

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**7th Day**

**Friday, February 24, 1950.**

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 23, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora):** — Mr. Speaker, before I commence my speech, I would like to congratulate the hon. Tom Bentley on his election in Gull Lake. I was very proud to have taken part in that by election. Mr. Bentley is a man who had resided in the constituency of Canora for a number of years, a man with great ability and I am sure that a very capable and competent man and that the back-benchers over here are right behind the Premier in the appointment of Mr. Bentley as Minister of Public Health. I would like to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Speech from the Throne. They did a dandy job, and it is a very easy, may I say, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House to make a good job. We have material with which to do it.

I want to congratulate, too, the hon. member for Arm River for the job he tried to do, yesterday. I realize he had a tough time with the material he had on hand. He carried on fairly well, may I say, for three hours and I am sorry that he was not able to keep the members and even the galleries in the Assembly during that time.

Mr. Speaker, the tirade for three hours yesterday against Democratic Socialism by the member for Arm River was yesterday answered and refuted by the 'mother' of democracy, the 'mother' of Parliaments. Hats off to the pioneer champions of freedom and democracy, the freedom-loving people of the British Isles, the guardians of freedom and democracy for the past four centuries! Mr. Speaker, the people of Great Britain certainly did not concur with the hon. member from Arm River, nor the hon. Leader of the Opposition. In trying to brand the Democratic Socialist movement as one with that of Communism they did not succeed. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that even the dynamic personality and oratory of Mr. Churchill did not succeed in scaring and stampeding the British people into voting heavily for a 'capitalistic' Government. Therefore, I would also advise our capitalistic opponents opposite so smarten up, to return to provincial and Canadian matters instead of wasting the bulk of their speeches and radio a time vying for the position of which one can paint the ugliest and most frightening picture of communism and comparing the same to British or Canadian Democratic Socialism. The people do not scare as easily now with your stale stories of the bogey man. The British people have come to the realization that capitalism is a social order of the past. The British people understand that while they were the centre of world capitalism and while their capitalists were able to exploit the natural resources and the peoples of the work they could continue to live in this paradise, but two devastating world wars produced by capitalism have smartened the people of the world.

February 24, 1950

The British people must now be exploited by their own capitalists – a few capitalists to live in luxury and plenty while the masses must live in misery. this, the people of Great Britain, have gain refused and have endorsed the co-operative Christian way of life – all for one and one for all.

The British people, Mr. Speaker, have stayed the hand of capitalism which would have ushered into Great Britain chaos, and out of the capitalistic chaos, Communism. The people of Czechoslovakia (and we have heard the member for Arm River and the hon. Leader of the Opposition speak of Czechoslovakia quite often), are not as fortunate as the British people. Their country had remained capitalistic too long; they were ravaged and occupied by dictatorial capitalism, which is Fascism or Nazism, and then preoccupied by Communism, and out of the chaos the communists took power. It has always been the mis-rule of capitalism that has brought about communism. This is true, Mr. Speaker, of Poland, Hungary and china. It is not very long ago that the Liberals of this country and the Liberal press praised Chiang Kai Shek as a great Christian Liberal. General Weidmeyer, of the American army, here only a few years ago when he returned from China, gave us a true picture. He pointed out that Chiang Kai She was keeping in power one of the most corrupt governments in the world. He protected free enterprises, controlled and ruled the country, living in luxury while the masses starved. I had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak to a clergyman working for the Swedish Mission out of the city of Shanghai, just before the Communists took over. May I say that this man was opposed to Communism, but he pointed out to me the corruptness of the National Regime. He pointed out that American aid, consisting of fish and grain, was sent to China but it never reached the people. Friends of Chiang Kai Shek saw that this food stayed in ports and rail-sidings until it spoiled. The profiteers of that country had grain and fish to sell, and since there was to be no profit on the transaction, there was to be no delivery to the consumer. Mr. Speaker, was this action not a reminder of our own 'thirties when God produced an abundance of food here but people went hungry? This is the kind of system that produces communism. This, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of system that will produce Communism again, and this is the kind of system that the British people refused, yesterday. This is the kind of system, Mr. Speaker, in which the Opposition glorifies.

Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition quoted only the other day two labour leaders, Mr. Green and Mr. Murray, in favour of capitalism. I, today, want to quote not leaders but groups – groups that are representing far more people throughout the world than Green or Murray would represent – and we will see what they have to say about capitalism.

I would like to quote from a statement made by the Council of Churches – 450 representatives of 150 Protestant churches, representing 40 nations. They issued a statement in 1948, from which I quote:

“The Christian Churches should reject eh ideologies of both Communism and laissez-faire capitalism, and should seek to draw men away from the false assumption that these extremes are the only alternatives. It is the responsibility of Christians to seek new creative solutions which never allow either justice or freedom to destroy the other.

The Church should make clear that there are conflicts between Christianity and capitalism. The developments of capitalism vary from country to country and often the exploitation of the workers that was characteristic of early capitalism has been corrected in considerable measure by the influence of trade unions, social legislation and responsible management. But (1) capitalism tends to subordinate what should be the primary task of any economy – the meeting of human needs – to give economic advantages to those who have the most power over its institutions; (2) it tends to produce serious inequalities; (3) it has developed a practical form of materialism in Western nations in spite of their Christian background, for it has placed the greatest emphasis upon success in making money; (4) it has also kept the people of capitalist countries subject to a kind of fate which has taken the form of such social catastrophes as mass unemployment.”

I am going to quote another one from the Lambeth conference of Anglican Bishops, held in England:

“Communism cannot be overcome by argument alone. It has to be outlived, not merely out-thought. The Church ought not to allow itself to be identified with social reactions. Its members should be ready for social and economic change and quick to welcome into the councils of the church, men and women with the workers’ experience of living conditions. We do not suggest that Communism is the only influence in our political and economic world against which the Christian conscience must take its stand. There are other forms of economic domination characteristic of our Western society which shows something of the same ruthlessness, and whatever their outward profession, do not in their practice exhibit any clear recognition of moral law.”

And I would like to make another short quotation made by Bishop D . . . speaking to Syndicate rally during the asbestos strike in Quebec. I quote:

“Capitalism is the cause of all our miseries. We must work against it – not to transform it, for it cannot be transformed, not to correct it, for it is incorrigible, but to replace it. The reform of our social economic structure will be made through Catholic Syndicalism or through revolution, blood and

death . . . Men of over sixty have seen two world wars and will perhaps see a third even more unjust and more destructive between two totalitarian camps, that of the concentration camp and that of the American Dollar. It is our task to change this situation by implementing the doctrines of the Church.”

Now, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is satisfied with those quotations.

The Leader of the Opposition endorse our rent controls. I was rather surprised. The Liberals in the Federal field have fought against price controls, and I believe that, only due to the pressure of our C.C.F. champions fighting in the House of Commons, we were able to hold rent controls as far as we did. May I point out one thing in connection with price control. We have, over the period of the last number of years, heard the challenge that, if the C.C.F. took over the governments of this province and that of the Dominion of Canada, we will have confiscation of wealth. Mr. Speaker, to me the lifting of price control immediately after the war produced one of the greatest confiscations of wealth in the history of this nation, not in the interests of the Government, but in the interests of a few of the private free enterprises. I would like to point out that before the boys had time to arrive from overseas, price controls were taken off. There is no doubt that private enterprise insisted on that from the Liberal Government. The boys were coming back home with credits and with cash. Many of them were hoping to be able to come back to Saskatchewan and other points of Canada to be able to buy a farm, to be able to buy a tractor, to be able to buy farm machinery, and I could see the capitalists scheming just as the boys were to return with these credit and cash. They were planning to raise price controls so that prices of commodities would sky-rocket, and so when the boys returned back home, they would have to pay for those articles two or three times the amount that they should have paid. For example, in 1945, an L.A. Case tractor sold at \$1,990, but by 1949 it was selling for \$3,300. The boys who were returning back from overseas intending to re-establish themselves in the province of Saskatchewan found that he had to pay \$1,000 or \$1,200 more for that very same machinery. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is confiscation of wealth, not in the interests of a nation, but in the interests of a few private industrialists. I would also like to point out that Massey-Harris, in 1945, showed that plainly: they made a net profit of a million and a half dollars, and in 1949 their profit had risen to nine million dollars. I say that the Liberal Party allowed the Massey-Harris and all the other large companies to confiscate the savings of the Canadian people and the boys who fought overseas to protect democracy. So when they talk of confiscation, we have seen too much of confiscation, not by any government but in the interests of vested interests.

The next point I would like to speak on is the statement by the hon. member for Arm River, when he talked again on that bogey, socialization of land. Mr. Speaker, the only time that I have ever known in the Dominion of Canada where socialization of land was affected was in the hungry ‘thirties and up until 1939 or 1940 by friends of capitalists and the mortgage companies. They had at one time practically confiscated farm holdings to somewhere around 85 per cent of all the farm holdings in the province of Saskatchewan, or came near to it. So when you talk of confiscation, confiscation in the Dominion of Canada has always been the other way – not in the

interests of the people or the Government, but in the interests of vested private free enterprisers.

