

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
10th day**

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock
On the Orders of the Day

QUESTION – RE COMMITTEE ON RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Telephones (Mr. Williams,). The other day in the house when he was speaking he referred to a committee which would be soon set up to help provide service to rural areas where other efforts have failed, or other means have not been available. I wonder if I might comment on the made-up of that committee.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think that is a question for the Orders of the Day. I think that is a question that could be asked in debate. I don't think the minister should be asked to comment on future plans of the government. The rules permit questions of fact.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Ed. Whelan (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and on behalf of all members, I would like to welcome to this house 33 grade eight pupils from Imperial School. They are a special interest group and are accompanied by their vice-principal, Mr. Mel Lindegern, grade seven teacher, Miss Devitt, two parents, Mrs. Dettler and Mrs. Humble. It is our sincere wish, I'm sure that their stay here be informative, pleasant, educational.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Michayluk for an Address in Reply.

Mr. David g. Steuart (Prince Albert): — Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks I would like to join with others who have in this legislature paid a tribute to members who are retiring. I refer to members on the government side, member from Saskatoon, (Mr. Stone), whom I don't know very well, but I do know by reputation has served long and faithfully that city in this legislature, and the Hon. Mr. Williams. I did have the pleasure of knowing him when I was mayor of the city of Prince Albert. We had him and his very charming wife up when we had the honor of having Princess Margaret visit our fair city, and while I have not agreed with Mr. Williams' political outlook, I have always found him a very fair and honorable gentleman, I am sure we are all sorry to see him retiring from public life.

I'd like to pay tribute to members on our own side of the house who are retiring, starting with the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). She is not only a very charming lady but also a most effective member on this side of the house and we are extremely sorry to see Mrs. Batten leaving public life at this time. Mr. Horsman, who is our whip, keeps us in order, and to him and Mr. Ross McCarthy, go our thanks as I think should go the thanks of people of this province for long and faithful service to them in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — I am sorry that the Minister of Mineral Resources is not in his chair I would like to comment — oh, he is coming in now — I would like to comment on some of the remarks he made yesterday, I thought they were — is he retiring too, but not voluntary, surely — I was very impressed with his remarks, especially when he quoted Time Magazine, about the write up in there about the provincial government. We on this side of the house felt that it should have been made as an announcement, a paid political announcement, since it was written by their correspondence out here, Mr. Higginbotham, who is also an employee of their government . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — . . . but we think Mr. Higginbotham is a very charming fellow. I think his was the only part of that propaganda series they had on the televisions on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan, called “In Motion”, we did enjoy. We were never sure “in motion” exactly which way, but it was announced and commentated upon by Mr. Higginbotham and I have listened to Chris over the years and I can understand him quite well, I’m not sure whether his accent is English or whatever it is, but it is a very charming accent. I think some of the pole in the country had a little trouble; they thought it might have been Saskatchewan’s first effort at bilingualism, but this program Mr. Higginbotham was connected with was nothing but sheer and outright political propaganda, on the part of the present government, and I would suggest that when we find out, if we ever do, how much it cost the taxpayers of this province, that it could run as high as \$2 to \$3,000,000. I understand they even had to make some of the programs over again, and it was about as effective as a rather unrehearsed high school drama effort, but I think it is a shame and a disgrace that this government should take taxpayers hard earned money and engage in this type of propaganda for their own particular brand of political philosophy.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — I understand that we are to be treated to more of the same, and that they are now in the process of taping another program that will be paid for by the government - - by the people is fur sure - - but it will be paid for by the government with the people’s money, as well as a booklet that we understand is also coming out. Every four years they do the same thing; they put out a booklet praising the great progress and progress that they have instituted in the last four years, and again the cost will be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars when it is distributed all over this province.

I am rather amazed that the press of this province doesn’t take the government to task. I can imagine what would happen if any federal government, no matter what political stripe it might be, engaged in this sort of blatant propaganda with the taxpayers’ money, there would be an outcry that would be heard from coast to coast, and I think that the same thing should happen in this province, we have been brainwashed over the years with our own money, money that has been poured out through the Department of Industry and Information, and propaganda, and I think that they will be held to account for this and I think they should be held to account for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I enter this throne speech debate, as one of the last speakers from the opposition, I would first like to sum up the major positions taken by the government and by the opposition. An examination of these conflicting views brings into sharp focus the real difference between the NDP socialists and the Liberals. The Leader of the Opposition stated the Liberal position in his address on this debate. He called for tax cuts and al all out effort to bring job producing industries into all parts of this province, and I think this is important – that we emphasize into all parts of this province.

The Liberal leader made a sound case both for the need to reduce taxes for the ability of the government to do so without restricting essential services. Mr. Speaker, when we total the provincial taxes we pay, our power and our gas bills, the taxes we pay on our homes, on our farms, and we find that it costs us more to live in Saskatchewan than in any other province in Canada. We also find that because of this heavy tax load, Saskatchewan cannot and does not compete successfully with Manitoba or Alberta, or with British Columbia, for its fair share of industrial and business development. The question, of course, arises, where would the money be found to cut taxes and still maintain necessary and worthwhile public service. Well this question was answered. This NDP government has in the past two years by their own admission, overtaxed our people by about \$20,000,000.

This government took at least \$20,000,000 more from the pockets of our people in the last two years, than they needed to run the affairs of this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you add to this the money that could be saved, by the introduction of a little business-like efficiency, in government operations, the problem of finding the money to cut taxes in this province would not be difficult.

The Premier, himself, admitted they could cut taxes if they wanted to, but he said they didn't choose to. And in taking this attitude he showed his contempt for the intelligence and the ability of the ordinary people of Saskatchewan. What the Premier said in effect was that he and his socialist planners can spend your money, my money, better than we can. And he also promised to keep on doing this as long as they can hold on to power. The Premier then suggested that there were some guide posts to the future contained in the throne speech, guide posts to the future. And after taking a rather dull look into this future the Premier then proceeded to defend his government's record and attacked the Leader of the Opposition. And in this attack he was joined by his clique of front benchers and I'll have a word to say about that before I'm finished.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the throne speech and see what a bright new world the socialists are promising this year. Well, to being with on page two of his speech, the Premier says and I quote:

We could close our eyes even tighter and do nothing to make secure the future needs of Saskatchewan.

Close our eyes even tighter. The Premier admits that in this matter his government has had their eyes closed tight for twenty years.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, let us look at the picture of our Premier gazing at his guide posts to the future, with his eyes shut tight. You know the NDP paint him as a calm, thoughtful man. I'm afraid by his own admission he has just been standing there with his eyes closed. And you know from time to time when our people rise up against a government's dictatorial policies, I'm afraid they close their eyes just a little tighter.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech makes vague reference to the problems of municipal government. Well, what happened to the great new deal of a local government that was promised back in 1956. Well, first there was the Baker Commission - - that cost us \$458,000. Then the famous Continuing Committee — another \$340,000. Finally the Municipal Advisory Committee and it cost us \$317,000. So the government spent \$1,115,000 to give our rural municipalities, our towns and villages a new lease on life. What were the results? After all these years and all this money, the government planners decided we need a country system. They said our rural municipalities were too small, too inefficient, and too old fashioned, and then with typical socialist disregard for individual rights they threatened to impose the country system, even without a vote of the people concerned.

Well, we all know what happened. The rural people took matters into their own hands, and they held votes all over this province. We on this side of house agreed with them in this exercise of their democratic rights. When our NDP-CCF socialist government finally realized that they couldn't force their way, they backed down and promised the rural people a vote before any change would be made in their municipal form of government.

But what is happening now? Have the NDP forgotten their pet country scheme? No mention of it in the Premier's guide posts to the future. Mr. Speaker, don't you or anyone else think for one moment that they have forgotten; they are just waiting, and they are waiting for two things, first the next election. They don't want the rural people stirred up again, but just give them four more years of power and they will find a way of planting their country system of control over our local governments. And second, Mr. Speaker, the NDP is trying to starve the municipalities into submission. The government's refusal to give local governments the funds that they need is the major reason why municipal taxes are going up and up, and many of their essential services are slipping and slipping badly.

Taxes on our farms, on our homes, in our towns and cities have increased 400 per cent since that government took power. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, this hits everybody. The wage earner and a small farmer are finding municipal taxes a real hardship. We say something must be done to give our municipalities the funds they need to carry out their responsibilities in a proper way and without breaking their rate-payers. Well our way would be to call municipal people together and listen to what they have to say, and then take action to help them, not to control them.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech refers to the Woods report on hospital staff appointments. The Premier and the hon. lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper), have challenged us to make known our stand on this matter. You know Mr. Justice Woods was appointed to look into and report on charges that certain doctors were being denied hospital privileges that they were entitled to. And these charges came in from all over the province, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there were two reasons behind these charges of discrimination and the publicity that followed. The first might have been legitimate, some doctors claim they were being denied the right to look after their patients in hospitals and they wanted the situation corrected. The second reason was nothing but propaganda. It was an attempt by the NDP supporters to cause dissension in our communities and stir up trouble for their own political ends.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — And Mr. Speaker, a prime example of this latter can be found in the city of Prince Albert. Charges were laid against two hospitals there; they were dropped, and never came before Justice Woods. They were dropped because they had no basis in fact. They were started to make local community clinic doctors appear as martyrs and to make the NDP appear as champions of the under-dog. No community clinic doctor, who was a legitimate resident in Prince Albert, and who had the proper medical qualifications was denied hospital privileges in that city.

There were, however, Mr. Speaker, other doctors referred to in that Woods report, whom the commission felt had been unfairly dealt with. And when the government brings in this legislation I challenge them first to prove that these people have been unjustly denied hospital privileges, and I challenge them secondly to prove that they are not using this situation as an excuse to take away the autonomy of local hospitals, and thirdly I challenge them to prove that their legislation will protect the public and not result in lowering our hospital standards.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal opposition have been fighting for the rights of people in this house and out of it for twenty years. We fought for the rights of lumbermen to make a living in this province, and we lost. The socialists put them under the tight control of the Timber Board and drove the most of them out of the province. Mr. Speaker, we fought for the rights of fishermen to sell their catch where they chose, we lost, the socialists are still hounding them, and even dragging them into court when they dare step out of line.

We fought for the rural people in their demands to conduct their own local affairs in their own way. We fought for the retail merchants when the Attorney-General put his heavy hand on them with The Retailers Act. We won and the bill was repealed. Mr. Speaker, we fought for the rights of the people of this province to have a free choice of doctor under the original state medicare act, we fought for the doctors' right to work inside or outside the plan. We won, the act was changed.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — The NDP backed down and they gave the people a medicare plan that had some chance of working. In all these battles over all these twenty years the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan has consistently fought for one thing; we fought for the rights of the people, for the freedom of the people, regardless of their race, color, creed or politics, regardless of how they make their living or where they make their living. Mr. Speaker, it was the NDP socialist government we had to fight on every occasion. These self-styled defenders of the "little man" had been busy for twenty years taking away his rights and his freedoms. Now, Mr. Speaker, we believe that doctors who are fully qualified and morally sound have a right to practice medicine in and out of our hospitals, and in and out of our medicare plan, to the extent that they are qualified. We will fight for their rights, we will fight for their rights regardless of their political belief, or where they come from. We also believe that people who choose to go to community clinics have the same rights as anyone else to be treated by doctors of their choice. And, Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister of

Health applauding, and we welcome the NDP into this fight for human rights; they are twenty years late but we will welcome them. We suggest now that they go all the way, free the fishermen, the lumbermen, take off the law books, that legislation that threatens and hampers business and industrial development in this province.

