

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature
14th Day

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Debate on Address-In-Reply

The House resumed, from Monday February 27, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Brown (Last Mountain) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I will dispense with the preliminaries of this speech, and just say that I think there have been some very fine political speeches given in this debate. One would almost think we were in the final days of an election campaign. I doubt whether many have made friends or influenced the people, but possibly what I have to say won't change the situation any either.

I sometimes like to reminisce and go back to when I came to this country as a youth, with no economic or political experience, and then later on when I became a young married man, raising a family, and buying a home, and trying to make a pay cheque stretch, which didn't seem to go half far enough in those days; but if I was in difficulty then there were hundreds around me who were in far more desperate straits than I was. And it appeared to be very confusing in those days. There wasn't a great deal of political choice; in fact there wasn't any choice. I would listen to the Liberal party and think, possibly, that they had some solution and support then, and in the next election I would get rid of them and support the Conservative party, but it didn't seem to matter whether I voted for Tweedledee or Tweedledum, the final result was just about the same – not much improvement for the people around me.

Then I saw the great upsurge of political and economic thinking during the hungry 'thirties' when people had many leisure hours to read, and they did read much on economics. They were able to think and discuss and study with their neighbours, the problems of that day and how they got in that position. I am rather inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that much of the vote during the 1944 election was not just a mere negative, not a mere vote to get rid of the Liberal government which had sat here and done nothing for a while; but much of it was a vote to elect a government which would give leadership to the people for a better way of life than they had experienced in the past.

We might ask ourselves, "has that position been bettered?" Of course, we on the government side definitely would say "yes", and I am sure the members on the other side would say "no". That doesn't prove a great deal. The final opinion will be left with the people, and on two

occasions the people have given their decision, and there isn't any doubt in my mind as to what the decision will be when they are asked for it on the third occasion.

I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition don't go to different places to get their public opinion than I do, because I meet all kinds of people. I meet people who are critical of this Government, but they do admit that this is the best government that Saskatchewan has ever had, and they are long and loud in their praise of our Leader, the Premier of this Province. They frankly admit that it would be a bad day for the people in this Province if we should lose such an able Leader, and a spokesman for our people.

I don't believe that the Opposition have advanced a great deal in their economic thinking, and I wonder if the people of this Province will take too kindly to the statement of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) when he refers to the Commission set up on Rural Life as "rubberstamps to a government policy". I am sure that this Commission, who have been all over this province, meeting people, coming in contact with people, have got the respect of the people, and I am quite sure that they will not take too kindly to that remark of the Leader of the Opposition. And, I say I doubt very much if they have advanced in their economic thinking when they make the statement that "this Government has done absolutely nothing to solve the farmers' problems, but blare at Ottawa and protest to the Federal Government". I say that, because I don't think they realize where the jurisdiction of a provincial government should assist the agricultural industry in every way possible; to assist it in the raising of better crops and to better land conservation, and so on. I believe that our Department of Agriculture are doing a good job along these lines wherever it is possible to do so and wherever the farmers will request that kind of co-operation.

We, too, as a provincial government must give services to our rural people, and I will say something about that later. They must give educational, medical, social aid and some assistance in market roads. But the main problems, the basic problems which affect the farmers are problems which the Provincial Government have not jurisdiction over. I refer to markets, a very serious matter for an agricultural industry. We have no jurisdiction over the markets, and we have protested to the Federal Government that they are not carrying on a vigorous enough salesmanship to get rid of our agricultural products. We have made suggestions to Ottawa as to how they might get rid of some of the surplus products of our farms. We have no jurisdiction over the price that the farmer will get for his produce, and definitely we have no jurisdiction over the price that he will pay for the things that he must have to produce his crops, and that is widening and widening – the price that the farmer will receive and the price that he will pay for his production costs. And it reflects, Mr. Speaker, down to the business man and down to the labourer. As the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) yesterday pointed out, our decrease in unemployment is not as good as the average picture across Canada, and for that very reason, because of the loss of income to our agricultural industry.

Now I would like to say, perhaps, just a few things of what I think we have done for the people of this province. I think all of us were impressed by the number of celebrations held during the Jubilee Year. We were impressed, and I think the Committee was certainly impressed, by the extraordinary number of communities which held celebrations. They held celebrations of the kind unique to their particular district. People gathered together to pay homage to their pioneers, to review the history of that district, and to give thanks to God for his blessings over the last 50 years. And there seemed to be a spirit prevailing there, Mr. Speaker; a spirit of pride that this was their home, this was where they were content to be. You could almost see them pick up the torch laid down by the pioneers to go on to greater things, to build a better place than they already had at their disposal.

I am impressed when I drive around the prairie at night to see lights dotted all over this prairie, farm yards lighted up, homes and barns, people enjoying electric power. I am impressed when I go into communities, large and small, to see the business sections well lighted, in some cases they have neon lights; the residential districts all lit up, and very often one will find the most modern stores in these small communities, and stores; the kind of store that one would expect to find in the larger urban centres.

I can't help thinking, when I hear the people on the other side talking about power, that they know no more about power today than when they sat as a government on this side. It appears that when they talk about giving free power to farmers, they haven't done too much studying. To them it is just a matter of putting up poles and stringing wires, and I would like them, when they visit Saskatoon, to take a trip through the power plant. I believe I am correct in saying that that is the largest generating plant in the province. I have watched that plant grow from a moderate plant to a very imposing plant today. At the present time, the last extension is going onto that plant. It is worth anybody's while to go through there to see the extent, the investment and the work that is put into a generating plant, and I was amazed to see a press statement on Saturday. I had to read it two or three times, I am a mechanic, and have seen many boilers in my time, but I was certainly impressed when I read it, and I had to read it several times to make sure that I read it correctly. There was an item there for \$1 ½ million for a boiler, an order that the General Manager of the Corporation gave to some firm in Eastern Canada of \$1 ½ million for one boiler to go into the new \$40 million generating plant, which will go up about one mile south of the present plant in Saskatoon. That will give you an idea of the work that goes in a power system, and, as I say, I don't think the members on the other side have any idea of what this system has meant to the people of this Province. Certainly it wasn't a service that they ever intended, I don't believe, to provide to the farmers.

I don't think I need to say too much about education facilities, I think our Minister covered that pretty well in his debate. I want only to say that certainly we can be proud of some of the many composite schools that have been built, providing technical schooling for our children. True, they are costing money; but will we deny our children those privileges in this day and age?

I hardly need to say anything about health. One can hardly get any argument today on the health services provided by our people in this province. Our old-age pensioners don't have to worry about having to go to the municipality or rely on the generosity of their relatives or friends, should they become ill in their old age.

I would like to say one thing, and I might say that I was rather amazed, the other night, when the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) was talking about crowded conditions in the mental institutions. Of all the members on that side that ought to talk about it, had one of the younger members done so, I would not have been so amazed because, perhaps, they don't know all the facts. But I remember in 1944 going to Weyburn with a group of members on this side of the House and one was a lady member from Maple Creek, Mrs. Trew, the only lady member that we had at that time. If it was an ordeal for the men members, then I certainly think it must have been for the lady who came along with us. It was just a terrible sight: overcrowding, and overcrowding of the type of mental patient that became unruly outside and was detained in that – I don't want to call it a prison, I will say a detention home. There were plenty of others outside, Mr. Speaker, who were kept in the back, away from other people, because of the shame that it might bring upon their family. We have gone a long way since that day. We have today in our mental institutions a trained staff which is second to none in any province in Canada, and they are anxious to do a job, and long with the Canadian Mental Health Association with their vigorous educational campaign, they have done a lot to bring up the status of mental health to the same level of any physical disease or complaint. It seems to me that it is nothing short of criminal, that our Federal Government has not progressed to the point from where they will put mental health on the same basis as any other physical sickness or disease, and I refer to the fact that they have not included mental health in an all-embracing national health programme. They have not considered mental illness, and they have also excluded T.B. under their national health programme, and I would think that if we had our friends from the other side over here as a government, it would be a sorry day for our people who might become mentally ill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other Department that I would like to say a few words about and that is a service that, in my opinion, has done a very valuable service to our people in the out-laying districts, I refer to the Air Ambulance. Surely the people in our distant parts of this province must feel a certain amount of security in knowing that they are almost as close to a hospital as any person living within a few blocks of that hospital. I might say that this wonderful service has just completed 10 years of service. It has increased its aircraft from one to five, and in that time of 10 years it has travelled approximately 2 ½ million miles, or the equivalent to 90 times around the world, in their work of mercy, and I would like to end up by quoting from an editorial in the 'Star Phoenix'. We often receive praise by our paper in Saskatoon, who are not quite so prejudiced as the 'rag' here in Regina. It went on to say: "The present personnel numbering 17, their predecessors in the service, and the Saskatchewan Government which inaugurated the service, all deserve the commendation of the people of this province". I think, Mr. Speaker, that they have done a wonderful job in providing that service to the people of the rural districts.

