

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
50th Day

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTION OF OUTSTANDING RETURNS

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the Premier and the Provincial Secretary, the fact that there are outstanding, according to my count, 22 orders for return, issued by this legislature, issued in the month of February, and 11 issued in the month of March, none of which have come down, and it is obvious from the nature of some of these returns that there was no particular problem in getting them, there may have been some of them difficult, but not all of them. Many of them would be very easy to get indeed, and I think, it looks to me as if the government has just been delaying these. I will send the list across.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member for Kelsey, that the government has been working, and so have the officials, to get this house business done as expeditiously as possible, and while there are some orders for returns still waiting, they will be brought down as soon as we can get them, and I am quite sure there were a lot more left last session on the Order Paper probably, than we are leaving this time. I remember one order for return about two years old, having to do with increased taxes, which never has come down, and my hon. friend . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, after the comments of the Premier, I want to raise another point. I think instead of the Premier making a casual remark about the numbers of returns left standing in some other session, if he is going to use statements like this he should be accurate, he should get their numbers. I am sure he is wrong, but I cannot quote the number, I haven't looked it up, but this is like many of the figures that he gives to the house.

Mr. Thatcher: — Any figures I give to the house are usually more accurate than the Socialists usually give.

THIRD READINGS

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture) moved third reading of Bill no. 87 — **An Act to amend The Liquor Licensing Act, 1959.**

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, with respect to this bill, a number of questions were raised in committee and on one or two questions, the minister indicated that he did not have the information with respect to the question which was asked.

One question which was particularly asked was — whether or not liquor outlets were open on provincial and municipal election days in other provinces, and as I recall the minister's answer, he indicated that he did not have this information, and the committee did not further deal with the manner in any degree of particularity.

I have had an opportunity to have checked for me the statutes of almost all of the provinces of Canada. I have them here in quantity, Mr. Speaker. I have the statutes of New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia, Alberta. I did not have an opportunity to check the others. It is not that I checked them and found them otherwise, it is that I didn't have an opportunity to have them checked, but in these provinces insofar as I can appreciate a reading of the statutes, it is not permitted that liquor outlets be open on election day, either provincial or municipal elections. I would refer very briefly to the Ontario act, the Liquor Control Act, section 35, and in the Newfoundland Act, to section 58, subsection 4. The Newfoundland Act is called the Alcoholic Liquor Act, and the

April 14, 1965

New Brunswick Act, the Intoxicating Liquor Act, chapter 116, section 28, and the Manitoba Act is called the Liquor Control Act, and it is section 56, and the Alberta Act, again called the Liquor Control Act, section 17, insofar as I can ascertain it. Here is a typical section:

no government liquor stores shall be open

and later section 41 deals with outlets, and I may say that these include clubs as well in most of these places. Here is a typical one from Alberta,

no sale or other disposal of beer, or liquor shall be made or take place in or from any club, in respect of which a club license has been granted, on a day in which polling takes place in either dominion or provincial election, on a day in which a municipal election is held in a municipality, if a club is located in a polling division where the polling takes place,

and I have here the British Columbia Statutes, Chapter 166, section 10 of the Government Liquor Act.

All of them, Mr. Speaker, essentially to the same effect. I won't take the time of the house to deal at length with these sections, except to say that all of them provide, if I appreciate them correctly, that outlets are not open on days in which there is a provincial or municipal polling. I noted that the Liquor Control Act which was introduced in this house, did provide for this. I think the reasons why all of these other provinces have felt that this was undesirable (again if I have properly interpreted the sections) is that there is a desire on the part of all of us to see that our election ditties are performed as a public duty and that they be regarded primarily as a serious decision on public policy, and not as carnival days. There was a time in the past when elections were largely thought of as carnivals, and it was thought entirely appropriate for votes to be traded for cups of grog, or as the case may be. We have changed our views on this and reached the conclusion that picking a government to rule or misrule us, as the case may be, is a serious business, and ought to be proceeded with, with the minimum amount of frivolity and a maximum amount of serious attention to the problems.

I am aware that the bill does not allow outlets to be open during the actual polling hours, but I think, none the less, the fact that they will be open afterwards, and they will, as a speaker has said earlier in this debate, they will contribute to even more consumption of alcoholic beverages than is usual on election day, and as he has indicated — that might be going some, would, I think, commend to this house the proposition that this change is ill advised.

I would, referring particularly to municipal elections, again indicate my understanding that neither SUMA or SARM were consulted about this, and since they are in a sense their elections, and since they presumably have a considerable stake in whether or not these elections are carried on in an atmosphere of seriousness and sobriety, I would think that the government ought to reconsider this matter and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I propose to move, seconded by the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank):

That the bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of deleting those provisions in the amending bill which allow for the sale of liquor on the days on which provincial and municipal elections are held.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) didn't pursue all of the statutes of the provinces, and perhaps I am partially to blame for the fact that he had to go to all this work, in that Mr. Burns has supplied me with the information with regards to those provinces in which outlets remain open all day during elections, or those provinces that have provisions for the liquor outlets to open after the polls close.

In the province of Nova Scotia, the liquor outlets open after the polls close, 6:01 or 7:01, depending on whether they are on daylight saving time or not. In Manitoba the outlets remain open all day during elections. In British Columbia, the liquor outlets open at 8:01, or one minute after

the polls close. These are the only three provinces that have this legislation at the moment, but it is my understanding that the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and Alberta, are endeavoring to pass similar legislation this session, that we have passed up to third reading during this session. This is the information that was requested by the member for Saskatoon, and the information has been supplied by the Liquor Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I can see no reason to send this bill back into Committee of the Whole, and I will oppose that procedure.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would most assuredly support this amendment to the motion that this bill be now read the third time.

We note that the federal legislation is and has been to the effect that these outlets should be closed all day when an election is being held.

Now, I note what the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) has just said in regard to legislation from Nova Scotia, Manitoba and British Columbia, and that legislation is possibly being considered in these other provinces at the present time, but I still note that the majority of the provinces and the federal government take the attitude that these outlets should be closed on the day in which an election is held. I think the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) has outlined some of the thinking that might be behind this. I think it is a sound idea and a good idea, that these places that sell liquor should be closed on an election day.

