembly. That was your remark. The Assembly chose, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals and the New Democrats, the very people, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party and the New democratic Party who we have suggested time after time after time are making deals, decided in their wisdom, that they would continue on with the motion at any rate.

MR. CAMERON: — How did you vote?

MR. COLLVER: — I shouldn't be called how I voted. I don't know how you voted, the member for Regina South, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is this. We intend now, we intended before, no implication of any kind whatsoever that in any way Mr. Speaker was involved in the deals between the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party. We withdraw any implication if that was taken, any implication whatsoever, that Mr. Speaker of the Chair or the Clerk's office was involved. Mr. Speaker, because of the remarks made by the members opposite and members to my right, I recommend and furthermore because this afternoon in the spirit of the season and the spirit of attempting to come up with a means by which this Assembly could return to the people's business, namely the half a billion dollars misspent by members opposite, we suggested this afternoon an amendment that wasn't totally complete for them and wasn't totally complete for us, it wasn't good for anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I notice the members have suggested a sub-amendment, that the mover of the sub-amendment says that his party is not going to support it. In our party I am going to recommend that my members not support me either because I do not any longer wish the amendment to be voted on by our party in favor.

MR. ROMANOW: — Great speech, Dick.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of having sat in this House for 25 years, first coming here in 1952. That wasn't my first entry into politics, Mr. Speaker. My politics go back far further than that. My party politics and my involvement in politics go back to the dirty thirties and I am one of the people in this House who remembers what a Conservative government was like. I remember, Mr. Speaker that the government of J.T.M. Anderson who was a Conservative and an honorable man as a Premier. I also remember the government, the federal government of the late unlamented R.B. Bennett and what people of Saskatchewan and Canada had to go through under him.

I believe what we see sitting opposite here in this newly resurrected so-called

Conservative Party has to be the dregs of what was left, something that was spawned from the worst of those regimes and brought forth, spewed forth and unfortunately landed here in the Legislature. I have never, I have never, Mr. Speaker, in the 25 years I have sat here, seen more callous disregard of law and order, the rules of this House. I have been probably over the years one of the hottest tempered members in this House and there have been times when I have been out of order and there have been times when I've been called to order and there have been times when I have been asked to withdraw, but I have always, Mr. Speaker, remembered that this House is something more than just a debating society, this is the very heart and core of democracy. This is what the earlier peoples of Britain and other countries of western Europe fought and strove for and died for. When I see these upstarts sneering at rules under this pseudo leader, under the person who aspires to lead and aspires, as he said the other day, to be Premier of this province, Mr. Speaker, I shudder. I am not so concerned, Mr. Speaker, with what these people say and do here in the House, I am more concerned that there are so many people, and I agree that there still a number of people, are believe that they ought to have the right to govern.

The Leader of the Conservative Party said a few minutes ago 124,000 people in Saskatchewan supported them. I just wish that those 124,000 people could see them perform and see his performance. Again he says that the Conservatives bother us, he is certainly right. They don't only bother me, they disgust me, Mr. Speaker. Their performance disgusts me from the stand point of someone who believes in democracy.

I have taken my beatings, I have sat opposite over there. I know what defeat is and I know what victory is. But if you have to seek victory with a continual sham on the huckster principle that says, you know. If we can get a few day's publicity, get a headline, that's good enough, because the public isn't really smart enough to catch on. It seems to me and that — and you know that theory, that theory is fairly viable. If people are disgruntled and angry, Adolph Hitler proved that. He said, tell a lie often enough and big enough and people will believe you. This man nearly conquered the world, so let it not be said that there is not some reason for these people to think that they can kid the public enough to grab power, especially when they have the help and assistance of a great deal of publicity and a number of the organs of publicity in this country, both federally and provincially. I say, Mr. Speaker, it's a sorry day for this House.

Now let me remind the House. First, they could possibly have been forgiven for that, the first session we sat here we had an agreement that we would meet early in March and we would not have a budget speech. There are eight days to the budget speech and it was agreed on, agreed on by this member for Souris-Estevan and the member for Rosetown on behalf of their party. They came walking in here completely disregarding the gentleman's agreements. All of this House has to run on the basis of gentlemen's agreements. When I first came to this House, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk of the Assembly was a man by the name of Mr. Stevens, a fine old Scots gentleman. He took us aside as new members and he said, "You know the rules of this House, gentleman, are something that should be respected. Now, we can't come down hard on you and neither can the Speaker come down hard on you but just remember this that it's an age old tradition that these rules, the House rules were made by gentleman for gentleman, made by gentleman for gentleman."

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I have seen very little evidence of that in this Conservative group that chooses to preach to us on decorum. They are more concerned about gum chewing and cigarette smoking then they are about honesty. More concerned about that. We can go and see other — he said, "Isn't it strange that these people are

being called on some of their statements.” Well, I don’t know whether it’s strange or not but the fact is they’re responsible for those statements, not us and not the Liberal Opposition. The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland was the one who venomously and I say, venomously, raised for publicity, cheap publicity, last spring the issue of ‘filthy hospitals’ which could not be substantiated and we made some more history by bringing witnesses in here to refute those statements in order to protect all those hospital boards in this province, who had been slurred by the innuendo of that member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane), who chose just for a few headlines, once again. Like the man who sold his soul for a mess of pottage, just for a few headlines, to grab a headline It didn’t matter about the honesty, it didn’t matter about the veracity.

So, Mr. Speaker, I’m grieved here today that this House has come to this kind of a pass and it is true. I recognize this, that it is confined largely to those of us here. There are thousands of people out in the country who could care less about what’s going on, if they know what’s going on. This arena here is where it’s happening and it may not have been so bad, I suppose, when Adolph Hitler burned the Reichstag. A lot of people applauded that, not too many people objected to that. When they slaughtered a few Jews, well, you know, Niemoller, when he finally came out, he was a Lutheran minister — came out of the concentration camp, he quoted a verse:

I didn’t object when they shot the first communist
without a trial because I wasn’t a communist
I didn’t object when they burned a few Jews because I wasn’t
a Jew
When they started to lock up some of the ministers, I didn’t
object to that
But finally they came to me

Truth, Mr. Speaker and honesty and decency is what is really being challenged in this House. That’s charm and honesty, gentleman’s agreement and so on. It isn’t a case of politics, petty politics, it’s a case of whether or not a few charlatans are going to be allowed to grab headlines and at the expense of an institution that is honored and hallowed, certainly in Canada and through out the democratic western world. That’s really what’s at stake here. The thing that really bothers me, if there was some sorrow indicated but when I see some of them, I say some of them, over there, the sneers, the jeers and the complete disregard for this House, it bothers me. It doesn’t bother me because they have to live with that as individuals but it bothers me again that there are a number of people, so many people out in the country, their supporters, some of them good friends of mine, who really don’t know what it’s all about.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment, the sub-amendment, I certainly will not, especially after this performance. I believe that the committee that is sitting must run its course. I believe that these people who have been guilty of an offence have to be brought before the bar. Certainly they have been shown as you stated and after the rules of the House a prima facie case, a breach of privilege and they laugh. Mr. Speaker someone has to stop that laughing. Someone has to stop laughing, someone has to prevent the laughing at institutions that hundreds of people, over the course of history have fought and died for in order that we may have, we may have, this free and open debate and may have a free vote in a free country.

I shudder to think what may happen if people who have so little disregard for truth and honesty should ever gain the seat of government in this House.