I was rather interested in the remarks of the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) the other day, talking about “we won’t get industry in this province, because we don’t believe in profits”. Then he went on to say something about wage controls, and I wonder if he ever remembers that, during the War, the Federal Government did adopt some kind of a controlled economy. It was, I think, fairly good. Industry did all right; industry, of course, wasn’t satisfied. Wages were pegged to the cost-of-living index. There wasn’t too much complaint, but everyone including those on small pensions, old-age pensioners and those getting small pensions and no income, could get their share of the necessities of life. Industry complained and price controls were lifted, and, naturally, the fight was on – ‘the survival of the fittest’. It is a pretty pitiful situation today that our old-age pensioners, those on small pensions and those of low income find themselves in, and our farmers today are getting in that position also. The only ones, apparently outside of the professional group, who have been able at least to hold their own, are those who are in organized labour and have just been able to slug it out with the power of their organizations to maintain a half decent standard of living. The member for Rosthern said “we would not have any industries here, but we don’t believe in profits”. I say if we follow that argument through, then we should have had all kinds of industry here when the Liberal government sat here in government before us.

This was certainly a very fertile field, they could have made all the profits they wanted, and they could have exploited labour to their heart’s content, because there was very little labour legislation. In fact, outside of an attempt at a Minimum Wage and Industrial Standards Act, and a Compensation Act which was brought down by the Anderson government and held out by the Liberal government as a bait (and nobody bit) in 1929, outside of those two pieces of legislation there was nothing, absolutely nothing, to prevent industry from coming in here and doing as they pleased, when the Liberal government were on this side of the House.

I would like at this time just to pay tribute to one service at least, of the Labour Department. I refer to the Compensation Board. It has been my privilege and, I suppose, as a member of the Legislature, to have considerable dealings with this Board. I usually get the tough cases; when everybody has kicked them around and can’t get anywhere, then I usually come into the picture. But I have got to say that I have to give this Board credit for bending backwards just as far as it is possible to go to give the injured worked every break possible. I have found that their decisions are really true and fair, and I have every respect for the work that they are carrying on in that Board.

I would like to say a little bit about my own constituency. We are, carrying on from the Jubilee spirit, about to erect some homes for our old-aged people. I think it was a splendid community effort to have fraternal organizations, yes, even the Teachers’ Federation, also the aid of the city municipality and the provincial government, but above all the community itself coming in and subscribing so that we may provide better housing accommodation for those people who have given such wonderful work to us in the past.

I notice that there is some sort of ‘schemozzle’ going on here in Regina over natural gas. Of course, we had a sort of schemozzle in Saskatoon, too. However, ours was spearheaded by the mayor at that time, who commanded a great deal more recognition than the small fry here in Regina is commanding. This carried on, of course, for a considerable time, mostly

political, until the people of Saskatoon thought it was time that these people had had their fun, that they wanted natural gas and they had better get down and bring it into Saskatoon, Natural gas, of course, had been kicked around in Saskatoon for some 25 or 30 years. First, we had it and then we didn't have it, and finally I think the people got good and fed up. I have come in contact with many people who are enjoying this good, clean, cheap fuel, and I have had very few complaints. As to the costs, certainly the kind of fuel is appreciated by those people in Saskatoon. I am sure, of course, Mr. Minister, any time you want to lower the cost, the householder will appreciate that too; but we do appreciate what the Power Corporation, or the Gas Corporation, are trying to do. I think we have a fair-minded group of people in Saskatoon, who would like to see others also enjoy the benefits of natural gas.

I want to say a little about the University Hospital, and I believe that that is a memorial to the people of Saskatchewan. Not only is it a fine structure, but it is also giving a very wonderful service. It has a wonderful trained staff. I often visit in that institution. I have visited several times, and it just seems to me that about all the patients want to talk about is the service that they are getting in that institution, and I get very little time to discuss their problems or how they are getting along. I hope that if I am unfortunate enough ever to want hospital attention, that I pick a doctor who is not so prejudiced as not to want to send me to the University Hospital.

I want to say that we also have a nice, new Telephone Exchange just about completed in Saskatoon, which should take care of our needs for some considerable time. Saskatoon is progressing; we are building now many miles of pavement. Traffic, of course, is increasing in our urban centres. We can no longer live in the horse-and-buggy days, and we have to keep up with the times. It is natural, of course, that this is expensive. People want services, but when they have to pay for those services, it isn't quite so good. I remember the member for Arm River (I think it was) the other night mentioned that one of our budgets is three times one of a Liberal government when they were in power. Well, that is right in the matter of dollars, Mr. Speaker; but dollar value today is a long way off the value of the dollar in 1943. I wonder where he has been lately. Does he ever spend any money, or does he ever ask some of the housewives just how much they do get if they were go into a grocery store with a five-dollar bill? Costs have gone up, taxes have gone up. I believe my taxes have not just doubled, from 1939; but if I take the value of a dollar, I don't think I am being taxed too far out of line at the present time.

A lot has been done in Saskatoon in the last couple of years. We in the urban centres, of course, are noticing it particularly, because of the influx of population into the urban centres from the rural districts. We are having to build more and more schools, and you can't buy school today for peanuts. We like to build nice schools. We pride ourselves on the schools that we have in Saskatoon, and we are maintaining that type of institution.

I see that my time is just about up. I am, of course, sharing my time with the Opposition, and I don't want them to cry that I have stolen a half-minute of their time. They haven't much else of a case to put up, and apparently they are appealing to the people on sentiment. So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I take great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that my remarks this afternoon are not going to be controversial; they are going to be more educational for my hon. friends on the other side. Before I go into the matter, however, I would like to refer to the unique situation; or at least, the happenings, of yesterday.

We witnessed the hon. Minister (Hon. Mr. Bentley) agreeing with the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) to the extent that there were secret Communist sympathizers within the civil service, and they were in high places. Then he went on criticizing him, calling him to task that he should go and tell anybody about it, and that was the most unique act I have ever witnessed here in this House, and he spent about half an hour doing it.

Then he went to work and spent about 15 minutes going after Ross Thatcher for having done them the dirty trick of resigning from the party, and alluding to the same reason as the member from Maple Creek had referred to. I want to say here, it is my opinion and I think it is the opinion of many people throughout Saskatchewan, that Ross Thatcher has done a great service to the people of Canada. We had been with this party for 10 years; he could be a member of Parliament as long as there is a C.C.F. party in Saskatchewan, with practically no expense to himself to get elected. Now he gave up all that. He sacrificed this unique position that he held in order to let the people know just what was going on within the inner circles of the C.C.F. party. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that many people owe gratitude to Ross Thatcher (a man whom I have never met) for the courage and for the satisfaction that he has conveyed to those thousands who have left the C.C.F. party since they first came into power, and the encouragement to the thousands that are on the fence today — there are a good many thousands of them not voting for the C.C.F., next election, let me assure you that.

Now, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to one remark that the hon. Minister made. He said that “it was all humbug that there was a split in the C.C.F. party.” I just want to refer him to a report. . .

Hon. Mr. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I never mentioned that word ‘humbug’.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, you have got another better word?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — The hon. member ought to know; he is using it.

Mr. Danielson: — I’m sure that is what you did.

Mr. Loptson: — Well anyway, I can assure the hon. Minister, that it is quite true that there is a split in the C.C.F. party, in Moose Jaw at least. And I am referring to. . .

Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — It is nothing to what there is in yours.

Mr. Loptson: — . . .in the latter part of the year, on December 23, 1955 — that is only last fall, when it said: “Several of the former executive members who supported Dempster Heming in the provincial field and Ross

Thatcher in the federal field have now formed a separate organization known as the 'Commonwealth Club', and have set up an executive and board of directors." Well now, I would say that looks as if there isn't much unity in Moose Jaw. There is another part of the same article:

"The formation of the 'Commonwealth Club' would serve to confirm this belief that Mr. Heming will not consent to such an arrangement and will stand independently, disregarding the official C.C.F. party in Moose Jaw."

That makes it appear that Mr. Heming is in this thing, too.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend what he is quoting from, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Loptson: — I am quoting from the Moose Jaw 'Times', December 23, 1955.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — A good Liberal paper.

Mr. Loptson: — Now then, having said that. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Probably copied from 'The Leader-Post'.

Mr. Loptson: — . . .we had another unique performance in this House, last night, which would indicate to all parties that Saskatchewan is quite a paradise for promoters.

Some Govt Members: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — At least the House passed a Bill, at the request of the Provincial Treasurer. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I submit that it is entirely out of order for a member to allude to debates and motions passed in this House, in the course of this debate.

Mr. Danielson: — . . .not out of order at all.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, he was the sponsor of it; who else could I have referred to it?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite right. Under the rules of the House, you may discuss any debate which has taken place in previous sessions. . .

Mr. Loptson: — Well, he is taking up these few minutes. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — . . .I know all about it; I am going on anyway.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — But, Mr. Speaker, I am asking you for a ruling. The hon. member. . .