This is something that has been accepted in this country for years. I cannot understand why this should be changed at this time by this province, or for that matter, by any other province. I think that this would not be a good situation. We have, as the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) has pointed out, a serious decision to make in choosing our governments, and the opening of the outlets even after the polls are closed are not going to help in this regard.

I am sure that the thinking in the past that no liquor should flow on election day has been a well conceived and well thought of bit of legislation, and I cannot understand why they should be lifted now. To open the outlets in the evening, election excitement is really at its height, not when the polls are open, but after the polls are closed and the ballots are being counted. I can see where this could be the result of many very spirited arguments, and I mean in saying this, spirited in the extreme. It could even lead, in some instances, to loss of life, and I don't think this is in any way an exaggeration. I think that this is a very poor idea to have liquor flowing freely on the night of an election, excitement and interest, and animosity builds up during election campaigns and this is the climax and to have liquor flowing freely throughout the country on that evening, I think is very poor legislation indeed.

As I said earlier, this quite probably will start the sale of more liquor, but I don't think of this in itself as a worthy gain. I don't think we need more liquor flowing on any night, Mr. Speaker, especially election night where it could lead to traffic accidents, and no end of other things happening on these evenings when public feeling is running so high. I feel that this is poor legislation indeed, and insofar as the federal legislation is concerned we cannot, if I may use the term, monkey with that here. It is something that is beyond our control, and this is our government which has said that we shall not have liquor on election days. But we have other governments, we have the municipal governments before us, and these we do have power to interfere with. But I still think that the attitude should be the same in regard to these governments as it is in regard to the federal government, and we, as a provincial government should not interfere in their affairs in this way, without consulting them at least.

I know it is our legislative power, and it is also our legislative duty to set these laws, but I surely think that they should be consulted. This government opposite has said many times, and dwelt to a great extent upon their interest in local governments and have held themselves up as being the champion of local governments, and Mr. Speaker, this strikes me as a very poor way to champion the cause of local government, to pass legislation dealing with a very crucial part of municipal affairs, that is the election of their aldermen and councillors, and allowing liquor to be sold and used in excess on the nights of their elections without even talking to them about it. It strikes me this is a very poor principle indeed, and because of these things I feel that we should certainly have another look at this legislation and that this clause especially should go back to committee that we may have an opportunity to discuss it with the municipal people, and see what their feelings are on the matter before we pass this legislation. I will support the amendment.

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, I am indeed amazed to see the government opening up liquor outlets of all kinds on election day. I would have thought they had a greater sense of responsibility and a greater interest in the general public's welfare, and had a greater respect for the ballot on election day, and the ability of people to be able to reason on that particular day.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one advantage in this and that is to the liquor interests. Certainly, the liquor interests don't need another day on which to sell liquor. The general public consumes enough liquor now. There is one product that doesn't require any advertising at all, but to open liquor outlets, or permit them to remain open on election day is almost beyond comprehension as far as I am concerned.

We are supposed to govern, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of law, order and good government. This, in my opinion, goes contrary to this concept. Election day is a day when emotions run high and feelings run high, both before polling and after polling more particularly. The after effects as the result of the outcome of an election are often much more severe on people and tend to stimulate their emotions far more than previous to an election. I can readily see the consequences, Mr. Speaker, of brawl after brawl taking place as to why a particular candidate won, as to what happened and what the opposition did and all of the recriminations that go with an election, particularly under the stimulus of liquor. The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) is making provisions if he can for R.C.M.P. policing of municipalities. Well, all I have to say is that they are going to be mighty busy on this particular day if this is going to be permitted. It is inexcusable that a government has such ill regard for an important day like election day, when clear thinking is necessary, when we ought to do all we can to tranquilize or remove any tensions or emotions that might prevail on that particular day. May I point out in the Election Act itself, it is very careful about food and drink in connection with an election for that very reason, but, Mr. Speaker, I can readily see, readily anticipate the promises that might be made, that if our candidate wins, why you just come over to Joe's and we will all have a good drink, this sort of thing, and the other side will do the same, with the result that there will inevitably be a clash, or could be a clash. The R.C.M.P. are going to be very busy on this particular day, this is not in the interests of law, order, and good government. Certainly, it doesn't indicate any sense of responsibility on the part of the government in regard to this important matter, and I will support the amendment.

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I certainly think this portion of Bill no. 87, allowing the sale of liquor after the closing of the voting polls on an election day, is to me, definitely a step in the wrong direction. Whether it is a provincial, urban, or a municipal election, because we know that on election day there is a great tenseness, and an anxiety within people, that is far greater than perhaps at any other time, and people are more apt to give way to their feelings as to who should be their representative than at any other time.

Arguments start and tempers flare, and to be able to go to a beer parlor, or a cocktail lounge, or the liquor store, expecting these places to cool them off, is sheer nonsense. You and I know the effect will be the exact opposite. Arguments and fights will prevail, more frequent, and when we get up and pass a bill here in this legislature, a bill asking for tighter restrictions on safe driving, and then allow a bill giving a more wide open privilege of consuming of liquor on election night, certainly, spells out poor judgement, and defeats the purpose of the former bill on safety completely. We are doing nothing but asking for more accidents, more unhappy homes, and communities, no matter how much profit a government might secure from the sale of liquor, particularly on election night, it never will be justifiable for the accidents, the deaths, the hard feelings and the dissension that is built up within the communities that will be caused by that same government making available the sale of liquor to the public, it could have curtailed or prevented it by defeating this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly oppose this bill, and urge you to support the amendment.

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I think this year will go down as the "live it up" year. I have a hard time to understand how the government can reduce the money voted to alcohol education, then on election day when we are supposed to be sober, doing a sober job, we are going to open up the liquor stores, and beer parlors, right after voting. I know that will cause trouble, and

every indication is that we are pushing for more liquor. Now it is a question that I would like to have answered, what position does this put an elected candidate in, if he buys liquor on that day, there will be tremendous pressures on a chap that is elected to buy a treat, and that would, I believe disqualify him.

