

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

April 11, 1980.

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

QUESTIONS

REDUCTION OF STAFF AT OUTLOOK HOSPITAL

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. The approved daily census for the Outlook Hospital for 1980-81 period was left the same as the ADC (approved daily census) for last year but their approved staffing complement was cut by 1.00 registered nurses. Mr. Minister, is this not an attempt by your department to force the Outlook Hospital Board to close more beds because of a lack of adequate staffing?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that those question weren't directed to me when my estimates were in the House. I haven't the information at my fingertip with some 130 hospitals in the province. I think it's not unreasonable that a minister wouldn't have that at his fingertip. But the staffing of each hospital is based on the population served. It could well be there may have been some reduction in the kitchen staff. It could be a reduction in the laboratory staff or it could be a reduction in some other area. I'm not sure in what particular area the staff was reduced. I will, however, take the question under advisement and provide the information to the member for Maple Creek.

MRS. DUNCAN: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't ask you this in the health estimates because the letter just came with a copy of the letter sent by your department to them asking them to delete 1.00 registered nurses, not kitchen staff. Mr. Minister, you and I know that staffing in rural hospitals, especially on evening and night shifts are today at the bare minimum. If they're to delete these registered nurses, are you doing this in anticipation of a substantial increase in nursing wages?

MR. ROLFES: — Of course not, Mr. Speaker. That's not the reason at all. The staffing, as I indicated to the member, is based on the anticipated use of the hospital and the anticipated population that will be served. It has nothing to do with the anticipation of increase for nurses. I have no idea what that increase will be. I'm not directly involved with the negotiations.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary. Well, if the ADC remains the same, how can you justify cutting back one nurse?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the member twice now already. It is based on the anticipated population that will be served in this coming year. It will certainly also be based on the use of the hospital. There is a standard that has been worked out throughout the whole province. If Outlook has been asked (I think you said the Outlook Union Hospital) to reduce one registered nurse, it will be based on those criteria.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it just not an example of backdoor bed closing?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, she answered the question herself. She said there was no reduction in the approved beds. You said there was no reduction. How can it be possibly a backdoor method of reducing beds? You've answered the question yourself.

MEDICAL CARE RE SENIOR CITIZEN

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Health. I have a letter here from a resident, a senior citizen who has been in Regina General Hospital, and he was advised by letter that his condition had improved and he no longer needed hospital care, and if he didn't find other accommodation he would be billed \$148.15 per day. Because nursing home beds are not readily available, do you not feel that the government should still pay the costs of this individual until you can provide him with a bed to move to?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, several things must be kept in mind. First of all, I think the member knows that on any one of those there's 30-days notice give to individuals that they no longer require hospital care . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Did you have a question? Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it's not the Minister of Health who makes the decision as to whether or not someone requires medical care. That's the decision of the doctor. I hope that the member would appreciate that. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the facts bear out that in Regina we have 96 some beds per 1,000 senior citizens — the highest in the province other than Saskatoon and I would say, Mr. Speaker, the second highest in Canada without any doubt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: — Supplementary to the minister. You state that it's not up to your department to make the decision, and I agree with that, but it is your department's responsibility to set the policies that the health care system operates under. Do you not consider that it's inhumane to ask a senior citizen to pay \$148.15 a day out of his own pocket when you don't have a bed for him to move to?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, if the member would set his brain in motion he would know (he told me himself) that the individual doesn't need a bed. That is a decision which the doctor makes. The individual simply needs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I want to tell the member for Qu'Appelle that I don't think he's qualified to decide whether somebody needs a nursing home or a nursing bed. He doesn't make that decision. We have people in this province qualified to make those decisions and they happen to be in the medical profession, and not the member for Qu'Appelle. You're not an expert in that the medical profession, and not the member for Qu'Appelle. You're not an expert in that area. I want to say to the member for Rosetown-Elrose that we have sufficient beds in this city. We have more beds in Regina in levels 3 and 4 than anywhere in this country except for maybe the city of Saskatoon. We have sufficient beds. It's not the answer to move someone out of a hospital bed into another bed. There are other ways of dealing with these people, and they should be taken care of in other ways.

MR. SWAN: — Further supplementary. I don't think the minister understands my question. Mr. Minister, we have a gentleman who no longer requires full hospital care but does require nursing home care. He was advised that he could have a month to look for another place. In a whole month neither you nor social services nor anyone else has been able to find the man a bed. Do you still consider that he should be paying the cost himself when you don't have a bed for him to move to?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, it is not my responsibility and it's not the responsibility of

the Department of Social Services to find an alternative facility for this individual. That is a responsibility of the individual and his immediate family. It's not our responsibility. It is our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to provide sufficient nursing beds in this province. I have indicated to the member, on average, we have 68 beds in levels 1, 2, and 3 per 1,000 senior citizens in this province, which is the highest in Canada. In Regina we have 96.1 beds which is a third higher than what we have in the province and I say to the member opposite that our level 3 and level 4 beds in this province in Regina are sufficient for the number of senior citizens we have in Regina and in the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