I would, however, warn the NDP in their new-found enthusiasm for the basic rights of people, to make sure their legislation on hospital privileges does not destroy the hard-won protection our people expect from the hospitals of Saskatchewan.

I wonder if this is another case of the Premier having his eyes closed even tighter and suddenly opening them and if it is let's make sure this time they are open all the way.

Mr. Speaker, one last look at the throne speech; we find some vague references to economic expansion. To find out what this really means we must go again to the Premier's speech. He rose in his place and painted a glowing picture of past accomplishments and great new things to come. I was impressed until I studied his speech and compared it with what I know has really happened in Saskatchewan.

Well, what was his promise for the future? (More stagnation is right). More of what we have had in the past, what a nauseating thought. Even the Minister of Industry and Information gave us a demonstration of how to look backwards with your eyes closed. You know I love his proud boast that he could juggle figures with the best of them. Well, we have long known that his department of so-called planners, were masters at juggling figures, but, Mr. Speaker, we hardly expected him to admit it publicly.

Well, let's look at the record, the NDP's record of economic expansion. The Leader of the Opposition in his throne speech cited figures to show that we had lagged far behind Alberta and Manitoba in manufacturing. He pointed out that the value of manufactured goods in 1962 were for Alberta, \$976,000,000, for Manitoba, \$856,000,000, for Saskatchewan only \$381,000,000, a poor third. And the record further shows that as of September 1963, the number of jobs in manufacturing, again — Manitoba 41,800, Alberta 36,194, Saskatchewan 11,748, again lagging far behind the others.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — Juggle those figures . . .

Mr. Steuart: — . . . but the most damning figure of all shows that after twenty years of CCF-NDP government, Saskatchewan has actually 167 fewer manufacturing establishments than when they took office in 1944.

Well, the Premier in his reply accused our leader of using what he called selected material to prove his case, and then he proceeded to select his own evidence and he compared 1956 with 1961 in an attempt to confuse the clear case of stagnation presented by the Leader of the Opposition. Why 1956-61? They came to power in 1944. It is just possible that there is an area in the record that even they are ashamed of. Then we heard the Minister of Industry and Information, talking about all those new industries his department had brought to Saskatchewan.

You know I began to wonder if we lived in the same province. Well, I invite him to come up north and show us those great new industries. Show us in North Battleford, Meadow Lake, and Prince Albert, and Melfort or Nipawin. Well, I will tell him what he already knows — they don't exist.

Development in northern Saskatchewan has been one of the government's greatest failures. Oh, they have drawn maps and printed books and held conferences, promised us great things, but we are still waiting. The Leader of the Opposition reviewed the socialists' long and sorry record concerning the pulp mills, and you know, Mr. Speaker, I hear now rumors up north about pulp mills, and, of course, this is natural, there is an election coming up. Well, I would first say to the government that the people desperately want and need new manufacturing plants and industries. We will co-operate in any way we can to help you, or anyone else, to establish industries in our communities. We need jobs for our young people and our unemployed. Our Indian and Metis population need to be given new hope and a chance to earn a decent living.

Northern Saskatchewan has the greatest potential for new wealth and new opportunity of any area in the province. Mr. Speaker, we hope they bring a pulp mill, we hope they give us a pulp mill, or arrange or help so a pulp mill will be developed in the north, but we say, please don't dangle one in front of us as election bait, because I warn you the people have never forgotten or forgiven your last performance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing things about our province in the last twenty years is the number of people who have left us. Some 260,000 citizens, many of them skilled and educated young people have been lost to us and it is a loss that we can't afford. Just look at the record, — 1944 the population of B.C. grown by 83 per cent, Alberta grown by 75 per cent, population of Manitoba has grown by 32 per cent, while Saskatchewan has grown by a mere 12 per cent. Mr. Speaker, at one time we had a million people in this province; today we have something like 933,000. If our progress was real and not just NDP propaganda we would have to have more people. This is one fact they can't escape nor explain away. This is the reason why we in the Liberal party say drastic steps must be taken to get job producing industries, businesses to come here and to help us catch up with the rest of Canada.

How ill we do it? We will do it by instituting a positive industrial and business development program, that will bring real opportunity and new life to all parts of Saskatchewan. Let me outline some of the steps we will take if the people give us a four year opportunity to work with them as the government of Saskatchewan. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that a new liberal government will help create 20,000 new jobs in industry and manufacturing during its first four year term of office.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — I can further state that this will help create 60,000 additional jobs in other fields. How will we do it? First, by creating a political and an economic climate that's favorable to investment and to industry. We'll grant tax concessions to new industry and mines locating in the province and if necessary will give major provincial tax holidays. We'll reduce power and gas rates to levels at least comparable to other provinces. Mr. Speaker, we'll reduce royalties on the natural resources to levels comparable with or if possible lower than other provinces. We must compete. In co-operation with municipal government, we'll provide land at cost and sewer and water on a local improvement basis, and we'll establish a branch of the government to provide technical and financial assistance to qualified persons interested in expanding or establishing businesses and industries in our smaller urban centres, the forgotten people of Saskatchewan under these NDP people.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, these positive steps will be taken, and they will be accompanied by a program that is bold, imaginative and practical in all other fields of government.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to a field which we find in almost all the speeches of government supporters which smear Ross Thatcher, - - smear the leader of the Opposition campaign.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — It starts with the Premier of this province. Oh and it comes from over there, I never know whether the Minister of Natural Resources is chewing gum or just flapping his mouth, and he makes just about as much sense doing either. Mr. Speaker, it starts with the Premier of this province and is carried on by his cabinet and his party supporters through the province. Now the smear campaign is nothing new, it started with the Communists, and has been raised to a fine art by you, Saskatchewan socialists. What form does it take? Well they attack our leader from any conceivable angle: his appearance, the way he speaks, his business success, his language, and because he had the courage to leave their party and join ours.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — Let us take a look at the man who is the object of this vicious personal campaign of abuse. The Leader of the Opposition was born in Saskatchewan; he went to school here; he graduated from Queen's University as one of the youngest graduates of that school, and he majored in economics and commerce. He went into the hardware business; he made a success of it. He started in the cattle business just a few years ago, and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether he's to be classed as a success in this or not; he tells me he's learned a lot, and most of it the hard way. Back a few years ago, he ran and he was elected as an alderman in Moose Jaw, and a Member of Parliament and more recently, leader of the Saskatchewan Liberal party, and MLA for Morse. Well, there's nothing much in all this to class a man in the role of a villain. He is a successful man who has taken an interest in public affairs. As we look closer, Mr. Speaker, we can see where he made his fatal mistake. He quit the NDP and he defeated Tommy Douglas in a public debate, and he holds strong views and he has the courage to express them.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — Well, Mr. Speaker, you're not supposed to leave the NDP; you're not supposed to change your mind, to disagree with their master plans of how to run our lives. It was an unforgivable sin to defeat the great undefeatable Tommy Douglas just a few years ago. Well, mind you the people of Regina finished this job, and I noticed that he's strangely absent from this province lately.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — But above all, Mr. Speaker, you don't dare hold or express strong views about the NDP. Oh, they can walk all over you walk all over anyone they please, and if you protests, you're reactionary or you're unenlightened. You know I thought the Premier hit a new low in his speech the other day when he referred sneeringly to Mr. Thatcher as a refrigerator salesman. Well, I'm a refrigerator salesman when I get time too, and there are thousands of salesmen, sales people in Saskatchewan and I presume they're held in contempt by their Premier and his party.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — And I think that sales people do a pretty good job in this province. I'll tell you one other thing that they do — they help pay the government's salary. Maybe they better not forget that, because they're liable to turn on them. They are some of the little people you profess to stand up for and to fight for. Mr. Speaker, I'm convinced that when our Premier and the members of his government get up in this house, day after day, and make personal attacks at the Leader of the Opposition, they degrade themselves and they degrade this legislature. By all means attack his policies and his stands on the issue of the day, but I think the other tactics will back-fire and I hope they do. The Leader of the Opposition has made an outstanding success of his own life — something that many of you people might emulate — try to emulate. He's made a success with our Liberal party, and I can tell you, that given the opportunity, he'll put those same talents to work for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stuart: — You know, Mr. Speaker, he has got his eyes opened. He's got the background to give Saskatchewan the kind of business-like, forward-looking administration that we so badly need.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Who wrote that speech?

Mr. Stuart: — Well, if he could write that, he's one up on you, Mr. Walker, because I don't know whether you can write, but when you open your mouth, you'd be better off if you kept it closed most of the time. I suggest that if the Premier keeps his eyes open and the Attorney General keeps his mouth closed they would both serve their party better.

You know the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) charged the other day, that the NDP organizers were pressuring civil servants to buy NDP memberships in his constituency and even threatening people on social aid. The hon. Minister of Social Welfare rose, clothed in his sanctimonious

robes and as usual, he missed a point and he did that on purpose. Every time we suggest that there might be someone on social aid, there might be some area in the social aid program that would require examination, that there might be some people on social aid who don't deserve to be there, every time we get up and say we believe in social aid, and most people on social aid need the help, in fact, they could do with more help, then they're getting now, the Minister of Social Welfare rises in his place and he says — "you're smearing the municipal, the city and the town officials". Yes, I know they issue social aid, Mr. Minister of Social Welfare, I was there when your government agreed and got us to take it over. Your people are responsible for social aid; you pay out of your own boast, 97 per cent of the money; you set the rules and if there is any area that needs looking into in this province, it's social aid, and it is not doing your government or the people of this province any good when every time we raise it in the house, all you give us is a whitewash of your department and say we're maligning the people on the municipal level. We're not. We know they do their best with social aid, but when we asked this government when the municipalities took over the administration of social aid, for more help, more help with administration costs, they turned us down. When we went to the Minister of Public Health and asked for more help with health costs for people on social aid, they turned us down. What did they want us to do? Take it over so they could stand in this house and go around and say, "if there is any abuses in Social Aid, it's not our fault". Mr. Speaker, this is where the responsibility lies and it's about time they shouldered it and took a good long look into what's happening, in many areas of this province in social aid.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — But as usual he attempted to sidestep the blame, and then he went into a long harangue about the uncle of the member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), and he said Dave Boldt's uncle was the campaign manager for the NDP. I don't know what that has to do with what the member from Rosthern had brought up. Well, now if the hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) wants to start looking into family trees, I suggest we might agree and I'm sure we'd find a few nuts hanging on some of their family trees.

