

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Thirteenth Legislature**  
**12th Day**

**Friday, March 1, 1957**

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

On the Orders of the day:

**PRIVILEGE**

**Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, on a question of privilege, I would like to draw your attention to a report of the proceedings of this Legislature in the 'Leader-Post' of February 28. When the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) was speaking he made certain remarks and he was asked to withdraw those remarks; and after withdrawing, the press reports as follows:

“He said that Mr. Korchinski asked the Legislative Librarian to get the book in the library. After Mrs. Bothwell received the book, Mr. Korchinski took it into the House and charged the librarian with promoting the reading of it, indicating she was a communist, Mr. Dewhurst said.”

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is contrary to facts. I looked over the speech that I made on that particular date and there is nowhere an indication that I called, or referred to, the Librarian as if she were a Communist. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The statement was withdrawn on the occasion of his address. The report in the newspaper is inaccurate. You are quite in order to draw the attention of the Assembly to this fact.

**Mr. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with there are two points I would like to draw to your attention. One is as reported in the 'Leader-Post' of yesterday, referring to the happenings in the Committee on Public Accounts, yesterday morning. It refers to questions which were asked pertaining to the Mental Institutions and so forth at Weyburn. It mentioned that answers were given by Mr. Dewhurst, the Chairman. It is a misprint. It should have been the Hon. Mr. Erb, the Minister of Public Health. It was not I who gave the answers to the Committee. It was the Minister in charge of the Department concerned.

Another point I would like to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, refers to my speech as reported in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' of yesterday, while speaking about the Ponass Lake drainage area

**March 1, 1957**

I think it is likely a misprint here. It said that I said the cost would be from \$25 million to \$50 million. If I did say that what I meant to say was from a quarter to half a million dollars, so I hope the necessary corrections can be made.

## **SPEECH FROM THE THRONE**

### **Debate on Address-In-Reply**

The House resumed from Thursday, February 28, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current) for the address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan)** (Continuing): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had something to say about political philosophies and political practices. Today I want to turn the attention of the Assembly to some issues which affect all of us in the province of Saskatchewan.

Before I do that I should like to call the attention of the members to an historic document which they will find on their desks. I say it is an historic document because it refers to the community of Estevan as having a population of 5,000. We no longer know what the population of Estevan actually is, but we do know that it is something a good deal more than 5,000.

Also before I deal with matters pertaining to this debate I want to draw the attention of this Assembly to an event which took place in the Premier's office today. There the proclamation and order-in-council were signed, transforming the community of Estevan from the status of a town to the status of a city. The event took place at 11:30 a.m. Mountain Standard Time, and 12:30 p.m. Central Standard Time. The city of Regina, as you know, observes Mountain Standard Time; the city of Estevan observes Central Standard Time, and no doubt historians of the future will always be able to argue whether Estevan became a city in the morning or the afternoon of the 1st of March, 1957. Regardless of that, it marks an important milestone in the development of the southeastern part of the province and in the history of the whole of Saskatchewan. I may say that this is the first time in 28 years that Saskatchewan has had an event of this kind. The community of Estevan was first incorporated as a town in 1906, and now it takes its place as the ninth city in the province of Saskatchewan.

It is always a fruitful question to ask how people make their living, and the answer always depends on the resources of land and hand and mind which the people possess. Perhaps it is presumptuous of me, as a native son of the southeast part of the province, to say that the people there are enterprising and progressive. Yet when I look at my neighbours in the constituency of Souris-Estevan, and when I remember what they have been able to accomplish in little less than a half-century, I can come to no other conclusion. The people of Souris-Estevan, as our past and our contemporary

history shows, are always prepared to go to work with their hands and their minds at any worthwhile venture.

I asked the question – how do we make our living? Well, in the area immediately surrounding Estevan we have some very rich agricultural land and many people there, like many people in the rest of the province, make living by farming. We are blessed with other resources of the land in our part of the province. Clay makes possible a brick and tile manufacturing industry which is owned and operated for the benefit of the people of this province through the operations and our Crown Corporation, Saskatchewan Clay Products. There are also vast deposits of lignite coal in the Souris River Valley, and the Bienfait-Estevan coalfields produce annually about two million tons of coal. Coal is used as a source of energy in the generating plant of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, which is located just south of Estevan, and which provides electricity for a large area of the province. The present plant, after its final enlargement, will have a generating capacity of something like 70,000 kilowatts. The new plant, now under construction at the Boundary Dam site will have a capacity of 264,000 kilowatts. To feed the new power plant will require a 50 per cent increase in coal production in the next four years – two million to three million tons per year.

These resources of agricultural land, clay and coal have been utilized in the Estevan area for many years and they made possible a fairly strong and vigorous local economy. And then, just three years ago, the economic life of the area began to move forward at a headlong and spectacular rate. Just three years ago, light gravity crude oil was discovered a few miles from Estevan. Estevan is located in the so-called Williston Basin which holds a vast reservoir of petroleum and natural gas. Since that date, at least one thousand oil wells have been drilled in the southeastern part of the province. Mr. Speaker, I need hardly elaborate on the tremendous impact this oil development has made on Estevan. To picture the drilling of one thousand oil wells in three years in an area about 30 miles wide and a little over 100 miles long is to envisage a scene of growing population and bustling activity.

So today Estevan has grown to such an extent that it is now a city. In that event I rejoice with the people of Estevan and the people in the surrounding area who think of it as I think of it – as home. I hail the event as a sign of the times in Saskatchewan. I hail it as a forerunner of greater days in the future than we have ever know in the past.

Estevan has the largest nurseries in Western Canada, largest dragline in North America, richest oilfields in Saskatchewan, largest power plants in Saskatchewan, largest show print plant in Canada, greatest lignite production in Canada. Thanks to the Power Corporation =, to the tremendous local growth and to the enterprise of its people, Estevan is the newest, the richest and certainly the best city by a 'dam' site.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this debate, I want to turn the attention of the Assembly to contemporary events in the province, or rather to the trend of contemporary events which have meaning in terms of public policy.

**March 1, 1957**

When I speak of public policy, of course I mean government policy, because of other agency in our society attempts to be responsible to and representative of all the people – the whole community. I want to say, too, that while I am mainly concerned with Provincial Government policy, I must make reference to our Federal Government and to our local governments. It seems to me that to talk about Provincial Government affairs, while ignoring the Federal Government or local governments is, at the very best, to be stupid. And to talk about provincial affairs with pre-conceived notions that the Federal Government is always rich, generous and full of wisdom and that local governments are always oppressed, cantankerous but efficient, is to be something worse than stupid, because it reflects certainly an attitude of irresponsibility, not only for the welfare of the province but to the people who send us here to conduct the public affairs of Saskatchewan.

Let me outline three major issues in the province, or three areas of major concern, then to elaborate on them in detail and then to point out some of their inter-relationships and some of the things they point to with respect to government policy. I know certainly there are more than three issues of concern to many people and more details related to these issues, but the kind of analysis I have in mind has at least three distinct advantages. It points to the major problems; it demonstrates their inter-relationships, and it points the way to a comprehensive government policy.

The first area of major concern is in the agricultural industry. I mention that first because, historically, agriculture has been our largest industry in terms of people employed, goods produced and incomes earned. The most obvious fact and the most serious problem in connection with agriculture in Saskatchewan is the instability of agricultural incomes and incomes indirectly dependent upon the agriculture industry. There are at least two reasons for this. And first of all, of course, it is because of the hazards of nature on these prairies. Rainfall is probably the most important natural factor in dry-land farming on these prairies and there really isn't much, so far, that any of us have found we can do to insure abundant and steady precipitation each year.

Other natural hazards are more controllable. Agricultural research has given us better varieties and better breeds better adapted to our environment; it has given us chemical fertilizers and weed sprays. I want to give credit to all levels of government – local, provincial and federal – for the programs they have sponsored in agricultural research, and I think such programs could profitably be extended and enlarged. More than anything else I want to give credit to the farmers of Saskatchewan, to the people who do the really hard work in agriculture, who, over the years, have continued to improve their cultural practices and to increase the quality and the quantity of our agricultural products.

I think, of course, in agriculture we are concerned about the

best use of our resources, and we are also concerned about providing modern and decent Canadian standards of living for farm families. One of the major reasons farm incomes and income dependent upon the agricultural industry are so unstable is not a result of natural hazards, but a result of the faults in our marketing system. In the present situation, since 1951, agricultural incomes have not only fluctuated widely, but over the long-term have declined. Western farm costs have risen by 8 per cent. Saskatchewan farm prices have declined by 26 per cent from 1951 to 1956. During that period net farm income in Saskatchewan has declined from \$553 million to \$400 million – a drop of 28 per cent. Mr. Speaker, it is nonsense to suggest that a provincial government can make up this difference in agricultural income losses. We might, if we so chose, turn over the whole provincial budget to our farmers in the form of direct subsidy payments and we could still not compensate them for this loss. What we need in our marketing system, to put it very briefly, are at least three things. We need, first of all, to extend the Wheat Board orderly marketing principle to include all farm products and to make it permanent by legislation. We need, along with it a complementary program of cash advances on properly farm-stored grain. And thirdly, we need a more aggressive and progressive trading policy, which will dispose of Canadian farm products, if necessary, by taking the currency of our countries and by entering into bilateral and barter agreements.

I need hardly point out where the responsibility for these programs lies, and I concur with the Attorney General, who appealed to all people in Saskatchewan who are interested in our agricultural welfare to join together and work for the achievement of these programs.

Now I want to say something about the non-agricultural sector of our economy; the second major area of concern. And here let me just say briefly that there are at least three distinct advantages in development of primary industries from our forests and our mines, secondary industries in manufacturing, and tertiary industries which include service industries like transportation and retail sales. The first distinct advantage is that this kind of development will make it possible to produce here in this province many of the things that are essential for modern life, from cement to bricks and textiles, and produce them closer to home, closer to provincial markets, at reduced costs to Saskatchewan consumers.

This kind of development is important because it provides jobs and more opportunities for young people and for people who must be displaced by the mechanization of agriculture, must be displaced from the agricultural industry. And if it is important, and from what we have heard in this Assembly and outside, it is important to keep Saskatchewan-born people in Saskatchewan, then we must face up to the fact that we have to develop our non-agricultural sector of the economy if we are to maintain Saskatchewan people within our boundaries. More job opportunities naturally mean larger payrolls, more money to be spent in businesses and in service industries which provide the goods and services to a growing population. The third distinct advantage is that royalties may increase from the development of minerals on Crown-owned land and, when they do, Provincial Government revenues are increased. Provincial Government services can then be extended without

**March 1, 1957**

any accompanying increase in the level of taxation. Therefore, all of us have a concern and a responsibility to do what we can to develop the non-agricultural section of our economy. I want to commend the Provincial Government for what efforts it has made in this direction, particularly through its three major agencies, the Trade and Marketing Services, the Industrial Development Office, and the Industrial Development Fund.