GRANTS TO PLANNED PARENTHOOD SASKATCHEWAN

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — A question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, last fiscal year Planned Parenthood Saskatchewan received \$40,000 in grants from Saskatchewan health. My first question is how large a grant are you going to be giving them this year and secondly, since this organization is the largest abortion referral agency in the province, will your department cease the funding of that organization with taxpayers' money?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I think my personal position on abortion is very clear — I'm opposed to it. However, Mr. Speaker, I could change my mind looking at the members opposite and in some instances I would make it retroactive maybe.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member for Regina South, no, I will not cut off the grants for Planned Parenthood. The reason I'm not cutting off the grants for Planned Parenthood is that I have had several meetings with these people, as I have had meetings with Pro-Life and Campaign Life and Serena, and I'm not cutting it off because their main emphasis is in counselling people who have difficulties in these areas, not counselling for abortions. If the member has evidence otherwise, I wish he would put it before this House and make it available to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not exactly sure what the grant will be for this year but it will probably be an 8 per cent or 10 per cent increase over last year.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then I presume from that it will be somewhere around \$44,000 - \$45,000. Are you aware, Mr. Minister, that the federal government is going to be discontinuing funding of Planned Parenthood and secondly, how much of a grant will you be giving the Pro-Life group?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, again we have had some discussions with Pro-Life. They have not asked for a specific grant; they have asked for some money to offset the cost of their conference. That money will be forthcoming. We are making a grant available to Serena — I believe it's in the \$30,000 bracket, give or take \$1,000, I'm not sure. But it's in that particular area. It was started under the previous minister of health and yes, I'm looking at increasing the grants in those particular areas. But, Mr. Speaker, I let me say that I would like to make grants available to organizations which are prepared to have a look at this whole area of dealing with abortions, dealing with sexuality and, Mr. Speaker, that does not mean I will only give it to Serena, only to Pro-Life groups, but will take into consideration other groups which will positively deal with the situation to try to reduce the number of abortions. I think all of the organizations we are funding have agreed that abortion should be the last resort and that we ought to deal with the situation by making sure people know what it is to have individual responsibility when it

comes to sexuality.

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — A question to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Health not agree that in light of the fact that the cost of hospital costs for teenage pregnancies is approximately \$1 million; in light of the fact that approximately half of these pregnancies involve unmarried teenagers, and in light of the fact that the work of Planned Parenthood is primarily to prevent such situations and to prevent unplanned pregnancies, that in fact what is needed is an increase in support for the Planned Parenthood organization in this province.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, certainly the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland makes a good point in regard to the costs available or the costs incurred when people spend time in our institutions or in our hospitals. I would like to increase the funds not only for Planned Parenthood but for Serena, for Pro-Life and any other group which is prepared to work in this area in dealing with young people in coming to grips with the problem.

I do want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that in my discussions with all of these groups, I have indicated to them my opposition to abortions. They have all agreed that should be the last resort which should be used in dealing with it and that it's not an effective way of dealing with it, and they would much rather spend their time in, and their personnel in, counselling and dealing with young people and with parents of those young people.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Have you talked to the doctors, Herman?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, I have too.

NATIONALIZATION OF CANADIAN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. In light of Premier Blakeney's comments yesterday to the national Press Club that there would be no growth in the Canadian manufacturing industry this year since more than half of the industry is foreign owned, and suggesting as an alternative that we should consider nationalizing these business places as your government did with potash, do you really believe this option is possible? Where would the indescribable amount of money be available to finance such a scheme?

HON. R.M. ROMANOW (Attorney-General): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make too many sweeping generalizations but the general thrust of the Premier's remarks is the thrust of the remarks that he's been making to this House. That is, if we are concerned about the country and the economic domination of the country by our friends to the south, the United States, with the attendant cultural domination that follows of necessity, thereby all working to lessen the bonds of Canadian independence, clearly the issue of Canadian ownership or foreign ownership has to be tackled. Nationalization, so-called, is a tool. It's not the only tool but a weapon or a mechanism by which Canadians can grab more control of the Canadian economy and make the economic decisions which affect us and our workers and our economic decisions here at home. From that hopefully, over a period of time, will stem and flow a logical expansion into the cultural area.

That is the position we take. Members of the Progressive Conservative party opposite don't believe in a greater degree of Canadian control through the mechanism of nationalization or provincialization. In fact, judging by their positions in the House here

in Saskatchewan, they would oppose any kind of intervention of American or other multinationals continuing their economic takeover of the country. I think that is a threat to the country and that's what Premier Blakeney, as I understand his message, is trying to communicate to the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAM: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Attorney General not agree that comparing resource nationalization to nationalization of major manufacturing concerns is not reasonable, and economically impossible?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the argument here I think is a fundamental one. Some people believe that economic takeover is inevitable, that we cannot finance it at home and people opposite scoff and some even on our side scoff but I don't think it should be scoffed at. They believe somehow we can't manufacture the money to pay for this, that it's inevitable. Then I think a logical conclusion would be to follow the member's and his leader, Mr. Collver's recommended course — annexation to the United States. I don't happen to share that point of view. I think Canadians can do it, can take over Canadian industry. It doesn't have to be by government but through a greater degree of Canadianization to be financed by the profits that are generated, be those profits through Crown corporations or through manufacturing companies at home. That's how I think it can be done.

INVESTIGATION OF LIQUOR INDUSTRY

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — A question to the Attorney General. Some months ago the RCM Police investigated the liquor industry and kickbacks to at least I believe one province's liquor commission. I believe they studied it nationally. Would you be prepared to table the results of the RCM Police investigation in Saskatchewan?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the position that we have taken throughout the piece has been that police investigative reports are confidential and that has been the position of all attorneys general in so far as I know in Canada. Certainly it has been the tradition in Saskatchewan. I can tell the hon. member that information which we received from the Quebec Provincial Police and the Quebec Attorney General was, without amendment or change or comment or deletion, turned over almost immediately to the prosecutorial staff of the Department of the Attorney General and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Saskatchewan who have done in my judgement their usual thorough and competent survey of the matter. I am advised by our director of public prosecutions that no charges are warranted in Saskatchewan at this time.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary. Well, rather than the police report, would you be prepared now to table your departmental official's report, which you have just admitted you have, before this Assembly?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the same position takes place with respect to prosecutorial reports. I am sure the hon. member will understand that prosecutorial reports, those which see the light of day in court and those which do not see the light of day in court of necessity (I don't know in this case; I don't recall the report; I haven't seen it lately) may or may not involve certain names. Keep in mind the investigation goes all the way back to 1964, from 1964 to 1980, and there are names which have been mentioned at length in this matter if my recollection serves me correctly. I think that it would do little to further confidence in the judicial system or the prosecutorial system

to have the reports tabled. That's the position we have taken.