I happen to remember — now I have never drawn much of a line, and I still don't, in the principle and the philosophy. We talk about deals. Well deals have been made over the years by parties other than ours in order to gain power. They have been made across Canada and they continue to be made. Governments are sitting in other parts of this country because of deals. One thing, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot say, I think I can, I am beginning to discern, after 25 years I am beginning to discern some difference between Liberals and Conservatives. Not much, mind you, as far as philosophy is concerned, I think back to some of our early history. Isn't it a bit strange, as the leader said 'strange' that a hero, now recognized as a hero, Louis Riel was hanged by a Conservative Government. Isn't it strange that in the time that I have been around the only time that I can remember men being shot down in the streets of Canada, in Saskatchewan, here in Regina and at Estevan for asking for work and striking because they were looking for a living for their wives and families. Shot down in the streets again by a Conservative government.

My friend from Kinistino mentions the cross burning and the Ku Klux Klan. Isn't it strange that the only evidence we have ever had has been aligned with some of those people, certainly the forerunners of some of the people sitting opposite. It is all very well to say I don't even remember a Conservative government 40 years ago, but the point is the apples never roll very far from the tree, Mr. Speaker. The apples never roll very far from the tree and some of those old tree have borne some bitter fruit and the bitter fruit that they have borne we see evidence here, in Saskatchewan and some places of Canada today.

I say to you that it is a sad day for us in this House that we have to be calling people to order for completely desecrating the rules of this House; desecrating the institution. I say that I don't want to see the Committee on Privileges disbanded. I certainly want it to run its course so that all the evidence is in. I believe that whatever punishment can be meted out to those people who want to desecrate this institution should be done. I say Mr. Speaker, let the law take its course for those people who preach law and order, but practise absolute anarchy when they come into this House. I will not support the sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I am very impressed by the state of paranoia of the Conservative members opposite. Everyone attacks them, everyone is out to get them, out to get the PCs. This is so very obvious in so many of the things that they have had to say in this House and out of it.

It doesn't matter, Mr. Speaker, that all parliamentary groups in the western world, or the British Commonwealth at least, in the United States have the Committee of Privileges and elections that operates much in the same style as ours. It calls its witnesses much in the same style as ours; that can allow members with lawyers sitting as they have on the opposite side, sitting on that committee and act for that member and that we have allowed that member, invited that member to be present. It doesn't matter that all those things are there as they have done in every institution throughout this British Commonwealth of Nations. But, no, Mr. Speaker, they are out to get us, they are out to get us! That strange feeling of paranoia, that unbelievable feeling of paranoia that everyone is out to get us.

The member for Nipawin says we have to traditionally withdraw any indication of wrongdoing by the Clerk and by the Speaker. But how can he, Mr. Speaker, withdraw statements against your office of arrangements or a deal regarding the seating plan of

this institution without involving the Clerk and the Speaker? It cannot be done. He refuses to withdraw that part.

The Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland talks about red herrings. The operation and the dignity of this House, Mr. Speaker, is a red herring that he talks about; the honor of a law-making institution in this province is a red herring, Mr. Speaker. In other words really the honor and dignity of law is a red herring to that member.

He talks about a parliamentary strait jacket, Mr. Speaker, the right to protect the honor of this House from statements made outside it and inside it, is a parliamentary strait jacket to these people. Paranoia, Mr. Speaker, paranoia. The right to prevent members of this institution from making continual defamatory statements outside this house is a parliamentary strait jacket, Mr. Speaker. To me it is a sad day in this institution. We had 'filthy hospitals', we had heaven only knows what of broken deals. The list grows. They withdraw from the House and go outside and repeat.

The member for Indian Head, in his attempt to make a sub-amendment, had a spirit there. It was an obvious attempt to prevent this business of withdrawing within the House and then going out and repeating the thing outside again. But the member for Qu'Appelle chose to ignore that spirit and to twist it.

From the beginning I was quite impressed with the Premier's motion and I felt yes, that that was a bit of an olive branch, a gracious offer to a new group within this House. If I had been a new person, I, too, would like to have had a bit of that understanding but the member for Qu'Appelle so completely went against the spirit of that motion, he went against it to the extent that I felt he was on the verge of uttering the words 'kangaroo court' once more.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that we must all vote against the motion that the Premier put forward in good faith.

Sub-amendment negatived.

Amendment negatived.

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the comments of the last few days. Certainly some of the comments made this evening, Mr. Speaker, leave a lot to be desired.

Mr. Speaker, in watching the manoeuvrings and in listening to the various speakers in the House I have come to the conclusion which I think the majority of the people in Saskatchewan have come to in relation to this whole topic. It has been very interesting for me to watch this, I am not a member of the committee, I am not a member of the legal profession but I have been watching with interest the manoeuvrings back and forth within the House. I think members in the House are being fooled completely, if they do not realize that the actions taken by this House concerning this matter has been considered by the majority of the people to be rather foolish.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I was on the understanding and a little bit disappointed that when you, yourself, sir, had asked this House to accept the withdrawal by the member for Souris-Cannington. The real issue arose in the real beginning of something very peculiar started at that particular time. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time it became very evident to everyone in this province that the government opposite and the Liberal Opposition refused to accept the wishes of the Chair but rather they seized upon an opportunity to play some political game. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, whatsoever in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan that after you in fact asked this House, not once but twice, to accept the withdrawal from the member, but both the government and the Liberals at that time said, No. Why, Mr. Speaker? Simply because they wanted to play a few games, they wanted to play a few games. No question about it

Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debates and the motions and the amendment and so on we have heard a lot of different things. I was most amused with some of the speeches made here this evening. Mr. Speaker, I have never been in court. I have never accept to be subpoenaed as a witness, but in having a charge laid against me as such, I have been very fortunate I never have. Mr. Speaker, if I was being charged with a serious offence and I walked down to the court room and I find that five of those people that I meet on the street are in the jury and they are telling me long before I get to the court room that I am guilty, I'm guilty. Well. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I want to go to that court, no way at all. When I listen to some of the statements being made and some by members who are on that committee, they are telling members in this House that the member in question, the member for Souris-Cannington is guilty. I don't understand the court procedure as my learned lawyer friends but I do understand that much. If I am going to court and I am already being told by the people who are my jurors that I'm already guilty before I get there. I'm already guilty before I get there. Mr. Speaker, the key issue, the key time, the prime time in this whole debate was when the government opposite and the Liberal Opposition refused and ignored your suggestion as they wanted to play political games, that's what the issue is and that's what it goes back to. I want to quote to you the words of the Attorney General. He says this: "If you have any kind of decency and strength it's that difficult and that easy, get up and withdraw the letter totally unqualified." Well that's what the member for Souris-Cannington did and he did.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I stood in this House and denied a statement made by the Finance Minister. I believe it was in the spring of 1976. He stood in this House and said that two Conservative members attempted to bribe him. I don't recall, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time, the holier than thou are holy group over there forcing that minister to name the members. I don't recall the Liberal Opposition at that time forcing him to name the members but yet he was able to make that statement in this House, a standard for them but not a standard for somebody else.

You know, Mr. Speaker, for 29 years I have in one way or another served the public in this province. The member for Regina Lakeview stood in this House not once but twice, twice, Mr. Speaker, and called the member for Rosetown-Elrose a liar — twice and then went out into the hall and told the press that he was still a liar. What kind of standards, Mr. Speaker, what kind of standards are we talking about, if the Liberals opposite, the member for Regina South, who serves on that committee, stands in this House and prejudices the member before the committee is even called? He's not a member of . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — He's not a member.

MR. BAILEY: — He's not a member of that committee?

AN HON. MEMBER:—Wake up Cy.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Speaker, the issue is not in what has happened today. The issue was at the time when the boys decided they were going to play some games. They were going to try to play some games to their advantage and Mr. Speaker, it has backfired on them, it has totally backfired on them. Mr. Speaker, they are looking for a way to try once and for all; they want to have the comfortable arrangement they've had for years of the NDP and the Liberals; that is the arrangement they like. They don't want to see another group in this House and if they can use this and they can play some games and get together and gang up, then of course they have served two purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this and the government opposite knows it; they know it very well; the Premier continues to go about the province saying 'oh, the Liberals aren't dead, oh, they are very much alive' because they realize, Mr. Speaker, that they have to have a divided opposition. That's how they are going to stay in power.