One other point I would like to speak about and that is old age pensions. Could you imagine a Liberal standing in the House speaking on old age pensions! They should be ashamed of themselves. Mr. Speaker, it took J.S. Woodsworth years of fighting and at an opportune moment when he had their leader up against the blank wall, that was the only time that they came through with the old age pensions. I have never seen yet in this country when the capitalistic parties did anything unless they were forced to do it, and forced to do it by such as the C.C.F., a people's movement of Canada. I recall, as the secretary-treasurer of a municipality, that one time I came in with an old party to the city of Regina to see whether this man could not be reinstated on his old age pension. I would like the member for Arm River to listen to this. May I say that his pension was cancelled in 1938, an election year. With the reeve, one of my councillors and myself, we came in to the Old Age Pension Department, to one of the important officials of the Department at that time, and when I brought this case before him the first answer that he gave me was: "This man who has lived in this country for 40 years is not able to speak good English. Do you think that he is entitled to a pension?" Well, I realize that the Liberals at that time they gave the pension, they dribbled it out in \$10.00 or \$12.00 whatever the people took.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Just the same as you are paying now.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — You keep quiet. You had three hours yesterday. And we want to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that in those days the people of this province were receiving a relief of \$2.00 and \$3.00 per month per family. So when an old age pensioner did receive \$10.00 or \$12.00 a month he was even happy with that, and so the Government of that day got away with it, and they say, shame! Shame on whom? May I come back to this old man, whom I brought into Regina pleading to be reinstated on the pension in 1938. The reply was he was not able to speak good English. I pointed out, to that official of the Government and I gave him the example of two of the same kind coming in 1898, 40 years ago. One got off at we'll take for example the city of Quebec — and the other one came into Saskatchewan. This man who came into Saskatchewan worked and toiled on the land for 40 years. Those are the people that made it possible to make Canada what it is today, and I pointed out to this official that people like him made it possible for himself and me to sit with white collars behind desks in a nice warm office. Those were the boys that dug the roots, the stones; grubbed the bush. They are the men that walked from Canora and Yorkton down to Winnipeg and Brandon to work and returned back walking in those pioneer days. Yet, when this man became 70 years of age, this particular high official of the Liberal Government at that time made the statement that he did not think he was entitled to old age pension because he was not able to speak English.

But let us go back. We left the other chap down in Montreal. I will give you actual example, if you want it. This other man for example got off in the city of Quebec or Montreal. This man remained back in Quebec or Montreal, he might have been a bum and a hobo, but he associated continuously with the English-speaking people and so he was able to speak English when he became 70 years of age. This Liberal official would then say that he is entitled to a full pension. But the man who went out West and built this country up, he was cancelled off in 1938. Why? I dug down into the files and the only thing they could show was that another person had written

a letter stating that this man had a modern home in the town of Canora. I knew the files then pretty well of the Old Age Pensions Department, and I asked this official, "Would you mind turning over the file and get down to the assessment notice of the Town of Canora? There is an assessment notice there, then you should know how valuable and how modern that home was." He turned the file over, looked at the assessment notice and I asked, "How much is it?" He says, "\$400.00," I turned around, Mr. Speaker, and I made the statement: "Do you live in this kind of a home, too, in the city of Regina, this kind of a modern home?" He was licked. May I point out that before I got through in that Department with my reeve and councillor, that man was reinstated, not on a \$15.00 a month pension, but on a \$20.00 a month pension. That was your misadministration of old age pensions.

Now, one other point that the hon. member for Arm River brought up was – "What did the C.C.F. ever do for the farmers? Why, they didn't do anything!" Well, well. I am going to tell you what they did; for example, one of the first things – the Farm Security legislation. The moment we got into power we stopped the socialization of land in the interests of private enterprise. yes, the hon. member for Gravelbourg may speak about his debt adjustment in the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act. I know something about it. I saw some of these things going through the municipalities. The only thing that that adjustment ever did was to make sure that the arrears of taxes on this particular quarter of land was scaled down; they saw to it that probably a doctor's bill was cut right out; they probably reduced the interest on the mortgage, and they made sure that the mortgage company had a better security. That is all. That was an adjustment in the interests of the mortgage companies. We brought about real Farm Security legislation to protect the farmer on his farm. That's one of the things we did for the farmers.

Number two, Mr. Speaker: Air Ambulance Service. The air Ambulance Service was really brought about to help the farming communities of the province of Saskatchewan. Those outside of the larger cities and towns where hospitals were located. Yet the member for Arm River says they didn't do a thing for the farmers!

Number three, hospitalization; hospitalization to all the people including the farmers. I remember the time they always had to go down to beg an official of the municipality in order to be admitted into the hospitals. Now they go like decent citizens of a democratic country.

Number four, hospital accommodation and hospital construction: May I point out that when we took over the reins of government in 1944, we had an average especially in our Northeastern Saskatchewan of 2.4 beds per thousand and now we have over six beds per thousand population. Again, doing something for the farming community of my Northeastern Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan as a whole.

Number five, Highways: I would like to say a word or two on highways for the farmers. In my own constituency, in 1944, we had eight miles of graveled highway; today we have some 126 miles of graveled highway. I am sure that the member for Arm River could not come into my constituency and tell them that the C.C.F. government has not done anything for my farming community.

Number six, Electrification: Let us look at this wonderful record of rural electrification. During the Liberal and Conservative regimes, over a period of 15 years they averaged 5.3 farm homes electrified in the province of Saskatchewan. 5.3 farm homes average. We have averaged over 500; last year, over 1,200. Yet the member for Arm River says, "They haven't done anything for the farmers." I would like to point out that, since 1944, there are 78 miles of transmission lines in my constituency. Before that, under the Liberal regime, there wasn't a thing.

Number seven, 1938 seed grains: I would like to point out that that is one other thing that this government did in helping the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan – by cancelling half of the 1938 seed grain and all the interest, putting the farmers back on their feet. Yet the hon. member for Arm River gets up and he says there hasn't been a thing done in the interests of the farmers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on municipal taxation. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, the other day, got up, and oh! He always loves to go somewhere else, get away from Saskatchewan. I know the poor fellow is ashamed of the record of the Liberal Party in the past, so he has got to get away from Saskatchewan. It is either Czechoslovakia or Russia, and then the odd time he moves into Manitoba. Well now, when you talk of municipal taxation in the province of Manitoba, he claimed that out of those gifts of the Federal government or the grants that Saskatchewan revived and Manitoba had received, Manitoba returned some \$4,000,000 back to the municipalities of Manitoba. I would like to inform the hon. leader of the Opposition, that for example in 1948, the average taxes per quarter-section, taking in municipal, school, public revenue, in Saskatchewan the average general municipal tax was \$21.75; in Manitoba, in 1948, it was \$54.06. Put that down, that's right. The general municipal taxes on an average quarter in Saskatchewan, in 1948, was \$21.75. The general municipal levy in Manitoba was \$54.06. The school tax in Saskatchewan, the average per quarter was \$23.63; in Manitoba the average school tax per quarter was \$36.81. The Public Revenue Tax in Saskatchewan was \$3.28; the average in Manitoba, 47.22. The total averages of taxes within the municipality in Saskatchewan per average quarter-section, in 1948, was \$48.66, in Manitoba, \$98.09. Yes, I believe that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, before he rises, had better check up on a few points, and then maybe I suppose he would go back to Czechoslovakia, or back to Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River also spoke about 'hybrid' Socialists. I am looking at some of them; there are a number of those hybrids right across, and the hon. member for Arm River is one of them. I understand that in the Federal election of 1949 he was supporting Diefenbaker and the conservative Party, and, of course, there is the hon. member for Moosomin. The Hon. member for Melfort even boasts about being a hybrid, and the same thing applies to the hon. member for Kinistino.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — That statement about me is just about as true as many others he has made, this afternoon.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member who is speaking ins taking responsibility for his statement.

**Mr. E.M. Culliton (Gravelbourg):**

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: the member can take responsibility for his statements, but surely we are not going to have a rule in this House that he can say anything he likes. If a member denies a statement made about

him, the hon. member has to accept that denial.

**Premier Douglas:** — He did not deny it.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — The hon. member for Arm River had three and a half hours, yesterday . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! A member on the floor of the House, if he is quoted, has a right to get up and deny the statement made, and that denial must be accepted. This is determined by this House not by any individual. I myself order, and I myself will try to interpret the rules of this House as fairly and as well as I possibly can. The hon. member for Arm River, if he had risen to his feet on a point of privilege . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I did.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Wait a minute. I have never yet refused to acknowledge anyone who gets up on his feet properly, and if the member for Arm River had risen on a point of privilege and had promptly denied it, then the hon. member would have to accept the denial. But this talking across the floor of the House is not Parliamentary and should be discontinued.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I rose in my seat and I asked on a point of privilege. The statement that I made was this: that the statement he made in regard to myself in the Federal election, last summer, is just as true as a whole lot of other statements he has made here this afternoon — and that's absolutely nothing.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the time to continue, but there is no doubt that I will be up in this House again to speak to the boys across in the Opposition. I would like to say that I am certainly going to stand behind the Speech from the Throne, and, may I point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, behind the Regina Manifesto.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say a few words of welcome on my own behalf of the new Members in this House. I am very pleased indeed to have the privilege of working with my new colleague, the Hon. Mr. Bentley, Minister of Public Health.