I can only say to the hon. member and to you, Mr. Speaker, as I reported earlier, this has been turned over to the deputy attorney general and to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who have the information and have dealt with it in the appropriate way. My position has been and remains, as Attorney General, that I have never interfered nor do I ever intend to take a position personally as Attorney General in prosecutorial matters of any kind and I stick with that position.

MR. LANE: — Final supplementary. Was the direction that you gave to the RCM Police without qualification, without limitation? They were free to pursue all aspects of the matters raised? Secondly, will you be prepared in your estimates to table your departmental reports as opposed to the police reports for discussion in this Assembly?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I will deal with estimates when the estimates question comes up but let's not fool ourselves when you deal with departmental reports, in this case it's prosecutorial reports. Those are the only reports I have, if my memory serves me correctly. I think we'll have to deal with the question, the specific question at the time. There may very well be some information we will want to table, dated to the earlier periods from 1964 and on. I think we will have to make that decision as it comes but the position I take, Mr. Speaker, is the position I have indicated. I think the only way a criminal prosecution system can operate is that the police do their job in an impartial fashion and bring to the bar of justice those who are required to be brought to the bar of justice. Mr. Speaker, my reaction is the same as for the second question. For the time being I just don't see any reason for doing this; we'll see what the specific questions are in estimates and how they are handled there.

SASKOIL RE DRILLING OF WELLS

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SaskOil. Mr. Minister, your SaskOil report for the past fiscal year shows that SaskOil was either a partner or directly involved in the drilling of 174 wells. I wonder if you would tell the Assembly how many wells SaskOil is going to partake in this year either as a partner or on its own?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get the substantive portion of the member's question.

MR. LARTER: — I wonder if the minister could tell the Assembly how many wells SaskOil is going to partake in this year and what proportion exploratory to development?

MR. MESSER: — Well, I'd like to be able to answer the member's question with precision but I think he can appreciate that's difficult for us to do. We do tentatively plan in global terms the kind of exploratory and other drilling activity we will involve ourselves in but certainly the success of the early stages of that exploratory development sets the course for the real number of wells that you would ultimately be able to conclude in a year's period of time. We are most ambitious and anxious to accelerate very significantly our exploratory and well drilling activity in the heavy oil area but as far as actual numbers I think it would be unwise to try to predict just how many wells we may complete this year.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, there were something like 50 rigs working in North Dakota in 1979. The border doesn't seem to bother this basin.

I know we haven't had too much success there but I'm interested in knowing because they drilled about 500 wells there last year, how many of these wells you plan on drilling in the Southeast and how many would be exploratory? Do you have any idea of that?

MR. MESSER: — If the member is asking about SaskOil only, he will know we do not have a large presence in that part of the province with the deep well oil that is being sought. That is not unusual because most of the land that has the potential has been held for many years by other companies. The majority of the exploratory and development activity is being done by Dome and Shell. Unfortunately Dome and Shell have not been that successful north of the Canada-U.S. border. There has been a higher level of success in the United States and as I talk to the representatives of the oil companies which are involved and optimistic about ultimately finding oil, deep oil, in this formation, they can't explain why there has been a higher element of success south of the Canada-U.S. border. I notice the member for Qu'Appelle laughing but I take it the member for Estevan is taking it very seriously because he knows something about this matter and certainly the member for Qu'Appelle tries to indicate knowledge about virtually everything and shows he knows nothing about . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — . . . but to the member for Estevan, I talk in an ongoing manner with both the executives of Shell and Dome and they continue to reassure me that even though they have not had the element of success they had hoped for in the last two or three years of activity in that area, they're continuing to pursue deep oil and they are spending more money and putting more manpower into that venture.

MR. LARTER: — Final Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, can you tell me does SaskOil have any plans of drilling in North Dakota either on a partnership venture or on their own, through hiring of rigs of course? And also, is there anything to the speculation that possibly there is a good producing well — deep well — on this side of the line, just south of Carnduff?

MR. MESSER: — Well, as I indicated to the member, Mr. Speaker, there is optimism that we will be able to obtain a level of success in this deep well activity. As far as SaskOil drilling in North Dakota, I have no knowledge of SaskOil's intention to so do. We do have activity outside of the province of Saskatchewan but it is not our intention, at least at this time, to extend that activity south of the border into the United States.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: — Yesterday, a point of privilege was raised by the hon. member for Saskatoon Riversdale to the effect that certain remarks of the member for Qu'Appelle, which were made outside the House, were a serious reflection on the Chairman of the committee of finance and constitute a breach of privilege of this House. In the second point the member claimed that a reflection on the Speaker had also been made. The radio transcript and press clippings of the remarks in question were tabled. I deferred my ruling. I have carefully considered the questions raised with regard to the second point of a reflection on the Speaker. I want to inform the House that I consider this matter closed.

The question of a reflection on the Chairman and Deputy Speaker is another matter. I

want to outline to the Assembly what the role of the Chair is in a matter of privilege. I refer all hon. members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, paragraph 84 as follows:

(1) Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a *prima facie* case can be established. The Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving such precedence (or as is sometimes put, that there is a *prima facie* case that a breach of privilege has been committed); and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity.

(2) It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege is limited to deciding the formal question, whether the case conforms with the conditions which alone entitle it to take precedence over the notices of motions and orders of the day standing on the order paper; and does not extend to deciding a question of substance, whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed — a question which can only be decided by the House itself.