February 28, 1956

Mr. Loptson: — There is no ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It is out of order.

Premier Douglas: — I ask you for a ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not that particular debate can be continued.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, anyway, to guarantee the loan. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — . . .to a cement company. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. . .

Mr. Loptson: — . . .for building. . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am asking Your Honour for a ruling as to whether or not this. . .

Mr. Loptson: — He said it was out of order and I have accepted that it is out of order. . .

Mr. Speaker: — I gave a ruling that it was out of order.

Mr. Loptson: — But I can discuss this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — I must ask the hon. member, if he accepts the point of order, that he must not continue along that line.

Mr. Loptson: — Along what line? Are you referring to the. . .

Mr. Speaker: — This Bill is something that has already been debated and disposed of as far as this House is concerned.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, can't I refer to something that has passed in this House?

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Of course not.

Premier Douglas: — No, not unless you go against the rules of the House, and you. . .

Mr. Danielson: — It has been done all the time.

Mr. Loptson: — It has always been done — that is a new ruling. You are ashamed to have it said, that is why you don't want it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — But I'm not going to speak of it any further.

The next thing I want to refer to in this House is a thing that has been referred to often by members of the Government and that is to the effect that the Liberals have never done anything for Saskatchewan . . .

Some Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — . . .and that they have done nothing for Canada.

Mr. Danielson: — Except for your Jubilee!

Mr. Loptson: — Now I'm going to refresh their memories with some of the things that have been done in the past by Liberal governments, not only in Saskatchewan, but also in Canada. They are not my words, Mr. Speaker. They are taken from the official records, and that proof is obtainable by anyone who wants to know the truth.

First I am going to tell what the Federal Government has done – only some of what they have done. In the first place, I want to refer to the Act of 1897, the effects of which every farmer is enjoying, today, and that is the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement, whereby every bushel of grain delivered to the terminals at Fort William (later on it was added so that it could go to Vancouver or Victoria) for a set freight rate. I know my hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) doesn't agree with that; he is one of those who has been wanting that broken and the rate increased. But that is still in effect, since 1897.

In 1898, the Federal Government gave aid to co-operators in these western prairies (which was then called the North West Territories).

In 1927, a Liberal government brought in the Old-Age Pension and Saskatchewan adopted it the next year.

In 1927, the Farmers' Credit Arrangement Act, reducing some \$54 million debt of Saskatchewan farmers. In addition to that there were other large reductions made, which I will refer to later.

In 1935, the P.F.R.A. expenditures in Saskatchewan amounted to some \$48 million.

In 1937, an Act aiding education, to 1954-55 grants, went up to a total of some \$198,000 paid in Saskatchewan.

In 1937, again, blind pensions allowances, now paying \$300,000 a year to the province of Saskatchewan.

In 1938, P.F.A.A., and they have paid \$128 million in Saskatchewan, which is \$78 million more than collected from the one per cent levy in Saskatchewan.

In 1941, unemployment insurance, where the Government contributed one-third of the fund for Saskatchewan.

In 1944, Farm Improvement Loans, where farmers in Saskatchewan have borrowed about \$200,000,000, making it possible for a farmer to borrow up to \$4,000 to improve his farm surroundings, buy implements, buy furniture, repair his house, and some have borrowed to pay this Government for electrification for his home.

February 28, 1956

Then, in 1935, the Family Allowance was adopted and no less than \$20 million a year is paid to the people of Saskatchewan by the Federal Government.

In 1947. . .

Mr. Gibson (Morse): — They were paying the people back.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — In 1947, subsidy and payments under the Tax Rental Agreement, now about \$28 million a year is paid to this Government, without any strings to it at all, and without which they would collapse at the rate they are spending money.

In 1948, National Health Grant, now about \$2 ½ million a year is paid into Saskatchewan. Oh yes, they try to make people believe that they are paying all the health grants, but yet there is this \$2 ½ million coming from the Federal Government.

And in 1953, Disabled Persons' Allowance Act was set up; and we should never forget that, in 1945, the best veterans charter in the world was established by the Federal Government, which is the envy of every nation in the world.

Mr. Danielson: — Under a Liberal government.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, by a Liberal government. Now these are some of the things that Liberal governments have done for Canada and done for the province of Saskatchewan during the years since they came into power, or have been in power, in Ottawa.

Now I will turn to Saskatchewan, and of course that dates back to the origin of the province; 1906 was about the first year an Act was put on the Statute Books. The first thing they did, when they got into power in 1905, was to establish a Department of Agriculture. That year they set up a livestock branch, a field service branch, dairy branch and the agricultural representative service. In 1920, co-operatives and marketing branch, and the Lands Branch were established, under a Liberal government. A Natural Resources branch; extensive drainage work was done as far back as 1909, and my hon. friends think that they have the first drainage problem there ever was in Saskatchewan. We had a drainage problem as far back as 1909, and there was no squealing about it either. We went about fixing it up ourselves, with a little aid from the Government. Co-operative seed cleaning plants in Moose Jaw, with fees less than half of what they are now. Grants and assistance to agricultural societies, horticultural societies and boys' and girls' clubs, and that was established as far back as 1908.

In 1917 the Farm Loan Board, which has been discontinued by this Government, gave aid to farmers who were being pressed pretty hard by the mortgage companies because they were charging as high as 10 per cent interest in some instances; and the Farm Loan Board reduced the interest to 7 per cent, because they loaned money for 6 ½ per cent.

Then we come to the Health Department. The Liberal government of Saskatchewan, in 1911, built mental hospitals. I don't think there have been any additions made to those hospitals since. They built the T.B. sanatoriums; started infantile paralysis clinics, provided for diagnosis and treatment of venereal diseases. In 1945, they provided free diagnosis and medical care, surgical and hospital care for cancer patients. . .

Some Govt Member: — You were out of office before then.

Mr. Loptson: — After the C.C.F. came into power they cancelled that diagnosis clause. The Liberal government provided outpost hospital and nursing centres in northern areas. They provided free hospital, medical, dental, optical and drug services for people in necessitous circumstances; provided an extensive disease preventive campaign, including free vaccine and services; established a public nursing system and baby care centres. That is what the Liberals did.

Under Liberal administration virtually our whole system of hospitals was established – Blue Cross plans were established. Prepaid hospital, medical, surgical care was provided for municipal governments, in 1944. One hundred and six rural municipalities had prepaid hospitals; 105 rural municipalities had prepaid medicals; 29 towns and villages with prepaid hospitals; and 71 towns and villages had prepaid medical.

In Education, the Liberal government of Saskatchewan built the University buildings; they built the Normal Schools; they built the school for the deaf, provided for the education of the deaf and the blind; and, in 1908, provided free public schools.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and yet these people go running around the country saying the Liberal government never did anything.

In 1942, we started the plan of financial assistance to students of universities, normal schools and nurses' training schools. We started equalization grants. In 1940, we passed enabling legislation for Larger School Units. In 1942 we passed the present Teachers' Superannuation Act, and restored the contributions which had been used up.

Under Liberal legislation and assistance the whole university, high schools, vocational schools and public school system was established; audio-visual branch established; book bureau in operation, and correspondence schools were put in operation.

In the Social Welfare Branch, the Liberal government of Saskatchewan started, in 1927, the old-age pensions. In 1937, the Blind Persons' allowances; in 1943, supplementary pensions; in 1927, Mothers' Allowances and maternity grants; provided legislation to establish and finance children's welfare institutions; passed legislation provided for care for neglected and dependent children; care of unmarried mothers; corrective care for juvenile delinquents; adoption of children. They provided hundreds of millions of dollars for relief and social aid, law enforcement and goals; they provided industrial schools for boys where they could get institutional and correctional care.

Now, with the respect to this relief item. I would just like to give the House an item from a speech that was made in this House, in 1938. We would never have found it if it hadn't been for my hon. friend, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who never misses anything. He gave me this clipping of a speech that had been made to illustrate the magnitude of the relief that the Government provided for fodder and feed and seed alone, from the fall of 1937 until the 5th of March, 1938. I am just going to read this to the House. It says:

“Up to the 5th of March, 1938, the Department of Agriculture has shipped into this province, directly or indirectly through free freight certificates about 450,000 tons of fodder. That represented approximately 5,100 miles of bales lying end to end, or a string of bales from Halifax to Vancouver, and almost back again. It would build a stack from Winnipeg, Manitoba, to Swift Current, Saskatchewan, two bales wide and 7 ½ feet high. It has taken 4,500,000 lbs. of baling wire, or 100 carload of 45,000 lbs to a car. The baling represented 28,125 8-hour day working days, with a crew of six men and a power baler. Or in other words, it would take 225 power balers and 1,350 men working every day (working day) from this first of October to the 5th of March to bale this fodder.