Mr. Speaker, we feel very strongly about the social aid situation in this province, and I was shocked when I read the report put out by the social aid department. Well, Mr. Sihvon said in there that we don't believe in the theory of work for aid. And yet it appears to me that most of the provincial governments in this nation, and in fact I'm not even sure that this government in Saskatchewan didn't join with them, have been petitioning the federal government to change the social aid set-up, change the work and wages set-up so that decent employment under a work and wage program can be given to able-bodied people who are on social aid, and I see the Premier nodding his head, I don't know whether he's asleep or he's agreeing with me, but if he is agreeing with me, then I agree with him. I think it should be done, but your own deputy minister, your assistant, or whatever you call him, came out in his report and said they didn't believe in this principle. He did and you had better read your own book. I'll read it right out of here; he disagrees strongly with the proposition of work for aid, right here on page eleven, social aid report. Well, I say our policy should be to help people to help themselves, if they're able-bodied. Most of these people would sooner work than have a handout. It's the handouts that disgrace them. I suggest the Minister of Social Welfare better go back and review what the people in your own department are writing. It just backs up what I say; you don't know what's going on in your own department and I think it's time that he took a look at what's going on.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as this debate draws to a close I must express my disappointment in the vague, unimaginative and impractical solutions that have been offered by the government of the day, as answers to our many pressing problems. When the CCF was first elected, whether you agreed with them or not, you had to admit that they had a vigorous approach to government. Today, they are a tired, dull government, tired old men without a new idea or energy to produce one. They're ashamed of their name, they're not even sure what it is, and they're busily trying to throw dust at anybody that calls the NDP out here in Saskatchewan, they correct I and say, "we're still the old CCF". They're not the old CCF, they're a new breed of cats, and I don't think the people of Saskatchewan know for sure where they are going. They've become arrogant, dictatorial and wasteful in government. Mr. Speaker, we say, we say sincerely it's time that they were replaced.

It's time for a change. We in the Liberal party have shown in this debate, shown across this province, that we have new ideas and new enthusiasm. We're convinced that Saskatchewan does have a bright future; we feel it can only be realized by a government that's prepared to bring the fresh air of real freedom back into the province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — We think it can only be realized by a government that will give our people in every part of Saskatchewan, the opportunity to share and profit in that great future. We've given the CCF-NDP more than a fair trial and they've failed us on too many occasions. We know our way isn't perfect, Mr. Speaker, but we know that it works better in every other province in Canada and I think it will work here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to join this debate on the motion, the amendment having been disposed of last night, I would like first to compliment the member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) and my colleague, the member for Regina (Mr. Whelan) on their lucid, clear and comprehensive presentations. It is always a pleasure to have the opportunity to compliment someone for a job well done and certainly the member for Redberry and the member for Regina, and future member for Regina North, are well deserving of our praise.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — They've acquitted themselves admirably and they have been ornaments to this house.

Mr. Speaker, I was tempted to interrupt the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) and suggest that in his quest for nuts on family trees his most useful tool might have been a mirror, but I thought that this perhaps would be inappropriate. I think I will take a moment or two to comment on some of the remarks of the member from Prince Albert.

With respect to the attitude of this government on social aid and employment, he has descended or fallen into the trap of distorting the position of this government and indeed of every government across Canada. I was at a Premier's conference a year and a half ago at which every representative of all provincial governments in Canada took the same position. They opposed the proposition that as a condition of getting social aid, someone should be forced to accept labor, to accept work and accept the social aid. They felt that the preferable position was that jobs be provided, separate and apart from social aid, that people not be asked to do tasks at the rate of social aid, but that they be asked to work at the going rates of wages. Mr. Speaker, that is the policy of this government, and I'm sorry to hear that it is not the policy of members opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) to the support of those who are in favor of all citizens enjoying rights of access to hospitals. He's a doughty freedom fighter as we know: the last time he was in favor of freedom for the implement dealers, a freedom which would have deprived farmers of access to spare parts. Oh yes, let's not forget this. We all know this story, the story of the implement dealers and the farmers' organizations repudiating the campaign promises of the member from Prince Albert when he was campaigning in the by-election.

I wanted now to turn to comments upon the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I think that many of us have felt a certain amount of comfort in hearing his words in this house. We're always comforted by hearing the strains of a familiar refrain and much of what he said was indeed familiar. We can recall his review of the clippings which go back for more than twenty years; we can recall also his suggestions that it is entirely improper for us to go back twenty years and make comparisons with the government as it then was. This was familiar ground.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was new ground in his remarks. And the new part was the Liberal new look on medical care. During the last session, one year ago, I became very used to jumping up in my seat and answering questions that were directed to me by the Leader of the Opposition, questions which were intended to heap criticism upon the medical care plan, as it then operated. The year all this has stopped. The Liberals we are told were in favor of the plan, Mr. Speaker. Indeed we're told that they were in favor of the plan, Mr. Speaker. Indeed we're told that they were in favor all along. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's today's story. It certainly was not yesterday's story and there's no reason to believe that it will be tomorrow's story.

Mr. Speaker, just what is it that they are saying? They're saying that they opposed the plan that was introduced in 1961 — at least they can hardly deny this — but they say that the plan which followed the Saskatoon agreement was a different plan, and that they're in favor of it. And furthermore, they say that the amendment which they introduced at the 1961 session would have produced a plan like the present plan. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is palpably false. I have reviewed every amendment proposed by the Liberal party, either on second reading or in the committee stage, during the 1961 session. These amendments if they had been accepted, would have led to a plan having no resemblance to the present plan. Now let's look at some of these amendments.

A couple of the amendments asked that there be a plebiscite so that the people might vote on this issue. Well, Mr. Speaker, there will be an opportunity to vote in accordance with the well-established tradition of the parliamentary system.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — Within four or five months, the people of this province will have an opportunity to pass judgment on the medical care plan, and on the government which introduced it, and I for one, Mr. Speaker, am confident of the outcome. Other amendments sought to have a clearer statement of regional administration. And Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the records of that session made clear that the government at that time did not oppose regional administration, and I want to point out that in point of fact, under that very act the Swift Current scheme is now under regional administration.

I want to say this: that to my knowledge, to my personal knowledge, during the early months of 1962 this government offered to the College of Physicians and Surgeons a plan based upon regional administration, not once but many times.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — And every time we offered a plan based upon a series of Swift Currents, this was turned down by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. And so far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, on no single occasion has the College of Physicians and Surgeons ever made a statement to the effect that they would be satisfied with a plan based upon a series of Swift Currents. If any member of the opposition can show me a statement which says that this was acceptable to the College, I would welcome being so guided. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in 1962 in this house, members on this side and members opposite voted in favor of the amendments to The Medical Care Insurance Act which make it well-nigh impossible for health regions to act as approved health agencies. These were in the act because the College insisted on it. They are there for that reason and for no other reason.

Mr. Speaker, there were other amendments which were proposed. On November 14th, the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) and the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) suggested that there be excluded from coverage under the plan services provided by any prepaid medical care plan approved by the commission. Here they were talking about a provincial plan which would cover only those people not covered by a private carrier. No suggestion that they were in favor of the universal plan then. Then on November 16th, the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) and the member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) moved an amendment which would have destroyed the plan as we now know it. It would have made the plan a collection agency for private carriers without providing any power in the commission to define the insured services which were to be rendered by that private carrier and without providing in the commission any power or any right to limit the

premiums charged by that private commission.

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be reasonably contended that acceptance of the Liberal amendments proposed during 1961 would have produced a plan like, or anything like, the present plan which they now profess to support.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — No, Mr. Speaker, we heard during 1961 and 1962 a large number of distortions of the 1961 plan. I remember some of these criticisms well. One of the familiar ones repeated many times and indeed repeated in this house last week and again by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) was the fact that under the 1961 act, the doctors could not practice outside the act. Mr. Speaker, this was denied time and time again. It was repeated by Liberal spokesman notwithstanding the fact that it had been denied. In June of 1962 the government made changes in the plan to remove any shred of possibility that doctors that could practice outside the act. And what was the Liberal reaction to the government's changes in June? Did they welcome this change? Well, let me quote the reaction of one Liberal spokesman, Mr. Otto Lang, Dean of Law at the University, and federal Liberal organizer in Saskatchewan. Here is what he said about the June changes:

It has always been my view that doctors could operate outside the act and accordingly the concessions offered are nothing new.

He is the Dean of Law and in his opinion the doctors could always practice outside the act. Now this is the patter, Mr. Speaker, every distortion was used until it was run into the ground and when it was no longer useful, the attack was launched in another quarter. I want to say again that there is no substance to the proposition that doctors could not practice outside the act of 1961, and I call in my support, Dean Otto Lang.

Mr. Speaker, as we know the 1961 act was introduced into this house by the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) and this is the same man, Mr. Speaker, who last week described this plan in this house, as unvarnished and unadulterated state medicine. This is what he says of the act now, but, Mr. Speaker, what did he say on that Friday in October, 1961, when he moved second reading of the bill? The flavor of his remarks can be obtained from these few sentences.

What we are in the course of doing here and will have done, is that we shall have written a new Magna Carta for health and well-being of the people of this province. Moreover, I am sure that we shall set the pattern for other jurisdictions to follow in the years to come. It is in this air, Mr. Speaker, that I hope this bill will be debated. Finally, that future generations will acclaim the men and women of this legislature for their vision, their courage to pioneer, and the sensitivity to human needs. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

These were the words he used when he introduced the bill into this house, the bill which he now describes as unvarnished state medicine. Mr. Speaker, he had some other remarks to make in this house last week. He wondered why the government had not taken the medical care issue to the people in 1962. Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that some people may ask this question, but I marvel that it is asked by the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb).

In 1962, the government was in the course of carrying out its election pledge given to the people in 1960 and for which it had received a mandate. It was in the course of fulfilling its undertaking to provide a medical care plan for all the citizens of Saskatchewan. This has been accomplished, and now, in good time, and in accordance with the long tradition of this province, this government is prepared to go to the electors, to give an account of its stewardship and to ask for a renewed mandate. Mr. Speaker, contrast this with the position of the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) in June of 1962, for whatever reason or whatever inducement, he had abandoned the party under whose banner he had sought and gained election in 1960. He had abandoned the program he had advocated in 1960 and 1961. He had abandoned those party workers who had worked so hard and sacrificed so much so that he could be elected. And when these same co-workers, his executive in the Milestone constituency

called upon him to resign his seat, to give an account of his stewardship to the electors in Milestone and to seek re-election on his new policy, he was unwilling to do so. Yes, Mr. Speaker, he would not face the electors of Milestone, no, not then nor not now.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — This, Mr. Speaker, is scarcely surprising, Consider the difficulty he would have had in making his explanation, in explaining why what is unvarnished and unadulterated state socialism today, was short months ago, a splendid achievement, an achievement for which future generation would acclaim him and us for our vision, our courage to pioneer and our sensitivity to human needs. It is, Mr. Speaker, understandable why he did not attempt such an explanation.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Wait until this June, it will explain the whole thing, my friends.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) is not the only one in this chamber who is adept at making the quick change. I think we've been amused to hear this latest declaration of Liberal policy on medical care. There have been a long succession of statements of policy by the Liberal party, each one different from the last. On this issue, the Liberals have changed direction so often that really they remind one of nothing so much as a weather vane in a squall of wind, and Saskatchewan people sympathize with their dilemma in this regard. Liberals have always had trouble with this problem of medical care. Even now, the Liberals in Ontario are having the same problem. Here's what the Toronto Globe and Mail says about the agonies of the Liberal Party in Ontario, and I'm going to quote from their issue of January 23rd – last month:

Since January 1961, the Liberals have espoused now fewer than five medical insurance plans, swinging like an inebriated pendulum between universal coverage, partial coverage, universal coverage, partial coverage and now back to universal coverage. The electorate can only hope that they have finally, with the assistance of the New Democratic Party, lit upon a plan which truly represents their thinking and which they are truly determined, given an opportunity, to implement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the article goes on to quote a Mr. Trotter, Liberal member for Parkdale in the Ontario legislature, as praising not only universal medical care, but indeed the plan introduced in Saskatchewan, and then the article goes on to say, and I quote:

An election is imminent in Saskatchewan, and the Liberal leader there, Mr. Ross Thatcher, was an impassioned opponent of the kind of medicare introduced by the New Democratic Party. On one exciting occasion he even carried his opposition so far as to kick the door of the Legislative Chamber. His attacks upon the plan have become less vigorous of late, but he will scarcely welcome the enthusiasm for it of his Liberal brothers from Ontario.