And that reference is May, Parliamentary Procedure, pp. 346-47. It is my opinion that in this case privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify giving this matter precedence over the orders of the day. I refer all members to a precedent of this Assembly: Journals of Saskatchewan, December 19, 1977. I, therefore, leave the matter in the hands of the Assembly to deal with as it sees it.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, in light of your ruling this morning I'm following — I don't know if I should do this — but I invite the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and I think the matter can be solved very easily by a simple withdrawal and apology. On the assumption that he has not beaten me to the floor, I think the only approach is to follow the procedure which we have followed in one other precedent I've been involved in two years ago or so. I shall move, without any further comment, seconded by my colleague, the member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer):

That this Assembly requests: (1) that the statements by the member for Qu'Appelle reflecting on the impartiality of the Chairman of the committee of finance, and accusing him of partisanship in the conduct of his office, be withdrawn forthwith and (2) that, the said member tender apologies to this Assembly in respect of the said statements.

I drafted the motion, by the way, based on a precedent which I think is fairly well-known to the hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Attorney General, unfortunately, has put me in a difficult position by referring to the precedent he has referred to because I just happen to have it lying on the table before me. The precedent, I must report to the House, unfortunately is a bad one. I'll explain why I'm going to call the Attorney General's motion out of order. This will allow the Attorney General to prepare another motion and submit it. Now, the precedent he was following, I believe, is December 19, 1977, because the wording of his motion at this time is substantially the same with just the necessary elements changed. I realize the context in which this is approached. Everyone here understands what is happening. But this particular motion should have a short preamble at the

beginning of it, and words to the effect that this matter constitutes a breach of privilege and therefore, that this Assembly requests — so on that basis I am going to have to state that I don't regard that as a good precedent and that in order to have this motion acceptable, I would have to have a preamble stating that, in fact, this constitutes a breach of privilege. Then I could proceed with it.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'm seeking guidance from the Chair because I went to the one, what I thought was obvious precedent involving the member for Thunder Creek and the member for Qu'Appelle — I think it was in '77.

Would it be in order (I'm not asking you to prejudge this), but if the motion which is tendered would read something to this effect:

That this Assembly requests: that the statements by the member for Qu'Appelle reflecting on the impartiality of the Chairman of the committee of finance and accusing him of partisanship in the conduct of his office be deemed a breach of privilege of this House, and, accordingly, be withdrawn forthwith.

That would precede the balance which would have in it the statement of the allegation of the breach.

What I would do, with your permission, is tender it to you and then you can make a ruling on it. You don't have to tell me now in advance. I'll take my chances with it.

MR. LANE: — I would just like to call to Mr. Speaker's attention, a precedent ruled by Mr. Speaker on the opening day of budget in 1977, I believe the year was, when the Conservative opposition attempted a priority of debate motion on budget day, and Mr. Speaker made it quite clear to the Assembly that it was not the Speaker's role to draft the motions, or to draw the motions for members of the House. I believe that precedent was firmly stated by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, I think that is quite legitimate, to raise that point of order, and I don't think I'm in contravention of that at this time. Because the Attorney General was, in fact, citing a precedent which I consider to be a bad precedent, therefore. I feel an obligation of the Chair to say that I don't intend to regard that as a precedent for this purpose.

I'm not telling him what to put on his paper; I'm just suggesting it would have to be revised in such a way that it would identify that a breach of privilege had occurred. I have declared his initial submission to be out of order.

MOTION

REGARDING IMPARTIALITY OF THE CHAIRMAN

HON. R.M. ROMANOW (Attorney-General): — I move, seconded by the Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources):

That this Assembly requests: (1) that the statements by the member for Qu'Appelle reflecting on the impartiality of the Chairman of the committee of finance and accusing him of partisanship in the conduct of his office be deemed to be a breach of privilege, and requests the remarks be withdrawn

April 11, 1980

forthwith, and (2) that the said member tender an apology to the Assembly with respect to the said statements.

MR. SPEAKER: — I find the motion in order.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a question first. I'll place it as a point of order rather than entering into debate on this motion because I don't want to lose my place in this motion. I wonder if Mr. Speaker would indicate why he did not rule on the comments of the Chairman on April 4, 1979 when he said:

I am not a bit impartial.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, that's a valid point or order and I'll try to answer that at this time. I said yesterday in the Chamber if it (meaning the subject before us or the quotation that the member for Qu'Appelle read from the previous debates) bears any relationship to this particular point of privilege that's raised by the Attorney General, I will consider it. Otherwise, it will not be part of the case or part of the decision. I took the trouble of going back and examining the record that was referred to by the member for Qu'Appelle. I must admit that I was surprised that it was offered as evidence in this instance. I rule it not to be relevant to this case. I'll tell the member why I rule it not to be relevant. In examining the record it is quite clear that the Chairman said:

I'm not a bit impartial.

He said this immediately after receiving a comment from the member for Thunder Creek who said:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank goodness that there is somebody who is impartial in this Assembly.

The member for Thunder Creek, it appears, was complimenting the Chairman on being impartial. The Chairman retaliated, it would appear, by saying:

I'm not a bit impartial.

Now, I examined this record very carefully. I could not find one instance where a member rose at that time on this very important matter of a Chairman declaring himself to be not impartial. There, I think, for that particular day, would have been a breach of privilege. No one rose. There's nothing in the record to show that anyone took exception to what the Chairman said. Therefore, I can only assume that it was said in jest. It's the only assumption I can make. No one challenged it when it was made. It's not my job today to rule on something that happened in 1979 unless it can be related in a direct way and be relevant to what is under discussion now. For that reason, I didn't bring the matter forward.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Well, speaking to a point of order, as Mr. Speaker stated, in an unequivocal statement . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll get out my ruling. This one is getting pretty dog-eared but I will read it to the member again. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth

Edition, citation 68 says in part:

He takes no part in debate and must be careful not to indulge in any argument with members on the soundness of his rulings.