I think this point should be cleared up, maybe the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) can clear it up . . .

An Hon. Member: — The people on the other side can clear it up.

Mr. Thibault: — . . .and one thing that amazes, the moment we start talking about liquor, the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) seems to vanish someplace. I just wonder if he is the one that is bringing in all these bills, or drawing them up. With this I want to say that I am going to support the amendment.

Hon. D. Stuart (Minister of Public Health): — . . .and against purple gas.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, there is just one thing I wanted to point out. Speaking yesterday, I believe it was, the hon. minister was introducing this bill, said, "Well you know what goes on election night anyway". He did not say what went on, but I presume that he meant that there were parties in private homes, and people drank. This is true and this will still happen, but remember this, when there are private parties, people choose their guests, and usually they are either celebrating together, people of the same party, or mourning together, the people of the other party. You don't get that cross-fire of differences of opinion, whereas if your beer parlors are opened, and your cocktail bars are opened and your beverage rooms are opened, you get people of opposing parties, taunting each other, and then you will really be in for sights and trouble.

I really don't think that you should pass this. I think your better judgement should make you change your mind.

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — I haven't had an answer to the question that I asked a while ago, where does it place an elected candidate, if he bought liquor after the polls were closed.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — He is in the same position that he always has been in. If he is an elected member, after the polls are closed, he is in a different position than prior to the polls being closed.

Mr. H.A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the government of the day has tried to have a reputation of a "live it up" province. I think they are doing a good job in that respect, but I will say this, that here they have an opportunity in sincerity to cut down consumption of liquor in the province by the closing of outlets on this day. I am sure that there won't be any other evening in the whole year when more liquor would be consumed and if they have an opportunity to purchase liquor, such will be the case. If the government is sincere in holding down the profits of liquor, as they have said, I think this is an opportunity for them to prove it by supporting this amendment.

I also believe that along with the lady member from Regina West (Mrs, Cooper) that you do get a cross-fire in a place that you don't in any other type of party, and it would be good if we could stop this cross-fire as much as possible, at least until the next day when the people are celebrating in the way that they do in the liquor outlet.

I believe that the government can show its sincerity and I mean this. This is an opportunity to show sincerity in lowering the consumption of liquor. I do think that the province as a whole has made enough money on liquor. I think that the liquor interests probably have shown the government appreciation of what they have done, and I think if they would let them go and not open outlets on election evening. I support the amendment.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, one could not talk on this amendment a great length of time without being repetitious. The hon. member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) said that he was amazed at the government in respect to the step

that they are taking in relaxing some of our regulations in regard to consumption of liquor, particularly at the close of the polls. I am not amazed. Sitting here and listening to the seriousness and the tone of the debate that comes from the opposition members, I see members across on the government side, sitting and taking it as one big joke. It is funny.

Personally, I don't feel anything funny in it. I have known, history repeats, history has been repeated and will repeat itself, nations that are of the past, have gone into oblivion, due to demoralization, nations that have, that did not practice restraints, this is precisely what we are going to do in introducing this type of legislation into this province. I am not thinking of the adults, I am thinking of the young people that are coming into public life. People that will have an opportunity to cast their first ballot, the 18 year old boys and girls. When they reach 21 they will be allowed to go into the beer parlors on election night. They will be "living it up" Mr. Speaker. Where is our respect, Mr, Speaker, to our upcoming young men and women who will be taking our place.

Certainly, we as a province, we as a society, could refrain one day, a day in which the citizens of a province should take seriously, soberly, and not voting and waiting for the beer parlors to open, looking at their watch or the clock, here we are going to "live it up". I know that there may have been pressures on the minister in charge of liquor, this may be also due to the fact that the Provincial Treasurer has reduced some taxes, this government may one day be looking forward to making up some of the revenue that they will be losing by certain tax reductions, but I think this is not the way to do it.

Reference has been made to say, the SARM, SUMA, whether the temperance organization has been consulted, the church and the ministerial association. What is their stand? What is the stand of the association in respect to this opening up of drinking on election night. I mentioned in passing, a day or so ago, when this bill was on second reading, that there will be communities where the feelings and the tempers will rise so high, that it will become brawls and fights and accidents. The remark was made by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood), that there may even be deaths resulting from this. If not, then certainly this will contribute to road accidents and possible serious injuries, because people on this particular night that have been taking an active part in politics and their feelings will be running high and tensions will be at a peak. Well, the member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) mentioned parties, sure there are parties and we know it, but she mentioned that your guests are selected, they are restricted.

Mr. Ian MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Are you . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — Oh yes, I think you know more about liquor than I do. Maybe you would be capable to get up and speak against this. Just don't speak until you are standing up. Get up and speak when I am finished.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Be a man.

Mr. Michayluk: — I will, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, and in due respect to our own younger people, support the amendment.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can add anything new to this debate, but I certainly can go along with what has been said by the member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). I would like to point out, if he has, and I hope it will sink in, that history points out, as he said, that nations have gone and rotted because of this kind of legislation. There was a time in Greece, when every school teacher, and there are some in this house that know that they had a philosophy which said, "Eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we may die." And all that life was worth to them was to eat, to drink, and to be merry. The modern way of saying it today is "live it up". I think that this province has had a very fine record in the past. We are sometimes considered by people from other parts of the West as a sort of temperance province, or a province where we don't go to extremes. We have had a tremendous amount of dignity in Saskatchewan, when you see all around us, and particularly in the south, where a lot of drinking and so forth goes on. We have held back because we know its been good for our children and for our families, not to be, say, too broad in this kind of thing.

I think you could say that it is the reason the people of Saskatchewan, and the reason the legislature prevailed and we had some temperance in our legislation.

Now when you look at the legislation that is proposed, on having drinking on election day, there is no doubt at all, that this will bring in considerable revenue to the province and it makes me think that probably the only one that would gain, or the ones that would gain, would be the Provincial Treasurer. I don't think he needs money that much, but he would gain and the only other people that would gain, would be the liquor interests.