We welcome the Member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) here. As has been said, we did our best to see that he did not get here, and we may have another chance at that some time later. In the meantime we are all here in this democratic House to carry on the business of the House.

I want to also congratulate the Mover, (Mr. Wellbelove) and Seconder (Mr. Buchanan) of the Address-in-Reply. Each year, I listen to some of our members move and second this motion, and I cannot but admire their ability and the excellent job they do as speaking for the people of their constituencies and the people of this province.

I want also to say a word of appreciation, which some of us don't think of very often, for our Premier. We who work with him take him for granted, but after working with him and after listening to him the other day, I do want to say how much I appreciate the privilege of working with him. He never asks me to do more than about half of what he is willing to



do himself, and that is pretty good in a boss.

For the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, I am afraid I will have to express the deepest sympathy. They have started out in this Session to make a rather not too good job of a very poor case. I expected from the Leader of the Opposition's speech to get many points which I would deal with in my speech. I was entirely disappointed. I could have read the press reports on what he said in the by-election campaigns, and what he said in the last Federal election campaign, and got the same points exactly.

It would not do, at this particular time, to pass on without a comment on the situation overseas in what is the Homeland for many of our parents or many of us – Great Britain. Looking back at this time on the service which the early members of the Labour Party gave to the people of Britain. There was a time – it was not so long ago, and I am not sure that it isn't with us yet – when Liberals and Conservatives did not think it was fit and proper that the people who work in the coal mines and the factories, drive the engines, the clerks and the accountants, should send a representative to the House of Commons or to a Legislatures. They thought those members had to be from a special class, and so the first Labour members who went into the House of Commons over half a century ago, faced a pretty severe situation. It was a hard battle, and there were a great many sacrifices made in that battle; but they won, and again yesterday, they won.

I have some good news, though, for my friends across the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker. The Liberals have made further gains over there. According to the last returns I have, they now have eight members; it was seven for a long time, and now they have it up to eight. The Labour Party, on the last report, has a majority of twenty-five over the Conservatives and the supporting Liberals – that is like the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald). Labour has a majority, at the present time, of seventeen over Conservatives and all Liberals. They had a great many before. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said from his seat just a few minutes ago, "They only just got by." I would like to point out to him that that is just the difference – they only just got by, and the Leader of the Opposition just didn't get by, and that makes a lot of difference to where you sit.

It is all right to keep cheering to keep your courage up, but don't forget that the people who do this country's work and who were referred to by the member for Canora, more and more are making up their minds to take into their own hands and to take out of the hands of the political parties which are controlled by 'big business', their government running their business. I think, too, that everybody, I hope on both sides of this House, wishes the greatest of success for the present Government in Great Britain. I am sure that all of us, being good Canadians, will pray that the government of Britain may achieve the greatest success in bringing to the people of Britain a new security, new and better standards of living than they have ever known before. I think that we can agree on at least.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, on July 21st, when down at Kenosee getting the hon. member for Cannington nominated, said:

“One has only to look at what is happening in Great Britain, today, to realize that Socialism is a retrograde movement.” He also said: “If a depression comes, it will be brought on by their failure of Socialism in Great Britain.” Mr. Tucker said that, and it is quoted in the ‘Leader-Post’.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That’s true!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — My hon. friends over there, of course love to shout, “That’s true!”; but the fact of the matter is that no Socialist government, no Democratic Socialist government, has any record at all like Liberal and Conservative governments for bringing on depressions. They brought them on and they brought plenty of them on, one after another; and if Mr. Gardiner and Mr. St. Laurent at Ottawa continue their policy of restricting trade with our great market for our agricultural products, we will pretty quickly get into another depression in this country here. That is exactly what they are doing in their trade policies, and I will tell you about that, too, and a lot of other things; their trade policy is doing just exactly that. I think maybe it would be a good idea of the hon. Leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Arm River, or you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those members in this House, would send an apology over to the British people on account of what the hon. member for Arm River said about Socialism and Socialistic governments in his lengthy speech in this House, yesterday, which was, in effect, taking in over half of the people of Great Britain. He was taking in a lot of territory.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I want to clarify that statement. I quoted certain statements from the record of British Socialism, and I had no reference or said anything about the Reds or anything else, and I want the hon. member to remember that he is absolutely excluding anything I said.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is no point of privilege. I did not reproach him at all. I just simply said that he had said some very disparaging remarks about the Socialists of Britain and how foolish Socialism was. If he does not think Socialism is foolish, he can get up in this House later and make another speech that way, too; and I don’t think that would trouble him at all, because in one election campaign he can go out and talk Liberal and the next one he can go out and talk conservative. So that would not be any trouble to him at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition does not like to be called the Leader of the political party that is the servant of ‘big business’. Well, I don’t blame him for not liking that. But, there are some facts that you can’t get around. You can’t expect them; and we know very well, and it has often been quoted in this House, that there are situations that have existed in the past. Everybody knows that the Liberal Party in Canada sold out the power resources on the St. Lawrence River for three-quarters of a million dollars of party funds.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a point of order; I think that when the hon. gentleman said, “everybody knows that,” he is saying something that is not true at all. Everybody does not know it, because it is not a fact.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I’ll take that back. The hon. Leader of the Opposition apparently did not know it. Everybody else knows it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Rt. Hon. MacKenzie King spoke about being in the ‘valley of humiliation’; but when they get that kind of people around

them within the party, and when they get their political campaign funds from big business as they did then, and as they do yet, they are going to serve big business, and don't you forget it. I shall, today, produce some evidence to show that they are servants of big business.

We talked about some ten million acre contracts, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker; but before I get onto that there is another thing I want to mention. We had a Federal election, last June. Everybody remembers that; and our friends across the floor are very cheerful about the results. Are they proud of the fact that the MacGregor report, which, according to law should have been produced in the House of Commons, should have been published, was kept hidden, contrary to the law, before the election? They are ashamed of it. I am ashamed of anybody in public life that does that. Are my hon. friends across the floor of this House proud of the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board, just a short before the Federal election, made a 20 per cent a bushel payment, and to do it they had to borrow money and pay interest on it? I have heard stories about governments using the people's money to buy the people's votes. This is a case, Mr. Speaker, where the government pledged the credit of the people of Canada to borrow the money to buy the votes of the people of Western Canada.

**Opposition Member:** — Would the hon. member permit a question? While it is estimated . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member would not permit any questions from me, the other day, so I will just carry on. I thought it was maybe a point of privilege that he had. But that is just the situation that existed. As long as you have men like Mr. Gardiner and Mr. St. Laurent who will permit that kind of thing, you have got a pretty corrupt political party. That was not giving the farmers their own money. And furthermore, there might have been some collusion between Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Abbott, because by paying it out right then, he pushed some more of them into the income tax bracket so Mr. Abbott could get it back. That reminds me of a story about the — I don't like to tell this on my Scottish friends — about a very, very tight Scotsman who said to the kids one night, "Now, who'll have some 'tatties, and who'll have a penny?" Of course, they all took pennies, and then they brought on the dessert and he says, "A penny for a piece of cake," and he got his money back, and he saved his 'tatties. So, there you are. They not only used the money from the Canadian people to buy the people's votes, but they turned it out in such a way that they got some of it back that they would not otherwise have got. That is a grand example I can say to the member from Melville, who comes from the same country as the Minister of Agriculture, of the tactics of the Minister of Agriculture in building his political machine to buy and command, if he can, 100 per cent support in the West. He can't do that any more. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment or two . . .

**Mr. V.P. Deshaye:** — On a point of privilege: The man has made a charge that Mr. Gardiner and myself . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is so busy he has not had time to read his rule books. It would do him a lot of good to do a little homework to learn what a point of privilege is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have done a little reading which I find rather interesting, in connection with the early days of the Saskatchewan

Power Corporation, and I want to take the members of this Legislature back over a little of the history in that regard. We go back to before the time of the formation of the Commission, when the Hon. George Spence, in this Legislature on December 18, 1928, was making a speech in moving a second reading of the Bill to establish the Power Commission. Now, just before that time, the government of the day had appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the power question, and Mr. Spence had the report of that Commission on the day he was making the speech, and he quoted from the report of the Royal Commission. Mr. Spence said:

“Consideration of this problem has been given at length in the report of the consulting engineers,. The larger cities consume, over 80 per cent of the electrical energy produce dnt he province and any scheme of development must naturally be closely connected with this load.”

Again, the report says:

“If the development of such a system has left to the initiative of the cities or of private interests and duplication of expense in many ways and the desired result would not be obtained as readily or as soon.”

It sure wasn't obtained as soon, anyway. Then, Mr. Spence himself said:

“There is little doubt today where the Province stands on the matter of ownership of these utilities. On every occasion where the people have had an opportunity to express themselves on the question, they have done so with no uncertain voice, and this question of power has been no exception; for, as soon as the report of the Commission was published – and even before – I find that the following organizations have expressed themselves.”

Then Mr. Spence went on to read: The Saskatchewan Union of Municipalities, the Regina Labour Party (he even quoted that), the Saskatoon Star and even the Toronto Globe, the Manitoba Free Press, and a whole lot of other quotes that he made. Mr. Spence says later:

“We must provide instead a means whereby our plants, now municipally owned, can be tied into a comprehensive and province-wide scheme, instead of each being concerned, as now, only with the needs of its own community.”