With friends like Mr. Trotter, who needs enemies. Yes, the Liberals in Ontario are swinging like an inebriated pendulum. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, are the Saskatchewan Liberals any steadier in their path? What has been their policy – or should I say policies? In 1960, they were in favor of the plan advanced by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, a plan operated by private carriers with subsidies for indigents on a means-test basis and on April 30th, 1960, quoted in the Moose Jaw Times Herald, Liberal leader Mr. Thatcher said: "A Liberal Government would have prepaid care under the MSI or other such plan", Mr. Thatcher claimed; he said this would only cost about a third as much as the government proposed plan. Certainly it would: it is a plan for indigents. In 1962 they were violently opposed to the medical care plan. They hoped at that time to stir enough public controversy to defeat the government and their motives in this regard were revealed with clarity by the member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) when he was quoted as saying:

It might be the quickest way to defeat the CCF government, if the doctors kept to their promises not to have anything to do with the proposed state controlled medical care plan.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, they spawned and led the K.O.D. and they led it to almost unprecedented excesses in their efforts to keep the universal plan from being introduced. This was their opposition to a universal plan, then. Now, they tell us they are in favor of a universal plan or at least in favor of it as modified by the Saskatoon agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatoon agreement was signed in July and the changes in legislation were introduced in August. What have been their public statements since August of 1962? In June of 1963, eight months ago, Liberal leader Ross Thatcher is quoted in the Star Phoenix as saying:

We will take the present plan and reform it by taking the politics out of it. We will sit down with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and hammer out a plan that will work, and will be within the financial capability of all people.

No suggestion here that they were in favor of the present plan; indeed they're going to sit down with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and hammer out a different plan.

Now, let's move on a few months to October of 1963, and that's just four months ago. Mr. Thatcher is again quoted in the Leader Post of October 28th, as saying:

The Liberal Party is not opposed to a medical care plan. They will have a plan but it will be formulated by experts and will operate with the co-operation of the doctors.

No suggestion here that they were in favor of the present plan. Indeed they were going to have a different plan formulated by experts and operating in co-operation with the doctors. Now this was in October, late October, 1963. What could that have meant in October 1963? That they would operate a plan in co-operation with the doctors? any doubt on that score had been cleared away, because only two weeks before Mr. Thatcher's statement, the College of Physicians and Surgeons had once again adopted a statement of principle on medical care plans.

For those how may have forgotten, let me quote the College's views on what medical care plans should be. Here are the principles they adopted at their meeting at Saskatoon on October 15th and 16th. First they reaffirmed their statement to the Thompson Committee, and remember this was a statement which favored a plan of private carriers with subsidies for indigents on a means-test basis. The College went on to say,

We believe that the self-supporting majority of the citizens should be encouraged to cover themselves for the comprehensive range of medical benefits available through the plans of prepaid medical care and other insurance agencies which have been operating successfully for years.

We believe that these programs should have free choice to secure insurance coverage which meets their individual needs.

We believe public funds should be made available, on application, in the form of subsidy to approved carriers for persons of all ages and limited means who are unable to finance the premium of medical services insurance.

Finally, we believe in prepaid universally available health insurance through multiple carriers free from compulsion and monopolistic control.

Mr. Speaker, stripped of its verbal adornment, this statement says that the College believes in competitive free enterprise in health insurance with a subsidy to indigents on a means-test basis. This is the type of plan which two weeks later the Liberal leader says his plan will be like, or at least he says that he will devise a plan with which the doctors will co-operate. Two weeks after they give this statement of policy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, four months have passed; the inebriated pendulum has swung again; the member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) and the Leader of the Opposition have stood in their places and said that the present plan will be continued. The statement of four months ago about a plan formulated by experts has been abandoned. The statement about a plan acceptable to the doctors has been abandoned. Mr. Speaker, intoxicated by the desire for success at the polls they have staggered to a new statement of policy. Now they tell us “categorically and without qualifications” that they will continue the plan, and make modest changes only in the commission and possibly in the benefits. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is simply not good enough. Not good enough for this house and not good enough for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — One can’t look at this record for dodging and bucking, of backing and filling without being reminded of a man going down a fence line on a pogo-stick, going down nimbly leaping on one side and then on the other as expediency dictates. I think the people of the province have had enough of pogo-stick politics, and I think that they have a right to know clearly and precisely just what changes the Liberals would make in our medical care plan. Mr. Speaker, this isn’t unreasonable: the plan has operated for 18 months. Everybody in the province knows about its operations. Two million accounts have been paid. Six or seven hundred thousand people have obtained benefits. There’s been ample opportunity to judge.

Mr. Speaker, during the past year, the Leader of the Opposition in addition to his sessional indemnity has received from the funds of the province a salary paid to him as leader, quite properly so, and an amount of \$12,000 paid to him to provide a research staff and a clerical staff. This is of the order of not quite \$2000 a month, not during the session, but throughout the whole year. It seems to me that it is not unreasonable for us to ask that his research staff might have taken two or three or four hours during the course of the last year to examine The Medical Care Insurance Act and to equip him with the information which would enable him to tell this house and the people of Saskatchewan precisely what changes he proposes in this major piece of social legislation. The time has come for the Leader of the Opposition to be perfectly frank with the house, and with the people of this province. The time has come for him to stop the swinging of this inebriated pendulum, and to stand up and say just what changes he would make in The Medical Care Insurance Act. The present lurchings of Liberal policy can perhaps be best commented upon in the words of the Winnipeg Tribune of November 29th, 1963, and the editorial there says;

Mr. Thatcher says his party would remove “the political control” and this value proposal supposedly is the difference between free enterprise and socialism. The compulsory aspects, however, are to continue and yet somehow Mr. Thatcher includes this as a feature of freedom in 1963, whereas it was attacked at being slavery in 1962. The electorate may understand the expediency of policy but it must be permitted to question the principle.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it must be permitted to question the principle.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I leave the problem of the inebriated pendulum and move to one or two steadier topics.

I want to report to the citizens of Regina, whom I have had the opportunity to represent in this house for some four years. These, Mr. Speaker, have been stirring years for the city of Regina. Developments have taken place which I believe will shape and influence the life of this city and its citizens for centuries to come.

As you know, I have had the opportunity to serve as Minister of Education and during this period I participated in some decisions of far

reaching importance to this city and to this province. In January, 1961, the decision was made to construct a new university campus to the south and east of these buildings. We can now see the first spanners rising above the level of the prairie. This signifies the commencement of construction of a university campus which will be a source of pride, certainly to me, and I am sure to my children and to yours.

During this same period when I served as Minister of Education I had the opportunity to participate in the launching of what I believe to be a bold and imaginative new project: the Wascana Centre project. I reported to the house on previous occasions the details of this project. From the beginning, it has been my honour to be the chairman of the preliminary planning committees and I have been chairman of the Authority. It fell to me to select the executive director and I felt that we were fortunate in obtaining the services of Mr. A.K. Gillmore, who worked with me at the Department of Education. The Wascana Centre project has already brought renown to Regina and to Saskatchewan. It has been the basis of newspaper stories throughout Canada, in the Financial Post, the Toronto Globe and Mail, and many others — stories in newspapers in Britain, such as the Manchester Chronicle, the Yorkshire Evening News — and in the United States newspapers in Texas and Nebraska — in a great many periodicals such as Civic Administration, The Journal of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, Weekend Magazine, The Star Weekly, Time, and others. It offers to the citizens of this city and this province an opportunity to do something of unique and lasting value, in creating for future generations a centre for government, for learning, for recreation, and for the arts. And I predict, Mr. Speaker, that it along with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police will be one of the hallmarks of Regina in the years to come.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — There have been other major developments in Regina. Construction of a steel mill has been completed and it has been established as a major industry in this city. And this has been no small task considering the inherent difficulties of establishing a basic steel industry in the prairies, and the added difficulty created by the shortsighted and malicious campaign of opposition against this industry conducted by the Liberal party.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — Last year, Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity to outline to this house point by point the way in which members of the Liberal Party had acted to bring about the bankruptcy of this firm, in an effort to embarrass the government. Mr. Speaker, I remember this well. The situation became acute at the time that I was Provincial Treasurer and it fell to me to go to Montreal and talk to the general manager of a major bank to try to convince him that the situation was not as bad as the stories out of Regina would have indicated, and to say to him that the government of Saskatchewan stood four-square behind that industry.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time of the house to repeat the tawdry tale of Liberal action in this regard. I will only say what I said last year, Mr. Speaker, that many people in the city of Regina will not soon forget that the Leader of the Opposition was willing to destroy this company and with it, their investment and their jobs, in order that he could get some purely political advantage by so doing.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there have been other memorable developments in Regina. We have recently the opening of the head office building of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, a building which is arresting and challenging in its architectural design and in its structural beauty. The building provided jobs when jobs were needed. It has already been noted by my colleague, the lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper), that it is particularly and peculiarly a Saskatchewan product: built of cement made in Saskatchewan, steel fabricated in Saskatchewan, pre-stressed concrete members fabricated in Saskatchewan, bricks made in Saskatchewan,

paint made in Saskatchewan. It is truly a tribute to Saskatchewan architectural genius and to Saskatchewan craftsmen. And here too, Mr. Speaker, the feat was accomplished not with the co-operation but with the bitter opposition of some members opposite.

Let me give you one short quote, which I believe will characterize the attitude of the Liberal Party to this project. The Leader of the Opposition of February 18th, 1961 quotes the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) as saying in this house;

The central Saskatchewan Power Corporation building in Regina now under construction will be a tremendous palace for civil servants, paid by the farmer and the small urban consumer.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — There we are, Mr. Speaker, such has consistently over the years characterized the breadth of vision of members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of hospital care Regina has a unique opportunity to create a hospital complex which would place Regina in the very forefront of such developments in Canada. It could offer an opportunity to expand the progress of medical science. It will offer an opportunity for Regina to participate in developments in other medical fields, such as mental health and tuberculosis care, when additional facilities are needed in those fields. If we can once again step out boldly and face this new challenge leaving aside the narrowness and the suspicions of the status quo, we can seize this opportunity to create in Regina a medical centre of significance and of value.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — These, Mr. Speaker, have been a good four years, and I am confident that based on the developments of these four years we will see yet another period of prosperity and growth for Regina, a further burgeoning of our industry, rapid growth of our university, progress and challenge in continuing the Wascana Centre as a project of Canada-wide significance, developments in the hospital field, all of which will set the stage for a new and rich era of growth and progress for Regina.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the remarks of the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) when he said that he saw no reason why all citizens should not have the opportunity to be treated in hospitals by the physicians of their choice, where such physicians are medically qualified. I think there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that there have been difficulties in this regard in the last year — these difficulties have resulted from the denial of hospital privileges to the doctors selected by certain citizens. In the last 12 months, there are more doctors who have been denied hospital privileges in Saskatchewan than during the previous 12 years. This seems to the government to be altogether remarkable, particularly, having regard to the provisions of the Saskatoon agreement which prohibited discrimination. Accordingly, the government arranged that the circumstances should be investigated. The government was fortunate in obtaining the services of Mr. Justice Woods, a former practicing lawyer, former national president of the Canadian Legion, former professor of law at the university, a doctor of jurisprudence, a judge of the court of appeal. As the speech from the throne indicates, his report has now been received. The report has been made public, and it indicates that hospitals have been denying staff appointments to doctors for reasons which have nothing to do with their medical competence. For example, in Estevan, while it was agreed that the qualifications of a Doctor Samuels were of a high order, the medical staff failed, prior to the Woods hearings, to recommend a staff appointment. In Regina two doctors who Judge Woods described as “impressive young men, with excellent backgrounds and references” were denied hospital privileges and are still denied hospital privileges for reasons which have nothing to do with medical competence. The reasons were that the doctors had differences with the members of the medical staff; not medical differences, no, “philosophical or ideological differences” in the words of Mr. Justice Woods.