I can say quite sincerely, that in all the years that we have had elections, and I have seen a lot of them and I know a lot of hotel keepers, I have yet to hear from one, who would say that he would like to have his premises open on that day. I am referring to country points. They don't want to have the premises open on election days, because they know what it means and they are just like other people, excited and they don't want to see brawls and fighting and there will be that, there is no question about it, because as the member who sits with me, my colleague, pointed out, people are excited on that particular day and they are high strung.

There is another angle and that is — everybody knows that there have been cases where during election day, in order to get votes, liquor was passed on to the voters. Now this amendment to the Liquor Act, that we are opposing maybe to remove that, so that these same agents can go ahead and say "now I am not going to give you any liquor right now, but as soon as the voting is over, you come over to Joe's place and fill up". And there are people that will go for this. Or "here is a dollar or \$20, go and buy it". These are facts, and opening up is exactly what you are doing, you are making it possible for all kinds of skulduggery on election day, and I don't care whether it is provincial or federal elections. For goodness sake, give the people a chance to get back home — to sober down — to cool down, and maybe next day, they will be what they are naturally. The excitement will be all over. And if no other reason than that, I would oppose this legislation, because I have seen things happen and I don't want to see them be worse than they are now.

There is nothing more that I need to say. It has all been said, and all I can do is to appeal to the younger men on the other side to first of all consider the morality of the situation and not the fact that they are a majority. We are here in this legislature, not as Liberals or CCF or Conservatives — we are here representing our constituency. Let us think of all the good people back home, and what they will say, if we would allow this legislation for the use of liquor on election day. Think of what they are going to say, and there is going to be much said about it. I am going to say a lot about it if the legislation does go through.

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, much of what I had intended to say, covering the moral and the spiritual aspects of the section of the bill has already been said, and I am not going to worry the house with repetition, but there is one aspect of the whole situation I would just like to cover.

During the session, we did find it necessary to increase our car insurance premiums, and I am not being critical of that, Mr. Speaker, but to me, it is a paradoxical situation. After increasing the car insurance premiums, and Mr. Speaker, especially appealing to the drivers of this province, that, telling them that they have the cost of their insurance in their hands, then we as legislators do the very thing to bring about the opposite result. It seems strange that we should, on the very night when the possibilities perhaps are the greatest for accidents, following an election and following indulgence, and the beer parlors and so on, because we have made it possible. Actually we have invited it, Mr. Speaker. We have a greater responsibility than just opening the gate. We are inviting the very thing that one member after another has suggested can happen. Following this kind of thing, this is a very paradoxical stand for any government or any group of legislators to take and I would ask the minister and the government to take a second look at this section of the bill.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that the deputy leaders is the only one sitting across the way who has had anything to say about this very reasonable amendment, which is before the house, and I hope before the debate concludes that we will hear from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) who does not seem to be here now, and my friend the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt). I was hoping that the Minister of Natural Resources, (Mr. Cuelenaere) would have something to say about this measure and the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) is now entering the chamber, he is a past president of the SUMA, and I cannot understand any government bringing in legislation that is going to affect 800 local governments throughout the province, rural and urban, without at least consulting them, to find out whether or not they have any views and I am glad to see the Premier taking

his place. It is significant that while he takes responsibility for this area of government, he has left it to the Deputy Premier to answer the questions and I think that it is significant that this is to be a first for Saskatchewan, in opening up on provincial and municipal elections in a number of the provinces. I think it was significant that Mr. Pearson in his important speech after the opening of this new session, outlined a great many measures that are going to be introduced in the foreseeable future. He did not say that the Canadian laws were going to be changed, so they could live it up on election night after the results came in. I think until Mr. Pearson decides that this is in the public interest to move in this direction, that all the provinces should go slowly. I hope the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) will have something to say. One of her very good friends phoned me very late Sunday night, she hadn't been able to reach the lady member for Saskatoon, but she felt very strongly about this measure and she intimated she was sending a telegram to her, hoping that she would speak up and oppose this legislation.

I am sure that if the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) phoned the mayor of Saskatoon, to find out whether Saskatoon would like to have liquor outlets opened after the election on municipal election night, that the mayor would have views which hon. members of this house would do very well to consider and unless I am mistaken, His Worship, the Mayor of Saskatoon, would have very strong views about changing the laws of Saskatchewan. I hope that the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) will have something to say about this, and regardless of what happens after we are in committee, I think it is reasonable that this amendment should be supported by members on both sides of the house so that we can come back into committee. The minister sponsoring the bill, has some information which he did not have yesterday, and I think the Premier should indicate why the authorities responsible for municipal government whether they belong to SARM or SUMA, without at least calling them in for a conference to give them a chance to understand what might happen, understand why the federal government and all the other provinces for so long have felt that the operation of this essential part of democratic government should not be disturbed by opening liquor outlets on election night for the very good reasons which have been given by a number of members on this side of the house. So I hope that before the vote is taken, that at least some members on the government side will have some reasons as to why they are going to vote against it, and indicate that they are at least willing to have this go back to the committee to permit the minister to give the house information which he cannot give in a debate of this sort.

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two with regard to this amendment. I think this proposal is also based on the same period that we saw in the other bill dealing with liquor. The government needs more revenue, this is the approach they are taking, they are not particularly interested in control, they are interested in revenue.

Perhaps it also has something to do with paying off political debts. I am amazed that the government which always prided itself on being such a friend of local government, would not even consult with SUMA or the SARM with respect to changing the law in relationship to municipal elections. I think the government is asking for a lot more than revenue. It is asking for trouble in this regard, and it is most likely to get it. I presume that it is reasonable to say that the rule "live it up" is now changed to "live it up with the Liberals" for election time. I could, if I had a little more time, had a bit more fun with this, I think, but I did concoct a little bit of a verse here.