Later he said this: “here, in Saskatchewan, we are starting off with a policy of Government ownership on a virtually ‘clean sheet’.” There was nothing wrong with that but they are just kind words. That is all they were. There wasn't any action.

Now I want to lead my hon. friend down the path from that time,

and show him what action was taken. On the 18 day of January, 1929, The Power Commission Act was assented to. After all these fine words about the system covering the province that should be developed in this province (assented to on January 18, 1929), on February 2nd, the Yorkton and Mid-West Utilities Act was passed. Immediately the Power Commission was launched, the Liberal government of that day began to sabotage the Power Commission by letting slip out of their hands the ownership of the important sources in regard to the use of electric power. The Liberal government in this Legislature approved the Yorkton Bill. February 2nd was also the time they made the Saskatoon Agreement – the only city that they did keep in the agreement to supply the power at cost. On March 11th, 1931, the Prince Albert and Canadian Utilities Limited Agreement was endorsed. Prince Albert was gone. On February 28, 1930, the Moose Jaw Agreement was approved.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What year did you say?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — 1930. That was a Conservative government. My friends have recently cheered for the conservatives in Britain; they have a Conservative sitting with them, they have got a half-Conservative sitting for the constituency of Melfort, and a near-Conservative sitting for the constituency of Arm River. There is no difference between the Liberals and Conservatives. There is no difference – they both believe in Big Business –

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference.

**Mr. Speaker:** — All right, that's no point of privilege. That there is a difference.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I want the right to speak. The question is this: the Minister said there was no difference between the party which I have the honour to lead and the Conservative force. Now, that's a substantial charge . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point of privilege.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. member said that the hon. member for Arm River was a chameleon or something like that, that he was not a genuine member. It is absolutely false, and for a Minister of the Crown to say that a member sits in a way in which he doesn't sit in this House . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. member does not obey the ruling of the Chair I shall have to discipline him.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member has risen to make a point of privilege to clarify this position.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I consider it an honour to be a friend of the sitting member for Lake Centre.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the hon. member take his seat.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. members would like to make it a point of privilege when the Liberal Party gets a crack, or the Conservative Party; but they will probably catch on after a while.

However, the story is that practically before the ink on The Power Commission Act was dry, the Liberal Party started to sabotage the whole plan of a unified power system in the province of Saskatchewan under public ownership, so that when we came into office in 1944, we found this situation.

Another little bit of reading here that is very interesting. This, Mr. Speaker, is the election Manifesto of the Liberal Party in 1944, and under the heading of 'Power and Electrification', the said . . . they started in 1928 and they still said it in 1944: "For this purpose the government is considering possible sources of supply such as the construction of a power plant on the Saskatchewan River and the development of power in the coal fields of the South." They are still considering that thing. Now, when we took over, we found the situation was entirely a mess as far as power was concerned, and it has been a big job well done to get back into public ownership and to tie together again that system of power to serve the province of Saskatchewan. My friends object to the public ownership of power, and they only say they are in favour of it when there is an election to win. They talked nice in 1928, and then let the whole thing slide.

There is an advertisement published in the 'Saturday Evening Post' in the United States. I think probably friends of my friends across the floor of the House are among the people who paid for this advertisement. It is the electric light and power companies, and sure they have some friends down there on the other side of the St. Lawrence River that were in this. They published this map of the United States and our member for Arm River should look at this one — and all these pins stuck in the map indicate the public-ownership places, and this advertisement says: "A long step toward a socialistic U.S.A." Now, are my friends over there in favour of public ownership of power and socialism?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes. You don't need to shout that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, then they had better go back to their Capitalist friends in the United States and get their terminology straightened out so they won't be contradicting themselves.

**Mr. Dundas:** — We don't have to go to the United States for anything.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I agree that they are not very likely in favour of public ownership.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You are the people who have to go to the United States for capital.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, there is a little matter I want to take up for a few minutes. This article, under the dateline of Kenosee Lake, July 26, 1949, published in the Saskatoon 'Star Phoenix': "What's Going On Here — Walter Tucker demands."

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In this article, the Leader of the Opposition is reported to have talked about the company known as “Search Corporations”, mentioning Mr. Havard and Dr. Shumiatcher and Mrs. Cates, whom he insists on calling the Clerk of the Executive Council of the Saskatchewan government, and who never was that at all. Then he goes on with some other statements. I want to read some of these statements and comment on them if I may; but first of all, might I say that there are members of the Legislature now who are shareholders in companies which have something to do with oil or other resources. There is no law against it. You have it on your side of the House; we have it on this side. Do you want that practice stopped? If you want it stopped that no member of the House can own a share in a company, why, say so! If you don’t want it stopped, well then, what about ex-civil servants, people who quite the Civil Service? I have no doubt that, if I looked, I could find many good Liberals who were in the Civil Service, who have now got interests in mining companies. Are these people who quite the service going to be penalized so that they can’t go into it at all? But, of course that isn’t the question that the Leader of the Opposition was interested in. The Leader of the Opposition was only interested in throwing as much dirt as he could at the commencement of the by-election, and there is plenty of it in this article. I am ashamed of the fact that any leader of a political party would use this kind of stuff.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege again. The hon. member said I was interested in ‘throwing dirt’, and I ask him to withdraw that. I was interested in trying to find out what the government is doing in regard to these oil resources and so on, and the hon. gentleman has no right to impute the motive to me that I was only interested in throwing dirt, and I ask him to withdraw it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I withdraw the statement that he was only interested in throwing dirt, Mr. Speaker. I am going to read what it is, and the members of the Legislature can make up their own minds about it:

“The Liberal Leader declared he also understood other companies composed of civil servants are working close to the government in the disposal of valuable natural resources assets of the people, and are obtaining valuable concession which may make large fortunes for those involved.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — Isn’t that right?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is not correct, the Leader of the Opposition should know that it isn’t correct. If he has any information to show that it is correct, there is a proper court to go to – unless maybe he does not like courts.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The court that I understand we have a right to go to, is this court right here, and if the hon. gentleman is going to answer these questions, I suggest he answer them, instead of making attacks upon me.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, it came to my notice the other day, that Article 12 of the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations states, “That all person shall be free from attack on their

honour and reputation.” In other words, there is only one place to attack it, and that is in court. If you have evidence that somebody is wrong, report it, and have them taken to court. But this is an attempt to smear the people in the Civil Service, who have no chance to answer back, for the purpose of taking political advantage, and I am not very proud of the fact that there is anybody in this Legislature who uses that kind of tactics.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend said that this was an attempt to smear people in the Civil Service. Now there was no attempt to do so at all. I stated certain facts there; that is all. He has no right to cast aspersions on me.

**Mr. Culliton:** — Has the rule been changed in this House that, when a member who speaks imputes motives to a member on the other side and the member gets up and denies that, the man who made the statement is compelled to withdraw it. I want to know whether that rule still holds.

**Mr. Tucker:** — We all want to know it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, may I say a word? No one asked me to withdraw anything in that. The member only got up to try to make a little speech. Now, I don't want to hurt anybody's feelings. Probably the member did not intend it that way, but if he did not, he certainly should be more careful of what he says.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member for Gravelbourg asked if I was changing my opinion as to points of order. I certainly am not, and if the hon. member for Gravelbourg is not satisfied with my presiding in this Legislature, he knows the procedure to take.

**Mr. Culliton:** — I just wanted to be perfectly clear on that particular point, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, then the Leader of the Opposition went on to say: “To what extent are these civil servants and former civil servants using information which prospectors in the North are forced to give the Government?” Now there are two things here I would intelligent enough to know that this paragraph does cast aspersions on the Civil Service. Maybe he did not know it, but it is true; and that is not very nice thing. In the second place, the Leader of the Opposition displayed his ignorance of the fact when he made this statement, because no prospector is forced to give any information about his findings to the Government. In the third place, he says many persons would probably make great fortunes from the handing of these concessions to promoters, who pass them on, retaining the over-riding royalty. People have been hauled into court on slander cases for less than that. That is a direct inference that the Minister of Natural Resources and his staff are probably making money by the handing out of these resources. Any decent person would refrain from making that kind of a statement, or if they, in the heat of the moment, made it, they would withdraw it. And then he said: “They certainly are doing things different, virtually giving away natural resources assets of the province which have tremendous potential value.”