The third major area of concern to people in Saskatchewan and to people in this Legislature, is in the field of provincial-local government relations and local government services. The impact of mechanization as population shifts from rural to urban centres, as we have noticed it in the agricultural and non-agricultural sections of our economy =, is being felt very severely by provincial and local government agencies which are trying to provide our people with services in the fields of health, welfare and education, and are trying to provide such things as roads, sewerage and water, and so on. All people, both urban and rural, want more improved and more government services in these fields. All governments, local and provincial, are faced in our inflationary times with rising costs. The rural local governments face these demands for better services and face these rising costs, but they have fewer and fewer people to pay for these services. Urban centres on the other hand are also affected. They face the same demand for better services, they face the same rising costs, and their populations are growing faster than their financial capacity to pay for these services.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because I do not have time to go into this in detail, and because there is so much information available on the problems of local government and provincial government services, I only want to make this observation: that certainly we must re-appraise our position, and we must look to new ways of doing things if we are to make the optimum use of our resources, and to provide the most efficient type of structure for the provision of provincial and local government services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that while those problems certainly affect all of Saskatchewan, there is nowhere in this province where these issues are more clearly obvious than in my own constituency of Souris-Estevan. There we feel the impact of rising costs, of falling farm prices, of mechanization in agriculture, of displacement of rural people, of population shifts into our urban centres, and we feel the impact of non-agricultural resources' development. The city of Estevan feels these problems. The larger towns like Oxbow and Carnduff feel them. Smaller centres like Midale, Macoun and Torquay; other places such as Gainsborough, Carievale, Bienfait, Glen Ewen, Alameda and Frobisher, all feel the impact of the trend of contemporary events about which I have spoken. I think it is perfectly obvious that all of these are interrelated; and to solve the problems which arise from them we must have a broad and comprehensive Government program. Such a program is outlined in the Speech from the Throne. The Provincial Government, after all, must keep pace with the developments not only in my area of the province, but in all areas of Saskatchewan, and this is what it is trying to do in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my place I want to elaborate a bit more on what I said about political philosophy and political practice. I

pointed out yesterday, that those of us who hold to democracy believe in the importance and the equality of individuals. Because of those beliefs, over the centuries we have evolved a system of responsible representative democratic government. We have done so because we realized that political power is a public trust, because we realize that governments have tremendous political power, and can, if they choose, develop to a fine art the techniques of pushing people around; by in democracy, because we know that political power is a public trust, we will not let it be abused. We will not let it be used to create special privileges for anyone at the expense of other members of society. I want to say to the people of this province that the C.C.F. has a message based on that faith in democratic principles, for we recognize that, in our modern technological society, there are sources not only of great political power, but sources of tremendous economic power. And the way in which this power is used, whether it is political or economic, has tremendous repercussions for the kind of life which any individual member of society is able to live.

Our message is simply this: that economic power, like political power, is also a public trust and must be used for the benefit and welfare of all people, and cannot be used for the creation of special privileges, for vested interest, for the right opposite something-for-nothing, at the expense of the basic needs of other members of society.

I want to conclude my remarks by quoting from a radio broadcast made on a Trans-Canada hook-up by the Rev. J.L. MacDonald of Speech from the Throne. Patrick's College in Ottawa, last December 9. The subject of his radio broadcast was 'Christian Ideals and Social Action', and the broadcast said in part:

“And even though, ultimately, we are concerned with the spiritual welfare of man, we must come to the immediate realization that material affects the spiritual. If a man has no money with which to buy food and clothing for his family, nor money to buy furnishings for his home, nor money with which he is able to live in decent surroundings, it is not inconceivable that his spiritual outlook will be blinded by his material necessities. For while his eternal salvation may be his most important need, his temporal maintenance is his most immediate.

“Slum conditions have never been conducive to virtue. A boy or girl will seldom esteem honesty or purity, if forced to live in areas where vice is in perfect accordance with the norm of daily life. The apostolate of Christ must extend to the causes of spiritual decay, even though those causes be material. This may require sacrifice and charity, but so it should. It is time, as Christians, that we began thinking about replacing a philosophy of self-interest with a philosophy of charity; a philosophy of strife with a philosophy of mutual help; a philosophy of hate with a philosophy of love.”

**March 1, 1957**

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the C.C.F. party has never been motivated by private, mean or selfish interests. The first National leader of our party . . .

**Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — Oh, oh. That's funny!

**Mr. Thorson:** — . . . the late J.S. Woodsworth said: "What we desire for ourselves, we wish for all". The C.C.F. party has always recognized that the true destiny of man is to develop his personality and his character, to adventure with his mind and with his spirit. And the C.C.F. party has always recognized, also, that these things cannot be achieved unless basic physical, human necessities are first satisfied. We have strived to do that: to so organize our society that it is accomplished for every single human being, and we have based it on a philosophy of mutual help, on a philosophy of charity, and on a philosophy of love for our fellow human beings. Later in Father MacDonald's broadcast he says:

"It is necessary to move from a state of inertia and passiveness, of indifference and lethargy, towards a goal of real social justice."

The C.C.F. party has never been inert or passive, or indifferent or lethargic, in the face of human needs, whether those needs are material, intellectual or spiritual. Since the beginning of the C.C.F. party to the present time we have strived, and we will continue to strive, to achieve that goal of social justice for every man, woman and child.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is a step towards that goal, as is the C.C.F. 'Program for Prosperity', which was accepted by the people in the last provincial election. It is our attempt, and our achievement, to build here a kind of society on these broad and beautiful prairies, in which there is real social justice; to build a society in which it can truly be said there is freedom – certainly freedom of speech and freedom of assembly, freedom from fear and freedom from want; but most of all, freedom of opportunity for every individual to develop the best that is in him. That is the kind of social democracy which we are building for ourselves, for our neighbours, and for those who come after us.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I feel just a little bit at a loss in rising to follow the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson), with his very remarkable ability to speak his mind. It is a wonderful thing to see young men coming into the Legislature, getting their experience and taking their place. During their lives they will certainly make a great contribution to our province and to our country.

I would like to take this opportunity – and I think I can on behalf of the House to wish for the member for Souris-Estevan a very happy



birthday tomorrow. The creation of the city of Estevan and the delivery of his maiden speech in the Legislature and his twenty-fifth birthday came pretty close to falling at the same time.

I want very briefly, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this Assembly, and also just as briefly to express my sincere belief that you will exercise the very important duties of that office to a very excellent standard.

I want also to congratulate all new members of this Legislature. It is not something to be taken lightly to be elected to one of the Legislatures of our country. It means that we are taking a responsibility, and it means also that we have been given a privilege and an honour; and I believe that we all should keep that in mind.

Briefly, also, I would like to congratulate our Premier. It is quite a long time since he passed the mark that made him the Premier of this province longer than any other individual, and I think I can speak for the great majority of the people of the province, and certainly for the people of my constituency, in saying to him, at the beginning of this new Legislature, that we wish him well and hope that he will continue to be our Premier in Saskatchewan for a long time to come.

I would like to say a few words about my own constituency of Kelsey. Mr. Speaker, it is another 'best part' of the province of Saskatchewan. All different parts of the province have their qualifications and their differences. We all love our own part of the province; I suppose that is why we live there. Kelsey lies over on the Manitoba border in the northeastern portion of the settled part of the province, and it has very varied resources. It is not all open prairie, nor is it all timberland. There is a lot of good agricultural land, but there are probably more timber products produced in Kelsey constituency than in any other constituency in the province. There is a very considerable amount of trapping in that constituency, too. We don't have any commercial fishing, but we do have some most excellent fishing for sport fish, particularly the brook trout, in that corner of the province. Mr. Provincial Treasurer, that brook trout up at Hudson Bay is making a contribution to your revenues, because I know a number of people from Regina who make several motor trips up there to fish every year, and, consequently, they help out your revenue. That is our local tourist business.

My constituency has in it quite a bit of area which could be classed as still being near the pioneer conditions. The country which is wooded to some extent does not develop as rapidly as the prairie country, even with the modern machinery and equipment; and so we do have pioneer conditions in some parts of my constituency. During the past few years we have suffered from floods, from too much rains, and while my colleague down in Shaunavon constituency was enjoying plenty of moisture and the finest of crops, we had too much of it. We suffered, together with a large part of the province, serious frost damage last year and very bad rust damage in 1954. These are problems which will not always be with us. Something can be done – at least in regard to some of them; and we will have, as we have had in the past, better records of production in the future. I might mention that one of the little problems that we have in my constituency is that there are too many

**March 1, 1957**

people who want to log for the Saskatchewan Timber Board and we haven't got enough timber. It seems to be a very popular job – working for the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

Looking backwards, 13 years ago we had no decent highways in my constituency. There were practically no gravelled roads at all; and now, while we have not got a complete highway system, we certainly have a good deal of very good highways. On behalf of the people in my constituency I want to express thanks and appreciation to the Minister of Highways for the work he had done there. Sometimes when conditions were very, very bad for doing work, when we had a lot of wet weather, it certainly was hard to get the work done.

I also want, on behalf of the people in my constituency, to thank the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Kuziak), the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet), because all of them, through their Departments, have made very substantial contributions to the development and welfare of my part of the province, as I am sure they have done in many other parts of the province, too. We have in operation in Kelsey one very fine senior citizens' home, which was officially opened last year. Two others are in different stages of organization. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there has probably been no single activity which brings so much satisfaction to some of our senior citizens as when they can move into one of these homes and occupy a suite there which is fully modern and very comfortable.

We have four hospitals operating in my constituency. Three of them are union hospitals and one is a private hospital operated by a Catholic Order. Three of these hospitals were built since 1944, and the one that was built previous to that time needs replacing and enlarging. So we have made progress, too, in the way of care for the elderly people and for the sick people.

The grid road program has been very well received in my constituency. It is true that, because of the conditions which existed during the last few years in regard to crops, and because of the cost-price squeeze, municipalities are having a little problem in financing their part of the work; but with better crops and when the arrears of taxes can be collected, I don't think there will be much trouble and certainly they are all very enthusiastic about these grid roads when they are constructed.

One of our chief problems is the question which is common to all and that is the prices for farm products. I suppose all the members of the Legislature read the editorial in the 'Leader-Post' of yesterday, headed: "Monotony Ad Nauseam". You know, it is funny, an editor of a daily paper who had at his disposal this whole volume of paper every day in which to put his words, seems to think that the people who are elected to the Legislature shouldn't talk very much, and he criticizes the legislature for talking so long in this debate. He particularly criticizes the members of the Legislature who talk about the federal problems which affect the people of Saskatchewan. Well, I would just like to say to the editor of the 'Leader-Post': you are perfectly free to write editorials like this; you are perfectly free to hold

the opinion that we shouldn't talk so long. But I would also say to him that, if he thinks it is monotonous, he is perfectly free to not listen to it. So I am not going to be kept back from saying what I want to say, even though it takes up time and even though they may be some of the things which the editor of the 'Leader-Post' thinks I should not say.

There is no need for me to explain, either to this Legislature or to the farmers in Saskatchewan, what is meant by the 'cost-price squeeze'. Different speakers in this House before me have gone into it in detail, and everyone should know; but I am sorry to say that it seems to be that the members sitting in the Opposition don't want to know that when people produce goods or give services at less than the cost of production, they get into financial trouble. They should know that; but they won't admit it, and they try to blame everything else. But that is the principal problem in the Kelsey constituency. It isn't floods, it isn't rust, it isn't frost; it is the fact that we cannot get a price for our farm products, our wheat and our other grains and our beef and our pork, that is commensurate with the cost of production and will give the farmer a chance to live, maintain and keep up his establishment.