“To haul this by horse team and men, averaging a haul of approximately five miles, it would take 1,100 from the 1st of October to the 5th of March in order to get this amount of fodder. During this period it was necessary to load, on track, 360 carloads every working day from the 1st of October to the 5th of March. Seven hundred and thirty-nine shippers have taken part in providing this fodder; 1,125 points have received shipments. In addition to this there have been approximately 5,000 cars of feed grain shipped in.”

And yet, Mr. Speaker, these men think they have something to do when a few farmers are short of feed, and they think they are doing wonders if they pay freight on 100 or 200 cars. It would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, for my hon. friends just to read this, because it is taken right from the records of the Department of Agriculture at that time.

Furthermore, the number farmers receiving assistance was 80,000 – 80,000 farmers in the province of Saskatchewan were served with fodder. Seed wheat supplied amounted to \$7,000,000. Seed oats supplied amounted to \$8,000,000. Seed barley supplied \$1,000,000. Feed oats supplied \$6,000,000 – total \$17,000,000.

Tractor fuel supplied was \$1,750,000, distributed into 1,500 shipping points. Feed grain, gas and oil, summerfallow, amounted to \$700,000 – total \$19,450,000.

Mr. Gibson (Morse): — May I ask the hon. member a question? Who finally paid for all of that?

Mr. Loptson: — Most of it was cancelled.

Mr. Gibson: — By whom?

Mr. Loptson: — By the Federal Government, and by the municipalities, too, because the municipalities. . .

Mr. Danielson: — This Government didn't cancel anything.

Mr. Loptson: — They never cancelled anything.

Now the, I will go on. We come now to highways, roads and bridges. During this period the Liberal government built 8,000 miles of provincial highways. They built 970 miles of secondary highways. . .

Mr. Danielson: — Do you hear that?

Mr. Loptson: — They built and maintained practically all timber bridges on municipal roads. They assisted municipalities in building municipal roads. They built, or assisted in building all the bridges across the north and south Saskatchewan rivers.

In the matter of Co-operatives, we passed virtually all the legislation that is now on the Statute Books for the establishment and promotion of co-operative enterprises. We established a Co-operative branch of the government, loaned money to a number of co-operative organizations and assisted in the establishment of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company to the extent of 85 per cent, in 1911, and the Wheat Pool organization, in 1923. Nearly all existing co-operative organizations were established under Liberal governments, carefully avoiding making any political use of co-operatives. I don't know whether that exists, today.

Then a Municipal Affairs Department was established in 1908, with all its branches. The province was organized into rural municipalities and local improvement districts. A northern area branch was established and all agricultural land re-assessed.

In Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker, more lumber, fish and fur was being produced than is being produced today. Numerous sawmills, which are not now operating, were set up. Conservation programmes for lumber, fish and fur were established. All the metal mines which are now in production, except uranium, were started under Liberal governments.

Roads in the northern areas were built. Extensive sodium sulphate production was started under a Liberal government. Extensive exploration for gas and oil, most of which was discontinued when the C.C.F. came into power, . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You chased them out.

February 28, 1956

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, you chased them out. Large quantities of coal were in production. Six hundred fur farmers operated under a Liberal government. A Game Branch was set up, a Survey Branch was set up, a Parks Branch, a Provincial Natural History Museum, which collected nearly all the material now in our possession – only they didn't have a million dollar building to put it in.

Premier Douglas: — They didn't have any buildings; it was in storage.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Brockelbank got that.

Mr. Loptson: — Labour: in 1913 there was established a Labour Branch of the government; started Workmen's Compensation; provided minimum wages; provided apprenticeship training; passed the Trade Union Act. In 1909, they passed legislation preventing the employment of young people in dangerous occupations; provided for the protection of female employees; provided for one day rest in seven; provided for weekly half-holidays, and the Industrial Standards Act also was passed.

Then in the matter of utilities, Liberals established the Power Commission in 1928, and the Telephone Company in 1908, to provide service at cost, and not for profit, as my hon. friends are trying to do. Liberals provided legislation for the rural telephone companies. An Attorney General's Department was set up. The whole judicial system as it now operates was established. R.C.M.P. established a provincial police force. The whole system of registration of land titles was established under a Liberal government.

We come to the Public Works. In 1906, virtually all our public buildings were built with the exception of the Museum and a huge addition of buildings purchased and constructed to house the C.C.F. party workers, mostly additional workers, who have been given jobs in the civil service. The Legislative Buildings were built by a Liberal government; the Revenue building was built by a Liberal government; the Court House; Land Titles Offices, goals; normal schools, etc., and I think we went through that before.

Mr. Danielson: — Liquor stores?

Mr. Loptson: — No liquor stores were built by a Liberal government. Debt cancellation and adjustments – the Liberal government provided for the cancellation of some \$206 million of farm and individual and relief debts. They provided all the legislation now on the Statute Books for the protection of the debtor; any addition made by the C.C.F. government has been declared ultra vires. The Liberal government established the Local Government Board, and it did most of its good work during the depression, and I want to give them the credit and I believe that they are a worthy body for any government to have.

Administration of estates of the mentally incompetent was established by a Liberal government. Despite what was said over the air here by the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer), this administration Act

was passed in 1921, and this Government has not changed a word in the Act since.

Expenditures – expenditure of the Liberal government – gross revenue – averaged, for the first 10 years, \$3 ½ million; the second 10 years, \$10 million; and the last 10 years, only \$23 ½ million. The expenditure on revenue account for this year, as my hon. friends know, Mr. Speaker, is about \$90 million. Under a Liberal government, at no time did the overall expenditure including both revenue and capital exceed \$30 million. This year the total amounts to about \$160 million. One wonders how the Liberals could possibly do as much with so little, and how this C.C.F. Government can do so little with so much.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — I think that is a fair question.

Mr. Danielson: — The C.C.F. Let them answer it.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, now, one might say, “Well, who is the Liberal party? Who are they?”

Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Who were they?

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I want to say that the Liberal Party is an association of men and women of all walks of life, who believe in the philosophy and the ideals of the rights of the individual, . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — Of doing the most for himself. . .

Mr. Gibson: — That is what the Social Credit say. . .

Mr. Loptson: — . . .as long as he doesn't interfere with his neighbour doing the same thing. We believe that a man should make the best of his talent and that he should profit by it, and if he is fortunate enough to make a little more than maybe the average, Liberals believe that he should share with his unfortunate brothers, and to this end they tax part of his income, they tax profits on corporations. We have often heard the C.C.F. going around the country and saying that this is a capitalistic government – the Liberal party never taxes corporations. How would you like to be taxed \$52 out of every \$100 profit you make, Mr. Speaker? Yet that is what the Liberals were taking out of the corporations in 1952. They are even taking \$49 out of every \$100 that they make now over \$20,000 a year. On the small corporations they took 25 per cent of the first \$10,000; now they only take 25 per cent of the first \$20,000. That is the money that the Liberal government is now using to pay the old-age pension, the family allowance and the \$28 million that they are giving to this Government. That all comes out of taxes of that kind. No, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government is no friend, or should not be considered a friend, of the capitalist. They hardly ever hand them out a plum like the C.C.F. did here, last night.

February 28, 1956

Now, having said this, there is another matter that is talked of very much in the country, and that is this wheat situation. I want to say a few words on that. But first of all I want to say that there would be no wheat problem in western Canada if it wasn't for the C.C.F.

Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — I'm glad you're on the air!

Mr. Lopton: — There would be no problem. Let us check the records. Let us see what was the effect of the speech of the hon. Premier in 1953, on the market. We must remember that the Premier of Saskatchewan represents the majority of the western wheat farmers. He represents the farmers that grow more than half of all the wheat that is grown in western Canada; so when he speaks he is expected to speak with authority, and when he made speeches in the fall of 1953 about giving away our surplus wheat, what happened? In the year 1952-3, we had exported no less than 385 million bushels. In 1953-54, following my hon. friend's speeches it dropped down to 255 million. It didn't drop in the other countries; but it dropped here, in Saskatchewan, why? They were waiting for this five-away programme which the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan said would have to be adopted in order to get rid of all our surplus wheat.

Argentina was probably the first on the break the International Wheat Agreement ceiling. When they heard of the terrible conditions in Saskatchewan and Manitoba and Alberta, they went to work and under-sold; I think my words are correct. They were the first ones to start to unload their surplus, and they, that year, exported some 100 million bushels more than they had the year before. And the price continually dropped and dropped until Mr. Howe said "this has gone far enough" and he stopped it at \$1.70. And these fellows were still harping and yakking around the country, "Give the wheat away." And then they said, "Well, we will probably not altogether give it away, we'll take some sterling for it." Well, that kind of got stopped in the bud, because apparently the United Kingdom is not very fussy about buying wheat for sterling.

I want to put on record an article that appeared in 'The Free Press' on December 14, 1955, which alludes to this dealing in sterling. It states this:

"The people who say that Canada could and should 'sell' wheat for sterling fall into two classes. Some do not know what they are talking about and some do; the latter, that is, know they are talking nonsense. But it is convenient nonsense, and particularly convenient for some Saskatchewan Socialistics. It gives an impression that they have a simple, government-dealing, non-capitalist answer to our wheat troubles, when, in fact, they have no answer at all.