MR. MacMURCHY: — No way.

MR. BAILEY: — Absolutely, absolutely. What do you mean 'no way,' Mr. Minister, when you can only gather 39 per cent of the votes? You know very well that's true and now we have a little bit of dealing here so we'll get them on this issue.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister of Highways and I enjoyed his little comments. I realize that he was quoting some of them. But when he goes back to the Ku Klux Klan and I might want to pass on to you, Sir, a partial thesis which I did on the Ku Klux Klan which is a long study. I want to tell you, Sir, what I found out (interjection) . . . You are calling me a Ku Klux Klan? Mr. Speaker, I think you should take note of that — a member calling me a Ku Klux Klan.

AN HON. MEMBER:—Right on.

MR. BAILEY: — Listen to that, listen to that. I think the people of Saskatchewan should know what the backbenchers are calling across. Would you stand up in this House and say that Sir?

I want to get back to the Minister of Highways. During the time of the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, Sir, we found out in research and I might tell you that there were three people involved in it; it's about that thick; it never did get published but at that particular time it was a proven fact that there were members of the Liberal Party, there were members of the Conservative Party and there were members of the Progressive Party, many of whom became the CCF, all involved in the Ku Klux Klan and for you to stand in this House and try to tell or infer that members of this caucus, as that member over there has inferred, that we are members of the Ku Klux Klan, shows the people of Saskatchewan the level of debate which government members wish to partake in. Make no mistake about it, none whatsoever, none whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say . . . (interjection) . . . You bet I took a lot of classes but I also know, Mr. Speaker, that a statement like the member for North Battleford used was

absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity a long time ago to bring this matter to a vote and could have brought it to a close but instead of that the government chose, the government chose and the members opposite chose, for reasons of their own, to play the chess game.

In the Liberal speeches, Mr. Speaker, I was interested to hear them talk about principle. You know two of the members there are candidates now for the federal Liberal Party are great supporters of one Pierre Elliot Trudeau who has shown the people of Canada that he has more dislike for the parliamentary system than any Prime Minister who has ever occupied that office and they know it. Mr. Speaker, one of the members the other night, to show you how they respect the House, stood in this House and said this; "Mr. Speaker, I'm gong to adjourn debate and if you don't let me adjourn debate, we'll let the bell ring until 10:00 o'clock." That's the principle of the Liberal party. They could care less about this House. Imagine making a statement such as that. Yes, you've had your golden opportunity. You've used your forces against the wishes of the Speaker. You the liberals for whatever reason have come out and tried to build it on further and further and further. Now, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't believe my ears today when the member for Indian Head-Wolseley got up and said that this is what we'll do and we'll hold this over their head — we'll keep the Conservative Party caucus completely muzzled for the next six months: we'll show them — we'll show them. I'm going to tell that member this, when the people out in the country hear the plot and plan of the Liberal party they will be done forever, absolutely finished in the Province. You know, just to obey the law, he said —just to obey the law.

You know. Mr. Speaker, I had quite a remarkable contribution from these people over here. Their opportunity was, during this time, to try to pretend, to try to take up the plea that the Premier has been yelling, that we are the opposition, so they joined with the premier and they are trying to prove through this debate that they are the opposition. You know what, Mr. Speaker, the people out in the country aren't going to listen to it at all.

Yes, Mr. Minister of Highways, you can say that the member for Rosetown-Elrose wasn't elected, he was just somehow spewed in here and I want to tell you, Sir, that the members constituency of Rosetown-Elrose is not going to appreciate that comment from a Cabinet minister. Make no mistake about it — when the people of Rosetown-Elrose know that the Minister of Highways and the Minister of the Executive and Minister of the Crown stands in this House and says that the member for Rosetown-Elrose just spewed in here, I want to tell you that they are not going to take kindly to you, Sir, or to any member of your Cabinet and make no mistake about it.

Make no mistake about it, when backbenchers stand opposite in the back and call members of this caucus members of the Ku Klux Klan it shows you the absolute gutter position that that government is in debate, absolutely as low as you can get. I'm a little bit surprised that the government that has got this hot potato in its hand has stooped to those lengths to say that the member was spewed into the House, that somehow he wasn't democratically elected, that somehow there was something wrong with the people of Rosetown-Elrose electing me and that it is what the Minister of the Crown is saying. Shame on you people opposite. You know, Mr. Speaker, the only time that backbenchers have a chance to say anything they have to do it from a two bit position in the House, they can't stand on their feet and say it.

MR. SKOBERG:— You sound guilty.

MR. BAILEY:— No I'm not guilty. No I'm not guilty. I'm not guilty of any offence in this House, Mr. Minister, not guilty of any offence and you know I'm not. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that people in this Assembly, all the elected members, took their responsibilities a lot more seriously than what I've heard today. That included members of that caucus. O.K. Let's take our responsibilities a little more seriously. Let's quit playing this chess game.

MR. MacDONALD:—You make the first move.

MR. BAILEY:— Wait a minute — I'll get to you. You played the game long enough — how much further do you want to go? You want to keep playing the game, you want to keep trying to humiliate my caucus — this caucus? Is that what you want to do? If you want to keep playing with the dirt, it's your choice, you made that choice two weeks ago. You still have that choice and if you want to keep playing with it, Mr. Speaker, we will have no other choice but listen to the whims of the majority of this House. Keep playing your games but make sure the people of Saskatchewan know the kind of a game you are playing.

MR. KATZMAN:— Mr. Speaker, something happened this evening that I didn't believe that I would ever see in this country, where a member of this House stood up in this Chamber and said there were Jews burnt and he didn't care. Now I don't know what he is trying to prove or if he's trying to prove as I said two years ago that that government is no doggone different than one we saw in Nazi Germany years ago that was to take away the rights of the individuals in this province.

MR. KRAMER: — If the member for Rosthern is referring to something I said I certainly want to call him to task. Are you referring to me, Sir?

MR. KATZMAN: — I am referring to your comment where you said that when they burned some Jews that I didn't care.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Chairman, would you dry up the floor?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order.

MR. KRAMER: — I was quoting from the former Pastor Niemoller who spent part of his life (listen and you'll learn) who came out of a German concentration camp with this poem and decrying the fact that Germans when privileges and little rights were taken away from them didn't stand up and he said, "I didn't care when they shot the first communist because I wasn't a communist. I didn't care when they shot and burned the first Jews because I wasn't a Jew." Then they moved on to the preachers and put them into concentration and shot some of them — they didn't care. But little by little their freedom was whittled away and that's what you people are doing, is whittling away at the institution of democracy and you're a party to that!