Cash advances is something that would be very welcome in my corner of the province, because it makes it very difficult, not only for the individual farmer to finance, but for municipalities to finance, if they cannot sell a substantial part of their grain in the fall of the year. But the solution is simple, and it is to institute a system of cash advances which would be the safest kind of an advance which can be made, which could be made with the least difficulty by the Wheat Board and through the elevators. Though a lot of people have talked about cash advances with interest on them, I don't know why the farmers shouldn't get cash advances without interest on them. It would also make it better for the other businesses in the province for the merchants. The merchants of the province often have to extend credit to their customers, and it would certainly help the situation if, instead of having to depend on a granary full of wheat and an empty pocket, a little bit of the wheat could be taken out of the granary and a little bit of money put into the pocket. It would make a much better balanced economy.

I said that the Liberal members of this House, ever since I have been in it, have refused to face up and recognize the problems of the farmer when those problems are the responsibility of the Government at Ottawa, and the . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I thought you said that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The dean of this House, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has time and again stood on his feet and had his name recorded in opposition to resolutions asking for decent prices for the farmers in this province. I think the Liberal party has got to get a little better vision than that if they are going to get any place. A great deal has been said about Liberal assistance to rural municipalities. One Liberal member in this House stated that we, the Government, have thrown the responsibility for the grid roads on the rural municipalities.

**March 1, 1957**

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's correct.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) says that is correct. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to imagine such ignorance.

**Some Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — How can the member for Cannington be so ignorant as to say such a thing?

**Some Government Member:** — He was born that way.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member works at it. Those roads, Mr. Speaker, were municipal roads.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Still are.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And they still are. That is correct. They still are. But what we are doing is taking over better than half the burden of constructing a good standard road on those locations.

**Some Government Members:** — Hurray!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — These people over here say we have thrown this burden upon the municipality.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who is going to keep them up?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — These people have the most convenient memories that I have ever found any place, when they talk like that, and they have a complete lack of logic. I have been very disappointed in the speeches they have made in this Legislature, and the speeches of the new members.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I haven't spoken yet.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, the hon. member from Cannington says he hasn't spoken yet. I know him from the past. I am hoping for improvement; but I am not too sure that it is going to take place.

**Mr. McDonald:** — No improvement there, either.

**Mr. Danielson:** — This is 'Brotherhood Week'.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Come on, 'Brock', liven it up!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — When the hon. members refuse to recognize these facts, refuse to recognize the facts that are on the record, I don't know what we can do about it. But while the member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) was wasting his time the other day, I did a little bit of research. So let us look at the record of grants to rural municipalities. We can't go over the whole picture, but we can look at some of it. Back in 1938, in the Arm River constituency, the municipalities got \$3,100 in grants. Mr. Speaker, that wasn't for one municipality; that was for all the municipalities in that constituency.

**Mr. McDonald:** — What year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — 1938. And that was a banner year, I would say to the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh! Where were you?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . because the next year, 1939 they got none. They got no grants at all in Arm River. Then in Humboldt constituency . . . I'll have to tell the hon. member from Humboldt a little story about her constituency, because I am sure that she isn't old enough to remember it. Back in 1938 there was a by-election in the constituency of Humboldt, and the Liberal Minister of Highways was defeated.

**Mrs. Batten (Humboldt):** — (Inaudible)

**Mr. Loptson:** — Your Minister was beaten there, last year.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And so they sent him up to Humboldt for a . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — What did you do with your defeated Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . for a by-election in 1938. And the Liberals, in that campaign, put up a poster, and this poster said: "Humboldt Needs Highways."

**Mrs. Batten:** — It still does.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member would have agreed with it at that time. And they were asking the people of Humboldt to vote for the Liberal Minister of Highways, because Humboldt needed highways. Well, in 1938 the Liberals had had 28 years of government in the province of Saskatchewan, and they still needed highways.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's pretty good.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, our C.C.F. people just stuck up a poster and said, "Why Does Humboldt Need Highways" and we won the by-election, too. We won the by-election in 1938, on August 4.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The question mark is still there. Tell us why you lost this one? Which one did you lose this year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In Humboldt in 1938 . . .

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — He never mentioned that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . the municipalities in that constituency got grants of \$5,028 – pretty big. And again, don't make any mistake. That wasn't for any one municipality; that was for the whole constituency.

**March 1, 1957**

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — 1938. They needed highways, they needed roads and they needed a Liberal Minister to get elected there; but it didn't work. And the next year do you know how much they got? Nothing, in 1939 – not a red cent. Then let's go and take a look at Wilkie constituency. Where's the member for Wilkie? (Mr. Horsman) He's away today.

**Mr. McDonald:** — How many didn't get anything this year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In Wilkie constituency in 1938, the municipalities got \$5,246 in grants; in 1939, they got none.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What did they get this year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You see, there was an election in 1938; there was no election in 1939. So the municipalities didn't need any grants in 1939, and it wasn't because the municipalities needed the grants in 1938 that they got them, either, but because the Liberals needed to get elected.

**Mr. Loptson:** — What did they get last year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Let's go and take a look at Pelly constituency.

**Mr. Loptson:** — What did they get last year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, they didn't do so well. Pelly constituency, apparently they had lots of Liberal votes there, didn't get much grant; but in 1938 in Pelly, all the municipalities they got \$912.62, but they did better next year than the other fellows: in 1939 all of the municipalities in Pelly constituency got \$120 between them! Now, let's take another little look at the picture. We look at the grants for five years, from the fiscal year 1938-39 to the fiscal year 1942-43 inclusive.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Pretty prosperous year, eh?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — First for Gravelbourg. We find that Gravelbourg constituency got an average per year grant for all the municipalities for those five years of \$544.90 - \$544 a year divided between all the municipalities in the Gravelbourg constituency.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's probably better than last year.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And the other day the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) was up talking about grants and roads, and one thing and another. He should get his eyes opened and take a look at past history, and what things were like, and then he would probably be able to talk about it.

Let's go to one other constituency. Let's take a look at

Melville, and I am awfully sorry that the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) is not in his seat. In Melville constituency in those five years, the average wasn't \$544. No, it was \$4,961 a year for five years. What was the strange situation that made the difference between Gravelbourg and Melville? What strange spirit, or power was behind the scenes? That would be a good question to ask, and I would suggest, if you are looking for an answer, that it was the same power exactly that dictated to the Leader of the Opposition who his secretary would be.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** —When he put in one secretary, this chap made a visit to Saskatchewan and changed it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Nobody ever changed my secretary, and you know it!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I know.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's an absolute untruth.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I understand the protest of the Leader of the Opposition. It's just like when you were in the army. That man can't make you do anything, but he can sure make you wish you had. That's what it is. He didn't do it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It's a lie, and you know it!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All right. Now, I also have the figures for Pelly constituency and I find that in Pelly the average grant for five years was \$1,462 a year. That wouldn't build much road, would it? I would say that to the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie). I haven't enough time to go over very many, but let's look at one constituency in the 10 years from 1945 to 1955 – Gravelbourg constituency. We find that the average grant per year for that constituency in that term was \$7,823 or over 14 times as much as the average Liberal grant made a few years before. In Pelly constituency, the average for a five-year term when the C.C.F. was in power was over \$13,000. Add to this the increased grants for education; increased health services paid for by the Provincial Government; increased social welfare grants; the 75 per cent of social aid, and the grid road assistance, and many other assistances and then let us ask: "Who loves the municipalities?" I think the answer is clear . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell us about the municipalities that didn't get any grants.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What about the hundreds of municipalities that didn't get a nickel?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — When the hon. members talk about the municipalities, I cannot believe the, because their actions in the past speak so loud I just cannot believe what they say now. Yet these people blindly continue to proclaim Liberal policy, knowing the situation as it existed in the past. Of course I think it fits this little old rhyme.

**March 1, 1957**

**Mr. Coderre:** — You're dreaming.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — "When the devil was sick, the devil a saint would be: When the devil was well, the devil a saint was he."

The truth is that the Liberal party in Saskatchewan is very sick. Every time after an election we always have to discuss the question to some extent as to who won the election. And I'm no exception.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Why?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We have to discuss it because my hon. friends across the floor are hard to convince who won it, even though there are only 14 here.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It's more than we had last time.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It's more than you had last time, and if 2,665 votes had turned from your candidates . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — In the right place.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . in the right places, there wouldn't have been one of them left. Not one.

**Mr. McDonald:** — We'd have won the election.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In other words, Mr. Speaker, there were only 2,665 votes between the Liberal party in this Legislature and complete extinction. Half of them would have been gone if 454 people had changed their minds.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — It might work against you, too, 'Brock.'

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in my constituency in the last election, I received a larger majority over the Liberal candidate than I ever did since 1944. So, things don't look too bad.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — So did I. I received a bigger one over the C.C.F. candidate than I ever did.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes I agree.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — How much money did you spend? Tell us the whole story.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I said the Liberal Party is sick. Not one Liberal member in this House was elected by a clear majority in the Legislature over all candidates — not one.



**Mr. McCarthy:** — How many over there?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Ten on this side were elected by a clear majority.

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hurray!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Was the Premier elected by a clear majority?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — There were only three Liberal s who were elected with over 500 votes ahead of their nearest opponent. 27 C.C.F. members were elected with over 500 votes ahead of their nearest opponent, and nine of them had over 2,000 votes ahead on this side of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — All the cities, all the cities.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And seven Liberals had less than 200 votes to the good, and no C.C.F. member had such a narrow margin as 200 with the exception of Athabasca constituency where there are only a few hundred votes in total.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Pretty close.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't think there is any question about who won the election, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — We knew that before you started.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, the hon. member says he knew that before I started. Well, I never would have guess it because from some of the talk that I have heard from the Liberals in this House, and some of their actions, you would think they thought they were the Government and were running this House.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Don't hold us responsible for your inability to comprehend.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Liberal Party had its chance in Saskatchewan for 34 years, but it showed very little sympathy or consideration for Saskatchewan people. All you have to do is go back and remember what took place. I know the days when people were afraid to attend a C.C.F. meeting for fear they would be cut off the relief roll. I know that it happened to people, when they attended a C.C.F. meeting. Everything that the Liberal Government had to hand out, they used for political patronage. There's no question about it.

**March 1, 1957**

**Mr. McCarthy:** — It's absolutely untrue, and you know it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) read some pretty good authority yesterday, and this is on the record. The Liberals in Saskatchewan have been caught red-handed in corruption more than once, and you don't have to strain your minds to remember it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What about the Rawluk case?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) shakes his head. Did he never hear about dye?