There is, of course, no reason why there should not be philosophical or ideological differences between doctors. Or among

lawyers, or teachers or farmers or carpenters or legislators for that matter. What is quite inexcusable is for any hospital to take the position that conformity in philosophy or ideology is a requirement for a doctor to obtain a staff appointment.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — No public hospital can properly take that position. Yet hospitals are taking that position. Some hospital boards allege that they are unable to do otherwise, because of the pressure from the hospital medical staffs. This, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the clear terms of the Saskatoon agreement quoted by Mr. Justice Woods, in the following terms,

It is no wish of the college that there should grow up divisions between physicians, and it will exercise its full influence to prevent discrimination in matters of professional practice. Accordingly, the College undertaken that in advising on applications for hospital appointments, applications will be judged solely on their merits.

Mr. Justice Woods believed evidently that remedies should be provided for the conditions which he found, and to this end, he made three specific recommendations:

One – that an appeal board be established, to provide an impartial appeal for any doctor denied access to a hospital in the service of his patients;

Two – that any doctor should be entitled to a written statement of the reasons when he is denied appointment to the medical staff of a publicly supported hospital; and

Three – that the sponsorship system used by two or three hospitals in the province should not be a bar to appointment to the staff of any publicly supported hospital.

Mr. Speaker, the government has received a large number of representations from public bodies dealing with this subject. Expressions of support for Judge Woods' recommendations or for actions along similar lines, have come not only from professional and lay groups having a direct interest in the problem, but also from such broadly based citizen groups as the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor, the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. The Saskatchewan hospital Association agreed with one recommendation and expressed dissent from two of the others. The only brief opposed to all of Judge Woods' recommendations was received from the College of Physicians and Surgeons. There will, Mr. Speaker, be general satisfaction that the speech from the throne contains an indication that steps will be taken to protect the rights of citizens to use the hospitals which they paid to build and which they continue to pay to operate.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, for nine years or so, all Saskatchewan has taken pride in the University Hospital at Saskatoon. It has served as a symbol of the progress of medicine in Saskatchewan, and is the centre of medical development for the whole province. It has been a tangible indication of the growth and maturity of Saskatchewan. I believe that the time has come for the construction of a second base hospital to serve southern Saskatchewan, a hospital which can in a number of ways serve the same functions for southern Saskatchewan as the University Hospital has served for the whole province for almost a decade.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — With this in mind, the government has retained consultants of international renown, Doctor Harvey Agnew of Toronto and Doctor Gerhard Hartman of Iowa City, Iowa, and these men are currently conducting an intensive study into the nature of the facilities required. Legislation will be proposed to establish a board along the lines of the University Hospital Board to review the work of these consultants and, if deemed feasible, to arrange for the construction of a base hospital centre to serve the south. Certainly the citizens of Regina and southern Saskatchewan who have long envied the superior facilities of the University Hospital will welcome the coming to Regina of facilities of a comparable base hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment or two to comment on one or two of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and of the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). They have spoken of the number of jobs in manufacturing and the Leader of the Opposition spoke in a derisive tone about the fact that only some 800 new jobs have been created in manufacturing in the province, according to his figures, in 20 years.

I wonder why, Mr. Speaker, no comparisons were made with the adjoining province to the east, Manitoba, on the number of new jobs created. All of us know that the prairie provinces are having difficulties with respect to employment. All of us know that agriculture is becoming perhaps the fastest automated industry in Canada. All of us know that thousands and tens of thousands of people have been withdrawn from this industry because of the progress of automation. And I want to say that not only Saskatchewan is experiencing difficulties.

I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Tribune of February 12th, 1964, a few days ago. The headline is "Our glowing progress, 260 more jobs in ten years" and it goes on to say

that in Manitoba, there were only 260 more industrial jobs created throughout Manitoba in 1962 than there were 10 years earlier, statistics by the provincial industry department revealed today.

This is a clear indication, Mr. Speaker, of the difficulty in providing employment at a time when not only industry but agriculture is going through a process of automation. This difficulty is being experienced by governments everywhere and certainly not only by the government which sits to your right, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted, Mr. Speaker, to take a word or two to deal with one or two statistics of the medical care plan. One of the matters which has been the subject of a good deal of comment in the last few months has been the supply of physicians in this province. May I state very quickly the situation which obtains at this time. The number of doctors at January 1st, 1964 in this province is 58 greater than it was at the same time last year. The increase in doctors has been from 881 to 939. And let me tell you one other thing of interest with respect to this, Mr. Speaker. Of this 58 added doctors in 1963, a number which is far above the average for the last ten years, the number of physicians in locations outside cities increased by 11 per cent, while the number of physicians in the cities increased by only five per cent indicating that the operation of the medical care plan has had the effect of having doctors locate in centres where it was previously not economical for them to locate. This is one of the often unrecognized benefits of the universal medical care plan.

May I quote only one or two more statistics, Mr. Speaker. The number of practicing physicians in the first quarter of 1963 was 733, in the fourth quarter of 1963, 785; a very substantial increase in the number of practicing physicians. The number of specialists — and we have heard a good deal about specialists — the number of specialists has increased from January, 1963, 221 — to January, 1964, 233.

One of the small triumphs of the Medical Care Insurance Commission has been the assistance that they have been able to render to communities which have had difficulty in getting doctors in the past. May I refer to the program of the Medical Care Insurance Commission with respect to under-doctored areas. As you may know the commission has a program of assisting areas which are under-doctored. This is done in a manner which is such as not to build in unfair or unreasonable competition with physicians that are already established, and it is done to the satisfaction of the representatives on the Medical Care Insurance Commission of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. During 1963, requests from 27 communities were received. These were analyzed and 20 of them were found to fall within the definition of an under-doctored area as accepted by the commission. The commission was instrumental in placing physicians in nine of these under-doctored areas, and an additional six obtained doctors without commission assistance, so that at the year end 15 of these 20 areas have secured physicians. The commission is still endeavouring to recruit five doctors for the remaining communities.

This is a very splendid record in this small but important area of Saskatchewan life.

Mr. Speaker, before I resume my seat I would like to say a word or two about some of the members of the house who will not be with us after the next election, and who will have left on their own volition. I want to say a word or two about the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) who has commended himself certainly to new members like myself, and to older members of this house for his zeal and the hard-working way in which he has conducted his duties, and particularly in the way that he has conducted his duties as opposition whip, in which post he has greatly facilitated the work of the house.

I know we will all miss the shamrock of the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) on St. Patrick's day. I don't know whether anybody else — possibly I can't say the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) because he is not likely to be the member next time — but at any rate perhaps some Son of Erin will be here to bear the shamrock.

Mr. Steuart: — Big Atch . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Certainly, we have enjoyed the privilege of associating with such a legislator as the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy). He has been in his genial and effective way an inspiration for younger members such as myself.

I was sorry to hear that the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) was unable to allow his name to go before the voters again. I'm sorry that his professional and other obligations have made it impossible for him to re-offer his services and I hope that an opportunity will be provided to him in later years to re-enter public life.

May I say a word or two about the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). All of us, I think have appreciated the qualities of the member for Humboldt, the keenness of mind and the analytical powers which she has brought to debates. She has, in my opinion, a keen appreciation of the fundamentals of the parliamentary system, and she has again, in my view, on occasion gone out of her way to see that his system works. Even though we may be divided into two parties we have an obligation, all of us, as members, to see that our system works. It seems to me that she has done her part. She is really the most attractive thing on the Liberal front benches, and I do hope that her period of public service is not ending.

The member for Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) has announced his retirement after long and distinguished service. He has commended himself as a conscientious and hard working member and a man who attended carefully to the affairs of his constituency. All of us, I know, wish him and Mrs. Stone every good wish in their retiring years.

And now a word or two about my colleague from Regina, the Hon. C.C. Williams. He has had, as we have heard in this house before, a distinguished career of public service, as alderman, as mayor, as M.L.A., as cabinet minister. As I think all members who have become familiar with the political scene in Regina will admit, he has drawn support from all shades of political opinion, and from all types of public service. He and Mrs. Williams have made it their business to be members representing Regina, to be approachable by every constituent, great or humble, and he has set a mark in this regard which I think it will be impossible for anyone to emulate or even approach. We certainly will want to wish the Hon. Mr. Williams and Mrs. Williams good health in the years ahead, which I trust will be fruitful and golden years.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to give you a few statistics with respect to the medical care plan, but the plan is, I suggest, something more than a cold statistical one; it carries with it a touch of humanity. Not many weeks ago I received a copy of a letter which appeared to have been written in desperation by a woman in a smaller center in this province, and it told of her difficulties. She had had a small debt summons for a debt. She had been ill in 1957, she had had an operation, she had been unable to pay. She had been in a Regina hospital for two months without a visit from her husband, because he couldn't afford to visit, and she goes on to say,

Believe me it is not our fault we can't pay this. If I could only tell you the whole story., the hardship, the miseries, since the flood years. Only God knows what we went through. I am asking you, Your Honour, is there any help that you can give me? I'm so mixed up and miserable already, goodness knows.

And she goes on in the same vein. She talked about received letters from creditors, receiving these letters week after week.

I don't know what to do any more, I can't get a job, I'm in poor health and these letters aren't helping me any. I would be most grateful to you for your kind help. I would thank God to get us out of this mess. My kindest thanks and affection, Yours sincerely.

I think this is a story of quiet tragedy, and we can't know as members of this house how many similar tragedies have been prevented by the medical care plan. We can know, I think, that there have been several, and perhaps many. We can only be thankful, Mr. Speaker, that it has been in our power to lift the burden from some shoulders such as these.

The medical care plan has done this. It has, in the words of the member who introduced the plan, demonstrated that the people of Saskatchewan have a sensitivity to human needs, that they recognize their obligations to those less fortunate than themselves, and that they are willing to discharge that obligation. Because, Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne offers a program which will continue our economic prosperity, and because it offers a further recognition of our sensitivity to human need, and a further demonstration of our willingness to act and meet that need, I will, Mr. Speaker, support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I rise under a very distinct disadvantage. I have been sitting here for some time trying to get up a spirit of righteous indignation, and this has not been assisted in any way by the very kind words of the hon. minister who has just taken his seat (Mr. Blakeney). Even though he did utter those kind words on my time, I forgive him. Every word he said about me was true, and, therefore, I can forgive him taking up time.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Batten: — Now, I refuse to take up the time of the hon. Minister of Co-operatives, I realize how important that portfolio is in this government and I wouldn't rob you of it.