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals charging anybody with giving away natural resources should make the angels laugh. What is the record of what



Liberal governments have done with our own forests in the province of Saskatchewan? Go right back to the time when they first began to be used. Given away, practically given away, destroyed, no conservation until today. We have less than 10 per cent of the original forest stand in this province. That was done by Liberal and Conservative Governments.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why don't you talk about what you are reading instead of . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I want to ask if the Leader of the Opposition is going to be allowed to sit in his chair throughout this Session and ask questions without rising, without asking any permission, but simply sit there and bawl across the floor, because if that is going to be the allowed procedure, then other members are going to indulge in it and the whole standard of debate is going to drop. I think the Leader of the Opposition knows the rules of this House well enough to know that if he wants to ask the Minister a question, he has to rise and ask permission to ask a question, otherwise the Minister has the floor.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, that is what I have done. I have done just exactly as the Premier has done ever since I have been in this Legislature. Time and time again he has asked me questions, sitting down in his seat. Now, if he stops it, I will stop it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is the thing that I have been trying to do right through the Session, and I thought that I had succeeded in getting a little less of that; but this afternoon, it seems we have gone back and I was forced to warn the Leader of the Opposition and I think this applies to everyone. A certain amount has always been allowed, I think, in all Legislatures, but we cannot let it go to the extreme that it interferes with the speaker and maybe puts him off his feet, especially when derogatory remarks are passed by a member sitting in his seat. I wish the members would refrain.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member just now said, "Why don't you talk about what you were reading," and I just want to say to him that if anybody needs to talk about what I was reading, he is the gentleman that needs to talk about it. I am just afraid he is not man enough to talk about it and to withdraw the aspersions from those people on who he has cast them. I am going to leave the talking about that to him.

Then, Mr. Speaker, another example of the handling of our natural resources which I would like to mention for a few minutes is our fuel resources in Canada. Everybody who has made any study of this situation recognizes that there is need in Canada for a national fuel policy, not only covering coal but also fuel oil, because fuel oil has now become an important complement in the field of fuels. Nova Scotia and Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan are the provinces that have any great supplies of fuel, either coal or oil. Canada could be practically self-supporting in fuel, but nothing is done about planning the use of our fuel. Here is our valuable fuel oil from the Lloydminster field, both in Alberta and Saskatchewan, and the freight rate situation is such that it costs four times as much to ship 100 pounds of oil as it does to ship 100 pounds of coal, and, in the interest of economy in the nation, it would be far better to ship that oil because it contains more heat units than even the best anthracite coal. Yet nothing is done about it, and the Liberals will never plan anything like that, because what the member for Canora said is true — they do not do things unless they are thoroughly scared.

Now, we come to the question of petroleum and again I want to . . .

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Could you tell us the equivalent of heat value in oil and coal?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I stated that the TBU's in a similar weight of oil bunker fuel is greater than even in the best anthracite coal. Now, my hon. friend, you ask some of your pupils in school that question. They are supposed to know it. I am not expected to know that and I do not know that. I get along very well. He can tell us when he gets up to speak.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I understood him to say that no information is sent in to the Department here about what was found by prospectors up North. I understood you to say that there was no information available here in Regina to civil servants in regard to what was found by prospectors up North. The question I wanted to ask is aren't they required to send in the samples which are examined here in regard to their uranium content and so on?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — A prospector does not have to send in any samples at all. They sometimes do on a purely voluntary basis. They do not have to; if they want to send it in, all right — and if they do not want to send it in, all right. However, most of them actually send in some samples.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is it not a service paid for by the government, to enable them to have their samples examined here and if they want to have information as to whether their samples are uranium bearing or not? The service is provided for them here, and when they send it in, isn't it available to civil servants around the Department?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, but my hon. friend doesn't understand that when these samples come in, they do not have to be identified with any particular location at all. It is 'Sample A' or 'Sample (1)', and it may be fifteen miles out in the bush that way or fifteen miles out in the bush this way where he got it, and there is no possible way of picking up information that is of any value in going out and staking claims, from those samples that have come in. He may know that in a particular area somebody has found some samples that look pretty good, but it may be in a thirty-mile radius, and a thirty-mile radius area in the bush is a mighty big piece of country.

I want to get on with this oil question. It does make me laugh when the Liberals talk about the C.C.F. government giving away the resources of the province. You know, when we took office, the Imperial Oil had some agreements with the Province of Saskatchewan in regard to development of oil, and to show the members just what the situation is, I brought a map with me showing the Last Mountain Lake and Imperial Oil Reservation No. 153, and here is Imperial Oil Reservation Number 152, south of Rush Lake and Swift Current and another one runs from Regina 'way up to the north-west. In those two areas there is over five million acres, and I want to talk about that agreement made in regard to those two areas.

You will notice that they were not adjacent areas; there was another area in between. One of the parts had over three million acres and the other had under two million acres in it. Now the term of this agreement

was five years from May 1, 1943, to May 1, 1948 – a five-year agreement. There were no fees or rentals on these reservations. The acreage was a little bit over five million acres; there were no Crown reserves, none at all. The company put up a bond to guarantee performance on this five million acres. Do any of you know the amount of that bond? It was \$10,000 to guarantee the work of exploration on 5,000,000 acres! They undertook to do, on five million acres, \$100,000 worth of work each year – half a million dollars in five years on five million acres! That just won't do anything to amount to very much in the way of exploring five million acres. This was an agreement whereby the Imperial Oil Company could hold five million acres with merely nominal expenditure, cheaper than they could release it. This was a give-away of our resources; and they had the right to take any or all of the area to lease, and, Mr. Speaker, they had the right to assign the lease or transfer it. The agreement had attached to it an approved lease agreement which provided for lease rentals of 50 cents an acre for the first year and \$1.00 an acre thereafter, and a royalty of 10 years with no work to amount to anything; a \$20,000.00 bond to put up, and it wasn't a cash bond but just a bond; a royalty of 10 per cent; no Crown reserves – they had the whole works in the five million acres.

The Premier, speaking the other day, had a proposed agreement from the Imperial Oil here, and that, too, was over five million acres – no rental, no Crown reserves; they could take any or all of the lease; royalty as in the regulations; work, \$10,000, and that is all there was to it. Then the Imperial Oil also very kindly gave me a proposed Petroleum Act for the province of Saskatchewan prepared by the Imperial Oil Company! We are not going to introduce that in the Legislature, however; but one of the clauses in that Act said, "All Crown reserves shall be abolished."

Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition may think what he likes but I am not going to deal with companies that want to explore our resources on terms like that. I don't intend to; and I will tell my hon. friend some of the progress that is being made in regard to exploration and development. I want you to contrast those terms where there is five million acres, very little work to do and five years in which they could hold it in case anything should turn up; there is a lovely agreement. Now, under our regulations, with our geophysical permit there is a small fee for a 21-month permit or a one-year permit with a possible 9-month extension; there are approximately 225 percent Crown reserves and a royalty of from 5 per cent to 15 per cent and that shades any oil deal that is a good oil deal. On that graduated scale it would be in the 15 per cent bracket for royalty, but it was only the marginal field, the low producers, that would get down to a less than 15 per cent royalty, and the ground rents for leases were 50 cents for the first year and \$1.00 an acre after that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Will the Minister explain how the amount of royalty is decided as between different fields?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I have not got that formula here, and I cannot explain it at this time, but, as a matter of fact, I rather wager that the hon. Leader of the Opposition may borrow a copy of the regulations from the hon. member for Pelly; he's got one and it contains the scale that shows the royalty rate.

These agreements with Imperial Oil that I have mentioned here were special agreements, and we have made some special agreements, too, and

I want to take, for example, some of the general provisions of some of these special agreements, and first of all, where Crown reserves are maintained in these special agreements. There is an ascending ground rental; we have an agreement where the ground rental for the first year is 20 cents an acre, the second year 30 cents an acre; if there is a third year it is 40 cents an acre, or if there is another half-year on top of that, it is 25 cents an acre. Now that rental is not all revenue – 90 per cent of that rental is in the nature of a deposit to guarantee performance, and there is a lot of difference between a \$10,000 bond and a rental to guarantee performance on that basis. The terms have been for 2½ to 3½ years. The terms contain drilling commitments. There were no drilling commitments in the agreement which the Liberals made with the Imperial Oil; they just had to fool around with it, and do a bit of work and they could hold it. Drilling commitments ranging from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the value of the ground rental, and the regular royalty, of course, from 5 per cent to 15 per cent are in our agreements.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I have tried to follow the Minister as closely as I can. Is he dealing with some concrete contract now, or is he dealing with some particular part of the province, or is he dealing with the general policy?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I am referring to a couple of special agreements that have been made that provide these conditions. They are not extensions of the permit term but they are agreements that fit in after that term when the company wants to continue work, and these agreements require the expenditure of very extensive sums of money. In that Imperial agreement which I referred to earlier, they were required to spend half a million dollars in five years on five million acres. I have, fortunately, been handed a cheque for an agreement concerning two million acres of land and this cheque is for one-half of the ground rental which is payable in advance for this year. Now, 90 per cent of this cheque will be refundable when and if the work is done; 10 per cent of it is revenue, and I thought the hon. members might be interested in making sure that I had it. It was just handed to me, this morning, and I thought I would bring it over and show it to the Provincial Treasurer and here is the cheque – for \$200,000. Of that sum, \$180,000 is a guarantee of work to be done, not for a year on five million acres, but for half a year on two million acres, and the other half-year will be the same and it will be increased by 50 per cent the next year, and increased by 33 1/3 per cent in the following year. You can take a look at it, Mr. Provincial Treasurer and see if it is all right. I want it back after I finish my speech, of course, so take care of it.

**Mr. Loftson (Saltcoats):** — For how long will that hold the two million acres, and what is the nature of the work that these companies have to do in order to get the money back?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They have to do drilling to the extent – they vary, in some conditions it is 50 per cent of the ground rental that has to be spent in drilling to get the refund and 75 per cent in some cases; the rest is done on geophysical work, and the terms, as I said, range from 2½ to 3½ years. It is a good cheque, gentlemen; a certified cheque – and we will be putting it in the bank, tomorrow.