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member has made his explanation and we won't have any debate on it.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):—The member's explanation, Mr. Speaker, is not what I heard in this Chamber when he spoke earlier. I will accept his apology and accept the point he is suggesting that he was quoting somebody else. But I will suggest to him that if you sit in this House and listen as I do most of the time, and I don't get on my feet

and speak because once something has been said once, that's enough. But you people are slowly taking the rights of individuals away in this province and this thing and shemozzle that we're going through and that we went through the other day when I sat on the member's committee is a . . . I can't think of a better word, but as one member called it, it's a 'kangaroo court'. I don't know what we've got. Something is going wrong when the rights of these people in this province and the rights of this Legislature are totally ignored. And the . . . you shouldn't be laughing. You're a part of the minority the same as I am, and it's minorities that always lose when the freedom of individuals is taken away, and you gentlemen have been doing it by this motion and this whole day's waste.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Moose Jaw): — Mr. Speaker, if I could preface my remarks by reiterating what I think several other members in this Assembly have pointed out today, what a wonderful day this has been. I have one or two regrets that perhaps I might bring to the Assembly's attention. Regret number one is that I have a sister-in-law in this Assembly in the gallery right now who is American who has never been in a Canadian Legislature or any form of a Canadian House of Parliament before, and she has been here since about 7:00 o'clock and I really shudder to ask her what her assessment is of Canadian democracy. The second one is that I promised I would drive her back immediately when her plane arrived. Unfortunately I was unable to do so and that is my second regret.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose the issue that . . . that paramount, overriding issue that has dominated this Assembly today could be very simply reduced down into one simple word today and that would be 'respect'. There are those in this Assembly who have risen and lectured us that something deserves respect come Hell or high water. Mr. Speaker, I would have to apologize in some respects when I say I think respect must at least in some small measure, be earned. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest to this Assembly that there have been days since this session commenced on November 13 or 16, whenever it was, when it has been very difficult for any member of this Assembly to really have the respect for this institution that perhaps he should have. In short what I'm saying, there have been some days in this Assembly that really have not been glory days or a particular credit to this Assembly or the 61 members who occupy the seats down here Mr. Speaker. I suggest that today has been one of those days.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I am any different from any one of the other 61 members in this assembly. There are many other places that I would rather be today, tomorrow and the next day, and I think that is true of each and every one of us. I was encouraged before the House went into session this afternoon on a conversation with one member who had an optimistic note that we could at least conclude the necessary business before Christmas. I really don't know what today has done to that timetable. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very valid question to ask. Have we accomplished anything in this Assembly today? And if we have, I would certainly ask the Attorney General as he closes debate to point out to me exactly what it is that we have accomplished.

We have had some speeches that border on horror stories. We have had at times, a sordid, sickening level of debate. We have had some catcalls that have been beyond belief, Mr. Speaker. I must admit that there have been times in this House I've been no pansy when it comes to the interjections. Since I gave up that habit some time ago, I really don't think that I have ever approached quite the level that I've seen at some particular times this evening.

Mr. Speaker, we're discussing something which originated with a letter to you the day

that this Assembly opened. Mr. Speaker, I am not being facetious when I suggest that the debate that followed two or three days after the opening of this Assembly, I found very difficult to take seriously, and I say that not facetiously, I say it respectfully, Mr. Speaker, because I really don't think that any of the 61 members of this Assembly, deep down, once he has stripped away the political facade, really considered it that paramount an issue.

Mr. Speaker, it was not that letter as it turned out . . . it was not a banner day for the members in this corner of the Assembly. There were repercussions from that letter and because of those repercussions and the desire to move on to the important issues that were at hand, the author of that letter stood up in this Assembly, and I'm sure at a very difficult moment and believe me, I've had to withdraw things in this Assembly and he faced you and I know how difficult it is but he stood up, faced this Assembly and he faced you and he withdrew it. Now, Mr. Speaker, what went on outside the door after that I fail to see the relevance whatsoever. It was done in here He recommended that it be accepted. Mr. Speaker, to carry it on was nothing more than political gamesmanship and there is not one member in this Assembly, deep down who does not know that to be true.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the date is December 19 (am I correct on that)? December 19, as I mentioned earlier. I think everybody who is remotely associated with the Assembly would like to get home to their families and I think that is true of the press gallery, the support staff and everyone else. But, nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, there is work to do. We have \$500 million laying on the table there. \$500 million which is just a lot of dollars, even in terms of the gentlemen across the floor. Mr. Speaker, \$500 million, an economy that is coming down on the top of our ears, problems like probably have never happened in this province previously. Compound that with the fact that Christmas is approaching, and I think it is generally accepted we would all like to be elsewhere, what do we choose to do today? We've got five days that we could get some work done on but what do we choose today? Mr. Speaker, I confess that there have been moments since I arrived in this Assembly that I have become extremely frustrated with the low, slow movement of red tape as the democratic process comes along, rolls along. I get particularly frustrated when we are approaching seeding time or calving time, just like everybody is a little frustrated now as Christmas is approaching, and I have vented my frustration in this Assembly on previous occasions

Mr. Speaker, I have a little trouble (and again I am not attempting to be facetious), but on a day like today I am having just a little bit of trouble having the respect for this Assembly and the institution that I do not dispute that I should have. But, Mr. Speaker, when you examine what has gone on in here today, the total day wasted, on what? On what? Mr. Speaker, this is hardly an issue that is going to affect very many people in the province of Saskatchewan, it is hardly an issue that is life or death to anyone. It is nothing more, as I mentioned previously, than a political facade where a couple of generals are playing their political gamesmanship. Mr. Speaker, we've got far better things to do.

Mr. Speaker, today, I suppose, has been prompted by a comment of mine that was made in the Rules and Privileges Committee. I believe it was last Tuesday. I have forgotten the exact date, I think it was last Tuesday, Mr. Speaker. If I could give you just a very brief background on how that came out and we will deal with the charge later.

Mr. Speaker, let's stop kidding everybody as to exactly what this Committee is set up to

accomplish. The member for Souris-Cannington was not allowed to withdraw his letter. I should rephrase that, he withdrew it, but the House wouldn't accept it. Again, I have a great deal of respect for anybody who ultimately does withdraw something that he has done or said in this Legislature. I have had to withdraw on a couple of occasions and I haven't liked it. It has been a difficult thing for me to do and I know how difficult it is for anyone else to do. It shouldn't be any easier for them than it is for me and it is a tough thing to admit that you have made a blooper, made a mistake. None the less he did it, but it wasn't good enough. You wouldn't take that. Mr. Speaker, when that business was moved into Committee, into a committee that had not met for some 60 years, Mr. Speaker, I really don't think that deep down, when you have stripped every bit away, that very many people in this Assembly, if any, really considered it all that serious, except for a chance to take a political pound of flesh off an individual and a party of which he is a part.

Mr. Speaker, immediately upon the commencement of that Committee, or after the chairman had made his opening remarks, the member for Estevan made a motion to bring this to a head. He suggested that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be suspended. At that time we really didn't think that the members opposite, and my friends to the right, were serious about going ahead with this because it had such little impact, it had such little importance as far as the economy, the importance to the taxpayers of this province were concerned, we really couldn't believe and we thought we would bring it to a head very quickly. Mr. Speaker, we were shocked when we were outvoted and they decided to move on. At that point in time, Mr. Speaker, it became very obvious that they were deadly serious about proceeding. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it was unreal or presumptuous on those members of the Committee who were in the same party as the member for Souris-Cannington to suggest to the Committee that the charges against the member be specified. Mr. Speaker, we then moved the motion, if I can paraphrase it, that this Committee does specify in precise and accurate terms the charge, or charges against the member, so that the member may be aware of the specific allegations, particulars of the allegations in order for the member to answer any allegations as he charges and to prepare such a fair and proper defence as he deems advisable.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of fair play or justice anywhere, does that seem unreasonable, that the defendant, or the accused, or whatever you may choose to call him, does it seem so unreasonable that the member had the charges specified against him? Well, immediately, Mr. Speaker we had the members of the Committee springing up — this is not a court of law, there is no accuse, there are no charges. Mr. Speaker, who is kidding who? That Committee was formed completely, specifically for a political act against the member for Souris-Cannington and the party which he represents.

Mr. Speaker, if you can believe it, a motion asking that the charges be specified was ruled out of order. Mr. Speaker, in the Legislative Assembly in this building, supposedly the representatives, the epitome of the British Parliamentary justice system, are going to sanction that the charges are not going to be specified. And an attitude was taken, we'll bring them in, we'll tell them about the charges a little bit later. That was ruled out of order. Then, Mr. Speaker, we moved into a situation where we asked the committee to supply a set of witnesses in advance. They weren't even going to do that. A compromise motion was put forward by, I think the minister in charge of the potash Corporation or the Provincial Secretary and we were able to solve that one.