"For this reason, the myth that 'sales' for sterling are possible and desirable no doubt will persist, in face of the most direct and simple evidence to the contrary. There are none so blind as those that do not want to see.

But one is entitled to hope that the Saskatchewan myth-mongers will in time gain fewer dupes; that their allies of the other class, the ill-informed will shrink.

“Two weeks ago, on November 30, Mr. Gordon Bowen spoke to the convention of the Saskatchewan Farmers’ Union. He said that Britain would not buy a bushel more wheat if Canada accepted payment in sterling. Mr. Bowen is the United Kingdom’s senior trade commissioner in Canada; if anyone ought to know the official British policy in this matter, it is he. And his pronouncement surely is a concrete enough, and sufficiently simple, to penetrate any head.”

Evidently it doesn’t penetrate the head of the Premier of Saskatchewan:

“Even those who profess not to be able to understand the most definite and simple statements of the case, made many times by Mr. Howe and other Canadians, may pay some attention to the official word of Britain as the buying country.

“There is one direct untruth that may, however, have to be disposed of first. It is sometimes said, by advocates of Canadian ‘sales’ for sterling, that the United States now makes such sales. It does not.

“The United States takes inconvertible foreign currencies from all kinds of countries whose currencies play no great part in international trade; whose governments, therefore, do not mind having such claims on them blocked in the hands of other governments; and which have no objection to living on charity.

“The United Kingdom, for all its economic weakness, is not that sort of country, and sterling is not an unimportant currency. Sterling that is not blocked – sterling that can be used at all – is the same thing as dollars to Britain, and to everyone else. To take payment in such sterling would be no different at all from what we do now. Blocked sterling, on the other hand, is useless to Canada – it means simply giving wheat away – and to the United Kingdom the exchange of blocked sterling for wheat would represent a further weakening in the status of sterling as an international currency. The Canadian advocates of sterling sales are apt to pose as friends of Britain, even though it be at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer. In fact, they are not anything of the kind. They are doing nothing at all but peddle a convenient political myth.”

Put that in your pipe and smoke it!

Premier Douglas: — May I ask the hon. member what he is quoting from?

Mr. Loptson: — ‘The Free Press’. I think this article is very sound and sensible, and I can quote many other references if you want me to, from other journals, too. But I think the time is getting on. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Oh, keep on, you’re digging deeper.

Mr. Loptson: — In order to prove my argument that this speech of the Premier – in other words, he’s talking about something he doesn’t know anything about – has cost the farmer of Saskatchewan a lot of money. Mr. Howe states here in his speech:

“The situation was aggravated by various propaganda originating in Canada. When he heard Opposition members use extreme language to describe the wheat situation, Mr. Howe was wondering what that speech was going to cost the producer in western Canada.”

Everytime we would get results from the Board of Trade in various areas, we would say to ourselves, ‘That postpones buying orders’, and that is why we haven’t been getting buying order; and, as Mr. Howe says, since my hon. friend took on that sales programme of giving things away (that is the only way he knows of disposing of a surplus), orders from importing countries have been slow coming in. Mr. Howe stated that it was not until the 1st of November, this fall, when the importing countries saw that Canada was going to stick tight to its price levels, that they started to come in with orders, and that has relieved the situation now. I realize that we have a surplus, and it might be of interest to you to know just where this surplus is. The way the C.C.F. is going around would indicate that it is fairly well distributed.

I have here a survey of Saskatchewan; as a matter of fact, I have a survey of the four western provinces, which is quite interesting. It isn’t far from what has been quoted by the Committee, or what we have heard in Committee, this last two sittings, with respect to the number of farmers. I find in this survey that about 17 per cent of the farmers of Saskatchewan are one-quarter section farmers. About 30 per cent are half-section farmers; 22 per cent are three-quarter section farmers. That gives you about 70 per cent small farmers in the province of Saskatchewan, which leaves about 30 per cent of what you might class as large wheat producers. I have surveyed the eastern area east of Regina and north into the Kamsack district, and there are very few farmers in that area who have enough wheat worth-while to borrow on, or on which to obtain an advance. Many of those areas will have no wheat at all to deliver on another one or two-bushel quota. There is room in the elevators right now to take what quotas are open when the roads open up. We’re not going to blame the Minister of Highways for the roads not being open out in the country; but that is the situation so far as this area is concerned.

That means that 30 per cent of the farmers in Saskatchewan are holding about 70 per cent of the surplus wheat, and these men who are asking the Government to advance money on this wheat without interest, are proposing that these small farmers who have nothing to borrow on or sell, should pay their share of the interest of the loan to these big producers. The big producers are not looking for it; they don't want something for nothing. They are quite satisfied to have an opportunity to borrow on it if they need to; but the farmer that has nothing and is not mentioned at all, and we have thousands of farmers in Saskatchewan, who, as a result of last year's weather conditions, couldn't sow any wheat. They got their barley in too late and the aphids got it; and their oats got in so late that the heat wave in July got it. Nothing is said about these people. They must be well-to-do, because they have no grain to borrow on, according to the C.C.F. — at least that's the way I have it figured.

Mr. Danielson: — They never mention it.

Mr. Loptson: — No, they have never mentioned it. Now, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if any farmer is entitled to free-interest money, then it is the man who has no crop at all, rather than the man whose granaries are full.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — A little bit of both, Minty.

Mr. Loptson: — I have another interesting survey here. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, if it was possible, my hon. friends would leave politics out of the Wheat Board. There is nothing more damaging than to have politics mixed up into an industry of the country, when all the people depend upon that industry, and with which people of all political stripes are connected.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — When did you find that out?

Mr. Loptson: — I have said so here in the House before; but if it is going to be a political bout, then I would say that if the farmers of Saskatchewan have enough confidence in this Government to run the province of Saskatchewan, then they should have enough confidence in them to run their Wheat Board as well. And since they have so much 'brain' among themselves to give so much advice, and if the farmers think that advice is so good, and the people down at Ottawa, and the other people down in Ontario and Quebec cannot see the same way as they do, then I can't see any reason why they should not hand it back to this Government — and I think that is what they want. I think that is forecast by this gentleman who lives in Alberta. This is a report from this Albertan under the caption, 'Cash-Conscious Farmers Sell Good Wheat for Feed at 60 Cents'. I shall read it all:

“A sharp break in the price of wheat being sold by the farmers to operators of large livestock feedlots in southern Alberta is expected to become more widespread.

“In the price break, feedlot operators lowered their offering for No. 2 Northern wheat to 60 cents a bushel from the former level of 75 cents. Only a few weeks ago they offered 90 cents. (Wheat Board asking price for No. 2 is around \$1.70).

“Cause of the sharp decline: the general glut of grain in western Canada and the poor cash position of many farmers overwhelmed with surplus grain that they cannot market.

“At the 90 cents level, feedlot operators were swamped with delivers of high-grade wheat. Many bought enough grain to maintain feeding operations for two years.

“Disappointed over the 60 cent price, one large wheat grower who went into this winter with more than 150,000 bushels of wheat on his farm told the Post:

“I’ve just sold 10,000 bushels of No. 2 wheat at 60 cents a bushel, not because I need the cash, but rather because I don’t see any hope of selling all my grain to the Wheat Board within the next two years. And two years from now I may not be getting 50 cents a bushel for the wheat after storing it that much longer.”

“Meanwhile, a new appraisal was being given the situation by car dealers and other retailers who have been accepting wheat as payment. Most of these have been allowing farmers 75 cents a bushel.”

He is expecting that the C.C.F. Government by that time will have the Wheat Board, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that’s what the price will be under their policy and their advice. I am going to suggest a theory of my own that might be considered in dealing with the surplus which we have, and which is in the hands of these farmers who have had two crops in one for two years. They have an accumulated surplus that has got to be disposed of somehow above the present quota, and I would suggest that, instead of giving our wheat away, and advocating more acreage and more wheat, we should set some regulation as to who should produce the wheat, next year. I would suggest. . .

Mr. Wahl (Qu’Appelle-Wolseley): — That’s Communism.

Mr. Loptson: — I would suggest that the farmer who has 10,000 bushels in his granary over and above this year’s quota should not get a quota for 1957 wheat. He can afford to rest his land; he can grow flax; he can grow rape. I have grown both of these and they are good money-makers. Then. . .

Mr. E. Walker (Gravelbourg): — You’ve got a special connection, though.

Mr. Loptson: — Then I would suggest that in order to encourage some of these small farmers, and help these farmers who have been unfortunate these last two years, that we should give them a little more than the regular price for their wheat. I think it might well be considered, not only to help those

who have had two crop failures, but to help out what we call 'the family farm', that the first 1,000 bushels that were delivered to the Board should carry a price of \$2 a bushel each crop year.