I want to thank all the members who have expressed their very kind feelings, or at least what they said were their feelings, on my departure, and, of course, on behalf of the other members who will, no doubt, speak on this themselves. It is very nice to hear kind things before one is dead. I had always had a very queer feeling when I heard people talking about the dead members, especially those of the opposing party. I have sometimes wondered what nice things they could say about me and how I would simply turn over in my grave if some of the hon. members did say nice things. Now to hear them during my lifetime is really twisting the knife. I am more than ever convinced, Mr. Speaker, that I have made the right decision because most of the kind things that I have heard since I announced my intention not to run again have come from my NDP and Conservative friends, I haven't heard too much from my Liberal friends. And I am beginning to think I certainly made the right decision, because I seem to be giving comfort to the enemy and little assistance to my own party.

I want to thank the hon. lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) particularly for the very kind things she said about me. I think we have sort of a mutual admiration society and perhaps we can form our own party, because for years I have been urging that she should accept

a cabinet post on the government side, and she has now wished me a judgeship. I wish that the hon. member could share her good view of me with the hon. Attorney-General, because he hasn't offered me any judgeship and he has been giving them in profusion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney-General): — Maybe . . .

Mrs. Batten: — On the other hand I don't think he could do this with a good conscience, I don't think I would make a very good police magistrate. Certainly I couldn't act the way one of his police magistrates did a few weeks ago when he turned down an application for an eight-day adjournment by a man who wasn't represented by counsel, because it was too petty a matter to come out to the country on again and then fined the man \$50 for the same petty matter, even though he had no counsel to represent him. If this is the judicial mind, Mr. Speaker, I hope I haven't got it.

The rather sad letter read by the hon. Minister of Public Health, certainly reveals a very strong indictment of this government, when you think conditions such as are described by this woman should exist after twenty years of government by the friends of the poor. This is a sad state of affairs and a sad indictment of the political philosophy and practices of the people who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker.

I have really not been exalted by the level of debate by the members on your right, Mr. Speaker, and I am sorry to say this in my last term in this house. I had expected that at least before an election we should see something glowing, something new, something imaginative, something desirable, emanating from those members who plan the platform of their party. But they have offered the people of Saskatchewan nothing in the speech from the throne, except old history, old complaints, and we will do what we have been doing before, what we have been forced to do by the pressures exerted on us. And this isn't good enough. Even the very intelligent and intellectual member who just sat down spent half an hour of his radio time talking to the people of Saskatchewan about the Liberals.

Now it is quite obvious that the speech from the throne and this debate is a discussion of Liberal personalities and Liberal platform and nothing else. Now, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this isn't a bad thing, because it doesn't really matter what is in the speech from the throne, the people on your right are not going to be putting it into effect because they are not going to be the government and it is the Liberal platform that is important. Perhaps in making this kind of decision on the debate they are doing the right thing.

Before I go on to say a few things about what the hon. Minister of Public Health said, and a few things about the speech from the throne, I would like to join with the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) in saying that I, too, resent very much the personal attack that has been launched by the NDP on the Leader of the Opposition. Now, I know that the members opposite disagree with us strongly on philosophical points, on political points, probably on moral points, but I don't think anything the less of them because of that. I think they have a right to their own opinions, and the mere fact that some of them at one time were Liberals and left our ranks for the CCF and then for the NDP, some of them were Conservatives and left those ranks for the CCF and NDP, doesn't make them scoundrels or cads in itself. There might be other qualities which qualify them for that designation, but not the mere fact that they left one party for another party. And certainly I think that anybody who professes to believe in political freedom, should not throw stones or utter the kind of disparaging, miserable, personal things that have been said about the Leader of the Opposition merely because he left the party. The same applies to the criticism that has been levelled at the former Minister of Public Health, the member from Milestone (Mr. Erb). If he was a great man when he sat on your side of the house, if he wanted and believed he was bringing in a Magna Carta, for the people of Saskatchewan, and if you believed him then, and if he was an honourable man then, surely he is an honourable man now. Surely you could say that when he spoke then, he spoke sincerely, and when he speaks now, he speaks sincerely. Surely a human being has the right to change his mind, certainly about a thing like politics.

I think it was G.K. Chesterton, who said that “it is only the insane who can be completely consistent” and I think this is true. I think any man or woman that grows and develops and thinks and looks around him, or her, changes his or her mind, broadens their outlook, enriches their sympathies, and becomes a better human being for it. And surely this should not be condemned.

And, Mr. Speaker, I resent very much the fact that, over and over, by the Premier, by the hon. Minister of Public Health, by other minor lights in this firmament, we have heard remarks about the hon. Leader of the Opposition kicking at the door of the legislature. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that the leader of my party had the courage, had the virility, had the life in him, had the desire, to do something for the people of Saskatchewan, and did kick a door. He should have knocked down that door to get action, to get some sort of responsible feeling out of you people who are barricaded behind locked doors. Better a leader who will speak for the people of Saskatchewan than a man who sits behind a locked door and refuses to see the people who drove hundreds of miles, in hot weather, because they were worried about their families. Better a man of courage, than a man of no courage.

I think that the hon. Premier first revealed his character to me, at least, when in a debate, which I think took place about six years ago, the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) was talking about the need for some sort of a revival in our system of education. The need of something more in our system of education than we had today, the opening of new doors for our children, and the new roads that should be opened for them. And at that time the hon. member for Maple Creek said to the present Premier, who was then Minister of Education, he said – “You are still fiddling while Rome burns”. He said to him – “you have never read further, or studied further, or gone beyond John Dewey in your conception of education”. And the Minister of Education, now our Premier, replied to him, after he got up – “I will never be ashamed of the fact that I sit at home and fiddle with my Dewey,” and this is exactly what he is doing even today. Instead of giving us leadership he is sitting home and fiddling with Dewey.

Far better to be knocking down doors and opening new doors for the people and the children of Saskatchewan. I think that none of you will object to a lesson from the Old Testament, which should be acceptable to everybody, where Isaiah commanded, even in that day and age, that the doors should open and the gates be not closed. And he said – “I will break in pieces the doors of bonds, and cut asunder the bars of iron”. And when we have a man in a political party, the leader of a political party, who has the courage, in spite of the criticism that he knows will be heaped upon him, to go and knock on a door, to bang at a door, to demand that the people of Saskatchewan be heard by the government of this province, why should we be ashamed of the fact that he did so?

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

An Hon. Member: — Good old Ross, come to his defense . . .

Mrs. Batten: — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I wasn't in this house when this party that sits on your right was a reform party. They tell me there was such a time in the annals of our history, and I am sure that after twenty years of government nobody has been as disappointed in these people as have been the true socialists, true reformers, who first believed in them and first elected them to office. Because they only good things that they have done have been the things that they have taken from the Liberal platforms and instituted in their own perverted, cramped way.

This entire debate, Mr. Speaker, has been as if these people on your right were not the government but were sitting in opposition, and this has been true of the entire eight years in which I have been in the house. The whole argument has been what the Liberals have done, or haven't done, the only questions before this house have been “What could the Liberals do?”

The Liberals are prepared to tell you what they are going to do, and when the hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and spoke for a lengthy time on the platform of the Liberal party, and told the people of

Saskatchewan what the Liberal Party is prepared to do, the hon. Premier objected to that. He said he shouldn't be discussing the Liberal platform. For years the government has demanded constructive ideas from the Liberals, because they themselves have been bereft of ideas, and the few ideas that we did manage to infiltrate into their befuddled little minds have produced some good legislation, and we are quite willing to admit this.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Batten: — Now, I just checked on the Premier's speech, and I find that he spoke for 27 pages on the Liberals, three pages on separate schools, eight pages on the dominion-provincial taxes, two pages on history, and the best I can give him was a page and a half on the speech from the throne, which was mostly in scattered sentences. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this is correct allocation of priorities, because, of course, when we form the government, it is our platform that is going to mean progress for the people for the next four years. The people should hear what that platform is, they should hear the criticism of the opposing parties and this is exactly what has been going on for the last week in this house.

Now, the Premier spoke of the allocation of priorities and carrying out of progress in three ways. One, by direct action; two, by indirect action, and three, by general influence. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in politics who doesn't believe and know that the art of politics is the art of priority. Nobody carries on a business or family life without taking into consideration priorities. This is merely making a choice of what is more important and what is less important, and certainly the only difference that there is between the average person in Saskatchewan — by this I mean a liberal person — and the abnormal type of state-worshippers that sit on your right, is that the first priority in the eyes of those people has consistently been the power of the government, to keep that power secure, and to keep themselves in power, and all priorities have been second to this.

The direct action that this government has taken, the programs that this government has instituted that were truly its own programs, were socialist programs: the crown corporations that failed; the plans that they had for changing local government, putting it under their own control, which failed; the plan for state medicine, which failed. These plans that were socialistic in their instigation and in their goals failed because our people would not put up with them because we have always had a strong opposition in the legislature that was able to point out the effects of this kind of legislation. Because these people on your right, Mr. Speaker, have been sufficiently astute to stay in power, they have managed to de-socialize the legislation when necessary.

The indirect action which this government has taken has been expensive and most of it has been good; this has been assistance to non-government programs, mostly to local governments, and this has been instituted only because the local governments demanded the programs. These programs weren't instituted, or originated, or thought of in an imaginative sort of way by the government. These were programs that local people themselves instituted. The building of hospitals — who built those hospitals? Local people. And they have had to beg every cent that they could get from this government, and they still don't get anywhere near enough.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Batten: — Drainage — the various grid road systems — the things that municipalities have received and instituted because the local government, on a local government level, originated those programs, saw the needs, planned how to cope with those needs and satisfy their people, and then had to appeal to the senior government to get those things done for them, and now this government boasts about those programs.

The general influence is the third method by which the Premier allocated priorities and carried out programs. The general influence of this government, I don't think I need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, has been anything but good. The general feeling and influence of this government has been one of inciting division between families and friends, has been one of coercing people, of frightening people, of keeping legislation on the books hanging over classes of businesses and occupations, over local governments, holding everybody in serfdom by fear. Not that they did anything, but there was a constant threat that they would do something.

When I hear the people on your right, Mr. Speaker, complaining about how they are treated by the federal government, I cannot help but be reminded of that infamous conference that they held for their local governments in 1956. When minister after minister got up in this very chamber and insulted the very governments that they were here to protect. Over and over they told them that they were inefficient, that they weren't spending money properly, and they were told by the hon. treasurer, then Mr. Fines, that they wouldn't get any money because giving them money is putting money down a rat hole.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Batten: — And this policy has not changed, but because there was strength in those local governments, because those local governments did have spokesmen in the official opposition, they have managed to survive and even become stronger.

Now I want to say just a few words, (have so many things to say, I can't possible get time to do them) but I want to say a few things about the separate school issue. First of all, I hope this will not become an issue. But I wouldn't be fair to myself, and to my own beliefs, or those held by, I think the majority of the people of Saskatchewan, if I didn't say a few words about this.