Then, Mr. Speaker, another gem happened. I moved, I believe, seconded by the member for Estevan, that the Select Standing Committee of the Assembly and Privileges and

Elections allow the member for Souris-Cannington to cross examine any and all witnesses called by the Committee in order to properly and fairly present his case. Again. Mr. Speaker, up jumped the chairman and several of his defendants (oh pardon me, not his defendants but his cohorts) and again we were told that this is not a court — there is no defendant — there is no accused and yet, Mr. Speaker, those gentlemen (check) ‘gentlemen’ voted down a motion which I believe is basic, as basic a thing which goes on in natural justice in the western world. Mr. Speaker, I do believe that I hear some pitter-patters of guilty consciences across the way.

Mr. Speaker, can you tell me any place in the western world where the accused, someone who was accused of anything, cannot cross examine the witnesses that may be called to present evidence against him? Mr. Speaker, and you, Mr. Attorney General, I invite you as you’ve closed the page on what I am sure would be your very scholarly remarks. You tell me why that may be? But spare me the argument. This is not a court — there is no accused.

Mr. Speaker, that one thing being voted down, we then moved on to another item. Mr. Speaker, it was moved that the Select Standing Committee allow the member for Souris-Cannington to call any and all witnesses and other evidence he deems necessary for the proper presentation of his case. Mr. Speaker, what an unreasonable request that the accused be allowed to call his own witnesses. Mr. Speaker, the only place I know where that isn’t allowed is on the other side of the iron curtain. It is unbelievable that something like this could happen in a building supposedly representative of the British Parliamentary system. Mr. Speaker, if you can believe it, a motion like this according to the minutes is ruled out of order by the chairman on the grounds that it was a departure from the practice of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and I ask anybody else who was a detached observer there, what does all that add up to, to you? Well, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I was brought up in a business where we have always called a spade a spade and I don’t apologize for that upbringing. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you called a spade a spade that morning, it added up to a ‘kangaroo court’ and Me. Speaker, we announced that, at least I announced it, to that committee that day, and, Mr. Speaker, I frankly think that on the basis of what I just presented to you that it was not an inaccurate assessment.

Mr. Speaker, that being as it is, we have now evolved to the motions of today. Mr. Speaker, again I think the day that we have spent debating this business has been totally nonsensical. It was suggested originally that it was a ‘kangaroo court’ which I mentioned in the committee and later I repeated, I believe, several times for the press. Subsequently it was repeated 24 hours later, I believe, for the press by the member for Qu’Appelle and we were subsequently today asked to withdraw those remarks with an apology. Mr. Speaker, having witnessed this Assembly ask for a withdrawal on a previous occasion of some — what three weeks ago — and seeing that withdrawal happen and seeing the Assembly refuse to accept that withdrawal, then proceed to spend an afternoon and evening and another sitting day to flaunt that member who has stood on his feet and made a withdrawal. Mr. Speaker, that early in the day was expecting a little bit much to have us sit there afterwards while you extracted your pound of flesh.

Mr. Speaker, very early in the day today it was suggested by the member for Qu’Appelle that if this was what was necessary to get this Assembly back on course and deal with the problems of the economy and the illusive \$500 million that is sitting out in the middle of that table, to be distributed to goodness knows whom, that if this committee that deep down no one really takes seriously, were to be suspended that it would

certainly not be beyond the realm of possibility that the remarks which were considered offensive, by some members, could possibly be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, it has been very interesting, I suppose in some respects there has been some interesting political by-play. Some members of this Assembly have taken great exception to the suggestion that there may have been collusion between our friends across the floor and some of our friends to the right.

Mr. Speaker, while I have not been back to committee since I made that remark, I did find it rather ironical that the suggestion that I be brought to task and the member for Qu'Appelle be brought to task for that remark came from the member for Regina South. Make no mistake, he is a very capable lawyer. I am surprised one of the lawyers across the way didn't come up with it first but it was certainly snapped up. I don't know whether that gives any veracity to the suggestions that there may have been collusion or not, I only comment on it as a possibility as someone who read about it in the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, the motion that was presented by the Conservative caucus today has not been accepted. I believe it was the member for Indian Head-Wolseley who suggested, or made the point, to withdraw first then decide whether we are going to accept it. He didn't say it in those words but I believe they added up to that. I think that is roughly what you said, Mr. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley. I am sure I will hear from you later if I am quoting you inaccurately. I really don't mean to but that is how it added up to me and by the look on your face I think I am reasonably close.

Mr. Speaker, we still stand. At least I still stand, on the basis of what the member for Qu'Appelle said, what seems like an eternity ago but was in reality many, many hours ago — that is if the House is prepared to get back down to the business of the people of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of this province who are footing the bill for us to be sitting here accomplishing nothing. Mr. Speaker, if this committee, which every member in this Assembly knows does not really amount to any great deal of importance, can be suspended and dropped, Mr. Speaker, then I am quite prepared to withdraw the remarks that are attributed to me on the opening day of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what else we can do to get on with the business of this province. We are wasting time. We have not a great deal of time left this evening. Hopefully if we get back down to business tomorrow and extend our sitting hours, take the bit between our teeth, we can get some work done so that we can conclude Bill 47 and whatever other pertinent legislation is in existence, by Friday, and go home and hopefully, hopefully despite the level of debate here, make some attempt to find the true meaning of Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, the members across the way, of course, have the choice as to whether you are going to continue to try to extract that pound of flesh from the Conservative Party. I don't know whether the Attorney General was serious as he rose to close debate. There may well be other members who may choose to come in and make some rebuttal to my comments.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, as we have said before, are ready to go to work. We want to go home for Christmas as we would like to get back to our families and I think on that score we probably share the same feelings as every one else in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I have made the offer that was basically raised by the member for

Qu'Appelle some hours ago. We will stand by it. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if you will not allow us, c'est la vie.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):—Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will not be long in closing the debate. I hope that I will not be emotional in my remarks. I must confess that from time to time I get provoked or promoted to be, perhaps, more emotional than rational, perhaps too often that way. But I do think that a number of comments have to be made in summing up this debate.

I must say at the very outset, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of what I say will have already been said and if I may say so, said by members of this House, particularly on this side of the this House, much more eloquently and with much more force, in a way, then ever I could or some members of the Legislature.

The member for Thunder Creek says that this has not been a glory day and I agree with him. It has not been a glory day. He is very right to that. It has been, indeed a very sad day for the Legislature and for parliament. It has been a day of members opposite thinking that somehow there is a virtue in fighting so that they don't have to grovel or words to that affect, that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland talks about. Somehow they said the principle at issue here was the act of grovelling, the principle at issue was not the Legislature or the sanctity of the Legislature or the sanctity of the committee. The principle, somehow to his mind, was grovelling and the fact that we shan't grovel and this is what the motion intends to do. I think, with respect, that that certainly is not a glory day when you misconceive the object of the debate.

The member for Thunder Creek says, "Have we accomplished anything? Maybe we will yet in the remaining time." Well I, like the member for Thunder Creek, am also hopeful that maybe we will, maybe we shall accomplish something yet tonight. Maybe we will accomplish after we deal with this resolution that at least from my point of view, hopefully passes, maybe we will accomplish the unqualified withdrawals by the member for Thunder Creek and Qu'Appelle with apologies which is the standard, normal, usual thing that's is done where a breach of privilege has been found by the House. I think that would be an accomplishment which would perhaps undo the lack of glory that this day has. Perhaps you can put a little glory back into it.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Thunder Creek says that we have wasted our time. He says. Let's get on with something more important. I must say, Mr. Speaker that if you look at the number of times and the length of the speeches given by the members of the Conservative Party during the course of today's debate I think that they have contributed more than their fair share to that time but I don't accept that proposition. Let's get on with something more important is a good enough argument if you believe that Legislature and the sanctity of the Legislature is unimportant. Then you are wasting time. There is no doubt about it. If you feel that what we are doing here, I'm not talking about the motion, the bills in Legislatures, the way we act toward the other, over and above and beyond, is unimportant, than I couldn't agree more with the member for Thunder Creek, we've wasted our time.