We vote in an election
To make a selection
Of those who will govern and rule
To celebrate the result
We now will consult spread-eagled
On a bar stool.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this amendment, because I believe it is right. Even if all of the other provinces of Canada allowed the outlets to be opened on election day, or election night, I still support this amendment because I don't think that is right. I don't think it is necessary. Certainly these people who are here in this house are the last people who should be in favor of opening the bars and liquor outlets on election night. All good candidates after an election at the end of an election are tired. They have been working hard, and this is one time, when

they want to get away as soon as possible and get to bed and have a good rest. If the bars are open they will, in a great many cases, be coaxed or dragged into the bars, other people will buy drinks and the candidate will be in the position if he doesn't buy a round, he is going to be considered as a cheapskate, and this would be illegal and would disqualify an elected candidate, because there are some famous cases in history. One that I remember is at Moose Jaw. The member was elected, had a dance the night of the election, he also paid for the orchestra and he was unseated because of that. An election includes the day of the election, so that we are making more problems for the people that are candidates. I agree with the arguments that have been put forward, that people are excited with elections, they are taking them seriously, they are fighting them hard, and with the inspiration of a few drinks somebody will be taunting somebody and pretty soon, there will be fights, or something more serious than that, and this is one night when we could do without this. I do hope that the government will reconsider and let this bill go back into committee for this purpose.

The amendment was negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 22

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Willis	Wooff
Cooper (Mrs)	Whelan	Snyder
Wood	Nicholson	Broten
Nollet	Kramer	Larson
Walker	Dewhurst	Robbins
Blakeney	Berezowsky	Pepper
Davies	Michayluk	
Thibault	Smishek	

Nays — 31

Thatcher	MacDougall	Bjarnason
Howes	Gardiner	Romuld
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	McIsaac	MacLennan
Cameron	Trapp	Larochelle
McDonald (Moosomin)	Grant	Asbell
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Heald	MacDonald (Milestone)	Radloff
Guy	Gallagher	Coupland
Merchant (Mrs)	Breker	
Loken	Leith	

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the government has done themselves a good deal of harm, with the bill that they are now bringing into this house, for which third reading is now proposed. I think that this bill will rebound not to their glory not to their dishonor, and for many days to come will react against them. This matter of holding the outlets open on the evening of an election — Liberals in the past have had enough headaches on the day after, they will have more from now on.

Mr. Steuart: — Close the polls?

Mr. McFarlane: — First ones to drown their sorrow.

Mr. Wood (Swift Current): — Also the Liberal members on our Liquor Committee which we had back in 1958, talked to great lengths about the necessity of having an independent commission. They were very insistent on this, and I can recall what was said on these things. Now, at the very first opportunity that they have when they are in power they do away with independent commissions. I think that this speaks very poorly for their veracity and for their seriousness of approaching the affairs of the public when they talk one way when they are in opposition, and immediately they have the opportunity to do otherwise they reverse their position on these things. They have talked a great deal in this session about the desirability to have a Department of Youth, doing something for the youth of this province, and spending considerable money along these lines, and at the same time, they turn around and relax the liquor legislation. I suppose they will easily obtain enough money this year to pay for their Youth Department, but who will pay the bill in other ways?

I think that this bill, which we have before us, shows as very few other bills have — well, I won't say that either, because we have had ample evidence of the insincerity of the Liberal party, but this bill shows to a greater extent, shall I say, Mr. Speaker, than even some other bills have, the insincerity and the duplicity of the Liberal party.

Saskatchewan in the past, as one member has said in this debate, has taken a very sensible position in regard to liquor legislation. I think we have been proud of the position Saskatchewan has taken in the past. Where other provinces have been allowing liquor advertising; where other provinces and other states of the union have had open bars and these things, Saskatchewan has been very reluctant to do these things. We felt that we have taken a stand against these things and have had a sensible position. We realize that possibly there should be some changes made a few years back in regard to the opening up of different types of outlets but, as was said in the report, we felt that this should be done in such a way as to enhance the . . .

Mr. Steuart: — What you are saying is, you can drink the whisky but you are not supposed to enjoy it.

Mr. Wood: — . . .to enhance the good behavior of the people of the province and the proper way of using liquor. This was the idea behind the legislation which was passed in 1959. But this is all being done away with now.

In our studies concerning liquor, Mr. Speaker, we discovered that the use of liquor, and the thinking of the people in regard to liquor is like a pendulum — it swings from one extreme to the other.

A couple of hundred years ago, in the United Kingdom, liquor was used to a tremendous extent. When the distilling of liquor was first discovered, it went wild and rampant across the British Isles. The debauchery and the depravity of the people of that time was astounding, until the public became absolutely nauseated with this sort of thing. The swing was from this sort of behavior into the Victorian position where liquor was frowned upon until we find in the early days of this century that it was popular to bring in very restrictive legislation. This was found to be the extreme on the other side and now the pendulum has swung from that. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the pendulum is swinging towards more open outlets and more open and relaxed legislation.

I am sure, Sir, that this trend will not continue forever. Before many years are passed and we see many signs of it now, we only have to listen to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) the other day, regarding traffic safety, to see how thinking people are beginning to look upon the use of liquor — what it is doing to our society. I predict that before many years have gone by that the legislation which is being proposed to be passed this morning, will be looking very foolish to the people of this province and the people of other provinces and we will be thinking about something else besides relaxing our liquor laws.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly vote against this bill on third reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved third reading of Bill no. 80 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Election Act.**

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, there was one very small point I wanted to raise on this and this was the point which arose as a result of the consideration of the Liquor Licensing Act, and primarily the question of treating.

I feel with some hon. members I think, that there ought to be a time after the close of polls when some sort of treating, that if one is guilty of some sort of treating it will not unseat one. I think members are familiar with some of these cases which suggest that until the day of the final count even, if you are guilty of treating you can be unseated even though the treating couldn't possibly have affected the result of the poll. There is a case over in Moose Jaw where a person, as I recall it, bought some dinners for some of his supporters after the polls closed. He was elected and he was unseated as a result of having purchased these dinners.