First of all, I, in common with I am sure hundreds and thousands of other people, am very disappointed with the legislation that is being brought forward. Certainly we are in favor of the legislation. Certainly it is much too narrow. This legislation, we had hoped, coupled with the revision in the other acts pertaining to schools and teaching of teachers particularly, we thought would give us a new look at education. I had heard so many speeches, and fine speeches, from the people on your right, about the great vision that they have had of a noble land and greater people, that I have almost come to believe that they mean it. And I think basically in their hearts, they like everyone else, do want to see greater opportunities for our children. But they haven't taken any steps to meet this situation.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that education and knowledge has accelerated in growth to such a degree that to even conceive of the vast body of knowledge and science that is now open to our children is almost too difficult for a person who was educated in our day and age. This is the greatest thing, the greatest challenge, the greatest gift, that we can give our children — a real opportunity for a good education. And, Mr. Speaker, what is a good education, what was a good education 20 years ago is simply not good enough today. We have new techniques, we have new knowledge, we have new methods by which children can meet the challenge of the times. And, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing, or there is merely a crumb in the speech from the throne proposing changes in our school system.

I believe, and this I think is where we differ on this side of the house radically from the feelings of the people opposite, as I understand socialism, socialistic thinking, they believe it is up to the state to educate the children and to give them health and various measures. We on this side believe that education is a right vested in parents, a burden on parents, a responsibility of parents, and something that the parents have a right, that they want to carry out, and that the place of the state is merely to assist the parents. We believe that the parents should be the guides and the directors of their children's educations. And I think this is the basic difference in our thinking.

I had hoped that there would be a revision in our school system, which would give to teachers a greater voice in their own education and in the education of children, because surely teachers have reached, and have long had, professional status except in the eyes of this government. And because this government has not seen fit to fully recognize professional status in teachers, I think we have now come to the position where the teachers are far ahead, In their thinking on education, of this government, of the standards of the Department of Education, and are rightly chafing at the bit. I am sure that if teachers had more rights, more leadership in the matter of their own education, and in the education of our children, we would be far ahead of where we are now. And in education we are still driving with oxen, and no matter how good looking the Minister of Education may be he is not going to get too far on an ox.

Believing as we do, that education is the responsibility and the right of parents, we believe that the sate has a responsibility to assist parents to give their children the kind of education they believe in, and, therefore, we are very disappointed that the hon. Premier saw fit to make it very clear, as did the hon. Minister of Education, almost, Mr. Speaker, as if they were boasting, they weren't going to give this aid to private schools. The Premier shakes his head, apparently this is good.

An Hon. Member: — I stated the facts . . .

Mrs. Batten: — The Premier is boasting, but the Minister of Education says he isn't but they are agreed on one thing — that there is going to be no aid to private schools. Apparently the idea of this government is to keep schools all exactly the same. Our children must go in there and they are made into little models of clay and they go out like little models of clay. There mustn't be any difference between schools. Well, this to us is a disappointment, because we thought we were a sufficiently mature and sophisticated society to be able to give our children opportunities for the very best of education, no matter whether that schools was being operated and maintained by Mennonites, Lutherans, Anglicans, Catholics, or any other group or denomination. And we feel strongly, Mr. Speaker, that we should not discriminate against any faith, or denomination, that wishes to set up schools that are up to the standards, and in many cases, of course, higher than the standards of our own Department of Education. We don't believe in state schools, we believe in state support for the parents of children, so their children get the very best of education.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Batten: — Now, let me go on . . .

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — That's a dilly!

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I am deaf or those people are ashamed of what they are saying, but I can't hear them.

Mr. W. Erb (Milestone): — He's just mumbling . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words about the Canada pension plan. It came as quite a shock to me, to hear the Premier say he didn't know where we stood on this platform. Well, obviously, the Premier didn't attend any of the meetings that we spoke at, because we spoke at meeting after meeting during the election and I am sure that the Premier, too, was active throughout the country and he should have heard rumors as to what was being said by the Liberals, for this was a part of our Liberal platform, Mr. Speaker. And we were very insistent that this be put into effect as soon as possible because we believe, being a reform party as we have always been, that we need security for our people and we believe that a pension scheme with contributions from those who receive as well as those who employ, is the best way to ensure dignity in the individual who will be able to retire without fear for his security, or fear that his wife will not be looked after should anything happen to him.

We believe in this kind of security, even as we believed in old age pensions, as we believed in family allowances, and all I have to do is point to our record as a party to show you what we believe in. Surely it wouldn't suggest itself to anything but a sick mind that we have no faith in a pension scheme.

We have heard a lot in this house, Mr. Speaker, about portable pensions, and how well the CCF used to believe in them, I suppose the NDP no longer believes in them because we haven't heard about this particular plan in their platform recently.

There were a number of questions raised by the constitutional issues that came up when the Canada pension plan was discussed, and I won't go into these because this is a matter of provincial-federal adjustment.

There was also the question of the funds in which the pensions monies were kept and who would have control of this fund, how large this fund should get, and, of course, this is a very vital problem because this affects the physical well-being of the entire country and the province, and I won't go into details on these. But I certainly would be very happy and will, no doubt, be discussing this issue during our next campaign.

Where I missed hearing the CCF stand was on the question of confederation. To hear the hon. Premier who spoke, and who was the only one, I think, Mr. Speaker, who spoke on this matter, the question of confederation is only a question of how much money we can get out of the federal government. And if this is the level at which these discussions are thought of, when the federal government comes to meet with the provincial Premier, and each Premier like a hungry dog at the sight of red meat, springs and tried to clutch as much of it as he can, this is not a very fine view of confederation.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Like Lesage . . .

Mr. Whelan (Regina City): — Lesage . . .

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Liberals . . .

Mrs. Batten: — It may be Lesage, but we do feel very strongly, that confederation means something more than sharing of a tax pie. We feel very strongly that Canada is a nation, one nation, Mr. Speaker, not as the NDP said, at their convention, that we are two nations. We don't believe in this, we believe that we have one united nation in Canada, we don't think that the fact that you speak French, or speak English, or speak German, or speak Ukrainian, or any other language, makes you a lesser citizen of Canada, or even a different citizen of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Batten: — We believe in the organic theory of nationhood too. We believe in the health of the parts, we believe that each province, and each region, must be economically secure and prosperous so that the people of Canada can be a united nation. And this kind of policy we support and we will continue to support when we form the provincial government in this province.

Now, I want to say that just a — Oh, I'm sorry I'm taking up the time that the hon. Minister of Co-operatives should have, and I will just end with a very few words.

I think the speech from the throne reveals what many of us have known. That this government has no program; it has lost its socialist tinge in the NDP shuffle; it has lost its purists and, therefore, I has now become bereft of ideas, and, therefore, the speech from the throne could give us no program where there was none to give.

The thing we are interested in is the future of this province. The future of this province is also the future of the Liberal Party, because, Mr. Speaker, we do have a platform, we do have a leader who will get out and fight for that platform. We believe in the growth of this province, not the growth of the city of Regina at the expense of every town, village and rural area. We don't believe in electing a few city members at the expense of the country that hasn't got industrial development, or beautiful big buildings.

We believe in planning and I would remind the house, Mr. Speaker, that the former member for Saltcoats, was the first one to point out in the house that we would do better by planning a center around the legislative buildings, instead of building outhouses on our front lawns. That was the kind of planning we had before he brought the subject up in this house. This government, Mr. Speaker, is bound by its fears, by its suspicions, by its general timidity. This government feels that if it gets the vote of the people to form the government for four years, it can exercise tyranny over those people. This government has lost the humility to go into the streets and the byways, and to find out what the people really want, to find out what the people really need, and it has lost the courage to give those people that.

We have a leader and a party that will give the people of Saskatchewan these things and I know that all of us are anxious to do

so and optimistic that we will be able to. As the hon. Minister of Public Health said “we are inebriated”. We are intoxicated with optimism, with desire to do something for the people of Saskatchewan and we shall.

I shall not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. Frank Meakes (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development): — Mr. Speaker, in rising in the dying moments in this debate, I first would like to say that it is kind of hard for me to pick holes in the words of the last member who was speaking, when we know that she is leaving this house, and as others have said, we have come to respect her for her sharp wit and her gentle way of pushing the knife in and then not just turning it once, but endeavouring to keep it turning. For those reasons I hesitate to even say anything about what she said in the last few minutes. But I do feel obliged, Mr. Speaker, to remark on two or three things she mentioned.

I don't know whether I would use the word amused or whether disappointed is possibly a better word, for she accused the members on this side of the house, and in particular, and if I am wrong I will retract it, she accused the Premier too, I believe, of personal attacks on the Leader of the Opposition. Then she went on, and because of her training she can use a little smoother words than what other members of the house could use, but I did catch the words “little minds”, “befuddled” and there were some others as well. Actually what she said, Mr. Speaker, was very little different than the last eight speeches she has made in this house in the last eight years.

One other remark I would like to deal with, was then she talked about the record of the Premier on confederation, and as one of the members who was at the Premier's conference in Ottawa in November, is she had heard the words said by the Premier, then she would not have said what she did. Incidentally he was one of the very few premiers, and eastern papers gave him credit for it, who spoke of the necessity of a strong united nation, of the necessity of a strong central government. Certainly, certain Liberal premiers, or prime minister, who went there in fact for only the dollars and the cents that they could get from that conference, it might be noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that those Liberal premiers go the dollars and cents of the extra money that was to be handed out to the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, to go to the remarks of the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), in which he quoted from the Premier's remarks when he spoke in this house, and, of course, this was the usual tactics of the members across the way to take partial sentences, or rather take sentences out of context, and use the words, such as the Premier said “close your eyes even tighter”, and I would like to just read what the Premier has said, “we could ignore the request of municipal governments for added measures to support the street and road building programs, we could close our eyes to the need for more staff, to make even more effective our Canada leading programs of care and cure for the mentally ill, we could close our eyes even tighter, and do nothing to make secure the future needs of Saskatchewan for water, and save still more staff, and then he went on and talked about priorities that this government had chosen which leads to another path.

And then the house heard the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) go on talking about the freedoms that had been taken away from citizens of Saskatchewan. He mentioned one that I might comment on; he charged that we had taken away the rights of the fishermen to sell fish where they wanted to. Mr. Speaker, that choice was made by the fishermen themselves, by a vote of the majority. It was very noticeable that when the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) got up in his place this year he never said a word about it. Why didn't he? Because one other time when he made much the same remark as our hon. friend did from Prince Albert, he went back and was severely reprimanded by the native fishermen in northern Saskatchewan who, I want to emphasize in this house, appreciate the opportunity to be able to do such things, to band together to get a better price for their fish, by selling through the co-operative method.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabaska): — And I'll speak again . . .

Mr. Meakes: — Very noticeable. He may stand there, or sit there, and snipe, but he didn't stand up and make any statement that might be recorded in the press, or over the radio, such as he made three years ago or whenever it was . . .

Mr. Guys: — Give me time, give me time, boy . . .

Mr. Meakes: — O.K., this is fine, Mr. Speaker, we will challenge him to say this in another debate.

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Tell us why it went to the courts . . .