**Mr. Danielson:** — There was never half the corruption . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Dye?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Never heard about the purple dye? But there is no . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Who are you blackmailing now? Who are you blackmailing on the dye?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — There is no question that the Liberal party made a mess in the province of Saskatchewan in the 34 years they were in office.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Go a little further with your dye.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the face of Saskatchewan has certainly been changed in the last 13 years; not only in my constituency but all over the province. There have been hard-surfaced roads, highways, gravelled highways. The highway system which we inherited from the Liberal party which was just marks on maps and streaks of mud out in the country, has been to a very large extent, rebuilt and surfaced; high schools constructed throughout the province where there were none before. Nobody knows better than two or three of the members sitting on the other side of the House who are school teachers, how much improvement there has been in the field of education, if they were willing to admit it. We have had union hospitals constructed by the dozen throughout the province, and rural power, as everyone has heard taken to over 40,000 farms.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Who paid that?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Liberal Party isn't worried, Mr. Speaker, because there is a capital charge that the farmer has to pay to get the power. That isn't what worries them at all. They never did worry about the farmer having to pay for things in their past history, and they are not now. What they are really worried about is because we were able to accomplish that feat, because we were able to get power

into 40,000 farms in the province of Saskatchewan, and they are worried, because they know that we will go into 25,000 more farms up to 1961. They would like to have us do things that would slow the program down. That's what they want us to do; because they suggest there shouldn't be any capital charge. Well, when you only have so much money to spend . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You spend it anyway.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . if it costs twice as much, you can only go half as far.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Would you apply that to the 'thirties?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It is so obvious it shouldn't take any explanation. One Liberal said . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Don't contradict.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Why not rural power like gas in cities and towns? But they all say the gas rates are too high. Now, you can't have it both ways; and if you just keep track of what these people say . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — You've got it both ways now.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . you will do away with all revenue for the Government, if you listen to all they say about cutting down revenue, and increasing to the ultimate the expenditure. It is just that illogical, that ridiculous. Then they talk about farm credit. The Liberal Government in this province once upon a time had a Farm Loan Board. It was very poorly administered, I will admit, and they made a terrific number of very bad loans. They quit the business.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You did.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They quit the business. The Liberals quit making loans . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's a different thing. You quit the Board, when you came into power.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, all we did was clean up the mess that was left by the Liberals.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You took it off. Don't try to get around it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Liberals quit the Farm Loan Board business away back in the 'thirties. It might have been the Conservatives that quit the business, but the Liberals didn't start it when

**March 1, 1957**

they were put back in again.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It was still there.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They had had enough of it. The machinery was there, and all it had been doing for years was collecting. They hadn't made a loan for years and years.

Will the hon. member keep quiet and listen for a minute?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, I will if you will tell the facts.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now we have a federal Farm Loan Board with a Liberal Government there.

**Mr. Danielson:** — They're doing good work, too.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And the hon. member from Arm River says they are doing good work. Mr. Speaker, do you know what they are doing? They will grant a loan to a farmer provided he doesn't need it very badly, and that's all. Unless a farmer has assets and a position where he can get along without a loan, he can't get a loan from the Canadian Farm Loan Board. That is the situation. I am not blaming the people who are administering it; it is the policy of the Federal Government. Then these people over here talk about a Provincial Government getting into the farm credit business.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Why don't you?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — What they should be doing is talking to the Federal Government about taking a long-term view . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — We're in Saskatchewan now.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . about taking a calculated risk, if necessary . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Thirty years, now; 30 years.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and giving to the farmers cheap credit. Not just to the ones who can actually get along without it, but to the people who really need it, to set up and start in business — young farmers . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's your duty.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . or to increase the holdings of those young farmers. That's where they should be talking instead of busy talking here.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's what you should do.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But if it their tactics to blame the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan for all the failures of the Federal Government at Ottawa.

Now, we have a Federal National Health Plan coming. We have heard talk and promises about it since 1919. We started construction grants for hospitals years ago. Three years later the Federal Government came into the picture with their construction grants. Now they talk about not a national health plan, which was promised back in 1919; not a national health plan which was talked about and promised back in 1945, and the Bill was printed at that time at Ottawa and circulated throughout Canada. What they are talking about now is less than half of a National Hospital Insurance Plan. The mental hospitals and the T.B. hospitals are excluded, and that is over half the hospital beds in Canada. They are not talking about 60 per cent, like they promised, but 50 per cent; and they have put in the way all the possible blocks — it has got to be six provinces; it has got to be a majority of the people in Canada. There is every evidence that they want to hold it back as long as they can. I have often said that Liberal Governments will adopt Socialistic measures like health insurance, when they can't help it . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — It isn't Socialistic.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . when they don't dare do anything else.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That isn't Socialism.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — What is it, then?

**Mr. McDonald:** — It is redistributing the nation's wealth.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Liberal Government is just like a balky mule; they won't do things unless they have to. I remember in the old days I knew a fellow who drove a mule, and this mule used to balk once in a while. He had a very cruel, but very effective remedy, and that was to take something like a neck-yoke and give him a tap on the head. I think probably that would be a good treatment for the Liberal party. If my hon. friends over here would just pick up a neck-yoke and give the Liberals at Ottawa a few good wallops, it would probably get them to act a lot faster.

**Mr. Danielson:** — When did you get yourself . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I'm talking to my friends over here, in their own best interests because they can never recover their place; they can never recover (I was going to say recover a reputation; they don't want to recover that one — it was too bad); they can never make a reputation in Saskatchewan unless they can get some action from the Liberal Government, and they had better go to work on it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — We wouldn't want a reputation like yours.

**March 1, 1957**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now they're talking about increased old-age pensions at Ottawa. Some generous soul talked about \$5 a month. Some other body who is equally generous had a word in the press something about he thought it should be \$10 a month.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's better than \$2.50.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, it is shameful if any increase that comes from the Federal Government is less than \$20 a month.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It's shameful that you don't increase yours.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — By an amendment to the Constitution, the Federal Government took over responsibility for those elderly citizens over the age of 70. We shouldn't be in that field at all, by right.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You're not.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You might just as well be out, for all you're doing.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But they should be paying today \$60 or more on old-age pensions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the broadcasting of the debate because there has been considerable said about it during this Session, and also during the previous Session. The Liberal members in this House appear to be opposed to the broadcasting of debates. They have never come out and said so, but they have certainly at times indicated that they didn't think much of the idea.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's your imagination.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I hope it is my imagination. I hope I am wrong, because people have the right to listen in the galleries in this Legislature, and they do. They have the right to read in the papers, and they do. The proceedings of the Legislature and the House of Commons are published, and many people read them. Isn't it right and proper that this new device, the radio, should be used to extend this right and privilege? Now, the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) said: "All speeches or none should be broadcast".

**Mr. Korchinski:** — That's right. That is correct.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the same as saying: "Because these galleries will not hold all the people of Saskatchewan, we should close them and have none at all". It is exactly the same thing.

**Mr. Cameron:** — C.C.F. reasoning!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — No! No!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** —What the member for Redberry really wanted was to argue that we should have no debates on the air because he knows it is impossible to put them all on . . .

**Mr. Korchinski:** — No, it isn't.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — So he could still go along with the other members, and say: "Oh, I like the radio broadcasts", but still working against them. And the member for Redberry said: "I am absolutely denied the right opposite be on the air".

**Mr. Korchinski:** — That's right.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** —Well, I want to say to him that if that statement is true, it was his own Liberal friends who denied him that right, and no one else. The Radio Committee report adopted by this House . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — It hasn't been adopted yet.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . allocated radio time equally to all members.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It hasn't been adopted yet.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, it has been brought into this House, and it allocated time equally to all members.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, he shouldn't be talking about it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Minister is hardly in order to discuss this matter which is standing on the Order Paper.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I shouldn't have mentioned the Radio Report, and I shan't mention it again. I am only mentioning what the hon. member for Redberry mentioned in his speech the other day.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Go ahead.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But certainly the hon. member for Redberry could have had his 36 minutes. You see, each member represents a constituency. All have equal rights in debates and in voting in this House, and, therefore, each member is entitled to equal time. No member could be compelled to give up his time. Now, if we choose to give up some of our time, if some members choose to give up some of their time to the Premier, or, at the length I talk, to me, or some members over there choose to give up some of their time to the Leader of the Opposition, that is their business. But what I suspect is – and I would say to the hon. member for Redberry that he should investigate this, as it looks a little fishy; I suspect that his colleagues over there engineered this thing so as to keep him off the radio.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Imagination again!

**March 1, 1957**

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Pure nonsense!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And as a matter of fact, if I were tin that party over there, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly not want the hon. member for Redberry to be on the radio with that speech, and I would hope, too, that the galleries would be empty. So I think that is where the trouble lies: that the member for Redberry can be pretty well assured that his colleagues didn't want him on the air, and got him into that position where he didn't have the air time.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's your imagination again.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, if the Liberal members want more time the air, there's one cure. Elect more members to the Legislature.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — We'll do that little thing.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now Mr. Speaker, the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) has some things to say the other day, and I have the newspaper here as well as a few notes. He spoke about the Cabinet Ministers, about their salary and pensions, and that they never had it so good, and so on. This sounded very good coming from a merchant up in the Pelly constituency, and I know, that in the 1930s the member for Pelly, when other people were on relief, was making a pretty good thing out of that relief in his store. He was one of those fortunate people . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Oh! Oh!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Come on, 'Brock'. Get out of the dirt.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I know that is a fact. I am not getting in the dirt. I am bringing out some of the facts of the case, and I am within my rights.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Get out of the gutter.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The member for Pelly, and I have heard of him for a good long time indeed, certainly is the last person that should mention some of the things that he mentioned the other day. When he came to talk about the composition of the Cabinet, I find that there are five farmers in the Cabinet, and five among the Liberal opposition. Five on each side, and in addition we have on this side of the House, in the Cabinet, three members who worked for farm organizations, for the Co-ops and the Pools, and who certainly were imbued with the farmer's cause and knew the farmer's problems.

Now, I would like to come back to the question of superannuation for a minute. All members in the House, unless it was with one or two exceptions, supported the superannuation Bill, and I assumed they supported it because they thought it was fair and just. The people who gave public service



should be entitled to some security. They could not, while they were giving public service, have the same chance to attend to their own affairs, and they should have some compensation because, if a member put in a long term of public service and got old at it, he should have that security. In Ottawa they agreed to the same thing. As a matter of fact the pension plan at Ottawa is much more generous than ours here, because . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — They don't give anything extra for Ministers. It is a flat rate for all the members in Ottawa.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now just a minute. Now that you have mentioned it, we take the example of the Minister of Agriculture from Saskatchewan at Ottawa.

**Mr. Loptson:** — His pension is no higher than . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — His total salary and expense allowance and indemnity is \$27,000 a year - \$17,000 salary as Minister of Agriculture; \$4,000 a year expense allowance as a Member of the House of Commons, and \$6,000 indemnity. Then, of course, he has his expenses for which he puts in the bills after that. But he only pays a percentage on the \$6,000; not on the \$27,000. The maximum pension at Ottawa is the same as the maximum pension here, and those people will qualify for it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The same maximum pension in Ottawa for ordinary members.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The maximum pension at Ottawa is \$3,000 a year, the same as it is here . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes, but the private members . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But the Ministers there get it easier, because they don't have to pay the percentage on their salary, and they get it easier than the members of the Legislature here, because they don't have to pay it on the expense allowance, which we members of the Legislature do. The members of the Legislature pay the percentage on the total amount they get, of \$3,600.