This is discussing the Speaker's position in the House. I don't intend to discuss my ruling on the matter. I was asked by the Leader of the Opposition to relate to the House why I didn't mention the matter. I didn't mention it because it's not pertinent.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, Mr. Speaker, of course I accept your ruling. Speaking to the motion of the Attorney General, I would just try to explain it why it may be perceived that the Chairman could, in fact, have acted in a rather partial or biased manner and I quote from page 235 of Erskine May on impartiality.

The Chairman of Ways and Means, during his occupation of that office follows the same tradition of abstention from party controversy as the Speaker. He no longer exercises the rights of the ordinary Member to participate in debates and division of the House. His independence has not . . .

On April 4, 1979 for whatever reason, the member for Rosemont while he was in the Chair in fact said, I am not a bit impartial, which would lead one to perhaps think that maybe that was true. In examining the record . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I just want to clear a point of order. I want to confine the debate to the resolution before us. Therefore, what members say must be relevant to what is before us. I have made a statement and I have ruled that the comment the member is referring to is not relevant to this particular debate. Therefore I have to say if the member is talking about that he is out of order.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Will you read the motion for me, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes. Moved by the Attorney General seconded by the Minister of Mineral Resources:

That this Assembly request: (1) that the statements by the member for Qu'Appelle reflecting on the impartiality of the Chairman of the committee of finance and accusing him of partisanship in the conduct of his office be deemed to be a breach of privilege and request the remark be withdrawn forthwith, (2) that the said member tender apologies to this Assembly in respect of the said statements.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As it relates to the impartiality of the member for Rosemont while he occupied the Chair, I have examined the record very carefully from April 4, 1974 on and no place in here have I seen a statement that said anything like I certainly am impartial, or I am in no way biased. And nothing has led me to believe and I think all thinking members of the House can understand why perhaps it was perceived . . . This statement coupled with the fact (and perhaps I'm not all-seeing) but it seems to me as it relates to this perhaps breach of privilege that when the continuing line of questioning, was cut off and someone opposite was recognized . . . And that coupled with the statement that I am not a bit impartial — you could understand why perhaps it should be perceived . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member is going contrary to a decision that I've made with regard to whether the member is in order or not. I don't want to get into the member's argument on how he phrases it, or whatever, as long as he's in order and talks about items relevant to this. I have to keep the discussion on this motion before us and I have declared that the comments raised specifically before by the member for Qu'Appelle are not relevant to this issue.

HON. MR. BERTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't quarrelled with your ruling from the outset. All I am suggesting is perhaps by justifying the perception of biased, an apology or withdrawal wouldn't be necessary — simply acknowledging that it was a breach would be all that was necessary. I think that's a valid point and it's not hard for any thinking member or even anybody in the gallery who has been sitting here watching perhaps perceived that impartiality was something that was a little foreign to the Chair. Mr. Speaker, I don't think, speaking from a personal point of view, that there has been a breach of privilege and I therefore cannot support the motion.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 31

Pepper	MacMurchy	Matsalla
Smishek	Mostoway	Lusney
Romanow	Banda	Prebble
Messer	Kaeding	Long
Snyder	Hammersmith	Johnson
Kramer	Kowalchuk	Poniatowski
Robbins	Dyck	Lingenfelter
Skoberg	MacAuley	White
McArthur	Byers	Solomon
Gross	Rolfes	
Shillington	Cody	

NAYS — 12

Berntson	Taylor	Muirhead
Birkbeck	Rousseau	Duncan
Larter	Swan	Andrew
Lane	Pickering	McLeod

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, it falls upon me as House Leader to move the next motion unfortunately in the light of the obvious decision by the member . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I declared the motion carried and it's incumbent on me in my position as Speaker, to have the member for Qu'Appelle consider his position in light of the decision of this House. That's a serious decision for the member to take regardless of what his decision will be and I hope that he will give it serious consideration. The rules of this Assembly stem from evolution over hundreds of years. They're not something that has been put in place by this Assembly but have been adopted and

evolved by this Assembly and it's the very framework in which we govern ourselves. I would ask the member for Qu'Appelle in light of the decision of the Assembly if he now wishes to make a statement with regard to withdrawal.

MR. LANE: — I agree that the rules have evolved for centuries and I suspect that in the centuries of parliament it is the first time we have had an admission of bias from a chairman in this Assembly and I will not withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think it's unnecessary for me to ask the member for Qu'Appelle again to consider his position, but it's incumbent upon me as the Speaker to give him generous opportunity at this time to adhere to the wishes of the Chamber and withdraw the remarks that the Assembly has made a decision about. I give the member one more opportunity.

MR. LANE: — I've given it ample consideration and I will not withdraw.

MOTION FOR SUSPENSION

HON. R.M. ROMANOW (Attorney-General): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will move a motion in just a few 30 seconds or so. As I was about to say it's incumbent upon me as House Leader of this Assembly to introduce the following motion and of course the previous motion as well. Frankly, I'm at some difficulty as to how to proceed. These are always very awkward situations. I note, however, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle in the Journals of the Assembly, Monday, December 9, 1977 was involved in an earlier involvement with the House and I quote from the record of the proceedings:

Mr. Speaker thereupon requested that the said remarks be withdrawn, Mr. Lane (Qu'Appelle) and Mr. Thatcher (Thunder Creek), having refused to withdraw the said remarks, it was moved by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Robbins 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 this House be suspended from the service of this House for five days. A debate arising and the question being put it was agreed to on the following recorded division.