I, for one, don't happen to believe that as corny as this may sound, the sanctity of the Legislature is a waste of time debating it. I think, Mr. Speaker, in a sense, preserving the integrity of this institution and the bodies that emanate from this institution is probably the most important thing that we could be debating. I know that when you consider \$500 million in oil, when you consider potash, when you consider everything else of that nature, these are all kinds of elements of the debate which are within this Chamber but take the Chamber away, take the law making aspects of the Chamber away and you're finished. Mr. Speaker, one destroys confidence by the public in the Chamber. There is no law anywhere that can therefore receive the respect and the weight and the acceptance and the following by the people of the province or the people of parliament. That's the key to the whole thing that we are talking about. And to say, somehow, that when you, Mr. Speaker, as the impartial judge of this House, say that there is a breach of privilege, to say for the full day that I will only withdraw with these kind of qualifications or I won't withdraw at all and then to couple that whole argument off by saying that it's a waste of time. I say, Mr. Speaker is tantamount to saying that this parliament is a waste of time and I don't, for one, accept that argument whatsoever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, moving briefly to a few of the words of the member for Rosetown-Elrose. He says we have been watching here 'manoeuvring.' He says, you know, we are being fooled if we think the people out there don't view us as being foolish. Well that may be so. Maybe they do think we are foolish and maybe they don't. I hope they don't. but I want to tell the hon. member that from my perspective the question of what some people may think of us is of secondary importance to what we are about here and that is, Mr. Speaker, the institution of parliament and the institution of this Legislature and when someone asks to withdraw the withdrawal. Frankly, I know what he talks of when he talks about the skepticism and the cynicism that's rampant. I know how public can

say sometimes that we act foolishly. I believe I've acted foolishly and I think all of us have acted foolishly. I know what he means but it is the very kind of actions that we have seen in this Legislature, the refusal after how many hours? Seven hours, five hours of debate, the refusal to make a simple withdrawal, that's all that's being asked, a simple withdrawal and an apology, the kind of mocking of the institution which has brought the skepticism and the cynicism to play, which has brought in result of the public to saying, well, these guys are acting foolishly. To succumb to that argument that because they think we're foolish, that somehow we should ignore the calls and the names which were attached contrary to the rules, I say only adds to the foolishness which is the very essence of our democratic system. I, for one, can't accept that argument.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a second point with respect to the member for Rosetown-Elrose and it was repeated by the member for Thunder Creek, the member for Nipawin, the member for Rosthern in his short moment of outburst, all of the members, that somehow there was a letter of withdrawal and words of withdrawal that were uttered by the member for Souris-Cannington. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this absolutely clear that there were words of withdrawal, unqualified words of withdrawal, to which yourself as the chairman of this House, intimated that the members of this House perhaps should accept. No one, certainly I don't dispute that statement of the fact, but, Mr. Speaker, for the totality of the day not one member of the Conservative caucus who spoke explained the subsequent event, which subsequent event was, as I spoke on the amendment and I don't want to repeat it now — within minutes after the so-called withdrawal the repetition of those words, of the substance of those words to the press outside and I am now advised and did not know, yet another subsequent repetition apparently to somebody in broadcast news.

Mr. Speaker, to adopt the reasoning of the Conservative Party, which would be to say this, that I apologize to this House, therefore, that's a dead issue, but I can go outside this House and tell all the people of Saskatchewan that what I said inside the House I didn't mean or I don't accept, surely is tantamount to non-withdrawal. Surely, if I may talk as a lawyer, at least amounts to the minimum to a doctrine or revival, the revival of the breach, the prima facie breach, of which your honor so found and recommended to the House that we should ignore, which they revived by virtue of the statements I am not here to defend the Leader of the Liberal Party notwithstanding what they say, I have had a tough three weeks with Bill 47 and I expect a longer time with Bill 47. I wish I could have the kind of time with the Liberals on Bill 47 that I am having with the Conservatives on Bill 47, quite frankly. But I want to make the facts absolutely clear. When the Leader of the Liberal Party got up and called somebody a liar and then repeated it on television and called him a liar, the next day you, Sir, as the custodian of this House inside and outside, called on the leader to withdraw and he did and there was no revival and there was no subsequent statement. That, Sir, is a very, very important fact.

AN. HON. MEMBER;— Nonsense.

MR. ROMANOW: — The member of the Conservative Party says 'nonsense.' And I ask him to show me where I am in error on those facts. At any time before I take my seat you can mention that to me, yes, before I take my seat you can ask a question. I say, Mr. Speaker — I have a few minutes you can go and find a quotation, go ahead — and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that's a kind of situation which I find to be really playing foot loose with the facts. Let's keep in mind what the facts are as I understand them to be. If I'm in error I stand to be corrected by the Conservative Party who will undoubtedly rise the moment I take my seat in this regard in this plight. So, Mr. Speaker I am saying that this is

something which must be very carefully kept in mind.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a brief word about the question of likening the committee to a court. I know that this is a popular, perhaps even an easy political way in which to defend oneself when these events are before us, to say that the committee is a court. Mr. Speaker, the committee is not like a court in the sense that the member for Thunder Creek and the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland and everyone, else would argue. Mr. Speaker, there is a very good reason for this and I think the member for Rosemont articulated it very well. We, in this House, Mr. Speaker, can say and do things which very often we would never say fifty feet outside that door and that corridor. We can say about chartered accountants, for example, that they fixed or jimmied chartered accountants' statements inside this House. That's the tantamount of it, and if we say it out there, Mr. Speaker, we are libel to the laws of the land. We have an immunity and if we have an immunity in the House, how do we deal with transgressions of the House? It can't be done by the court, Mr. Speaker, 'like a court' as the member for Thunder Creek would have us believe. It has to be done according to the rules of the House. That's how we deal with transgressions, and the rules are a Committee on Rules of Privileges and Elections. The procedure and the mechanism of that Committee of Privileges and Elections is set out for us and determined. The issue has been referred to us, the issue of the letter, the facts and circumstances surrounding the letter for a recommendation by that committee back to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you cannot compare in those terms. If you can compare it as a court then you will without a doubt diminish the very freedoms of speech the member for Nipawin and others say in their self defence are so highly an issue here. May I say parenthetically speaking, that there is nothing prohibiting the Conservative Party putting on the member for Souris-Cannington as one of their nominees on that committee if they want to do all the questioning and statements that he wants to or to put one of the learned, able lawyers that comprise their caucus, the two messieurs from Qu'Appelle and Saskatoon-Sutherland, to do the questioning in defence of their members. There is nothing preventing them doing that. It's not to be represented as if somehow this is a helpless, defenceless group of people who are too shy to speak up. We saw the evidence to the contrary today in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't been at the committee, I am not a member of the committee and I am not looking forward to my role in the committee as it is coming forward I suppose, but from what I can judge from the newspapers and it's the only comment I'll make about the committee, to me it is making every step that it can make, its bending over backwards to notify people that they should be attending, giving them the right to have representation and the like. The Conservatives have chosen to boycott the committee and to walk out, not the NDP, not this side or the Liberal operation. Mr. Speaker, the argument that somehow says this is a court of law is an argument which is a fallacious argument. It is an argument which again belies the true principle and the true understanding of the question of what parliament really means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to add one other comment with respect to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) whom I note is not in his seat at this particular time. It is really a minor issue. Perhaps I should not even rebut it but I think that I will make the comment and that is he says that the motion which I am now wrapping up is a motion to censure. Mr. Speaker it is not a motion to censure. In fact, if anything, it is the farthest thing from a motion to censure. It's a motion calling on the members in the light of your ruling, Sir, because you asked the House to deal with your ruling to do what is the right, the decent, the honest, the simple and difficult thing, namely, to withdraw and to

apologize. That's not a condemnation; that's not a sentencing; that's not a situation which involves any disapproval to attach to it. It's a matter of you having found the fact of a breach of privilege, they responding to that finding of fact by saying, I withdraw and I apologize. Five words, Mr. Speaker, that's all and for the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland to say that's a motion of censure surely begs and twists the reality of the situation before us.