Mr. Meakes: — Let us not discuss this case. It is still in the courts., for your information and we cannot discuss things which are in the courts. It is still within the courts of law in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is growing close to when I know you will be interrupting me but I would like to add to the words that have been said about — the good words that have been said about the mover and the seconder, I think they did a good job of the heavy responsibility that was placed on them. As one who has done it, I know that this entails a lot of hard work, and I believe that these were two of the best speeches that have been made in this house, moving and seconding the speech from the throne, since I came into this legislature. I know that the constituencies are proud of them, I'm sure that the people of the same political belief are proud of them. They both lucidly portrayed the success and the problems of their areas and also clearly showed the continued growth of Saskatchewan.

I too would like to add my words of good wishes to those members who are leaving the house. Through the eight years that I have sat in here, I have to come to respect the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) who through the years we have been together had many good chats together and I wish him the very best in many years to come. I would like to have seen him defeated in his own seat, but I am glad to see that he will go on and hope that he goes on to enjoy many years continued good health. I already said that I want to give my good wishes to the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). I hope that she too, has many years of good health and success in her life ahead of her. And also I would like to say au revoir to my hon. friend the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) and wish him too, many years of success and health.

As one who has sat in this house and worked with the senior member from Saskatoon (Mr. Stone), some of you across the way, may know that for many years he was the secretary of our caucus and he has been an inspiration to me and I am sure to all other members, faithfully dedicated in the manner in which he carried his responsibilities, not only to the caucus but to the members, to the people of his constituency. I also would like to say a few words about the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Williams). I think he has been an example not only to the back benchers on this side of the house, but he has been an example to myself as a new member coming into the cabinet. He is a hard working, hard slugging member, not only in the legislature but of the cabinet. He stood up for the things he believed. If he found that his way could not be always won, he took his defeat with a smile, and these are the things I think all members of a house must respect and I wish him and Mrs. Williams, many more years of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I have enough material here, that I could speak for the next half hour, but I see that you are getting itchy in your chair. I just want to say in closing that in case anybody doubts it, I am going to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas – 30

Messieurs

Lloyd	Willis	Berezowsky
Johnson	Meakes	Michayluk
Williams	Thurston	Semchuk
Brown	Wood	Perkins
Blakeney	Davies	Thiessen
Brockelbank	Nicholson	Stevens
Walker	Turnbull	Dahlman
Kuziak	Stone	Kluzak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Peterson
Strum (Mrs.)	Thibault	Broten

Nays – 21

Messieurs

Thatcher	Cameron	Horsman
Klein	McFarlane	Coderre
Batten (Mrs.)	Gardiner	Snedker
McCarthy	Staveley	Gallagher
Harris	Foley	MacDougall
McDonald	Guy	Erb
Danielson	Boldt	Steuart

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Walker, that the said address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, by such members of the assembly as are of the executive council.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

HON. C.C. WILLIAMS, (Minister of Labour and Telephones) moved second reading of Bill no. 5 – An Act to amend The Electrical Inspection & Licensing Act.

He said:

This amendment refers to the penalty clause section 45 of that act. Now, what brought it to our attention was an occasion last summer when the owners of an apartment block were prosecuted for refusing to make repairs to the electrical wiring, which was in very bad condition, hazardous and had actually caused a fire in the block, and it was only by a fortunate circumstance that the block did not burn down. It could have been a heavy loss of life.

Now we prosecuted under section 45, sub-section 10, and the magistrate dismissed the case because he ruled that it was not broad enough to cover non-compliance of an inspector's order. Now this amendment will definitely give us power to prosecute, not only the owner of the apartment block but the owner of a dwelling, if they should refuse to eliminate a hazardous wiring in the electrical system of the building concerned.

We think it is quite an important matter and I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. O.A. TURNBULL, (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 6 – An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.

He said:

This appears to concern itself with extending the compulsory age of attending school by one year and raising it from 15 to 16, but in order to explain the thinking behind this it is necessary to review the changes underway in the entire system from a lock-step, graded system to the division system and to understand what this means. The lock-step graded system takes a student through a series of one year grades. Present legislation refers to grade eight or the age of 15 as being the basic unit in academic training of the youth of this country. We in Saskatchewan over the past 12 to 15 years, and I mean the Saskatchewan Educational community, rather than the department; in this I include the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, school boards, parents and department, have been working in various places in Saskatchewan at the divisional system. It is to group blocks of learning of three year packages. Instead of requiring the student to progress at a specified rate that can be related to the curriculum of the department, it is now thought that greater responsibility and freedom ought to be allowed to teachers within the general scope of requirements of the curriculum together with the idea of providing a better quality of instruction meeting the individual needs of individual students. In other words the concept is, that we will have a broader spectrum in curriculum that will enable the varying capacities of the students to be developed to whatever limitations that they themselves only possess, rather than to try to move all students forward at a lock-step system that has been existing in this province and is still in existence in many parts of Canada.

As we looked at this over the years in Saskatchewan, we thought first of the junior high school type of approach with the development and the extension of the vocational and technical training and all that is implied therein. With consultation outside of Saskatchewan and other parts of the world, it became apparent that we ought to think of extending the clock of elementary training by one year, to give great emphasis on the basic skills within this particular block of training. The skills here are the arithmetical, reading and spelling, skills of communication. We would think of moving one more year into the elementary orbit of education, and this concept means that we would have to re-examine the question of school attendance. At this point, the minimum block is not eight years but nine years as a result of the consideration of curriculum and as a result of consideration to pilot projects that have been going on in Saskatchewan, we arrive at this particular amendment which says that The School Attendance Act shall be amended to delete the word 15 and to substitute the word 16 which means that the student will have to attend school until they are age 16 — or reach the first nine years of training depending upon which they reach first — and with that outline, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Mr. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. TURNBULL, moved second reading of Bill No. 7 – An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

He said:

This bill is necessary because we are changing the method of training teachers, in that the teachers colleges and the College of Education which is in the university, will be merged into a single system, and therefore, the pertinent words used here are related to the phrase, "Saskatchewan Teachers Colleges". We delete those words and add the ones, "may make such arrangements with the University of Saskatchewan as being necessary for the education and training of teachers". These will appear at other times in the particular bill

related to how this training shall be done, but it would be impossible to introduce that bill which provides for this change of training of teachers without also amending this particular bill which will allow for that change. So with this, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. F. MEAKES, (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development) moved second reading of Bill No. 8 – An Act to amend The Credit Union Act 1962.

He said:

All the amendments are minor, I think, and they have all been requested by the Credit Union League of Saskatchewan. I believe they have all been discussed by their legislation committee.

I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. F. MEAKES, moved the second reading of Bill No. 9 – An Act to amend The Family Farm Credit Act.

He said:

This bill is to amend The Family Farm Credit Act. This amendment extends for another year, a period during which a grant not exceeding one per cent of the loan by a co-op trust company under this act may be made to assist the company with the administration of loans, and I move second reading for this bill.

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this particular debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. A.G. KUZIAK, (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 10 – An Act to amend The Oil and Gas Conservation Act.

He said:

There are three amendments here, two are very minor and one may be classed as a major amendment. It is in connection with section 32, where the board in the past had ordered the sharing of the costs in the drainage unit where there may be two or more owners of the drainage unit, and where one of the owners, an oil company, may want to drill a well. The pooling order divides up the cost between the two or the three. In the past, the only way that the drilling company could collect back the cost of drilling from the other owner, or the other two owners, was that if it was a producer. If it was a dry well, the company who agreed to drill the well would have to stand the cost of the whole operation. Now industry has been after us to put a penalty on this, so in this amendment, we are putting on a penalty whereby if the second owner does not agree to go along and the well is drilled, and if it becomes a producer then the second owner or owners would be penalized by at least a 50 per cent surcharge. In other words, we are going to make the second owner within a drainage unit pay a penalty or surcharge of 60 per cent of the cost for the risks taken in the drilling of the well. Some owners stand by and say, "Oh well they are going to drill anyway, I am going to have a free ride if it is a dry well, if it's a good one then I will pay my regular share of the cost of the oil". This amendment will allow putting a surcharge up to 50 per cent of his share that he should have paid. With that I am going to move second reading.

Mr. Thatcher: — May I ask a question or must I wait until the bill is in committee.

Mr. Speaker: — I think you can ask a question, as long as you don't enter the debate at this stage.

Mr. Thatcher: — I would like to ask the minister if the petroleum association asked for this amendment?

Mr. Kuziak: — Both of the associations have asked for this amendment, we did not go along with it for a while, but we have now.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. E. I. WOOD, (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 15 – An Act to amend The Local Improvement District Act.

He said:

There is one small amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I don't think is very consequential, having to do with traffic signs in local improvement districts but there is one amendment that is proposed here that I believe is quite consequential and of a good real of interest to the house.

We feel that self-government is a very important thing in this province. We feel that it is a very good principle that people be entrusted with looking after their own affairs and that they have both the authority and the responsibility in this regard. We have had, as you know, for a good number of years, local improvement districts of which the minister is technically the reeve and we simply have at the present time a board of representatives that are elected at an annual meeting by a show of hands and their responsibilities are very restricted. We feel that this should not continue, we feel that it is very good principle that we entrust more of the government of our local improvement districts, to the people themselves, and we are hereby making provisions for setting up districts within these local improvement districts, electoral districts in setting up provisions in regards to electing their representatives along the lines as they have in the rural municipal councils, that we may entrust to these people, as elected, the properly elected representative more of the control and the care of their local improvement districts affairs, and I think this is a very good principle, Mr. Speaker, and I would thus move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. O.A. TURNBULL, (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 16 – An Act respecting The Education and Training of Teachers.

This is a bill which relates to the changing of the program for education and training of teachers, and the proposition that is expressed within this bill, is that the training of teachers shall take place on the campus of the two universities, that the full resources of the university will be available for the training of teachers, and that the government — while it is not said in this bill — shall retain certification of teachers. The university shall be in full control of accreditation of courses for degree purposes, and the program that is to be used, shall be developed and recommended to the Minister of Education and the president of the university for their respective duties of certification and accreditation. The program shall be developed as I said by a board of teacher education; and this board of teacher education is to represent the Department of Education, the university, the teachers federation and Saskatchewan Trustees Association; and they shall be responsible for the development of the program. In addition to this particular point, there remains the question of special grants for special purposes

which is stated in the bill. There may be a program that the board designs which for some reason or another, the university for its own good reason is unable to undertake, and there is a section in this bill which allows for the department to make special grants for special purposes as recommended by the board of teacher training. The monies for this will be handled in the same ways as the other monies at the university; the program would, of course, be put on by the university. There may be a program, such as it now going on in teachers college s of closed circuit T.V., monitoring. There may be other programs related to academic content which may be slightly different from the academic content of the regular university courses which the board of teacher training, wishes to attempt, and if such a situation were to arise, the provision is made for the money, for such program to be undertaken by this particular section.

This particular bill reaches the floor of the house after some 16 years, as I understand, of consultation between S.T.F., the university and the department. In a general way this form of the bill which is before you, reaches us after consultation between the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, the university, and the department, and I think with that I move second reading.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, this bill has great implications and far-reaching consequences in the training of teachers, and as the minister has pointed out, I am surprised he knew it, but he said it took the department 16 years to formulate this plan and this bill, and if it took them 16 years to do so, I would like to adjourn the debate to have further study on the bill.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.