And there was a division based on the party lines. One might argue reasonably that within a short period of two and one-half years, the hon. member refuses in a different circumstance to do the same thing — to retract and withdraw. One might logically argue that the appropriate approach to be taken by the House in this matter would be to increase the period of suspension of service beyond five days. But I don't believe that we ought to perhaps make martyrdom of something which in my judgement does not merit martyrdom and I firmly believe that no amount of suspension will make any member on that side or this side of the House act in a reasonably responsible manner if that individual is bound and determined under any circumstance to flaunt the rules as set by this House for whatever reasons. I think that a suspension of less than five days would be equally inappropriate given the precedent of but a short two and one-half years.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the members of this House, with a great deal of regret I move, seconded by the Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources):

That the member for Qu'Appelle having refused to retract and apologize for his statements reflecting on the impartiality of the Chairman of the committee of finance and accusing him of partisanship in the conduct of his office and thereby having breached the privileges of this House be suspended from the service of this House for five days.

MR. LANE: — I think in the very short remarks of the Attorney General we see proof of the partisanship of his motions today. First of all he made the comment that even this won't get all the members on this side of the House. Oh, yes you did! All the members on this side of the House if they don't want to obey the rules, that this wouldn't be good enough and you proceeded to bring in all the members of the Conservative opposition into your comments. I think that proves precisely what you are attempting to do today and that is to make sure the member for Qu'Appelle in particular is not participating in DNS estimates. And that is precisely what the Attorney General is doing today.

Secondly, the Attorney General doesn't think we should go back to 1979 to discuss previous statements but he sure didn't hesitate to go back two or three years ago to attack the member for Qu'Appelle. It didn't bother him a bit to go back and be highly inconsistent. Let's face it. This motion was debated and voted along party lines, along partisan lines, and the record of course shows that we have the only time in Saskatchewan's history, that much we know, a blatant admission of bias by a chairman. That was an unequivocal statement. The Attorney General says well, why didn't you raise it at the time? Because we don't have to raise it at the time! He could have raised it as House Leader at the time. He didn't bother doing it. None of the government members bothered. The fact that we saved the unequivocal admission does not mean the admission and the statement are less than the unequivocal admission of bias by the chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The fact that you got caught a little short, not realizing before you made the motion yesterday what the chairman had said a couple of years ago, is no reason to blame the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I will ask the member for Qu'Appelle to stay on the subject which is before us. The member for Qu'Appelle will be quite aware of the fact that the matter he is discussing is not relevant to this and I have stated that it's not relevant to this. And any member at the time that statement was made could have risen on a point of order or a point of privilege. None did and we are not going to do it today. The member must stick to the debate which is before us or the subject matter which is before us.

MR. LANE: — I suppose it could come under the topic of easing of the penalty, so to speak. I believe that in some courts there is the right to do that. Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear a ruling on the relevance of previous actions by the member for Qu'Appelle. I was awaiting that when the Attorney General . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. The member is reflecting on the Chair. If the member wanted to raise a point of order, when that occurred he should have raised it. He did not raise it. Therefore, he cannot reflect on the Chair now for not saying anything about it.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, the actions, myself, are one, justified based on the statements of the Chairman, the member for Rosemont; my actions and

statements are true in light of the statements of the member for Rosemont in his role as Chairman of the finance committee. You can have your motion. It obviously warrants no penalty and I'm going back to what the Attorney General has indicated yesterday when he referred in tabling the motion (I'm talking to penalty) about libel. Libel on the individual member was the phrase he used, and the Attorney General nodded his head in affirmation when I indicated that in a court of law an absolute defence to libel is truth. And he nodded his head in affirmation.

What we're seeing is a vote along strict party lines. A vote brought in, a motion brought in by the Attorney General today because he didn't want the questioning last night about when the investigation started and why it took so long to get to the RCMP and several other questions that followed naturally. I suppose we could go back to Judge Noble and how he wasn't going to put an individual in jail because there was active participation of a department and there was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I am only going to caution the member once more to stay on the subject and then I'm going to move on to another member. Nowhere, within my knowledge, has any decision by any judge entered this contingent to this motion. What I see before me is what I read out to the members and that is what we must discuss at this time. We cannot discuss something that happened at another time when I wasn't here and bears no direct relationship to this. We have to stick to the subject or otherwise I'm going to have to allow all members to do that and I am not prepared to do that.

MR. LANE: — Speaking to sentence I believe the phraseology is, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have the vote along strict party lines, that the penalty will be imposed by the government and I suggest in no uncertain terms to the House Leader, that no penalty is justifiable or warranted and nowhere in any of your remarks on this matter have you denied the unequivocal statement of the Chairman.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Mr. Chairman, I suppose as members of the Assembly we sit here today as judges as we sit in judgement of another member of this particular Assembly. Listening to the Attorney General, he attempts to go through the normal arguments of a prosecutor as it relates to the matter in which a person will be sentenced. He clearly, I think, as a prosecutor, has said that the deterrent is not there, by saying it doesn't really matter what we say in this Assembly. The deterrent is not there. The deterrent is not going to be followed by the members of this side and I believe, to a degree, he also said by members of the other side. I think in that sense he included the whole of the Assembly. I think when we look at the type of sentence we are proposing or the Attorney General is proposing, we are talking about mandatory sentencing if you like. Is there a question here as to whether it should be five days or ten days or whatever it might be? The Attorney General makes reference to (if you like) a previous conviction. He makes reference to a previous conviction but then moves away saying no, that shouldn't be a factor. I think in any question of sentencing you must look at circumstances around the alleged offence and whether those circumstances in any way mitigate the type of sentencing that should be imposed. Are we not talking here about something different than a person charged under the Vehicles Act where he will pay \$25 or \$35?

The Attorney General falls back in his final defence to simply saying that two or three years ago the sentence was five days and therefore today the sentence must be five days. He makes no reference to what I think is a mitigating circumstance in this case. Clearly and surely the previous statements of the last session made by the member for

Regina Rosemont must be considered by the Assembly; surely that has some bearing. The Attorney General made no reference whatsoever to the mitigating circumstances in this case. I suggest any fair-minded person is going to take into account those statements made before, clear statements as to his partiality. Surely that has some mitigating effect; surely that mitigates somewhat the sentencing that we seek to impose. As an Assembly, surely that has something to do with it. I simply ask the members of this Assembly: is it relevant when it comes to sentencing that the Speaker has ruled (and I respect his ruling) it has no relevance as a question of privilege or as a question of the offence? But when it comes to sentencing, surely we have to look at that.