That is merely a suggestion. I think that most of the members who know about small farms would realize that if you got \$2 a bushel, say, for the first 1,000 bushels of wheat, or the equivalent for other commercial grains, that the money would go a long ways to help in making your payments on your land. I am not encouraging the man who thinks he can live on half a section, and just grow wheat or grain; I think there is a problem there that we can consider in Committee very profitably. I agree with some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Rural Life; I think they have brought in a lot of good information; and they were not new to me – because I lived in that environment all my life. I have lived among farmers who have made their living on one-quarter sections. I lived in an area where most of the farmers have a half-section, and I lived in an area where a lot of them have three-quarter section farms; so I don't know who should know more than myself, since I have put in close to 50 years among them, and have farmed in those same areas myself.

Nobody can tell me that a man needs to starve on a quarter-section of land. Nor is anybody going to tell me that a man is going to get rich on a half-section of land; now can we say we could have a higher standard of living on a three-quarter section land unless the management goes along with the quality of land.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that I am not going to support the motion.

Hon. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

MOTION RE SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON RADIO BROADCASTING

Moved by Mr. Howe, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Burton:

“That the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Radio Broadcasting of Selected Proceedings be now concurred in.”

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the report of the Committee was a decision to divide the radio time which is made available for the broadcasting of the sittings of the Legislature, would be divided into groups giving three hours of radio broadcasting time to the Government side of the House, and one hour of broadcasting time to the Opposition. I would like to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that to every question there are two sides, and I would like to submit to you that it is as much the duty and responsibility of the Opposition to a government, to criticize and to sometimes compliment

governments for the type of decision they are bringing into effect here in the province of Saskatchewan. For that reason I believe there ought to be a more equitable distribution of the time that is being paid for by the people of Saskatchewan.

There are other types of free broadcasting available, not only in Saskatchewan, but outside. That is, types of broadcasting that are paid for by public funds, and I can refer to the 'Provincial Affairs' series which we have over eight stations in the province of Saskatchewan. I note that when the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation divide that time among the political parties in Saskatchewan, I understand they take three factors into consideration. First of all, they consider the number of candidates that each political party had in the field in the last provincial election. They take into consideration the number of members that were elected from each political party. They also take into consideration the percentage of the popular vote that each political party receives, and we find that the Provincial Affairs broadcast for the present season had them divided among the various political parties on the following basis: The C.C.F. party are receiving 12 15-minute broadcast; the Liberal Party are receiving 9 15-minute broadcasts; the Conservative Party are receiving four 15-minute broadcast, and the Social Credit Party are receiving four.

There was a second division of free time made here, a few days ago, in regard to the television broadcast that will be carried by the C.B.C., and I noted from the press report that carried this decision of time, that it was suggested it was being divided on the basis of the number of members who sat in the House of Commons from each different political party. I noted there that the C.C.F. have, in the House of Commons at Ottawa, 23 members, and they are given two 10-minute periods of free TV time, but I noticed the Liberal Party, with 169 members in the House of Commons, are taking four periods for themselves. The Conservatives, with 54 members, are taking three periods. The Social Credit, with 15 members, are taking one period.

Well, if you could take the figure of 12 members of the House of Commons, giving a political party the right to one broadcast, which would be the pattern that would be followed if they decided to follow the same pattern we use here in the province of Saskatchewan for dividing radio time here in the Legislature, then you would find that the Social Credit would remain with one broadcast, or one TV show; the C.C.F. would still have two, the same as they are granted now; the Conservative Party would be given four, but the Liberal party would be given 14. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that probably here again the CBC has recognized the fact that there are two sides to every question, and they are giving the Government of the day, the Government that sit in the House of Commons with 169 members, four TV spots, and they are giving the Opposition five.

The same thing in regard to 'Provincial Affairs'. We find that the Government of the day in Saskatchewan have 12 broadcasts, and the Opposition parties to that Government have 17 broadcasts. I might submit that in the division of the time, as far as broadcasting the proceedings of this Legislature are concerned, if we were to adopt a policy of considering the number of candidates that each political party had in the field in the last election, and the

number of members that that political party elected, and the percentage of the popular vote they received, then we would have a far greater share of the radio time in the opposition.

It is not my intention here this afternoon to debate whether we should have radio or whether we should not. I know there are arguments on both sides. Some people have found it is quite a service; they appreciate it, and they enjoy it. Other people have said that it interferes too much with the daily routine procedure in the Legislature; but that isn't the point that I want to debate here this afternoon.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion and in the opinion of the Opposition, the Opposition are not being given their fair share, and have never been given their share, of radio time, at least since I became a member of this Legislature. I believe the Opposition should have 50 per cent of the total radio time as far as this Legislature is concerned. The reason I say that is because of the fact that every question that is presented in this House, there is another side to it, and we are not given the opportunity to present our case to the thousands of people who listen to the radio broadcast. There isn't any doubt that there are far more people listen to the radio broadcast here from the Legislature than they do to the average political broadcast that you may buy, and pay for out of the party funds. I estimate there are probably somewhere in the neighbourhood of 100,000 people at least, who listen to the Legislative broadcasts. I also believe there are about 10,000 who would listen to a political broadcast, when the time is being paid for out of party funds.

Therefore, I believe that the Government of the day, in taking three hours' radio time out of every four to put across their side of the story, are taking advantage of the political propaganda which should be made available to the Opposition, if any part of this House is going to use it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to move non-concurrence in the report that has been brought into this Legislature.

Hon. T.G. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think is somewhat strange that the Opposition should be taking exception to this report from the Committee on broadcasting, since, I understand from the report, the division of time which they have suggested is exactly the same basis that has been carried on every year since the broadcasting started. Why the Opposition now, after nine or ten years following this basis of time, should suddenly find it is unfair is, in my opinion somewhat strange. My hon. friends are not usually that slow in finding an injustice or inequity. It seems difficult to believe that after having this basis of decision of time all these years, they should now be coming along and saying it is not fair.

The Leader of the Opposition has based his whole case, it seems to me, upon a misconception of the reason for having these proceedings in the Legislature broadcast. He bases his whole case on saying that in political broadcasts there should be a division of time to allow both parties to present their case. He cites the 'Provincial Affairs' broadcast, and the

'National Affairs' broadcast, and the new television regulations that have just come out of the C.B.C. Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the two situations are not at all analogous.

The 'Provincial Affairs' broadcast and the 'National Affairs' broadcast, and the proposed TV broadcasts, (and I think they are to be congratulated on it). The C.B.C., a public utility, had said, "Here's free time which is going to be given so that every point of view in Canada may be expressed." They worked out a formula based on the number of members in the legislature and in Parliament, and on the last popular vote for the various parties and the number of candidates they ran. All parties who have been running candidates and can be recognized as provincial or national parties, are given a chance to be heard. That is as it should be. One of the things we can be proud of in Canada is that we have that type of democratic society: one of the things, may I say, that I don't think we would have if we did not have a publicly-owned radio and television system in Canada.

But, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of broadcasting the proceedings of the Legislature is not that of providing free political time. The purpose of having a broadcasting of the proceedings of the Legislature is in order that the people in the country, the people in this great scattered province of ours who can't visit Regina, may have an opportunity of hearing what their particular representative has to say with respect to the important issues of the day. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the cost of carrying on this broadcast is paid for by all the people of the province. People of the province in whatsoever constituency they may reside, have a right to hear what their member has to say on some particular discussion, or in some particular debate.

If we are going to divide the time as my hon. friend has said, so that both sides can express their point of view, what would be the situation? Let us assume that there were 10 hours for the Government, and 10 hours for official Opposition. Each constituency represented by an Opposition member would be entitled to one hour (10 members). Each member of the Government side would be entitled to less than 15 minutes. Now, I maintain that the people in a constituency represented by the Government member has just as much right to hear their member and to ascertain what his stand is on the particular issues of the day, as have the people who reside in a constituency represented by an Opposition member. That is why, strictly speaking, we ought really to divide the time for broadcasting the proceedings of the Legislature on the basis of representation in the House.