Well I would say one other point with respect to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland and that is the business of the letter and I must tread carefully here because this is before the committee, but the argument is, as advocated by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, that the letter is made up of two matters: (a) the deal and he went on to repeat the deal, everybody on that side repeats the deal: and (b) the other part relating to your part in the deal. Now, Mr. Speaker, the committee will have to assess the totality of the words which are said in that letter from the very beginning of 'Dear Mr. Speaker' to the closing lines and the allegations of the deals. But it seems to me to say that we shall withdraw the letter but not the contents of the letter somehow, how this can be done I don't know but that's the argument advanced or to say that I will withdraw a part of the letter, the part pertaining to you, Sir, and the others although they are interwoven to and around us and you like the proverbial red tape that entwines some Christmas packages and say they are separable and can be divorced, I fail to see Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that the rationale and the logic is applicable there.

Now I move to the member for Qu'Appelle who was into this debate at a very early stage. Again, this business of the question of the fact that the member for Souris-Cannington, he said, withdrew his remarks but we wouldn't accept it and you heard my arguments in rebuttal to that, there was a doctrine of revival.

I have here, dated November 30th, Carnduff Gazette Post News, an article called: "High and Dry" by one Rick Barnes, a little section that I think shows that not only I understand the fallaciousness of this argument but I think the public does as well. I would like the members to read the article. I am not a regular subscriber to the Carnduff Gazette Post News but this happened to come across my desk on this particular issue, relating to the member for Souris-Cannington MLA, who I think, I repeat parenthetically again, is really being badly used on a personal and political level by his colleagues.

The writer says the following in summing up the editorial:

After trying to withdraw the letter (obviously hoping that the whole thing would go away) Eric (may I say again that the writer acknowledges he is a personal friend of Mr. Berntson) then went on radio and repeated the same thing to them thus leading to a Legislative investigation that could be nothing but trouble. Since then things have been quiet. (November 30th). This leads me to believe that Berntson's leader, Dick Collver has sat on him and told him to let the heat die down, which in turn leads me to believe that Berntson never in fact wrote the letter. That, in my mind, was Collver's work and is now taking all the blame for it. Berntson signed the letter all right and now he is paying for it, and paying dearly in my view. AND, if in fact, Berntson did write the letter it was a bad move, Eric. At the writing of this column Berntson is being hauled out on the carpet by the Legislature and one will have to wait and guess what happens from here on in. My guess is that Mr. Berntson will be wishing he had never seen that letter.

The point of the article, Mr. Speaker, is not a question of Mr. Berntson so much,

although I am, on a personal basis, very sympathetic to what I think he feels, maybe he is fooling me, but to what I think he feels.

The point of the letter is that here is a gentleman by the name of Rick Barnes in Carnduff, Saskatchewan, who knows that the withdrawal was repeated by radio and revived resulting in the Legislative committee. Not so the member for Qu'Appelle, he doesn't know that; not so the member for Thunder Creek, he doesn't know that; not so the leader of the Conservative Party, he doesn't know that. But Mr. Rick Barnes; whoever Mr. Rick Barnes is, (other than he is an avid anti-NDPer) knows that. Carnduff, Saskatchewan — why wouldn't somebody in Carnduff, Saskatchewan know it? Sure, they would know it because those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. That is why the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose says that people out there think we are foolish. I don't think Mr. Rick Barnes thinks this issue is foolish and I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan will believe that this is foolish.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the member for Regina South has more than adequately doubled the argument of scrutinizing a political party in the words attributed to the member for Indian Head. He defended himself in this regard. He calls on us, the member for Qu'Appelle, to be guided by the House. If you are guided by the House you look at the reference motion and the reference motion is to refer the letter, not the party or the PC party. I don't care anything about their finances or what they operate, that is up to them. It is none of my business. That is not before the committee and it is not the mandate nor the resolution that is before the committee.

Then finally, the member says we liken the 'kangaroo' comments to the comments that some of us have made here, he says, on the Supreme Court. I think. Again, the member for Rosetown covered that off very well. Wherever we have found to be out of order there. I won't make any comments as to my opinion in that regard, but you made a ruling on one of them. The member for Cutknife did what is the issue of this motion. He got up and he said simply, "I withdraw and I apologize." And if the member for Qu'Appelle is telling us that a 'kangaroo court' is just like the comments that we made about the Supreme Court, although I don't agree, but if that's so then it is incumbent upon him to do the same kinds of things that we've done where the comments about the Supreme Court have been found to be out of order, to withdraw and to apologize unconditionally. But the logic stops after identifying the situation, the logic does not continue to that one last act of decency and civility.

Mr. Speaker, finally in conclusion I must say a word or two about the Leader of the Conservative Party and his arguments, in the course of this debate. May I say to the hon. Leader of the Conservative Party that I, personally believed before tonight that he was going to provide a government with a difference. Well, I'll tell the Leader of the Conservative Party that if I had any doubt about it whatsoever tonight you convinced me Sir, that if you should ever become Premier of this province it will be a government with a difference, a very big difference to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker — a government which would not care about Mr. Speaker; a government which would not care about committees of the Legislature and the words that are attributed to it, a government which would not care about descriptions about chartered accountants who do not have the right to defend themselves in this House; a government which would act in absolutely any fashion that it wanted to.

The member for Elrose said, in his words he said, "Well if the majority is winding up, if the majority decides in its wisdom to continue playing this game, so be it." What does that mean Mr. Speaker? It means, I don't care what the majority says. I'm going to do my

own thing. I don't care if the law says I should only drive in the right side, I am going to be a government with a difference. I don't care what the rules of the Legislature are. I am going to do my own method of operation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the member for Nipawin and I am going to close with these words and this point, with all the strength that I have in me, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about this, the issue that is before us is the issue no less issue than the issue of freedom of speech. That is the issue that is before us, Mr. Speaker, because you cannot have freedom of speech without a corresponding responsibility and limitation for the rights of that speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And when the Leader of the Conservative Party says, as he said this afternoon in one of his first interjections, “We have the right in this Legislature to speak in any way.” I think those were the words that he used. I have it marked down here, he meant just that. He is offering the people of Saskatchewan a government with a difference, ‘in any way,’ we have seen examples of it. Mr. Speaker, when you say that you can act in any way from a speech point of view and somehow mask that in a perverted way on the basis that it is a freedom of speech, I say that you are attacking the very fundamentals of freedom of speech because you don't recognize the corresponding responsibilities that are attached to all of us. You don't attach the responsibility of following the rules. If you don't like the rules you say whatever you want to say because you have the right to freedom of speech. That's the argument.