A man who does something wrong in this situation because he is charged with the offence is not going to always have the same penalty imposed. We must look at different things when it comes to sentencing. I clearly ask the members of this Assembly, when you are voting, don't simply break down on party lines. Surely that is nothing more than mandatory sentencing. I ask you to bear that in mind when the time comes to vote.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, in my judgement this is one of the very grave acts that this legislature or any Assembly can carry out.

There used to be a time, Mr. Speaker, and I still hope that it has not gone by, that when a member was suspended from service of an elected legislative body, there would be condemnation in the land outside and inside of this kind of act.

The thought of suspension, I hope, is still foreign to the minds of most of us. If the threat of suspension — be it five days, three days, whatever the penalty date is — has no impact on us, then Mr. Speaker, this parliament will not and cannot function. Accordingly, the issue here is (whether or not it's five days or three days; I'm following the precedent) whether or not we as members of this House, notwithstanding our high feelings and high debate can discipline ourselves to have enough respect for the institution to avoid the ultimate decision by the elected peers of this Assembly. I ask you, Sir, and members of this House to contemplate no higher trust than that of election to avoid the penalty. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle in my judgement has defied, openly defied and continues to defiantly challenge the request of this House and Mr. Speaker's finding that it's a breach of privilege.

I want to make two or three very quick points. One, the member for Qu'Appelle says I've exhibited partisanship, and he uses as evidence that I said the Conservative caucus only was unruly — or words to that effect. I did not say that. I thank the member for Kindersley for acknowledging that that, as a fact, is what I did not say. I said that no sentence to both sides will have any impact if we have no fear, or no respect, for the institution, and I mean that of all sides. I think it's a wrong statement of facts for the member for Qu'Appelle to say it.

Secondly, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle says that somehow by debating his statements of years gone by on policy issues, I have betrayed the rules, or informal rules, of the House. I say to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that it's my duty, as it is his, to read back statements to other members in the course of policy debate but to do it always within the context of the rules of the foundation of this House. And where I've breached those rules, Mr. Speaker, I hope, I know, I'll be brought to order by you, and by other members; and I hope the day never comes where I don't say to Mr. Speaker, right or wrong, or to Mr. Chairman, right or wrong, you are the Chairman and I must obey the

order that is given.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, a brief word on the question of mitigating circumstances which has been raised by the member for Kindersley. Can this be viewed — the question of the quote of April, 1979 — as a mitigating circumstance? Should it be so viewed? I take the position, Mr. Speaker, that, with all due respect to you, you made the right decision in saying the remark of April 19, 1979 cannot be viewed as a mitigating circumstance or a debating factor and in ruling that issue out of order, Mr. Speaker, is it relevant? The hon. member for Qu'Appelle would have us believe that he and the members (or I would say he, I won't say the members of the PC caucus) knew about this comment made by the Chairman in April '79 and kept it in their hip pocket just for an occasion like this.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that offends your ruling and the rulings of this House which say that a privilege should be brought at the earliest opportunity. I was in the House exactly as were some of the members of the press, and the conclusion by Mr. Speaker, who was not in the House at that time and would not know other than by the reading of the record, in my judgement is the correct conclusion. It was done in a jocular manner from the member for Thunder Creek and responded to, unfortunately, by the Chairman of the committee of finance in a jocular manner, and was treated as such, Mr. Speaker, by all the members. There can be no other explanation as to why it was not raised for a period of virtually one year. No other explanation, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle was there and he did not raise it. The very member who now alleges that it was an admission of bias so serious as to justify his accusations of the other day, today, was in the House a year ago, but did not apparently view those remarks so seriously as to raise them a year ago. Why? Why, Mr. Speaker?

I close by saying two final things. I quote the hon. member Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, page 13, naming of a member, rule 25, sub (3):1

If the member (and I draw this to the attention of you Sir, the members of the press and the public, and to the House) satisfies the House by an apology, no further action is necessary. If the member's statement is insufficient it is the duty of the government House Leader to present a motion proposing a suitable penalty.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle says (I cite this from rules, hundreds of years of rules), this is an act of partisanship by the government House Leader. The rules obligate me as the government House Leader to present this motion. That's the way it works in every parliament . . . (inaudible) . . . and that is a fact. And then in sub form, Mr. Speaker, I think it's relevant to say that this quotation is also important. For my own edification and perhaps for some of the members of the House I would read this:

A government House Leader in a statement in the House explained his role: 'Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the situation that has arisen, I feel I should explain the proceedings in which I am now engaged. It has been the tradition of the House of Commons that when a Speaker names any particular member, the leader of the government in the House supports the Speaker in that decision. That, I believe, has been the unvarying tradition of the House of Commons with one exception, and when that occurred the Speaker of the day was left in a very exposed, unprotected and unsupported position. It is therefore my desire in discharging my responsibility to support the Speaker.

I would add that while the Speaker did make the suggestion that I put this motion, it is a decision which the leader of the government in the House make son his own account and he can either agree or disagree to move the motion'. Debates, May 16, 1978, p. 5457.

Mr. Speaker, those are the facts and the traditions of this House, no matter what the member for Qu'Appelle may say inside or outside this House.

MR. LANE: — My point of order is that he has gone on now for about seven minutes talking about responding to me and not speaking to the issues of sentence, which I was cut off for on three different occasions.

MR. SPEAKER: — That's not a valid point of order. The Member for Qu'Appelle was warned several times about talking about the things he discussed. The member for Kindersley further discussed them. I warned the members what would happen. The Attorney General is responding. He has every right to close debate and to respond to any points that were raised in debate. Therefore the member for Qu'Appelle's point of order is not valid.