This came to my mind, not having been raised by previous amendments, when I consider this Liquor Licensing Act, and I simply would like to make the suggestion to the hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that when a revision of the Saskatchewan Election Act is being considered, and obviously a revision is in order with the very substantial number of amendments we are passing at this session, that some deadline, midnight on the polling night, or something, be inserted in there so that a candidate knows that if he buys a cup of coffee for a constituent three days after the election, as he might do in the ordinary course of his life, or picks up the check at lunch, that there would be no question about it. It is a trifle and I don't want to take the time of the house on it, I simply want to put forward that suggestion.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. D. Stuart (Minister of Health) moved third reading of Bill No. 98 — **An Act to ratify, validate and confirm a Certain Agreement between the City of Regina and Saskatchewan Power Corporation.**

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina East): — I just wanted to say a few words before we take the final count, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to repeat what I stated the other evening. I just want to point out that I had hoped that the government would have, in ratifying this, would have permitted it to go back to the burgesses for another vote because of a major change in the contract whereby the reduced rate would remain in force more than three years. There is not any doubt the rates will increase after the three year period.

We were told, when we had begun negotiations, that that would be extended for the lifetime of the agreement. So, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the government side, in rectifying it, would have permitted this to go back to the voters. We in Regina City are going to have to look for some \$800,000 next year because of this agreement being completed here tonight. There is no doubt it is going through. I don't hear many no votes but this will mean 4 mills to 5 mills on behalf of our city.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — You've got that paid.

Mr. Baker: — Well, that is some of the tax shift that you created over the past few weeks.

I think it is most regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that this day has come about. I think the pioneers will turn over in their graves, those who started this wonderful utility and the people of this city, I am sure, will regret what is happening at this time.

In conclusion, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I should declare a week of mourning on behalf of the Regina people.

Mr. Speaker: — The mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Prince Albert): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say a great deal but I do want to say that in concluding this deal, while we did inherit the deal and the deal was started by the Power Corporation under the previous administration, I think it is a good deal for the city. I hope it will be a good deal for the Power Corporation. The citizens are, in fact, receiving a reduction in their power bills. I don't think the statement of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Baker) is factual, that while the rates are guaranteed for three years that they will go up after three years. I don't think they will. In fact, if anything I hope that they will be lower and certainly I am confident that they will not be any higher.

It is a fact that the city made a good deal of profit especially this last year. If the reason is looked into it will be found that the city was able to purchase a peak load power from the Power Corporation without having to invest any money. I think had the citizens of Regina maintained their own power plant and distributing system, they were faced with tremendous capital costs over the next few years. But I think that the main thing in us ratifying this agreement was that it was entered into by the vast majority of the duly elected members of the city council. It was put to a vote of the people of the city of Regina and by a majority vote they ratified the agreement and gave the city permission to enter into this agreement so I am quite happy that most members on both sides of the house supported this bill

April 14, 1965

ratifying the agreement. I think it will work out and I hope it will work out in the best interests of not only the Power Corporation and the people of Saskatchewan generally but of the citizens of Regina.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill no. 100 — **An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is a consequential amendment dealing with changes in the Executive Council Act necessitated by changes in the Department of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation now known as the Department of Welfare; and the Department of Industry and Information which is now known as the Department of Commerce.

These two small amendments simply reflect those changes in those statutes, striking out the words "social welfare and rehabilitation" and substituting the word "welfare" and striking out the word "information" and substituting the word "commerce".

With that short explanation, Mr. Speaker, and by leave of the house, I now move second reading.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — The minister got leave for second reading today when he moved first reading so you are alright.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. D. Steuart (Minister of Health) moved, seconded by the Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General):

That the adjournment of the house do not take place at 10:00 o'clock p.m. as fixed by an Order of the House made April 6, 1965.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before we move to adjourn the debates, I would move, seconded by Mr. Heald, that the adjournment of the house do not take place at 10:00 p.m. as fixed by an Order of the House made April 6th, 1965.

The reason I do this, I know that we only have Bill no. 42 to move into committee and I understand there are some members on the other side who would still like to speak on this, so I would move this motion.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I take exception, I would like to refer you to rule no. 99 under Standing Orders —

Except in cases of urgent and pressing necessity, no motion for the suspension of a standing order or any rules respecting private bills or petitions for private bills, shall be entertained, unless the same has been reported upon by the Committee on Standing Orders, and the committee in its report shall state the grounds for recommending such suspension.

and I think clearly in another section —

urgent and pressing necessity

Mr. Speaker, is taken to be that urgent and pressing necessity that has to do only with the unanimous consent of the house, and I am representing to you, Sir, that this motion cannot now be entertained because the Committee on Standing Orders has not had an opportunity of meeting to discuss this matter, and it has not made the requisite representations, or submissions to the house on that matter, and in any case I do not see that it is necessary for us to go beyond the hour of ten p.m. as a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, which clearly does not exist. The house meets tomorrow under present orders at 10 a.m. all afternoon tomorrow, and all evening tomorrow.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I question very much whether the exigencies of the situation are such as require the government at this time to impose closure with respect to Bill 42. That is what this is, and it strikes me that first of all the Order Paper is not cleared off, other matters are still before the house. It is not as though Bill 42 was the only matter before the house, and secondly, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the urgency of Bill 42 has not been demonstrated. If the government came here with some kind of evidence that the repeal of Bill 42 was mandatory at this time, and that it was a matter of urgency, and that grave public mischief would flow from the failure to pass Bill 42 in a given number of days, then I think the assembly might well consider this highly unusual procedure of invoking closure. I have been in this house now for 18 sessions and I do not recall closure ever having been invoked in this house before.

Mr. Stuart: — We debated it last year.

Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion is that we debate it tonight, until I don't know when, but the hon. member knows that the rules of the house call for the house to rise at 10 in the evening and I must say that all hon. members, including members on the other side, have been most patient and most tolerant with the government in their frantic haste, and frantic desire to get the public business disposed of, with as much dispatch as possible. Hon. members on the other side, just as we on this side have responded faithfully to the call of the government that we appear here at 8 in the morning and that we work here until 10 at night on public business, and I suggest a fourteen hour day — we have not complained about this, Mr. Speaker, but now when it is suggested that the hours of the day should be extended from fourteen to fifteen, sixteen or eighteen, or whatever number of hours the Premier had in mind, then I think that it is time that some of us express just a little bit of anxiety about just what the government is trying to do here.