I say, Mr. Speaker, to all the members of this House that this issue is freedom of speech, freedom of speech tied in with responsibilities of that freedom of speech. The duty and responsibility to talk not in a maligning way of you or of this House or of a committee of this House or of other individuals, that's freedom of speech. If you do not discipline, if we do not discipline, if you interpreted one it interprets freedom of speech without any corresponding responsibility attached to it, then I say, Mr. Speaker, we are all wasting our time in this Legislature and make no mistake about that. You can't say simply this is a game, this is manoeuvring, that this is because of a gang up or political fear, that this is unimportant, Mr. Speaker. This is what it is all about, rule of law, parliament, sanctity, freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, I so move this resolution.

Motion agreed to on the recorded division

YEAS — 36

Pepper	Mostoway	Thompson
Thibault	Kaeding	Lusney
Bowerman	McNeill	Malone
Smishek	MacAuley	Wiebe
Romanow	Rolfes	Merchant
Synder	Cowley	MacDonald
Byers	Tchorzewski	Penner
Kramer	Vickar	Cameron
Lange	Skoberg	Anderson
Matsalla	Nelson (Yktn)	McMillan

Robbins
MacMurchy

Allen
Johnson

Nelson (AS-Gr)
Clifford

NAYS — 11

Collver
Larter
Bailey
Lane (Qu'Ap)

Birkbeck
Ham
Berntson
Katzman

Wipf
Lane (Sa-Su)
Thatcher

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle);— Mr. Speaker, I believe that my position was started during debate earlier today that we believe the public business should be proceeded with and we offered a compromise accordingly. I made it clear in debate today that I withdraw unconditionally and unqualified statements made if we could get on with the public's business. Unfortunately that was rejected and my position has not changed in any way. I regret that public business is taking second or third place to the matters today. My position was stated in debate and I re-affirm my position.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I won't take the House time. I concur completely and thoroughly with the remarks just made by the member for Qu'Appelle and, I suppose, add one additional comment that I do not look forward to whatever action that the House may deem necessary. I don't think any member would but I suppose when you have been brought up in a family where principle meant something, I suppose from time to time you have to stand for that. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the member for Qu'Appelle I guess we will have to accept the judgement on the basis of a principle that we deem to be correct.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, it saddens me to rise from my seat in this House and move the following motion, seconded by my seatmate, Mr. Robbins, the member for Saskatoon Nutana:

That the member for Thunder Creek and the member for Qu'Appelle, having refused to retract and apologize for their statements that the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections is a 'kangaroo court' and thereby having breached the privileges of the House, be suspended from the service of this House for five days.

I so move

MR. SPEAKER: — I would ask the members to just bear with me for a few moments. I would like the mover who moved the motion to clarify a point in the motion, 'service of the House for five days.' It's understood it is five sitting days.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, this is one of those days I don't think anybody in this Assembly is going to reflect back on with a great deal of pleasure. I think that perhaps most members in this Legislature before they entered the field of politics felt

that they were getting into a very honorable profession and they all strived to gain entrance to a very honorable institution, this Legislature. I know for myself that one of the things that I tried to do in my political career was to get politics out of the gutter, to get politics out of the dirty sense of politics that many people regard the business that we are in. I have a very high regard for this institution as well as other institutions that have made this province and this country a great place to live in. I find today, though, that the remarks of the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Thunder Creek can only be construed as remarks that are contemptuous of this particular institution, contemptuous really of the office of politics, the office of politicians. I think that when we are trying to determine today as to what penalty should be assessed for the remarks of the members, we must bear in mind that we cannot treat their comments with a cavalier attitude, an attitude that's says, so what. We cannot impose a penalty or censor them in such a way that this matter is just going to be regarded as nothing very important.

I think all of us here, including probably the members in question from their remarks they made earlier today, regard this as a very important matter. So accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can pass a penalty that will be regarded as a light penalty because of what I feel is the disrespect they brought to this institution. Furthermore, I don't believe that this House can act in a way that can be construed as vindictive. It can be construed by the members who sit to my left as making martyrs of the two members in question. I think we must act in a reasonable and a responsible way to show to the public of Saskatchewan and to other people that we do not regard lightly the statements made by the members who sit to my left and furthermore we don't regard lightly their refusal to withdraw those statements after a full day's debate and after being requested to do so by the members of this legislature.

I think, as well, Mr. Speaker, we must take into account the remarks of the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Nipawin. They are prepared to withdraw the very remarks that are the subject of this debate providing a condition was attached, the condition being that the Select Committee on Privileges stop its hearing as of today. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that by making that concession, by making that particular motion to this Legislature it indicates to the members who made these remarks about a so-called 'kangaroo court' they themselves . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — May I request the permission of the House to stand the clock for a few minutes.

MR. MALONE: — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the members in question indicated that they were prepared to withdraw their remarks providing a certain condition was met. That type of statement by their leader and by the member for Qu'Appelle would indicate to me that they acknowledge that the remarks were improper. The condition that they suggested to us has not been met with approval by this Legislature and accordingly we must view the whole situation in that particular light.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestion by the Minister of Transport that the members be suspended for a period of five days presumably starting tomorrow, although that is not in the particular motion, is well taken. I think that that type of penalty does not show that the matter is being dealt with too lightly, nor does it indicate that the matter is going to be treated in a way that is too harsh. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is an appropriate motion to deal with the particular matter that has unfortunately come before this House today and the Liberal caucus will be supporting the motion.

MR. COLLVER:—Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a sad day in the history of the province of Saskatchewan when an Assembly and parties therein can use their majority position to defame another party. I want it clearly understood by the members of this Assembly that actions taken by this Assembly against the member for Qu'Appelle and against the member for Thunder Creek are taken against the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan and are taken against me, the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan. Any action that has been taken by the majority of this Assembly to attempt to stifle the ability of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan to spell out our case not only in this Legislature but outside will be presented to the people of the province of Saskatchewan and they will be the ultimate arbiters as to whether this day is correct for the majority in the legislature or whether this day is correct for those who would stand for what they believe in and what they believe. to be right Therefore, Mr. Speaker. make no mistake that action taken by this Assembly against these two members and any other member of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan taken by the majority, is taken against the party and taken against me, the Leader of the Party.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to rise once more to say one or two words in brief rebuttal to the Leader of the Conservative Party. I think in a large measure what the Leader of the Conservative Party has said is right. While it does not in straight legal substance amount to a condemnation of him as Leader of the Conservative caucus, he is dead right. He too is responsible. And, Mr. Speaker, I would welcome that acceptance of responsibility on his part because he is the leader of the caucus. It is not a matter of majority, a position of majority, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of a rule, a law that has been passed. The hon. Leader of the Conservative Party has condoned two members of his who have said, that's fine, we're not going to comply with that law. So I agree with the hon. Leader of the Conservative Party the final arbiters of this action will be the public, the final arbiters of your statements and those of your colleagues will be the public and we will be pleased to explain that. I am sure we will have to explain that to the members of the Legislature. I can only say that it is very hard to believe that even at the last moment, it would be an act of graciousness on the part of either the leader or his two members.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division

YEAS — 35

Pepper	Mostoway	Thompson
Thibault	Kaeding	Lusney
Bowerman	McNeill	Malone
Smishek	MacAuley	Wiebe
Romanow	Rolfes	MacDonald
Synder	Cowley	Penner
Byers	Tchorzewski	Cameron
Kramer	Vickar	Anderson
Lange	Skoberg	McMillan
Matsalla	Nelson (Yktn)	Nelson (As-Gr)
Robbins	Allen	Clifford
MacMurchy	Johnson	

NAYS — 11

Collver
Larter
Bailey
Lane (Qu'Ap)

Birkbeck
Ham
Berntson
Katzman

Wipf
Lane (Sa-Su)
Thatcher

MR. SPEAKER:—The motion has been carried and in carrying out the wishes of the House I will begin the five days suspension of the members at the next full sitting day of the House.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:09 o'clock p.m.