**Premier Douglas:** — As long as it is a flat rate, regardless of whether it is 20 years or 10 years.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, as long as they earn the pension, they get the maximum rate; there is only one rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a suspicion that during the last election campaign Liberal candidates campaigned on the issue throughout Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — More suspicion!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In fact I have had pretty good reports to the effect that they were doing just that. The hon. member from Pelly also said that farmers were denied the privilege of getting

**March 1, 1957**

timber permits. That is not true. Farmers have had the right to get timber permits all along the forest area for years, and they have been getting them, too. Then he mentioned the profits of the Timber Board. If we make a loss, it's wrong, and if we make a profit, it's wrong, too, according to the members opposite. He said the profit of the Timber Board was made at the expense of the producer, and at the expense of the consumer. I said before today that one of the problems up in my part of the country is that we have too many people wanting to work for the Saskatchewan Timber Board because they can get more. The Timber Board is paying a better price, a better contract price for logging and sawing than they can get either in Alberta or Manitoba.

**Some Hon. Member:** — More independent.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is one of the problems that we have. We are selling our lumber on the open market, and if we wanted to, we couldn't get more than the open market; but actually what we have done is that we have not taken advantage of every possible rise in the open market. Lumber could be procured through the piling yards of the Timber Board (and there are seven or eight of them throughout the province) cheaper than you could get it any place else in the province.

I would like to deal with just one or two things in connection with mineral resources. I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who at the opening of this debate, mentioned the statement quoted in the press by Dr. Link. This was referred to by the Premier, and I want to draw again to the attention of this House, and anybody who should be listening, that when one item comes up on this subject and gets Saskatchewan spread like this on Page 3, a denial comes out and gets a spread like this on Page 15, it takes a bit of a stretch of the imagination to call that a free and fair press.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You should go and run it, 'Brock'.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The annual report of the Imperial Oil Company for 1946 states the case. It says: (This is a report to the shareholders).

“In Saskatchewan your Company drilled 5,005 feet and completed its second deep test on the Davidson structure, and the Company has withdrawn almost completely from Saskatchewan to concentrate its efforts on more promising areas,”

And the President of the Company told me practically the same thing, that, at that time Imperial Oil was in the process of drilling that series of dry holes which finally amounted to 133 before the discovery of Leduc, and that they left because they were looking for fields where there were better prospects.

The Liberal Party has not been very constructive in the province of Saskatchewan; in fact I don't think it is any help to the province. There is a great job to do in this province, and there is one particular job that the Liberals in this province could do well, and that is get for Saskatchewan the remedy, the kind of service and attention, which we need from

the Federal Government at Ottawa.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Down there again, eh?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** —But no matter whether the Liberal party will do that, or will continue with its illogical and destructive criticism, I can assure them that this Government will carry on with a program for progress and prosperity, and we will also continue to press Ottawa to come across with the things they should provide. We'll do all this in spite of anything to the contrary that our friends across the floor may do. We will continue to work for the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan, not only in Saskatchewan affairs, but also using our influence outside the province as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

**Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** —Mr. Speaker, to date, you have been perhaps one of the most congratulated persons in the whole of the province, and I, too, would like to add my voice of congratulations to all the others who have already congratulated you, and heartily concur with everything they have said to you thus far.

I would also like to add my voice of congratulations to all the members of this Assembly, and particularly to those who have spoken for the first time. The members who have made their maiden speeches, have set such a high level of speaking that I find myself in a very difficult spot at this moment, to try and keep pace with the other members who have made their maiden speeches.

At this time, I would like to indicate to the members of the Assembly, some of the things I discovered that go on in this House, since the time that I have been in here. I don't think I had been here three days, until I noticed that I had to become aware of certain booby traps that are set around here. Prior to the question period on about the third day, I looked at the Orders of the Day, and I found that I was supposed to pose a certain question. When the question came up for discussion, I grabbed the Orders of the Day, and I pages furiously looking to find that question, and Leader of the Opposition and behold! it wasn't in that Order Paper. My hon. friend over here was no help to me. I asked him for his and he wouldn't part with it. He must have thought it was a precious possession; but he wouldn't let me have it. I looked again at the title, and it referred me to the appendix. So I went through the four sheets again, and I thought if an appendix was that hard to find, I'd hat to be a doctor, but what had happened really was that they took two front pages and stuck them together and tacked them together on the sheet that I had on my desk, so I was unable to find the question. It didn't help in the least to take any nervousness away from me at the time.

There are some other impressions that I have gained since being here. Prior to the sitting of the House and my coming to Regina, I had it quite clear in my mind where I had intended to go next summer on my holidays, but due to the lavish invitations we have received from almost every part of the province, to come and fish up there, I don't know where I am going to go now anymore. I might say that I sincerely appreciate the invitations, and I

**March 1, 1957**

guess if I find myself next summer in the position where I spend another summer without catching any fish, it won't be the fault of the members of this Assembly.

I would also at this time like to mention some of the observations. A couple of days ago, a member of the Government had indicated that the members here are slavishly spouting – I forget what he had said, but we are slavishly repeating that which we have had dictated to us, otherwise we will be eliminated. Yesterday we had the unhappy situation, when one of our members got up and stated his own personal view points, there were shouts of “hypocrisy” from the other side of the floor, so I wonder if they are consistent in trying to belittle us.

With those few remarks, I would like to adjourn the debate until Monday.

(Debate adjourned)

### **SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON RADIO BROADCASTING**

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

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

**Hon. Russel Brown (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, when the Committee of which you are the Chairman, met, we agreed that the Legislative broadcast would take place for some five weeks. That would give us 31 hours and 15 minutes of broadcast time. Realizing that it was going to be difficult to come to any agreement as to the division of that time, we felt that allotting on a numerical basis amongst the members of the House would be the most suitable; and we decided then that it would be fair to allot each member on the Government side of the House some 35.71 minutes, and for the Official Opposition and the unofficial Opposition some 36.76 minutes each, slightly more than that allowed to each member on the Government side of the House. That works out to 20 hours and 50 minutes for the members of the Government side, 8 hours and 35 minutes for the 14 members of the Official Opposition, and 1 hour and 50 minutes for the 3 members of the unofficial Opposition.

It was suggested by some members of the Committee that the allocation of time was not fair. It was suggested that the only way they felt they could accept an allotment of time was to divide the time equally between the Government and the Opposition. In their opinion, as expressed, there are two sides to each question, and, therefore, both sides should have an equal amount of radio time and put their opinions across. It was pointed out, however, that, in this Assembly, it can be considered that each question will have more than two sides to it (if that is the proper expression) at least there are three different opinions on each question which may develop; and if you followed that argument through, it would be only fair to suggest that the

time be allotted one-third, one-third and one-third. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Official Opposition would not agree to granting the unofficial Opposition one-third of the radio time. And, of course, it is obvious that the 35 members sitting on this side of the House would not stand for an allocation of that kind. But, when the matter was put to a vote, Mr. Speaker, it was agreed on division four to two. One member on the Committee from the Opposition voted with the members on the Committee from the Government side of the House.

I realize we are probably going to have to listen to a considerable number of arguments, which we have listened to, year in and year out, when the matter of the allocation of radio time has been up for discussion. I, nevertheless, am prepared to move, seconded by Mr. Howe, that the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Radio Broadcasting of Selected Proceedings be now concurred in.

**Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things in connection with the proportioning of the radio time to the various members in this Legislature. The other night I did not think that it was fair that just part of the debate should be broadcast, because it creates a distorted picture of the debate in the Assembly. Quite often there are things said on the radio and no replies made to them. For example, the other night I spoke in this Legislature, my speech was not on the air, but the next day I was being mentioned as having said something in this Legislature, and I had phone calls from my constituency asking me when did I speak; they didn't hear my speech. I had to explain to them that my speech was not over the air. "Well", they said, "They certainly would have liked to have heard the other side of the story." And so, this is one reason I said that all the debate speeches should be broadcast, or none. I believe that the Government has this point, where they claim that there isn't a radio station that is willing to carry the length of the debates, but I believe that it would be possible to record those and broadcast them at the time when the radio stations could rebroadcast them.

If we are spending \$10,000, or somewhere near \$10,000, I don't think it would take very much more to get the rest of the speeches recorded and broadcast. It may be possible to arrive at some agreement where the speeches could be limited to a certain length of time, and I am sure that the members on this side would be in favour of that; but I think that all of the members should have equality in this respect. I do not think that any member should give up any of his time, or should be asked to give it up by anyone, Ministers or anybody else. I believe that any Minister should not have any greater privilege than any of the members of this House, and he should not ask any of the members on his side to give up any of their time.

It was stated by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) just a little while ago, that the members on this side did not want me to go on the air, and that is why I wasn't on the air. That isn't true to fact. We had agreed that, because there was so little time allotted to us, we would let the new members giving their 'maiden' speeches go on the air, and that was the reason why all of us did not go on the air.

I believe the way the arrangement is now, that it is a sort of a form of a closure, because you either don't get any radio time, or if you do

**March 1, 1957**

get it, it is so short that you have to limit yourself to very few topics, and you don't get the chance to develop your topic properly. And there is another thing that has to be considered. Quite often you hear members speaking to the radio audience instead of speaking to the House =, just because there is a radio audience. I have nothing against information going out to the public. I believe that it is a good step to have the people in the province or any place else listen to what is going on in this Legislature; but the only objection that I have (and it is a very strong objection) is that all the members should have the same time devoted to speaking, and I think that sometimes there are certain problems that have two sides, and sometimes they have three sides. I think that this is a very important topic to be debated, and I think that the same amount of time should be given to all the sides to debate a particular topic. Every side should have a chance to present their views on this particular topic.

I don't think that there is anything else that I can say in this respect.

**Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our group I would like to say a few words in this connection. We realize that we have a small representation here in this Assembly, and due to the fact that we have a very short time allotted to us (that is radio time), I guess it had been noted by all the members here, that we were put in the very awkward position in that we have to divide up our time in such a manner that we couldn't fully cover some of the important topics of debate.

I think that this Committee should reconsider their allocation of time, and should bring it out on a basis whereby at least the Leader of the Government, the Official Opposition, and the semi-official Opposition (if you wish to call it such) would have a chance to discuss the major items of legislation in this Session on a complete period of one hour and a quarter radio time, and to continue on if they found it necessary to discuss the subjects.

I am only referring to the two main items of the Session, which are the Throne Speech and the Budget. I would like to see the radio time worked out on this basis: that the Premier, or such other member as he would designate, would take full radio time for the Speech from the Throne, and the Official Opposition would also receive the same hour and a quarter of radio time, and the Leader, or whichever member should be designated, of our group, would also receive the same hour and a quarter of radio time on these two major items in the Session. From then on, the time could be allocated on the basis of representation; but there should be no hampering of speeches or opinions expressed in this Legislature by any group or Official Opposition or other Opposition; they should not be hampered by radio time to express their opinions in connection with such important items as the Speech from the Throne and the Budget.