The Premier is apparently of the impression that unless the legislature responds exactly according to his every whim and every wish, that he should take some kind of reprisal, or retaliation against the assembly. We have listened with a good deal of patience and fortitude to threats that he was making as long ago as three weeks, that unless this assembly did so and so, he was going to crack the whip, that he was going to make us jump and dance to his tune, that if we didn't do exactly what he said, we were going to be sitting here until next May, or May the 15th, I think he said.

Mr. Thatcher: — Or June . . .

Mr. Walker: — Or June yes, and I suggest that the Premier's anxiety about how this democracy conducts itself betrays some little machiavellian . . .

Mr. Stuart: — You like that word.

Mr. Walker: — . . .trait. Yes, Prince Machiavelli could learn a thing or two from the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Stuart).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the necessity of this house getting the work which is laid before us by the Premier out of the way. Well, the Premier started this session out by saying that it was going to be an exceedingly heavy session "Why, there is going to be a tremendous list of legislative achievements to show for this session", he said, and yet out of the twenty years almost that I have been here, there have been at least thirteen of those years that there has been more legislation presented to this house than has been presented by this government across the way. At least thirteen.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — The Commonwealth . . .

Mr. Walker: — Yes, that is a good authority for it, and I am pleased to know that my hon. friend is going to accept that as conclusive authority for the statement. As a matter of fact in most years, we have passed a much larger volume of pages of legislation than this government and what is even more important, Mr. Speaker, we have passed legislation which has been of infinitely

April 14, 1965

more benefit to the people of Saskatchewan than this legislature has passed. All this haste and hurry about us getting on with our work . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — We will let you sit as long as you want.

Mr. Walker: — This suggest to me, Mr. Speaker that there is something a little bit ulterior in the minds of the Premier and some of his colleagues. It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that closure is really something that should be reserved for special and momentous occasions. Has this government made such . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, this government has not suggested closure. We have suggested action to stop a filibuster, to let members talk. We want to let them talk all night if they want to, and we are determined that this legislation, Bill no. 42, is going through, whether my hon. friends want to talk until June . . .

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, who has the floor?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Now this question which is before the house . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to speak on the point.

Mr. Speaker: — You will have all the opportunity in the world to do it when I settle the one that has just been raised. The question that has been raised, if I understand it correctly by the Premier on the point of order, was the member was probably wandering some distance from the motion, and the fact that he mentioned closure. I draw your attention, that the whole closure performance is covered by Standing Order no. 25, there are about five paragraphs, I will read it to you, if anybody wants it, but this motion which we have before us now, is not a closure motion.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, call it what you will, call it the gag, or the muzzle, or . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! You are not going to make any reflections on what I have just said. This is out of the book. Period.

Mr. Walker: — I haven't any doubt about that, Mr. Speaker. I know it is out of the book, I have seen it there, as a matter of fact. Mr. Speaker, the Premier can call this anything he likes, but it is an infringement upon the integrity of this legislature when he starts trying . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — It is a filibuster.

Mr. Walker: — . . .to impose unreasonable hours on deliberation in this assembly.

Mr. Thatcher: — Again, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, last year, March 17th, this government on the last day of the session moved exactly the same motion, and if you want it, I will read it. A motion of Mr. Lloyd's, seconded by Mr. Blakeney —

Ordered that the adjournment of the house do not take place at the hour fixed by Standing Order 5 (3).

That is exactly the motion you fellows moved a year ago, but you forget you are not now the government.

Mr. Walker: — But, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Now we are not going to have a disorderly debate. This is a debatable motion. Members can speak on it, and they can speak one at a time.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that at the last session of the legislature, this motion was introduced on the last day of the session.

Mr. Thatcher: — You were bringing in an election.

Mr. Walker: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that was a cat of an entirely different paint job, and the Premier knows it, Mr. Speaker, because he said himself, it was introduced on the last day of the session. The hon. members know that that year there were still a few items of business left to do at 10:00 o'clock, and this was done in order to allow the Order Paper to be cleared off so that we could prorogue the house, and it was done by the consent of every member of the house, Mr. Speaker. This is an altogether different thing, this is an attempt by the government, knowing that this is not the last day of the session, knowing that we have a lot of business left to do, knowing that there is still business left on the Order Paper, which I submit, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — And we are going to do it.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I have submitted to three unparliamentary interruptions by the hon. Premier, and I think it is time we had the Premier called to order.

I want to say that the situation is an entirely different thing, this year we still have on the Order Paper, a large number of items of business, and I may say that part of that number of items of business was put there because this government, sitting across the way, was improvident with the use of their time during the last eight or nine months. That government sitting across the way was unable to make up its mind about the legislation that it wished to present to this house. We have had no fewer than four pieces of legislation brought in here and then dropped or withdrawn, in this session, an unheard of performance for a government.

Mr. Stuart: — You did it last time.

Mr. Walker: — The fact of the matter is that this government came here unprepared for this session, after being in office ever since May. They have some seven or eight months to get ready for the session, and they came here unprepared. They were presenting at least twenty bills in the last ten days of the session, something that no other government ever had the effrontery to do to this assembly, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government is in this dilemma because of its own doing.

Mr. Thatcher: — We are not in a dilemma.

Mr. Walker: — If the previous government had attempted to require members to attend committee meetings from eight o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night, there would have been an outcry, Mr. Speaker. Every organ of public opinion in this province would have condemned the CCF government if they had attempted that kind of Huey Long tactics being perpetrated on us here in this assembly.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, we did . . .

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — You can watch hockey games.

Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is no need, and no pretext for a motion that we should now suspend the 10 o'clock adjournment rule. The 10 o'clock adjournment rule is a good rule. It is an old rule, and it is an honored rule. We do not object to working, we do not object to doing our duty, if our duty requires us to be here tomorrow and Saturday, and all next week, we are prepared to do that. We are not trying to put the government in the position where they are going to fall asleep in their seat but I suggest that this is an imposition on us, and on all members, and why, particularly is it oppressive against the opposition, Mr. Speaker, because for days now, Bill 42 has been before this house. It has been debated five or six occasions, for a few minutes, or an hour, it has been debated, and members of the government have not got to their feet and told us that there is any particular urgency about this. The Premier told us just now in one

April 14, 1965

of his interruptions "That, by God, we are going to put this through in spite of you. You are not the government anymore." Well, let me tell the Premier that if he has that much sense or urgency about Bill 42, just what commitment has he made with respect to Bill 42?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Who has a string on the Premier with respect to Bill 42, why does the Premier feel that if he doesn't produce results on Bill 42 that it is going to be a terrible state of affairs? The Premier said that he has got to deliver on Bill 42, he has got to deliver . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think that the member must discuss the motion. We are not on Bill 42 yet.

Mr. Walker: — The motion is that we continue to consider Bill 42, after the usual adjournment time.

Mr. Steuart: — It has nothing to do with Bill 42 and you know it.

Mr. Walker: — I say, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side of the house have honestly and diligently analyzed the effects of Bill 42, and the provisions in it. The only speaker that we have had from the other side has been the mover. I hope that if members opposite will discuss it, that they will take advantage of these extra hours that are provided by the motion of the member over there. So, Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose any motion that we suspend this usual ten o'clock ruling. I shall oppose it because I think it is unnecessary. I think it is iniquitous abuse of the processes of this legislature. It is a totalitarian form of whipping this legislature into compliance with the whims of the Premier.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Aw, sit down.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, this is not a motion of closure. We know that many hon. members opposite want to talk on Bill 42. We know that they have been filibustering every time this has come up. All we are going to do is give them the opportunity to talk on this bill, and in order to help the farmers out before spring seeding, we are going to let them talk all night next week if they want to. They can talk just as long and as often as they wish. They can make two hour speeches, or three hour speeches, and this cannot be called closure. Mr. Speaker, you are a fair man, you know that all this is doing is letting them talk. The more the better. I think we can sit here just as long as the opposition.

Now, this Bill 42 is government policy. We think it is sensible legislation, and in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. This government will sit here just as long as it is necessary to pass this legislation, and I assure you, Sir, that this legislation will not be withdrawn.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier in one of his very rude interruptions, a little while ago, quoted from the Journals of 1964, March 17th, the motion moved by Mr. Lloyd and seconded by Mr. Blakeney, similar to the one we have had tonight. But as usual, he did not tell the whole story. He had the book before him, but he only told a little bit about it, that was the last day of the session, it was by unanimous consent, it was agreed to, and furthermore, do you know how long we sat, Mr. Speaker. At 10:25 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the chamber and the session was over, twenty-five minutes . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — We are using your motion.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . .twenty-five minutes, we could not finish this session in twenty-five minutes, that is what we did last year, we finished it up in twenty-five minutes, and I will have no objection on the night when we can finish the session, to setting aside this rule and taking twenty-five minutes to finish the session. That is not what they propose to do tonight. What is proposed tonight by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) is to take

advantage of the fact that he has in the opposition a minority in this house, and so as to put the steam roller on them.

Today we made good progress in our business in spite of some of the warm moments. We practically cleared the Order Paper, several items for which we have to come back tomorrow anyway, and the last thing was that the minister got unanimous consent to revert from public bills and orders to government orders, and then he pulled the dirty little trick of moving this motion.

An Hon. Member: — It was not a dirty trick.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — It is a dirty trick.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! A dirty trick is an imputation. I am going to ask you to withdraw it. I do not like that kind of language and I do not think that this legislature or this assembly should condone it or tolerate it. It reflects on every member in the house and we are all members of the house.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Well, Mr. Speaker, on second thought, I know it is unparliamentary, and I will withdraw it, and withdraw it without any qualifications but I was surprised after we had been making progress, such good progress, that the minister should take this action, very much surprised.

Now, we have all day tomorrow, we have Saturday, and we have next week, and every night next week. I don't know what the hurry is, why we would want to change this rule tonight, I think there is going to be lots of time, and I know if we have to stay, well, I guess we have to stay, and certainly we can stay, but I don't like it, and I think this is taking an advantage of the rules because by no stretch of the imagination can anybody call the reason urgent for this motion. As has already been mentioned.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Will the hon. minister sit down. I have the floor.

Mr. Steuart: — I was just going to say I will withdraw the motion. I did not realize it was going to upset you so badly. I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Well, if the minister wants to withdraw the motion, if he wants to rise on a point of privilege.

Mr. Steuart: — If I have permission, I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has asked leave to withdraw the motion, is leave given? Motion withdrawn.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart for second reading of **Bill no. 42, An Act to amend The Hospitals Standard Act.**

Mr. Walter Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I guess it is about the same time that I rose last night . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Keep laughing for awhile and ten o'clock will come.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I have to make will, I hope, have some influence on the members opposite particularly. When ten o'clock rolled around last night, I said that I was inclined to agree with the hon. member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) that co-operation cannot be legislated but that legislative action to prevent discrimination is appropriate and is necessary. Even if the anti-discrimination law is not used at times, it is,

April 14, 1965

however, an important deterrent and indeed a law providing for the right of appeal whenever discrimination occurs or is suspected. It is the very heart of democracy. Without the right of appeal, justice cannot prevail. Surely no one here, I would hope, would dare to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should eliminate our Bill of Rights, even though it was not used, or rather, court action has not been undertaken under this particular law except for once in the last eighteen years.

Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned last night, I said that my remarks on Bill 42 will be divided into three main categories, one — the extent of monopoly in the field of medicine generally, the extent of control at the local level, right down to the small community level, and the relationship of these two items to the third item, why it is necessary to keep hospital appeal board legislation on the statute books of the province.

Mr. Speaker: — It being 10 o'clock p.m. the house stands adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.