MR. ROMANOW: — Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to put this on the record as well with respect to the sentence. I cite Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, sub (5), page 14:

The penalty common in Canada is suspension for the remainder of the sitting day. On one occasion the House decided upon a seven day suspension for a second offence by the same member. Journals, July 4, 1944.

I remind the members of the House that this member for Qu'Appelle was only a few days ago suspended for the remainder of the day, two days ago. Two days later we are now acting again on a five day suspension. When you read that, together with the history of two and one-half years ago and the allegations there, five days is indeed, one might argue, if anything, a very generous sentence under the circumstances. I close by saying to him and to all the members of the House, let's not inflict any more injury on ourselves or on the House when we pass this motion and get on with the business of what we were elected to do, responsibly and honestly and passionately, but within the rules deal with the issues of this legislature.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 34

Pepper	Shillington	Cody
Bowerman	MacMurchy	Matsalla
Smishek	Mostoway	Lusney
Romanow	Banda	Prebble
Messer	Kaeding	Long
Snyder	Hammersmith	Johnson
Kramer	Kowalchuk	Poniatowski
Robbins	Dyck	Lingenfelter
Baker	MacAuley	White
Skoberg	Byers	Solomon
McArthur	Vickar	
Gross	Rolfes	

NAYS — 12

Berntson	Taylor	Muirhead
Birkbeck	Rousseau	Duncan
Larter	Swan	Andrew
Lane	Pickering	McLeod

MR. SPEAKER: — I declare the motion carried. The member for Qu'Appelle is aware of the decision of the House. I expect him to take the appropriate action.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, last night in this Assembly the member for Regina Wascana, in his speech to this Assembly, made reference and inferred and directly stated and I will quote, that the members of the Progressive Conservative Party were racists. This was reinforced by the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan when he said, and I quote — although I do not have the quote with me, but as I recall it (and I quote for the minister) that the member for Regina Wascana stated in his speech the Progressive Conservative members tend to be racists. In the quote from Hansard, which I picked up this morning, Mr. Speaker, the member for Wascana says (I will read those areas which refer and infer the members of the Progressive Conservative Party are racists):

Thirdly, the opposition has engaged in an attack on the minister which has been classed by some people outside this House as racist. Now, I just want to read a part of the two telegrams read yesterday from native and non-native members of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. And just to quote a line or so from one, 'We have heard the racist and personal attacks which Conservative MLAs have made against you in this House.' The other one bears the phrase 'the obviously racist tirade of the opposition.' That's not the first time that statement has been made of the members opposite.

I quote further, Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina Wascana:

I think you will find it highly relevant. The point I want to make for the benefit of the gentlemen opposite is if you look at the attack they are making today on the minister, that type of attack has been made before. Various selections were fought on racial, religious and language issues — no less than three of them. The Conservatives finally came to power and when they did they brought in legislation dealing with these various matters.

And I quote further, Mr. Speaker, from the member for Regina Wascana:

Yes, in power the party proceeded to restrict language rights, educational rights and immigration to try to keep out some people it considered undesirable. But I want to point out to you, your party was very short-lived, one term, then every man was wiped out. The point I want to make to you is this: don't feel it was the depression that did this; that's a comforting illusion. People who have studied your party have this to say. The Conservative Party of early years based its campaign on race, language and religion.

April 11, 1980

I quote further, Mr. Speaker.

Now, if you look at what is happening today under your new leader, you are heading in the same direction. If you continue in this direction you can be assured of two things. Your tenure in this House is very insecure, and your moment of glory will also be very short. You may get some headlines by sensational charges, by appealing to the press, by raising racial issues under your new leader . . .

Mr. Speaker, these remarks were made by the member for Regina Wascana last night, reinforced by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. I consider those remarks, Mr. Speaker, to be unparliamentary. I would ask those two members to withdraw those remarks and apologize to the members of the Progressive Conservative Party and to the opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I hope all members realize to raise a matter of privilege is a very serious thing and requires serious consideration by those involved on all sides. Therefore I will thank the member at this moment for bringing it to my attention. I will study the record and will return to the House with a decision as soon as possible.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on another matter of privilege, I would ask that you take this as notice as well and review the record and bring your decision back to the House. On April 10, in response to a question to the member for Qu'Appelle, the minister responsible for SGI said (referring to a Mr. Buck):

I understand he has done (meaning resigned). If he has been granted a licence, then he's no longer employed by Crown investments corporation.

The Leader-Post last night or this morning's paper said:

But a phone call to Buck's office contradicted the minister's statement. A receptionist confirmed Buck was still an employee of Crown agency.

Lest you think I take the word of the Leader-Post as gospel, just five minutes ago I phoned (and I'll give you the number) 565-5892. Mr. Buck's office, was the answer. I said, is Mr. Buck in? No, he's in Saskatoon today. He will be phoning in. Could I take a message? I said Mr. Buck is still secretary of CIC? Yes, he is. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, that is clearly another indication of government members misleading the House. I would ask you to review the record and see that our remarks are not in fact justified.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. As I said before, the matter of privilege is a very serious matter and deserves serious consideration on all sides. I'll take the matter under consideration and bring a decision back to the House in due course.

HON. R.M. ROMANOW (Attorney-General): — Mr. Speaker, I think it's obvious from the proceedings of this morning, this House has suffered some injury from which it will take some time to recover. I think, Mr. Speaker, given the present mood and attitude of members to conduct further public business today would not be productive. I think we need time to reflect on our words, conducts and our actions and on the motivations of

people. Accordingly taking cognizance of the time as well, I think the wise and most prudent thing would be for members, over the weekend, to reflect on the serious act of today. I beg leave to adjourn the House.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:10 p.m.