We have made two or three of these agreements, and I don't want to lead anybody astray by saying it is 2½ years because there is one that

is 2 1/2 years and another one that is 3 1/2 years. We are following this policy to get the best possible deal we can on the exploration of our natural resources, and to see that the greatest share of them is saved, if we possibly can, for the people of this province. That is the way we are going to deal with you when you come to dicker with us for oil reserves: we are going to want the best deal we can get for the people of this province. I frankly tell the oil people that, and they say, "Well, that is all right; we want the best deal we can get, too." Then we go to work on it and we make it and I am pleased to say . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I have a question on that. The Minister says they try to get the best deal they can: How do they give people a chance, one to make a better deal than another? How do they pick whom they are going to deal with?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, if my hon. friend will come along with a better deal than the other fellow is offering, we'll take him up on it.

Now, where a company has an acreage — take, for example, the Albercan Oil Company, which has this two million acres under permit stage. They want a further time to develop; now I think they should have the first chance to make an agreement for further exploration. If we cannot make an agreement with them, we will do something about offering it to others; but the land was not open for the general public. There is one way in which you can be sure you are getting about the best deal possible, and it is this: once in a while people go away and don't take your offer; but I am pleased to say that we are not in what I think are going to be successful negotiations for some land on the basis of 50 per cent Crown reserve — to get exploration drilling done on it on the basis of keeping 50 per cent of the Crown land in reserve for the people of this province. I am very proud to announce that we have been able to get along that far towards protecting and saving for the people of Saskatchewan their natural resources. The members opposite, next year, might have to call us fifty-percenters instead of twenty-five percenters; but we'll keep going and do the best we can.

**Mr. Loftson:** — This is not in the form of criticism at all, I am just asking for information: How long can these people hold this land without making any honest effort to find oil?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — If they are willing to pay \$1,500,000 revenue to the Province of Saskatchewan they can hold that two million acres for 2 1/2 years, and not do anything on it. Just a minute now: this cheque is just for six months. In the next six months there will have to be another cheque like that; you see, the rental being refundable is, I think, a very excellent bond to guarantee that work will be done. They have put up the money; it is gone — now what would you do? Would you let it go or would you go and do the work? You have paid for the work anyway so naturally you are going to do it. Yes, I think we will get work done on that; they are not going to pay us that much in revenue. If all the companies all over the province would pay us rental like that, it would certainly help our revenues a great deal in this province.

**Mr. Loftson:** — The Minister mentioned the fact that the rental is refundable. What part of that money is rental and what would be the balance retained by the Government?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I said before 90 per cent is refundable and 10 per cent is revenue.

Now I would like to deal for a few minutes with some other resources.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Referring to this contract which has been made by the government, I understand, Mr. Speaker, it is a well established rule that when a Minister refers to a contract he should be prepared to table it so that we can speak about it and the members can have a look at it themselves. I suppose the Minister is prepared to table that contract?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I have not got it with me, and if a Motion is made for a Return asking for the tabling of this contract, the government will have to consider the matter, and I am inclined to think you would probably get a copy of it; but I have not got it here, and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, just because I refer to the Bible I have to table a copy of it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I will take his word for it if he can give us a copy.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The proper way to ask for it is by a Motion for Return asking for the tabling of this contract, if the members want it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I contend there is a Point of Order on that. It is a well-established rule of all Legislatures and Parliament that a public document, if it is referred to by a Minister, must be tabled. In other words, it is a well-established rule of Court and Parliament that a person can't refer to a document and tell what the contents of it are unless he is willing to lay it on the table and make it available for the Court or he is willing to lay it on the table and make it available for the Court or the Assembly that he is dealing with. Now I have not got Beauchesne here to make the citation, but I have seen the rule applied over and over again that a public document that is referred to by a Minister must be produced.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is true if the document were quoted form or extracts were used as part of an argument. What the Minister has done has simply referred to a general policy that was carried on by the Government with reference to certain special agreements. Now, the members of the House can always, if they want to, bring in a Motion for Return of a public document and ask that the document be tabled; but the Minister is not under any obligation to table it merely because he referred to the fact that there are such things as special agreements and that they had such and such general terms.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I point out the hon. Premier and to Your Honour, that the Minister said that this had to do with a certain area of land, he said how much money he had received in respect of this deal, and he displayed the cheque showing the company involved, and he has gone so far as to indicate exactly the terms of this particular contract. It was not a matter of referring to it in general terms at all, Your Honour. He actually went so far as to produce the cheque paid on the strength of this contract, so surely it cannot be argued that this was just a general argument. Surely, having gone so far as to even produce the cheque in respect of that contract, it cannot be any longer argued that it is a general argument. We want this contract now produced.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, cannot the hon. member ask for it in the proper way by a Motion for Return?

**Mr. Tucker:** — The Minister gets up to the House here, and refers to a specific contract, refers to the cash payment and produces the cash payment, and refers to all the terms. Having done that, Mr. Speaker, the proper time to ask for that to be tabled is right there and then, and I think Your Honour is aware of that rule.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to Beauchesne, Citation 315, which says:

“The Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch or other state paper before the House unless he is prepared to lay it upon the table.”

Now, he did not read or quote from it. Citation No. 316 says:

“It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House if it can be done without injury to the public interest.”

There are two points there – first of all, whether or not the document was quoted from, which it wasn’t; and the second thing is, the question of public interest is always involved. I think the very least the members of the House could do, if they want it, is to simply bring in a Motion for production of the paper; but the Minister is under no obligation at any time, merely because he refers in general terms – he did not refer to the area; he did not quote from the document at all, and he is under no obligation, certainly, to table it.

**Mr. Tucker:** The rules which the Premier cited to your Honour indicate that when a document like this is referred to it should be tabled unless the Minister of the Crown says that it is against the public interest to do so. Now, if the Minister of the Crown, at this particular stage, will take the stand that it is against the public interest to table this whole document, having talked about it for half an hour, then, of course, I would be very interested to hear him take that stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** — My understanding is that the Minister was referring to this particular agreement to illustrate the method in which these Crown lands are being disposed of. He was not quoting from the document – he could not have been because he has not got it. If there was any document that he was quoted from and reading extracts from, then I think he should have tabled it; but I can’t see how he can table it, today. I think it can best be decided by a Motion for Return. He hasn’t it in his possession, and he certainly is not quoting from any document that he hasn’t got in his possession; he is simply using this particular instance to illustrate, in answer to questions, how the Crown lands are being disposed of.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I appreciate your Honour’s attitude that if the Minister comes in and purports to be quoting from a contract and then he comes along and says, “I haven’t got the contract here – I’ve just got a copy,” we certainly on this side of the House understood him to say, “Here are the

terms of a contract that we have just entered into,” and he proceeded to speak about that contract. If he has not got the contract here, today, then, I think, Your Honour, unless he is willing to say it is against the public interest, he should get that contract and table it tomorrow.

**Premier Douglas:** — I would like to repeat the quotation I gave you before — Beauchesne says: “The Minister is at liberty to read or quote from.” Now the Minister has neither the agreement nor a copy of the agreement and he neither read or quoted from it. It says the Minister of the Crown is neither at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch or other state paper, not before the House, unless he is prepared to lay it upon the table. The one I also quoted: “It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House if it can be done without injury to the public interest.” That definitely says ‘cited’. In this case the document was imply referred to in general terms, and the Minister has made it perfectly clear that he was not quoting from the document and he certainly was not citing any clause in the document. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk, today, on the question of privilege and a great deal of talk about imputation of motives. The Leader of the Opposition is much better at getting offended than he is about being fair. No one has refused to table the document; but there is a proper way to do things, and we are not going to be asked to do something under a rule that does not require it and there is a proper procedure for securing a document. If the hon. members want the agreement, all they have to do is go the proper way about it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — If there is proper way of doing things I submit it is for your Honour to say what the proper way to do this thing is, and your Honour has been good enough to intimate that if this specific agreement was actually being referred to, it should be tabled. I appreciate your Honour’s ruling, and I think that it does not lie with the Premier to suggest that this is not going to be the right way to do things, because there are two ways of getting documents, one to get a Return and the other to ask for it as we have done right now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — In regard to this point I am going to reserve my decision on it. I understood, as the discussion was going on, that he was not quoting from a particular document but he was using one particular deal to illustrate the method in which they deal; but he did refer to a particular agreement. I will bring my decision down later.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to think that on the Order of the Legislature, if the Legislature wants copies of these agreements they can have them. But giving them on the Order of the Legislature and the Legislature taking the responsibility is one thing, and one member suggesting they be tabled is another. Anyway I have not got them here. I have not quoted from them nor read them, and I do not think that, according to the rules, I am required to table them at all under those circumstances.

Now, to go on with some other resources. One of our fairly important resources, and which I think as years go on, many many years go on, will be very important is our clay resources. There has been some work done, and is continuing to be done, to explore our clay reserves in the province, and as they are explored it is found that we have clays of different kinds that are very valuable to the manufacturers in the United States and



in Alberta, and the result is that they are buying our clays. That kind of work of exploration and of research and study into the use of the clays will be continued.