Therefore, we would suggest that consideration be given to the different parties represented here on that basis.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — I would just like to point this out, if we are voting \$10,000 a year for

radio broadcasting and presumably as a public service to the people of the province. Someone said the people of the province were politically mature, were very conscious politically. If they are politically mature, then I don't think that we should be too afraid of expressing ideas and letting the people here those ideas. We have in the Legislature today, different political parties, each commanding some support throughout the province. There are several voices to be heard in this Legislature, and I think there is something to be said when you find \$10,000 of public funds being spent to bring the so-called voice of the Legislature to the people. You find that, of the 31 hours approximately I understand that the radio has been engaged for, 20 of those 31 hours is devoted to Government speakers, eight to the Liberal party, and of that 1 hour and 50 minutes to the Social Credit party. In other words, the Government said "Since we have twice the number of members in the House of the opposing parties, we are going to insist that we have twice the air time. The Official Opposition will be allotted half as much time as we have, and what you do with that is no concern of ours, whether you take it all, or whether you give some to the other party in the Opposition as well." Now I think that was some of the discussions that went on.

I want to say there are lots of dollars being spent in this province telling the people about the activities of this particular Government. You have a series of Crown Corporations. They are called 'business enterprises', and you say, because they are business enterprises, they are entitled to, and should, spend money in advertising the same as any other business, and that is why we find today that the Power Corporation and the other firms have T.V. programs, entertainment programs and programs of every nature as a competitor in a business field. When people throughout the province listen to the amount of information which is given to them through various programs down through the years, then you can notice the amount of funds that is being spent by this Government in advertising what this Government is doing.

Yet, when you consider the Legislature, which is the important thing, we find they are still insisting on twice the amount of time given to the Opposition to express my voice which they have in there.

There are many things to be said, I think in this whole field of broadcasting. There are many advantages, and there are certainly many disadvantages. I do believe that everyone will agree that to some extent it does disrupt the procedure of the House. There is no question about it. It does lead, I think, to a deterioration of the debate in the House, and I think that it is natural that every member in those few minutes that he is on the air tries to advance some political viewpoint rather than a business-like discussion of the things, or problem, or motion under review. Sometimes people tell me it becomes a sounding board for political propaganda. Those are some of the reactions you get from the people out in the country.

I don't think it is possible that every debate that goes on in this House can be broadcast. The time consumed would be terrific, and the bill would certainly not be accepted by the people of Saskatchewan. But, I think, too, if we can't arrive at a better apportionment of the time, perhaps it might be better to restrict the radio time to one hour to the Premier on the Throne speech debate, one hour to the Leader of the Opposition. They

**March 1, 1957**

set the pattern for the Throne Speech debate. Then, if you wish, a certain length of time could be allotted in there to the other party in the House as well; we have three parties now. Then, on the Budget debate, there might be time given to the Budget Speech delivered by the Provincial Treasurer, the speech delivered by the Opposition financial critic, and the speech delivered as the official viewpoint of the third party.

I am not offering that as a solution, but I think that we must come to the point where we must look in an unbiased and somewhat helpful manner at this apportioning of radio time. If that is one of the solutions, it might be considered. Someone suggested that you might have the debates restricted to a certain time. I know we are getting criticized in the press for prolonging the House. People say there is too much repetition, and that to some extent is justified when you hear us over the radio.

I would suggest that this Committee should reconvene in the light of the discussion here, and see if we can't come up with some fairer apportionment of the time than we have here. It causes discontent in the House. It upsets the rules of the House. The Opposition feels that we are not getting half a chance to put the viewpoint of the opposition parties in this Legislature before the people of Saskatchewan.

For that reason, I am opposed to the present allotment of time. I don't think it is fair. I don't think we have taken into consideration the people of the province, and the viewpoints that are to be expressed. And, I think that the best that we could do is to send this Report back to the Committee, and see if we can't bring in something of a more stable and a more equitable distribution of this air time.

**Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — I must disagree with the remarks of the last speaker. First of all, I don't think that we have necessarily three separate points of view on all of the questions that are raised in this House.

I think it was the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) who, in such a delightful manner, told us that when we come into this House, we come in here to represent all the people of the province. We speak for our constituencies when we come here; we don't speak for a political party. Every constituency in this province has a right to be heard, and every constituency in this province has a right to be heard equally. There should be no differences. If there are certain members who wish to give a portion of their time to someone who, they feel may express their point of view better, that is a matter for them; but I do think it is the right of every member in this House to insist that he should have the same rights as every other member. The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) just referred to the \$10,000 which is voted for radio broadcasting. We should not take the total amount of money which is appropriated for indemnities to the members, and divide it, split it three ways, so that the three members representing the Social Credit would get a third of the total indemnity. We wouldn't think of doing that, and yet it is just about as logical, as what my hon. friend has just suggested.

I believe that I must disagree, too, that the radio upsets the routine of the House. I don't think it needs to. I see no reason whatsoever



why it should. I do think that there are certain things that can be done that could expedite the business of the House. That, I think, is a subject which should be considered, and I would hope that our Committee on Standing Order and Rules will meet very shortly in order that we may eliminate some of the things which are causing some of the delays. I think the hon. members will agree that we have kept them working reasonably well since they came in. I don't think the House has adjourned much before 5:30 any evening during this past two weeks, and I believe this morning we had the eighth meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. We have met two evenings in Public Accounts, and we have met six mornings, so I don't think we have lost too much time. In fact, I think some of the hon. members couldn't care to work much harder. So I don't think that it does necessarily upset the routine of the House. I think if we could arrive in advance at a certain length of time for the Speech from the Throne debate to go on, as they have now done in Ottawa, and a certain length of time for the debate on the Budget Address, I think these things could be ironed out. Then I think a certain amount of time could be appropriated for the leaders of each of the three groups, and probably the rest of us could then be satisfied with a lesser amount of time. Probably we could split the rest evenly among us. But I don't think we can do that until such time as we know in advance how much time is going to be consumed in these two major debates.

So, I think we will have to wait for a Report from the Committee on Revision of the Standing Orders, and I hope that they might give some consideration to that question. But, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, there is any other way that is a fair way, except to give every constituency in this province equal rights. We come here as representatives of a constituency, not as representatives of a political party. We are not in an election campaign. If we were in an election campaign, as time was being distributed by the CBC, it would be on the basis of parties; but when we come here to this House, even though we sit on opposite sides, we each come here as representative of a constituency to express the point of view of all the people of that constituency, and, therefore, all the people of each constituency should have an equal right to be heard on the radio.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, we have heard arguments on the motion, from this side of the House, from the Cabinet Ministers; and also from the members opposite. I am speaking for the private members who sit on this side of the House, and I have contended at all times, exactly what the hon. member for Regina (Hon. Mr. Fines) mentioned, that we are not here as members of any political party. We are here as pres of the constituencies of the province of Saskatchewan. We all have problems in our constituencies which we wish to bring to this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, you know that on certain occasions, I have not always agreed with the Government. So I submit, when it is argued from the other side of the House that there are only two sides to the question or three sides to the question, I think that I can argue just as well and say that there are 52 or 53 sides to every question. Just because we align ourselves with our political philosophy, or with certain viewpoints, with either this side or that side of the House, doesn't mean that there aren't 52 or 53 sides to the question. To be fair, I think the only way that we can decide any question is to see that every member has a right to whatever share there is of radio time.

**March 1, 1957**

I feel that if one of the Cabinet Ministers can present a public question better than I can, I am quite prepared to forgo my time; that is my privilege. But for me to have to agree to subsidize the Liberal party or the Social Credit party at the expense of the C.C.F., which has two-thirds of the representation in this House, I don't think it is fair, and I don't think it right. As a matter of fact, I don't think that kind of an argument should be brought into this House at all.

I would like to remark on something that was mentioned, I think, by the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) about political maturity and discussing questions on the radio that had not too much bearing on the problems of Saskatchewan. It may be unfortunate that the members in this House, instead of talking about the problems affecting their constituents, and affecting the province of Saskatchewan, get out and talk about political platforms, and things like that. It is entirely up to the members. If they so desire to use their time on the radio that, of course, is their privilege. If on the other hand, they really want to discuss the problems of our people here in the province of Saskatchewan and of Canada, that again is their privilege.

I agree entirely with the motion as it has been submitted.

**Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak very briefly on it. I want to say that the Provincial Treasurer was talking about the length of the House. Well, it is my opinion that, owing to the radio, we break a very great number of rules of the House, and we have to do it because of the radio. I am not talking about the Committee meetings, but I mean just to give you one instance of an amendment moved. Under ordinary circumstances you would debate that amendment, and when it was disposed of, you would debate the motion, but owing to this, they debate it all together. That is just one instance.

You are breaking an awful lot of the Rules of the House, in my opinion, in order to make it conform with radio time, and I don't see that you can do otherwise because, if you are going to limit that time, well, then you have got to make it conform, and a lot of the proceedings of the House are just to conform with radio time. Another thing – the political aspects of most of the speeches, including my own probably, are more political than they are to do with the subject before the House, and it does give a very distorted idea, in my opinion, in the country of what goes on in the House. After all, the real work of this House is done in Committee, and when we are doing that work, it is not political. The radio is getting more political, I believe, getting to be a sort of political sounding board. I don't suppose we can do away with it, but I inclined to think that if it were all broadcast, we can do away with it, but I inclined to think that if it were all broadcast, or none, it would be better, and there may be some way of working it out. But I do think that the radio is deteriorating the conduct of the House.

**Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Social Welfare):** — May I ask the hon. member a question before he sits down. Does my hon. friend think that if the radio time were divided equally between both sides of the House, there would be any less politics in the speeches?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I don't know. It seems to me they are getting more political all the time.

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this Report. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee which brought in this recommendation.

When this Committee met, it was pointed out to the representatives of the two opposition groups that the amount of radio time that it was possible to engage was approximately 31 hours and 15 minutes. Now how could that best be divided up among the various groups of the House? Those from this side of the House felt that being 53 constituencies, it should be divided according to the constituencies. But you, Mr. Speaker, being in the chair and not have the opportunity or the privilege to say what you might want to say on behalf of your constituency, we were willing on our side of the House here to delete you from the 53, and we would divide the total number of minutes by 52. We would divide the total number of minutes in the 31 hours and 15 minutes, which would be 1,875 minutes. If we divided that by 52, Mr. Speaker, (this side of the House don't claim any privilege because you don't have the privilege to take your time), we find that the total amount of time which would be allocated to each member is 36.05 minutes per member. We also went further than that. We said that while we are entitled on that ratio to have slightly better than 36 minutes, we are prepared on our side of the House to accept slightly better than a quarter of a minute of a deduction from our side; 36 times a quarter of a minute (a little over that), will work out to 35.71 minutes from our side of the House, 36.76 minutes for the other side of the House, and that includes both parties there. So in reality it gives each member on that side of the House slightly in excess of one minute more on the average than it gives members on this side of the House.