I don't consider myself as being in this House alone to represent the C.C.F. people from the Weyburn constituency. I consider that when I speak, I am speaking for the Weyburn constituency, trying to advance their interest. I say what I have to say as their representative. Every other member is the same. The people of that constituency, whether they be Liberals, Conservatives, Social Credit, or C.C.F., have a right to know what stand I am taking, or the stand of any other single member when he speaks in

this House. Therefore, strictly speaking we ought to be following the representation in the House. If we are going to follow the representation by popular vote, and the number of candidates that have run, then we ought to allow the Social Credit and the Conservatives to come in and have a chance to say something in the House. The L.P.P. ran 10 or 11 candidates, last time. They should come in and make use of the radio. That is not the purpose of broadcasting the proceedings of the Legislature. There are other facilities for doing that: 'Provincial Affairs' and 'National Affairs', and other facilities. The purpose here is to allow the people in the constituencies to have a chance to hear their member, and if we were to follow that the division of time in this House would be roughly four to one. Now that is too one-sided. Therefore, it was agreed by the representatives from this side of the House who were on that Committee, that the division should be three to one. I know that there are members on this side of the House who are not too happy about the fact that per capita they have less time than the Opposition. But they are bound to, for it is part of the penalty they have to pay for being with a larger group. To ask them to reduce the time to the place where they would get one-quarter per capita of what the Opposition is getting, would certainly be unfair to them, and would be unfair to the people in their constituencies. They have a right to know what their members say, and how he stands on any particular subject that comes to the attention of this House for discussion and debate.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Committee has been most generous to the Opposition, when they suggested the division of time on the basis of three to one. That is the basis of time we have gone on in the past. What would happen if we carried this thing to the logical conclusion that my hon. friend is suggesting? I want to remind him of the one time in this House when we had five in the Opposition. Another time five were in opposition, over against 47 on this side for C.C.F. If you gave 50 per cent of the radio time to five members and the other 540 per cent to 47 members, what an impossible position you would be in! To members who sit on the Government side of the House, their people in the country would have a perfect right to say, "Well, surely our tax money is being taken and some of it ought to be spent so that we may have a chance to hear what our member says, and how he stands on these various matters that are of public interest."

Therefore, I think this division is quite fair. I think to go on a 50-50 basis would be a distinct disservice to the private members on this side. I think it would be more, Mr. Speaker; it would be accepting a wrong principle – a principle that the broadcasting of the proceedings of this Legislature is simply a medium for political propaganda. I hope it isn't. I hope that the broadcasting of the proceedings of this Legislature is for the purpose of allowing the people of the constituencies to hear what their member has to say. We should not depart from the principle that any member has a right to some time, whether he is in the Government or the Opposition, or sitting as an Independent, or whether he is a member supporting the Government who wants to criticize the Government. He has a right as a member – not as a member of the Government or the Opposition, but as a member representing people who have sent him here to the Legislature. He has a right to be heard, and to be heard by the people of his constituency. I think any reduction of the time, or any change in the time, would defeat that purpose.

February 28, 1956

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the Hon. Premier. His reasoning does not seem sound to me. It might be all right if everybody was C.C.F., and you were in a C.C.F. constituency; but how about the Opposition people that are interested? They would like to hear from the Opposition.

Premier Douglas: — He's still their representative.

Mr. Loptson: — Quite true, but he's not their representative by choice, and they would like to listen to the Opposition just as much as they would like to listen to the member himself. I submit for that reason that the division should be more in line with popular vote than by members elected. Now, you wouldn't like us, when we get over there after this next election, if we gave you hardly any time. We wouldn't treat you that way.

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — You won't be in.

Mr. Loptson: — No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the fair way of doing it. After all, the Opposition is here for a purpose, and the people of every constituency should hear it, and every C.C.F. and every Opposition member should hear the Government members, too. The best way to do that is to give divided time as equally as possible between the Opposition and the Government members, and that, I think, has been done by the Liberal Government at Ottawa. Apparently they even took less than half, in spite of the fact that they have probably five times as many members as the whole Opposition put together; there's no doubt about that — no, I guess there's about three times as many.

But I think in all fairness to the people, if we are going to consider the people instead of the political party advantage that we have by number of members, it should be divided more equitably by popular vote.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — As one of the back-benchers who would be affected by any reduction in the amount of time distributed to the Government side, I want to say that I have a good deal of sympathy to what the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) said. I wished, this afternoon, that I could have given five or ten minutes of my radio time, so that he could get the rest of what he said broadcast, because it would have ensured the re-election of the C.C.F. Government, even if nothing else was said in this election campaign!

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Oh, go on!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, if I could be sure it would be allocated to the hon. member for Saltcoats. . .

Mr. McDonald (Leader of Opposition): — Words of wisdom!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, checking back the division of times since this House met on February 9, I find on the Government side we have had a total of 660 minutes, and on the Opposition side they have had a total of 225 minutes. Now, dividing that by the number of members on each

side, I find that a Liberal member has had 20 ½ minutes, while the average C.C.F. member has had 15.7 minutes. Now, I'm saying that the average is arrived at by dividing the total number of members on each side of the House, which suggests that the Opposition is receiving one-third, a little better than one-third, better treatment per member than is the Government side.

I think it ought to be recognized, which it certainly is on this side, that those of the Government members who have to discharge a cabinet responsibility, have got to do something in the nature of a report of the work of their departments in addition to their ordinary legislative functions. As a matter of fact, they are under greater obligation to take time in this House than our ordinary private members, and so if some special allowance is made for them, then the average for the members on this side of the House is even less than 15.7 minutes. It's also worth remembering that there are more people in Saskatchewan who think we have something sensible to say than there are who think that the hon. gentlemen opposite have something sensible to say.

If that is the case, then I think we ought to continue to give to the people of Saskatchewan what they want. What they want is more and more of the things which the members on this side of the House have to say.

Mr. Loptson: — They're sick and tired of what you have to say!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — I'm rather timorous about suggesting that some of the things the people want to hear sill haven't been said by any of the hon. members opposite, even in the time which has been allotted to them, namely 225 minutes. There are many things which the people would like to hear them explain away, that they haven't done in the 225 minutes which they have used.

So, Mr. Speaker, as a back-bencher, I want to say that I would object very strenuously to any further disparity brought about in the allocation of time to the two sides of the House. I would object very strenuously to still further reducing our 15.7 minutes, in order to increase the 20.5 minutes which each member of the other side has, on the average.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I believe this matter has been discussed at some length. I would like to point out something in connection with the figures mentioned by the hon. member for Hanley. He told us a moment ago that we represent 20 minutes against 15.7 minutes as far as the Government side of the House is concerned, but by the time the session is over, the thing has been reversed, and the discrepancy between the two will be far greater than it is now. So, I don't think we need to take these figures too seriously, by what the member for Hanley has said. Then, too, after all, the Premier is always given to exaggeration, and he goes to work and he tells you what might happen with so and so, and so and so; when we get down to five minutes, and then we would have. . .

Mr. Kramer: — There's a good possibility that could happen.

Mr. Danielson: — It can happen, but we don't know which side of the House.

We're dealing with the matter as it is now, as it is today, and we wonder why we have not raised this question before. Well, I was on the Committee, Mr. Speaker, for several years, and I know the question was raised in committee, but was just like everything else; when they put the steam-roller to work over there, then there is absolutely no right or wrong to it; it didn't matter at all. It is a question of what benefits them, and the advantage that they have in spite of whether it's right or wrong, they're going to continue to exercise that particular (what they call) "right", which is nothing else than just a rule by force. That is all it amounts to. Mr. Speaker, even in the province of Saskatchewan, it doesn't make a difference whether it is a member from this side or a member from over there, speaking, this goes over the whole province of Saskatchewan. It isn't any particular constituency. The premier said that people of the various constituencies would like to listen to their members. That is true to some extent; but nevertheless, the people who are politically-minded in the province of Saskatchewan, almost every person in the province more or less, listens to these radio broadcasts. It does not make any difference whether it is the member for Cannington, or the member from Gravelbourg, or who it is that speaks in this House; all the people of Saskatchewan like to listen to it.

The fact of the matter is this, that 40 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan voted Liberal. No matter what they say on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. Here we have the radio time divided by a majority of the Government, which relegates the Opposition to a very minor matter so far as publicity in this Assembly is concerned.

It is all political, Mr. Speaker, and there isn't a fair-minded man in the province of Saskatchewan, whether C.C.F. or anything else, that does not think it is wrong. I will say this, without any fear of contradiction, that you can go out and speak to any person, whether it is in hotel, a home, in a station, bus or anywhere else, and they will say to you quite frankly, "Why don't you make a speech sometime, we never hear you any more?"

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — That's because they shut the radio off, Herman!

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that may be for you, but not for some people who prefer to listen to something else besides the C.C.F.

I don't think there's anything more I can add here, but I want to emphasize again that this a wrong thing; it has been condoned now for 11 or 12 years – ever since we started, I think in 1945 to 1946. It has been kept on at the same rate all the time, and don't let the Premier tell anyone there hasn't been protests. It has never been brought up by resolution in this House, because we have come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that it is useless to waste the time, because they decided what the steam-roller was going to do, and they did it, and they are going to do it this time.

We're raising the matter because this is a session, I think, where the people are more conscious, and more interested, and more keen in listening to what is going on in this House. If the question had been debated,

Mr. Speaker, wouldn't that have been a real entertaining period last night, if we could have had this particular Bill go through on the radio? I'm sure I would have donated \$25 to have had it broadcast, but they were darn sure to keep it off.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — So would I!