Our programme in regard to conservation of forests has gone forward during the past year. Our forest inventory is farther ahead than before. Last spring, was an exceptionally difficult spring in regard to forest fires. Our forestry men in the bush, who have been there for many many years say that the conditions for fires were worse than existed in any previous year in their experience, not excepting even 1937 which was one of the worst forest-fire years we ever had in this province. We had some losses, and we would have had extremely bad losses had it not been for the fact that we did have good equipment and a pretty well-organized body of men to control the fires.

The fur trade has had another very successful year with higher numbers of pelts in muskrats and beaver being taken than ever before. It is very interesting to note, and I am pleased to report to this House, that we had a trappers' convention at Prince Albert and had trappers from the east side and the west side of the province, from the fringe area along the edge of settlement and from as far north as the Churchill River. That trappers' convention was of very great benefit, and the interesting thing was that the trappers, almost unanimously, were in favour of the programme of conservation, including the controlled marketing, which is in effect by agreement with the Department of Indian Affairs. We got complete support for that programme.

At the last Session of the Legislature, I announced the change in policy in regard to the operations of the Fish Board and, during the summer, the operations under that new policy have been very well received by the fishermen themselves. We held meetings on twenty-one different lakes in the province, and at sixteen meetings they decided, by their own vote, that they were going to use the services of the Fish Marketing Service to market their fish. In a number of cases, they got a further payment. In some cases on the southern lakes, we guaranteed no payment whatsoever, nor made any advances, but sold the fish, deducted the charges we had agreed upon, and returned the whole balance to the fishermen. In sixteen of those meetings, the vote was that way. In five, they voted to sell the fish to the dealers through the open market. In two cases out of the five, shortly after they voted that way, they came back by petition and asked the Fish Marketing Service to go back into the business again.

Why I talk about this policy, here, is because you will remember, I think, that we agreed the Department of Natural Resources would underwrite or guarantee the prices which were paid on certain lakes. On some lakes there was a further payment, and that meant there was no loss. On other lakes there was a loss and there will, in the supplementary estimates for this year as a consequence, be a small vote to take care of those losses during the past summer since that policy was changed.

**Mr. Danielson:** — In regard to the North country, your Fish Board then is really acting as agents for the producer?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We buy very little fish at all. Our chief business is selling fish for the producers.

One of the things in the North that has made a great deal of

difference is the radio system which we have set up. We have five main monitor stations: Prince Albert, Lac la Ronge, Stoney Rapids, Hudson Bay and Meadow Lake. Then we have 162 portable and semi-portable stations. We have radio in aircraft, and we have some radio in trucks and cars; we are making some walkie-talkie portables and so forth. It is extremely useful in fire detection and fire control work. Through the Prince Albert station there were merely 50,000 messages sent during the past year. The radio and the air service being given has made a great deal of difference to the North not only in a business or economic way but in other ways as well. Just a little while ago, there was a message came over the radio at Prince Albert that a woman at Reindeer Lake was suffering from a hemorrhage. A plane went out and took a nurse there; the case was taken care of and the woman recovered. Now you can't do that just with planes alone, and you can't do it with radio alone; it is a case of working together on a job. In fact, our Mr. Hook in charge of the radio is recognized to have done such a good job that the Manitoba Government asked if they could borrow him for three weeks or a month, this Fall, and he was down in Manitoba helping there with their Radio Branch to set up a radio system in Manitoba. He has done an excellent job here in setting up our system.

A word or two about the Far North minerals. Government geological parties carried on work during the past year and that work in due course will be reported. Dr. Byers and Dr. Maudsley of the University, and another geologist (I just can't recall his name) from the United States conducted and looked after these parties. The Prospectors' Assistance Plan was again very well-received, and prospectors were working on that plan. We also have put into effect a plan of training native people in the North for prospecting. We do this by giving them instruction and lectures on it, and employing them to go out on these geological parties to help to make the surveys so that they will be conversant with the minerals and the rocks. I think that, if we can get many of the people who live in the North conversant with the rocks and knowing them, they living there and travelling over the country will become the very best of the prospectors that we have. We have had schools for prospectors in Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, this winter, which were very well-attended and very popular. They were night schools which lasted for a week each.

In regard to mineral development, more mineral claims were filed, that is Northern mineral claims, during the past year than ever before. I have heard some of the 1950 programme being prepared by the mining people, and as far as I can see it will mean an exploration programme in the pre-Cambrian probably entailing the expenditure of millions of dollars.

In regard to the conditions of the people in the North, the local people do some logging. We have some small portable sawmills up there, and they cut their own logs, do some lumbering and build houses. Many houses which in the past had no lumber floors or roofs for that matter, now have good floors and roofs.

**Mr. Tucker:** — When you say “we”, do you mean Department?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Department has some small portable sawmills, small enough to be carried by aircraft. I would like the members to take a trip up North and see the hospitals which the Department of Public Health has established. Those hospitals are appreciated to a great degree by the people living in the North. They become a community

centre to the people in the surrounding areas – Stoney Rapids, Buffalo Narrows, and there's one at Lac la Ronge. I should like hon. members also to see the schools in the North, and the pupils, and the work they are doing; the teachers working in those schools are doing a wonderful work in the North.

The Leader of the Opposition said, "How did people in the North vote?" If the Leader of the Opposition waits until this generation grows up and all have an opportunity to learn to read and write, that will likely teach them to think . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Are you teaching Socialism in the North? Is that what you are saying?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We are teaching them to think. My friends would like it far better if we kept them in ignorance so that they would vote Liberal.

A good deal has been said of the different constituencies; I would like to say something of mine. In the Tisdale constituency, I think we have one of the finest pieces of the province of Saskatchewan. Certainly, outside the two large constituencies in the North, it is one of the largest constituencies, as well as the finest . . .

**Mr. Loftson:** — You haven't seen Saltcoats yet.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Though I have not seen the statistics yet, I think Tisdale produces as high an agricultural production as any part of the province, and, in addition, almost half of the timber cut in Saskatchewan is out in Tisdale constituency – not quite half, but getting on that way. Except for the two Northern constituencies, more fur is trapped in Tisdale than in any other part.

It has the deep forest country, and it has, too, some of the finest farm lands to be found in the province of Saskatchewan. It is large, and we now have a population nearing 30,000 in that constituency. Progress is being made there, too. In 1944, when we took office, there was only one urban community in the constituency which was gravelled road connection with the outside world, and that was the town of Tisdale. The former Minister of Highways in this House argued with me how that the roads were good there. He never travelled over them. They were in terrific shape, and only the one town had a gravelled road connecting it with the outside. It was not possible to do much construction work in 1944-45. The programme was set in 1944; contractors were scarce, machinery was scarce. We started in 1946, and I want to say the people of the constituency appreciate very much what the Minister of Highways and his Department have done. Approximately 175 miles of grade has been built – we had never any grade built for many years previously, in the constituency – and nearly 80 miles of gravel has been applied in that time. I hope the Minister will keep on for some while longer and get the job done there. But I want to repeat how much we appreciate the progress in regard to roads in Tisdale.

We have in the constituency most of the Hudson Bay School Unit, and the change that has taken place in the time since the school unit was organized is simply amazing. One district paid a 45-mill rate for school purposes previously, and all they had was a one-room school – and not a very good one. Now, it is in the unit, they have a good school and pay 16 mills. Two, four, and six-room schools have been built in the unit since it was

organized, and several one-room schools have been built.

In regard to the question of health services, we have a very fine hospital at Tisdale, run by the Sisters – St. Therese, giving very good service. There is a Union hospital at Porcupine Plains, a small one at Hudson Bay, and other small ones at Arborfield and Nipawin, giving a great deal of service to the constituency.

The constituency I have the honour to represent is one of the finest areas of this province of Saskatchewan, and has a pretty good crop record. They are pioneer people who, in a great many cases, had to fight the bush to get their land cleared. They are not all wealthy people, but they certainly are good people.

In closing, I want to say that I shall support the motion because I believe in the right of people to freedom and the right of people to govern themselves. Because the programme which we have is a programme through the vehicle of a political party which was organized in the face of opposition and paid for by the hard-earned pennies of the people who do most of the work in the province of Saskatchewan, we will carry that programme into effect, and maintain the resources of the people of the province. We cannot do otherwise because, under this set-up, the people of the province are very definitely our masters. For that reason I will support the motion.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Before the hon. Minister resumes his seat, there are two questions I would like to ask him, that I thought he would deal with. The other day I suggested that we should have a statement from the Minister on a resignation of Mr. Bichan, and I thought he would make that statement today. If he is prepared to do so, we would like to have it. And if he is prepared to make it, he might at the same time, tell us what his attitude is towards people working for this Department a few months and then going out with information – they have acquired.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't think the Leader of the Opposition ever liked our employees very well anyway. I have no statement to make with regard to the resignation of Mr. Bichan at the present time. I would like to ask what the hon. member would suggest be done with regard to people who do not want to work for us anymore. Would he suggest that they be tied, and kept that way?

**Mr. L.S. Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I wish to join with those who have preceded me in extending my congratulations to the Mover and the Seconder and the splendid efforts which they put forward in their moving and seconding addresses. I do so not necessarily only for the feeling of pride which must be in the constituencies for the masterful job which they have done, but I feel that with these two members in this House, they personify the feeling that is and has made the C.C.F. movement great; they personify a group of people who not only know where they are going, but, possible what is more important, know why they are going.