The Official Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) was one of the two which represented their group at that meeting; he suggested there was two sides to the story. If the Government should take half the time, then the Opposition should have half the time to reply. I suggested to him that, if he took that to its ultimate conclusion, if the Government was only getting half the time regardless of their number and we were only to have half the time on this side of the House, then it would only be fair to say, regardless of the size of the two Opposition groups, that the remaining half the time should be split evenly between the two groups. The Leader of the Official Opposition objected to that suggestion.

The member for Rosthern (Mr. Elias) who was representing the Social Credit group on the Committee agreed with the Report from this side of the House. He also stated right there that if it was going to be divided 50-50, they would insist on half of the Opposition's time. And if, Mr. Speaker, we were going to allocate 50 per cent of the time to the Government, and 50 per cent of the time to the Opposition, I see no justification why the amount of time which the Social Credit group got should not be the same amount as the Liberals got, if we are going to disregard party standing in the House, or the constituencies which we represent. I believe my constituency, because I don't occupy a front bench, if I want to have a right to speak on these debates, my constituency has equally as much right to hear from me as any other constituency in this province. If I don't choose to take radio time, as the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) said, I can

**March 1, 1957**

agree with my own group here to allocate my time to someone else, and that should be my right and my privilege. But I shouldn't have to forsake that unless I want to.

The member for Maple Creek feels that it should be divided so that the Opposition has equal time; the Social Credit should have more time and so should they. I wonder if the member from Maple Creek would also agree under his analysis that the House Leader of the Social Credit party should get half of the Leader of the Opposition's salary. Each member gets his indemnity, his expense allowance, each Cabinet Minister gets a salary for the work they do. The Leader of the Official Opposition gets a salary as the Leader of the Official Opposition. Would he and his group be prepared to follow their argument all the way through and say that the Social Credit should have more time, and that they should have some of the Leader of the Opposition's salary? Should that be split evenly, Mr. Speaker?

This Committee has tried to do, in my opinion, what is fair and just for all of us, and we on this side of the House have conceded, as I have mentioned, over a quarter of a minute from each of the 35 of us on this side of the House, in order that it may be added proportionally among them.

The House Leader of the Social Credit group said that they found it very difficult to be able to express their viewpoint on account of the time. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that they have encountered some difficulties in arranging the debate between them and the official Opposition; I don't know, but it could be. There is nothing to stop any member on that side of the House from getting up in the afternoon, or in the evening, after the air time has finished and speaking for half an hour or so, and then adjourning the debate until the next day, and taking their time, which they want to take at that particular occasion, on the radio 15 or 20 minutes or half an hour, or whatever is allocated to them for that debate. I realize the position the Social Credit group was in, the other day, when two of them had to speak on the same day on the airtime, and then make way for a spokesman from the Liberal party. They were stuck in between two spokesmen for the Liberal party. They didn't have that opportunity. But it isn't our fault on this side of the House, if arrangements can't be made between the two Opposition groups, whereby one of the Social Crediters couldn't have adjourned the debate the night before, spoken for 15 or 20 minutes, or an hour or whatever he wanted, and come back on the air the next day and finish up his time. The other one maybe could have taken the last 10 minutes of the radio time and then tone on for an hour after.

It isn't up to this side to arrange those things, but I do believe, looking at it from y viewpoint as a private member, we have tried to do the best to give everybody a fair opportunity, and I think that it fair and just that we should each have the same amount of liberty.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, now that I have had an explanation from the member who has just taken his seat, I want to assure him that, if there is any ill will among the members of the opposition, whether they belong to the Liberal party or the Social Credit party, as to the division

of time, I think that probably we in the Liberal party or the members of the Social Credit party are quite able and willing to express the difficulties that we are having.

In this whole matter of radio time, I have never agreed with the division of radio time, and we have had examples this year that have demonstrated to me, at least, that it is certainly very unfair and it interferes with the working of this House. The hon. member who has just taken his seat mentioned the fact that yesterday, for instance, we had two members of the Social Credit party sandwiched in between two Liberal members and, consequently, they had some fifteen minutes apiece. I do not believe that any member can deal adequately with the Speech from the Throne in fifteen minutes. First of all, a new member likes to refer to his constituency that he represents, which our two friends in the Social Credit did – they followed that pattern yesterday; and then undoubtedly they would like to have presented some of the programs and suggestions of the Social Credit party, but as far as I can make out it was not possible to do that.

We had another example here yesterday of how the radio interferes with the workings of this House. After the decision had been made to divide the radio time – some 20 hours to the Government, 8 hours to ourselves, and 1 hour and 50 minutes to the Social Credit party; then there was a list of radio time presented to the Opposition and on that list there was a division for each particular day. We were allotted Tuesday of next week. Naturally that would be our radio period, and so we arranged to have our speakers take part in the debate for Tuesday, with the understanding that the Budget was to be presented to the House on Wednesday. But then we have had some people accused in this Legislature of having their rattle or their lollipop taken away from them; but because the Government had their rattle or lollipop – the radio – taken away from them on Tuesday, then they were not prepared to bring the budget in on Wednesday; so we were going to have to wait until Monday, the 11, for the Budget to be presented to this House, for the simple reason that they were not able to have the radio time on Tuesday. They, themselves, had made arrangements for the Opposition to have it on Tuesday. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is interfering with the workings of this Legislature, and it is also to be pointed out that we are all equal members, whether we are a Cabinet Minister, the Premier, or a private member; and I couldn't agree more with that statement. But here, Mr. Speaker, we are voting some \$10,000 annually of the peoples' money of this province to carry out a certain job or to present a certain amount of information from this Legislature to the people of Saskatchewan, and I agree that, if it were humanly possible, all the citizens of Saskatchewan and elsewhere ought to have the opportunity to see what goes on in the Legislature. I am always pleased to see as many people as possible come and visit our Legislature. But to say that we are presenting a true picture of the workings of the Legislature over the radio today is the most ridiculous statement that any person could ever make. After listening to one of the speeches that we heard here, this afternoon, from the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank), I don't think he ever got past 1939; and if the impression went out to the people of the province of Saskatchewan that the Minister of Mineral Resources, in presenting the report of this Department to this House, never got past the year 1938, then I think he created a very false impression.

**March 1, 1957**

The great bulk, or a great proportion, of the work that goes on during a session of the Legislature, as all of you know, takes place outside of the sittings of the Legislature, and apart from the radio broadcasts. Personally, I am aware of the fact that through radio broadcasting, we are creating a false impression to the people of this province and to the people of other parts of Canada and the United States, of what goes on in this Legislature. I understand, when the radio was brought into being (the broadcasting of parts of the session), that it was the wish of the Legislatures of that day to convey to our people some things that some people felt were not being conveyed to the general public through the medium of the press; and I suppose the idea was a sound one. But having been in this Legislature for some nine years I doubt very much if we are doing the job that the radio was intended to do in the first place.

It is quite true with the division of radio and television time throughout the Dominion of Canada (that is free time that is being supplied by the CBC), we are giving the different political parties of Canada the opportunity to present their platforms, their philosophy and their beliefs to the people of Canada; and in the division of that time we find that opposition parties invariably are given more than 50 per cent of the total time. Perhaps we have a little different situation here, because, as I mentioned a moment ago, and as several previous speakers have mentioned we all, or we should have the same rights inhere, one with another, regardless of what particular position we might occupy while we are here. But we are dividing this time. In other words, we are dividing the \$10,000 equally among 52 constituencies. You, Mr. Speaker, are not allowed any radio time. Perhaps we should give you some, I don't know, so that your constituency should get their share of the \$10,000. But if you want to follow that argument through to its ridiculous conclusion, then you would take the budget and divide it into 53 pieces and give each member 1/53rd of the budget, and say now you go back to Moosomin and take care of your roads and your education and all the rest of it. This is the only vote in the budget that is being divided amongst 53 constituencies. The Minister of Mineral Resources this afternoon, was telling us about road grants. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are 134 or 135 municipalities that haven't received any road grants for many years. Is that an equal distribution among all the municipalities?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the speaker is out of order. Is he speaking to this motion, or replying to the Minister of Mineral Resources?

**Mr. McDonald:** — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking to the motion and comparing this expenditure with other expenditure =s that take place in this Legislature, and I am suggesting, too, that I am in order.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us agree that no votes should be equally divided among every particular area of Saskatchewan. When carrying out a program it is necessary to spend particularly large sums of money in one area one year, and in some other particular area another year. It is necessary, and we all realize it is, to carry out a program; but this radio

time, in my opinion, should be divided equally between the Government and the Opposition, and I include both parties that are represented in the Opposition, and I feel sure that if 50 per cent of the radio time was given to the Opposition, we would have little or no difficulty in working out a division of that time among the opposition members.

**Premier Douglas:** — On a 50-50 basis?

**Mr. McDonald:** — I said that we would accept full responsibility for a division of that kind with our friends in the Social Credit party.

**Premier Douglas:** — I am asking you if you would agree to a 50-50 basis?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Certainly I would not.

**Premier Douglas:** — You would not?

**Mr. McDonald:** — No.

**Premier Douglas:** — Why?

**Mr. McDonald:** — No, I would not. Now, if you want to bring that argument up let us go back to some of the CBC time that is being divided between political parties. If we were to divide it on the same basis as my hon. friends, the 'humanitarian' party, divide the free time of this province, I would suggest that the C.C.F. party in Canada would have on TV show every third year and would appear on free time on the radio about once every 18 months. But no, Mr. Speaker, under the CBC regulations, with regard to the Provincial Affairs series, the C.C.F. party, with 36 members in the House, has 12 free periods of broadcasting time; and the Social Credit party has 7 free periods of broadcasting time. The same thing applies to the free television time: the C.C.F. party, with 22 members in the House of Commons, has two ten-minute periods; the Liberal party, with 170 members in the House of Commons, has four — twice as many as the C.C.F. I might suggest that that is a lot closer to being a 'humanity first' party than the C.C.F. are. Then the Conservatives, with 54 members in the House of Commons, have three; and the Social Credit, with 15 members in that House, have one period of television time. I would suggest that that is a lot fairer distribution of the time than the distribution that is being made here.

It is quite true, as other members have said, that there is probably more than two sides to the story of any program that is presented to this Legislature; but in the great majority of cases we find that there are certain proposals made by the Government, and the Opposition either agree with those proposals or criticize them, and I suggest in that manner there are at least two, probably three (now that we have three different parties in the House) sides to every story.

I also suggest that, for the reasons I have stated previously, the radio is interfering with the work of this Legislature, and I wonder some-

**March 1, 1957**

times why it is necessary for us to spend two weeks or more debating the Speech from the Throne in a Chamber where we have a total of some 53 members, when in the House of Commons, with a total of 265 members, they dispose of the Speech from the Throne in some 10 days. I, too, hope that the Committee on Standing Orders will be called together so that we can take a look at the proceedings that we have been following over the last several years. I can see no ready why we could not speed up the two main debates and probably spend more time on some reports of the Crown Corporations, reports of the different Departments of the Government; and also I have found in the last two or three session that we have been getting into Estimates very late in the session. It doesn't seem to matter what particular line of business or profession an individual follows; there is a certain time of year that members believe we are spending enough time on, for instance, the Estimates that come in at the close of the Session, and I, personally, would like to see this Committee called together and I am sure that we can reach a mutual agreement to change our Standing Orders so that we may move along a little faster in the early days of the Session and have more time left to take care of some of the major problems that confront us later on in the Session.