Mr. Danielson: — That's the idea. The people of the province of Saskatchewan are the audience here — not us that sit here. If that is the case, throw this radio clean out of here. We don't need that in here to hear each other. We can all talk loud enough so that everybody can hear in here, and so do you, Mr. Speaker, sometimes! This thing is kind corralled into this chamber, but don't forget that the audience we speak to is the people in the province of Saskatchewan, approximately 800,000 of them, if you figure them all. More than half these people, probably, are ready and eager to listen to what goes on in this House, and they are just as much interested to listen to us expound the Liberal philosophy, as to listen to the members over there who are spreading Socialism all the time.

I say again that I think the things as it is now it outrageous. It is injustice of the worst kind.

Hon. J.W. Burton (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, you, as chairman of the Radio Committee, no doubt wondered, the same as I did, why all at once at the beginning of this session, that some objection was taken by the members of the Opposition of that Committee. Permit me to say that the few years I have had the pleasure of being a member of the Committee have been friendly, and never very argumentative, but this year, it appears that the Opposition representatives on the Committee were all at once dissatisfied with the ration of the time. You no doubt wondered, the same as I did, what was the reason for it; but I think that, after we listened to the hon. member for Arm River just now, we begin to get an inkling as to the cause of it. There are apparently some people sitting on the Opposition side that have, throughout their lives, been so taken up with special privileges, and believe in special privileges, that they have been prodding the members of this Committee, that special privileges should be carried on further into the division of radio time.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, it is now. That's what we are objecting to.

Mr. McCarthy: — Sure it is.

Hon. Mr. Burton: — My friends across the way have been so used to standing for special privileges, incidentally, that they cannot think of anything else than above the lines of special privileges. I want to say that when we agreed to the division of time on the three to one basis, I was not very happy about it, because when the Leader of the Opposition gets up here this afternoon, and referred to wanting to have a more equitable distribution of time, he absolutely forgets all about the members on this side who are not going to have their fair share. When he refers to the political propoganda, as has been pointed out by the Premier, they have an opportunity to spread their political propoganda over the medium which has been provided for them

by the Provincial and National Affairs broadcasts, deliberately done so that the various viewpoints of the party could be heard. But no, they want to look at this here as a political propaganda medium.

I want to say to my friends who sneer at this Government about a number of things. One of them is, “Would you have had the broadcasting of these legislative proceedings in this Assembly yet if we didn’t have a C.C.F. Government? They were the only ones that had the vision and the courage to establish it. What other Parliament in this country, what other Legislature in this country have you got proceedings of the Legislature broadcast? It was brought in by this Government because they had some vision, and they had some courage.

Mr. Danielson: — This has nothing to do with it. The people are paying for this.

Hon. Mr. Burton: — I want to tell you this much, Mr. Speaker, that there isn’t a parliament or legislature government in existence in the British Commonwealth of Nations, or even beyond where they follow parliamentary procedure, that the members come into the Assembly or Parliament with a list, a percentage list of the people that voted for this or that party, and vote according to that. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the representation in the House of Commons and in the Legislature, is based on one member, one vote. But, if the idea of the hon. member from Arm River was adhered to, he would come in here with a list, pulling it out of his hip pocket, and say, “I come in here with a list, pulling it out of his hip pocket, and say “I represent so many people in the Arm River constituency and I am entitled to. . .”

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, silly!

Hon. Mr. Burton: — . . . Ever since I have been here, sitting back of me here there are quite a number of members that did not have an opportunity to make use of air time, and others had to cut it up so fine that they didn’t have near the breaks that the members on the Opposition side have had.

I want to say one thing further, before I sit down. From the experience that I had sitting on the Opposition side along with you and some **of he other** of our colleagues, when the hon. member for Arm River was sitting over here, had they by any chance of stretch of the imagination brought in a radio coverage of the proceedings of this Assembly, then we would have been held down to the exact amount of one out of five, instead of what they have now – one out of four.

Mr. Danielson: — Who says so?

Mr. McCarthy: — Who says that?

Hon. Mr. Burton: — Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that by the experience that we had when we were sitting on the Opposition side. I can furthermore tell you that when the hon. Leader of the Opposition was making the plea about having a more equitable time on radio, he forgot that in Parliament, in the Legislature, we vote one member, one vote.

Mr. McDonald: — What has that to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Burton: — And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this is so dissatisfying to the members of the Opposition, I will reserve, insofar as I am concerned, my opinion as to the advisability of carrying on this radio business from the Legislature because apparently, they want now, instead of making it a public serviced feature, to make it a political propaganda medium which I am opposed to.

Mr. McDonald: — You made it that way.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I won't be very long, but after listening to some of the speakers on this side of the House, I thought that probably the other side should be convinces as to purposes of parliament, the purposes of the members sitting here, and how we are to be given the chance and opportunity to present a case for our constituency. But, as the saying goes, "A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still", so I don't think there is any chance of converting them.

I represent Cumberland constituency, and when I say that, Mr. Speaker, I mean I represent every person who lives in that constituency whether he voted for me representing the C.C.F., or whether he voted otherwise; and I want to have a chance in this Legislature to present the feelings, the opinions and the things that my constituents want me to submit in this House. I stand by my right by being in parliament here, that whether it is radio time or any other time, I should be able to get on my feet and take the necessary time, a fair share of the time to perform my duty. Certainly, as has been pointed out, we on this side at the present time are the ones who should complain because we are discriminated against, and the only thing that I can say concerning the members opposite is that they are behaving like the proverbial camel, when you let him put his head into the tent, he tries to get his whole body in! I shall not support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I have just a couple of points I wish to make. First of all, I have had something to do with this right from the time radio was inaugurated until about three years ago, and this question has arisen from time to time. I think we had a very happy solution during the last Legislature, when we had three broadcast on this side and two from the other side of the House each week.

In other words, there were 20 members over on the other side, and at that time they were quite content that they should have two broadcast a week; and we should have three, because that was directly based upon the strength in the House. However, that 20 was cut down after the last election to 10; they were out in two, and they should, of course, have lost one of those two days. In other words, they should now be getting one day a week, while over here there should be four.

Mr. Danielson: — Better give us some more, then.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, we do this — it is not only in broadcasting; but we have precedents that you can go to all over the British Commonwealth of nations. We have committees that are established by parliaments and legislatures all over the Commonwealth, and wherever they are established, committees are set up on the basis of the numerical strength of parties in the House — not by the number of votes they got out in the country. If they are based on that, then we should get a dummy to come over to this side to bolster up the other people in Arm River constituency, for example, where we got almost as many voters as the hon. member himself.

Mr. McDonald: — You've got some!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — So that actually, we have already established a precedent through our memberships in the committee, and I think that we should follow that same principle. I was very disappointed this afternoon to hear the Leader of the Opposition point out that there were only two sides to every question. I hope that we are not going to make a political issue out of every question that comes into this House. I would like to see 53 points of view on some of these questions. Most of the time is spent on the Speech to the Throne. I think instead of having only two points of view, we should be able to have 53 points of view; there should be sufficient independence among members that they can express their own feelings. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition had his way, he would not allow that; he would crack the whip and he would have two points of view only.

Mr. McDonald: — That what you're doing.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has pointed out that the 'Political Affairs' broadcast is dealt with in a certain way. Well, of course, the Political Affairs broadcast does, because it is what it says; it is a political affair. It gives the people of the province the different points of view of the various political parties; but the Legislature is not that. The Legislature is an institution where men and women come and present the point of view of their constituencies, and who has a better right to hear that point of view than the people living within the constituency?

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I think we have, on the basis of three to one, pretty well representation on the basis of the membership, because there are, I believe, two points of view, Government and Opposition, in the principle addresses that are given on the Speech from the Throne and the Budget. I would hope that when I deliver a budget address I am speaking for the Government side of the House. I would hope, too, that when the financial critic speaks, he speaks for the Opposition. On the Speech from the Throne, when the Premier gets up to give his address, he presents the Government side in the key-note address. The Leader of the Opposition presents that side. So there are five days. Now, if you leave those four and then the mover and seconder, which must use up one period, take those five days out, and that leaves us on a basis of five weeks' broadcasting, a total of 20 days left. Well, I worked it out roughly, and if we took four-fifths of the 20, that would give us 16 days, plus the three days that I spoke of, which would give us 19 days, and it would give the Opposition six days. On the basis presently being used, taking three-quarters of the 25 days, works out

at 18 $\frac{3}{4}$, and 6 $\frac{1}{4}$, so that it really works out (leaving out the principle addresses that have to be given) pretty well on the basis of the four to one, which we are represented by in the House.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing further I want to say, and that is the question that has been raised as to the usefulness of these broadcast. I read the article in the 'Star-Phoenix' the other day, where the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as being very much opposed to the broadcasting of the debates from the Legislature. That is his privilege. The Opposition were opposed to this when we introduced it in 1945. They were against it then, and they have been against it ever since, because they realize that as long as we have the radio broadcasts and the people can get the truth of that is going on in this House, then the Leader of the Opposition realizes that there are no hopes for him or his party.

The question being put on the motion for concurrence, it was agreed to.

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