I also wish to join with those who have expressed regret at the passing of two of our members: the late member for the constituency of Gull Lake, Mr. Murray, who I knew and associated with in this House and also outside this House; and I also express my regrets at the passing of the member for The Battlefords. While my associations with him were confined practically

to this House I do know, from my short association in the area in which he served, that those in that area deeply regret his passing.

I also wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the new member for Gull Lake not only because, through himself, the people of the Gull Lake constituency have once again endorsed the record of the C.C.F. Government, but I wish also to congratulate him on this appointment to the Cabinet. The hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested that there might be some dissatisfaction in the ranks of the back-benchers in connection with the appointment of Mr. Bentley as Minister of Public Health, but I think that in itself clearly indicates the ignorance the Leader of the Opposition must have as to the workings of the minds of those who associate themselves with the C.C.F. He has failed to realize that when we join the C.C.F. we believe in what the C.C.F. stands for, and if we believe in the philosophy of co-operation, we are prepared to co-operate and serve the C.C.F. Party and the people's movement in any capacity that we may have. I feel satisfied that I have expressed the opinion of the back-benchers, and we realize that in Mr. Bentley we have a man who is well able to serve as Minister of Public Health. I can assure you that there is absolutely no jealousy on the part of any of the back-benchers.

I would also like to congratulate the member for Cannington on his election and, in passing, I would only remark that I hope that his associations in this House will be as pleasant as our associations have been here. The individual that he succeeded, the former Leader of the Opposition in this House, Mr. Patterson, is as happy and contented in his position as I feel satisfied the new member for Cannington is in his present position.

The Leader of the Opposition has, on several occasions, gone out on a 'prophecy' campaign, and it seems to me at times that he has attempted to be the guardian angel at the death of the C.C.F. organization and of the C.C.F. Party. I can recall that shortly after the provincial election in 1948, he suggested that it would be practically impossible for the C.C.F. Government to remain in power for five years of office, which is the legal term of office. He suggested at that time that there would be by-elections and that, through these by-elections, the C.C.F. majority in the House would be reduced to the point where it would be compelled to go to the people before its legal term was up. Well, in the past year we have had three by-elections and the result of these by-elections has meant the net gain for the Liberal Party of absolutely nothing. Now, it may be presumed that a gain of nothing can be construed as a gain, and possibly the Leader of the Opposition takes some consolation from the fact that they have made a gain of nothing, and assumes that they have made some gains. Only this Fall, during the by-elections held in Cannington and Gull Lake, he suggested that by electing Liberal members from Gull Lake and Cannington and taking into consideration the number of C.C.F. members from this side of the House who were going to walk across the floor to the other side, it would be possible to defeat the C.C.F. Government and compel them to go to the people. Well, once again he has obtained a net gain of nothing. He gained nothing in the by-elections, and I know that there is no walking across the floor from this side of the House to that side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, today has been a day of considerable rejoicing in the world. The Social-Democrats in Great Britain have once again put forth a tremendous victory, and I would, in no way, wish to mar the rejoicing that goes on today by giving a speech. So, with the permission of the House, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

## SECOND READING

### Bill No. 1 – An Act to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act, 1946

**Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — I think that, when the farmers find out what is being done to this Fuel Petroleum Products Act, they will not agree with the Opposition. Many years ago, a Liberal Government decided that farmers would be able to use tax exempt gasoline in tractors providing those tractors remained on the farms. Three or four years ago, we made an amendment to the Act to allow the tractors to be used in going from one field to another; but I think we all realize that it is very difficult to tell a farmer to confine his tractor to the fields. On many occasions the farmer wants to take the tractor to town. It may be his only means of getting to town. It may be that he wants to take his tractor to town to have it repaired. To remove the purple fuel and put in taxable fuel is a job which will take him several hours.

We have given a great deal of consideration to this and while I deplore the loss of the hundreds of thousands of dollars it is going to cost – considerably over a hundred thousand, Mr. Speaker; probably two or three hundred thousand – yet the Government, in the interests of the agricultural community, is prepared to forgo this amount of revenue, and if this Bill passes the House, as I trust it will, then it will be possible for the farmer to legally use his tractor in connection with all his agricultural operations, whether it be on the field, whether it be on the highway, or no matter where it might be.

This Bill will remove the necessity for using taxable gas in a tractor, and it will no doubt be very widely acclaimed by the farming community and as I said before, this is one of the most important bills that will probably come before the House this year, a Bill which is going to, once again (as this Government has since it was elected), reduce the taxes for the farmer.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I take it that this does not cover a farmer using a tractor to haul grain to the elevators.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Yes, it does that very thing. This enables a farmer to take his tractor to haul grain to an elevator or to haul pigs to the stockyard or anything he wants to haul. As long as he is using this tractor in connection with his agricultural operations he will be able to use the purple fuel in it. I take great pleasure in moving that this Bill is now read the second time.

**Mr. G. Danielson:** — I am glad to be able to rise to my place in this House and congratulate the Provincial Treasurer. I was very pleased to listen to his speech, because I pleaded with him here, three years ago, in almost exactly the same words. I put up the same plea to him as he has expressed now. There were one or two members on the other side of the House that even agreed with me, but it was no use talking to this Provincial Treasurer at that time. You see, he can grudgingly concede now – and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that his loss in revenue won't be one-fourth of what he has mentioned; just because of the nuisance of it and the prosecutions. Mr. Speaker, I am telling you and telling this House that

it is not the cost of the tax that is a nuisance; it is these Government inspectors and ‘heelers’ coming along and hauling them into the court. That is the trouble; not the amount of the tax. You can drain out all the purple gas by turning the tap and then put in fresh pure gas in that tank, Mr. Speaker, and still the colour is purple. That is the situation, and, as I said, there is more of a nuisance in the enforcement of that law than anything else.

As a matter of fact, I think perhaps the enforcement of it has been rather slack, the last few years, particularly since the last election. Before that time, there were a few, of course, that were called up and prosecuted; but I am glad to say now that, after all these years, they grudgingly consent to have this privilege granted to the farmers that they don’t have to waste their time washing out the oil tanks on the tractors when they want to go to town with a wagon behind to get a load of coal or something of that sort. I congratulate them on coming through now with this small concession, because the amount of money involved does not amount to anything.

**Mr. Gibson (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I am sure the farmers will appreciate this very much and my hon. friend from Arm River, when he was up here talking, I wonder if he remembers that, when his party was on this side of the House, it was against the law for a rural municipality to put purple gas in their road-building equipment to build roads for their municipality!

**Hon. Mr. Fines (Closing):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Arm River for giving me his support on this occasion. He challenged my statement that we will lose a hundred thousand dollars revenue, and he says the loss in revenue won’t amount to one-quarter of that. Well now, if that is true, and it is only a matter of twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars, I should like to ask him why did the Liberal Government not do this ten or twelve years ago? Why have they kept an Act on the statute books which has not provided them with any revenue, but which has just been a nuisance, as he has said, all through these years? Now, I am sure that the hon. member for Arm River won’t be able to answer that question. I would like to ask him again who put this law in the statute books? Why did they put it in the statute books, if they did not require the revenue? Why did they not remove it from the statute books when they found they were only getting a measly ten, fifteen or twenty thousand dollars like my hon. friend believes we have been collecting?

Mr. Speaker, it is a very substantial amount of revenue that will be lost, and what I want to say very frankly is that this is a question which has given me a great deal of concern for many years. I have said from my place in this House at every Session, every time I have introduced a Vehicles Act or the Fuel Petroleum Products Act amendment, that this one of the most difficult problems that I have had to deal with, and I am sure the hon. member for Gravelbourg will agree with that. There is a certain element of unfairness. Now today, I don’t do this too happily, because I realize that it is going to be very unfair to those farmers who use a truck to haul grain to town and another farmer hauls his grain to town with a tractor pulling a big trailer behind. On the one hand you tax him; and not only that – he takes out a farm truck licence. He has licence and he has to pay tax, while the other fellow does not. Now we are going to get around some of that of having a small tax on the trailer – it is a very nominal tax but one which the farmers will very gladly pay to be relieved of the nuisance of having to change the gasoline every time.

February 24, 1950

The hon. member says the enforcement has been very slack; another hon. member here says the enforcement has been too strict. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I would say then that it must have been just about right. When one thinks it is too slack and the other one thinks it is too strict, I would say that we must have been doing a pretty good job of the enforcement.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there is no one that will say the mounted police of this province are using any political influence or considerations in their prosecutions. I do not think my hon. friend means that, and I think that he would like to take that back. We have eight highway traffic officers, and I believe there are 275 mounted police – 34 mounted police to every single highway traffic officer. I am sure there is no one here that would suggest either that these highway traffic officers, who were appointed for the most part by the Government represented by my hon. friend opposite, used what you might call considerations in making these prosecutions. Out of eight, there are five appointed by the previous administration, and we appointed three. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are going to have this agreed to so unanimously – another milestone in the path of the C.C.F. Government towards reducing taxes for the people of this province.

The motion for second reading of Bill No. 1 was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.