I want to make myself clear on that. I believe that we are all guilty of wanting to move out of here some time when we have very nice weather in the spring and the grass begins to turn green. I think it is human nature; and I think we should do everything that is in our power to take care of that problem, even if it means dealing with this radio with a little different view than we have, in the future. Now last year I moved non-concurrence in the report of the Radio Committee. I suppose I am not going to accomplish too much, after what has been said, by moving non-concurrence at this time, but because of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are certainly not satisfied with the division of radio time, I feel that it is my duty to move non-concurrence in the report that has been presented by the Minister this afternoon.

**Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to speak on this because there are so many things that I haven't grasped too well; but I do feel that the radio time has been abused, and is being abused terrifically. I, for one, have, on many occasions, shut it off, when you hear someone, from one side or the other, just actually abusing the other party.

Now if it is deemed to be the right thing, and necessary, and if we are going to change this thing at all, I feel that the combined Opposition should have the same time on the air as the Government, but I also feel that, in the division of that Opposition time, the two factions in the Opposition should get radio time on the basis of the popular vote they polled last June, or at the election previous to any time. The situation here now is that the Social Crediters polled more than one-fifth of the vote in the province last summer, and we get less than one-fifteenth of the time to tell the people who supported Social Credit what we have to tell them. Yesterday I would like to have had another hour. Being my 'maiden' speech, naturally



you start a little slow; I am always accused of speaking too fast. I intentionally tried to speak slowly in order to possibly put it over a little better, and the result was that I wasn't able to touch on many subjects very important to my area of the province. Still I am not allowed to speak a second time on that debate, I understand, even off the air, because we are in the minority at this time and we have to take pretty well what we can get. I would like to have the opportunity of taking an hour in speaking to the people of the northern part of this province. I know I can't do it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Sure, you can.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — When can I speak on the debate again? Will I have the privilege of speaking again on the Speech from the Throne?

**Premier Douglas:** — You will have an opportunity of speaking on the Budget.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Oh, on the Budget, certainly.

**Premier Douglas:** — The hon. member could have, by his Whip, simply arranged his time so that when his 20 minutes or 25 minutes or 30 minutes of air time was finished he could still have had an hour.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Oh, but we were in the middle.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — You can't be at the tail end when you have four speakers n one day all on the radio.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — I honestly think, Mr. Speaker, that the thing to do with it is to follow through the suggestion made earlier and give the Speech from the Throne radio time – the Opposition speakers radio time, the Premier radio time, the Budget radio time and the budget critic from the opposition side radio time, and cancel the rest of it and use that money for some other better purpose.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from what has been said by both the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that the Liberal party still are not very keen about broadcasting the proceedings of the Legislature. Of course that is not a new thing; they have never been very happy about it. They enjoyed the days when the proceedings in the House weren't too well known in the country and people had to depend for their impressions of what transpired in the debates upon newspaper reports and whatever part might be carried in the news broadcasts over the radio.

These Legislative broadcasts were introduced so that the people, particularly in the far-lying corners of the province, would have a chance to hear what their members and the other members had to say about the particular problems which affected them. These legislative broadcasts, I think, have met with a very widespread response. I am not saying that every member has used them wisely. It may be, as the member for Nipawin says, that sometimes they have been abused. Well, the electorate usually have a way of dealing with people who abuse things. Certainly changing the basis of the time is not going to stop anybody from abusing them. Whatever allocation of time

**March 1, 1957**

there is (whether it were turned topsy-turvy), isn't going to mean that somebody will be less partisan or more partisan; and if members are not using the time wisely then, of course, it is up to the respective caucuses to tell their members that they are not using their time wisely.

The two main criticisms that have been levelled by the two speakers I referred to in respect of legislative broadcasting are first, that it disrupts the business of the House. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't need to disrupt the business of the House. I was surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that the debate was being prolonged because we had to have the radio on Tuesday. As a matter of fact, the Whips had agreed to take the vote today, and they had planned the entire debate with the idea . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — They had no such thing.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, that was certainly our impression, and that the Whips had agreed.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The Whips had never agreed to that.

**Premier Douglas:** — There seems to be a lack of communication somewhere over there between the Whip and the caucus, because we were certainly under the impression and our Whip was under the impression, that the vote was to be taken today. And the vote could have been taken today. There was nothing to prevent the vote being taken today except that some members in the Liberal caucus wanted to speak next week, and so the debate had to be prolonged.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — And if it were going to be prolonged . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that there was certainly no arrangement made for the debate to end today; none whatever. The arrangements were made that you were to have the radio time n Monday, we were to have it Tuesday; I understand that the Budget was to come in on Wednesday – and that was 100 per cent with us.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, I think the Whips had better start to exchange notes in triplicate in order that there will be come record, because certainly the impression of our Whip was that the debate was to end today and that the debates would go on, on resolutions on the Order Paper, and Bills on the Order Paper, on Monday and Tuesday and that the Budget would be brought down Wednesday. That was the distinct understanding we had, and our Whip was certainly under that impression.

May I point out that the reason it is going on is because there are some Liberal members who want to speak next week. The suggestion was they should speak on Tuesday. If the Government was going to wind up the debate it meant that the debate would have to wind it up on Wednesday, and that would mean putting the Budget back to either Friday or a week from next Monday. I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the Budget should be

brought in as quickly as possible so that, when we get the Budget out of the way, we can get into Estimates which are very important and shouldn't be pushed through in a large sums of money in the dying days of the Session. That is what we were anxious to do. And it could have been done very easily if this debate had been wound up today. May I point out that there is no need to prevent us getting into other work. We have right now assigned to the Committee of the Whole some 41 pieces of legislation. I brought in a motion, the other day, to set aside Standing Order 40 to allow us to go into Committee of the Whole. One of the members opposite objected, and since it has to have unanimous consent, of course we are not able to go into Committee of the Whole. Certainly there is some need for a revision of Standing Orders. I think that is one of the Standing Orders which could very easily be set aside. There are a number of other Standing Orders. I agree that we could probably, in the Standing Orders, provide that the Speech from the Throne shall take so many days and that the vote shall be taken on a certain day; - the same thing with the Budget. You may even want to put a limit on the length of time that people can speak. I would be one of the persons who would suffer most from that probably, but I would be quite agreeable to it. I do think we ought to go over Standing Orders. But I am quite convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in broadcasting part of the proceedings of the Legislature that needs to upset the business. If the Whips will work closely together, and if we were to make certain changes in our Standing Orders, it need not upset the business.

Another statement was made by the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) that you can't have proper debate because if there is an amendment moved to the Speech from the Throne or to the Budget we have to consider it all together because of the radio. It is considered all together where there is no radio. In Ottawa it is quite customary to speak to the main motion, to amendments and even to sub-amendments, and debate all three of them. On the last night – the night the Whips have agreed upon, they vote on the sub-amendment, they vote on the amendment and then they vote on the main motion, one after the other.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I would just like to ask a question at this time, if I may, Mr. Premier. I understand that in the House of Commons (I don't know whether it is in their Standing Orders) there is a mutual arrangement that when a member has moved it, at the end of so much time that amendment must be taken off. Is that right?

**Premier Douglas:** — No, it may be different under the new rule, but quite frequently the custom was to leave all three of them and vote on them all at once. There is one provision by which there are stipulated periods of time, and I think it is a very good idea.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think you can rule our radio broadcasting of part of the proceedings on the grounds that it upsets the business of the House. I think if the Whips will work closely together, and with some changes in the Standing Orders, there is no reason why part of the proceedings cannot be broadcast.

**March 1, 1957**

The other objection which has been taken to the broadcasting is that there has been an unfair allocation, and reference has been made to the basis of allocation to political parties by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Now the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has a formula for allocating time, based on the number of candidates there was in the last election, the number of people elected, the total popular vote and so on. It is a very complicated formula which allocates time to political parties. There was never a thought, Mr. Speaker, that, in providing for broadcasting from the Legislature, we were allocating time to political parties. The provision for broadcasting was made because members come into this House to represent constituencies, and it was felt that this service was paid for by the people of the province and that, no matter what part of the province I lived in, I would have a right to hear my member and to hear what he had to say about the problems which affected me and my welfare. For that reason every member should have an equal opportunity to speak. It is true that in order to give the Leader of the Opposition and myself and the financial critic or the Provincial Treasurer time for opening some of the major debates, somebody else may have to give up part of their time. That is to say several people might have to give up ten minutes of their time for that purpose. But certainly every member has the right to be heard.

When the gentlemen opposite talk about how unfair it is, I ask you to put it the other way. If you are going to take the total amount of time and cut it in half and give half to the Opposition and then cut that time in half and give 25 per cent to the total time to the Social Credit and 25 per cent to the Liberals (leaving 50 per cent to the Government), it simply would mean that an opposition member's time is twice as great as that of a private member on this side. The Social Credit member's time would be two or three times as great as a Liberal member's time. If we happened to have a situation in the House where we had a Progressive Conservative and a Labour Progressive, well, I suppose we would start cutting it down the same way. I think the only fair way you can allocate this time is to recognize that we are here representing constituencies and that our constituents have a right to hear their members and to hear their stand on the various public questions. It is an old tradition of British parliamentary government that every member has the right to bring his grievances to the House of Parliament and to present his case to the elected representatives of the people. It is an old tradition that every member has that right to bring in the grievances of his constituency. Certainly the constituents have a right, in their turn, to hear that presentation, or at least part of it. I know that this presents some problems to a member who wants to make a longer speech and who gets sandwiched in between two other speakers. I think that is one of the things the Whips might work out. They are probably not sufficiently experienced this year, but it could have been worked out. I think that the Leader of the Social Credit group, for instance, should have been either put at the beginning or at the end so that he could have, if he wanted, spoken for half an hour or an hour the day before and taken part of his broadcast the next day. Or, as last speaker in a day, he could have spoken on the air and then continued, but he probably wasn't aware of that. This could apply to any other member. I am sure the Whips would agree, if a member had a longer speech than was going to be on the air, that he could be given that extra time either before or after air-time.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it would be, in my opinion, a very retrograde step to discontinue any of the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Legislature. I think the people of this province have come to appreciate the opportunity they have had (many of them for the first time) to hear parts of the actual debates. Not to have to depend on fragmented reports, but to be able to hear the presentation is an advantage. I don't think the people of Saskatchewan would agree with some of the suggestions that have been made, that we should abolish it. I certainly think that, as far as we are concerned here, we would like to see as much of the session broadcast as possible. If it were possible to get radio time so that it could all be broadcast, as they do in New Zealand, I would be very happy to see that done. But of course, it is apparent we couldn't get that amount of time, and I doubt whether we could afford to pay for that amount of time. But for as much as we can get and as much as we can afford to pay for I, for one, shall continue to vote that the people of this province have a chance to hear part of the broadcast and that every member should have an equal right to be heard in this Legislature and over the air.

**Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, it is 5:30. I have a few words that I would like to contribute to this debate – not on the allocation of time so much; so I think it would be in order if I adjourned the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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