

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
21st Day

Thursday, March 1, 1951

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 28, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply.)"

Mr. L.M. Marion (Athabasca): — In rising to speak on this debate, first I want to congratulate the member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe) and the member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) and the other members who have spoken.

I, on this side of the House, miss the member from Kinistino (Mr. Woods), and I sincerely hope that he makes a quick recovery and will be able to join us again.

I also miss the former member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton), and I am sure that he is qualified to fill the high position he has achieved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take much time, but what I want to say is just a few facts.

We will start out with roads. In regard to roads, Mr. Speaker, I heard the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) speak for the northern part of the province. I also heard the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen). I, naturally, am glad of these two members and would like to have some roads in my constituency. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it would do me any good to ask the Highway Minister (Hon. J.T. Douglas) for any roads, so I will just let the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank), who is in full control of the north through his administrative office in Prince Albert, look after that. He is the "Cock of the North." However, we need roads in Athabasca. In fact, we would be satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with just one road, to get out of the seat to the south, either to Big River, Meadow Lake, North Battleford or Prince Albert. I have seen the time — and it is yet — when it takes 10 hours to three days to cover 150 miles by truck. Mr. Speaker, I have seen these truck drivers try to get through, but they need help. They cannot only put logs in the road, and so forth, in the mud-holes; they need help from the Government. Not only that but as far as the Minister is concerned, any time we have asked him for a snow plow in the winter, or a bulldozer, he has given it — he has helped. He has also helped by trying to fix the roads, but the money that is allotted for Athabasca is not enough. We have taxes up in our country — every shack, every Metis that has a shack, is taxed. We have licences for fishing, trapping; we have the gas tax, and I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should have more money allotted for the Athabasca constituency than we have had for the present day. The Minister may say that he has done a lot of road work in the north. That is quite right;

March 1, 1951

I will agree with him – but not enough. I understand that he did quite a bit of work in the Goldfields area to connect up some mines, and if I understood him right, he had help from the Federal Government in doing so. Maybe – I would not say yes, and I would not say no; maybe he is waiting for help from the Federal Government to help us out in the southern part of my seat. If he is waiting for that, I do not think we will get many roads.

If we had a good road, Mr. Speaker, as Waskesiu and Lac la Ronge have, why they would not even be heard of. We have the best beaches, we have the fishing, and any other attraction that would attract tourists to my part of the constituency.

We also are on the west end or side of the Pre-Cambrian Shield, Mr. Speaker, and when I say that I am talking of the southern part of the Athabasca seat. The Pre-Cambrian, Mr. Speaker, as you all know, passes, I would say, around Cree Lake, halfway between Ile a la Crosse and Goldfields, and it extends north of Cree Lake. That is where, on Athabasca Lake, we have uranium finds; but on the southern end of this we have not got the rocks and muskegs, possibly not as bad as the road going into Waskesiu and Lac la Ronge.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, if I remember right, there was \$40,000 spent on roads in Athabasca – that was for the whole seat – I would not say that is the exact figure, maybe I am giving the Government the benefit of the doubt on that amount; but \$40,000 would not go very far. It would cover, possibly, a few mudholes, but there are quite a few others. While on this road work, I will say again that I hope the Minister sees fit to give us a road into Ile a la Crosse, and then, if he has any money to spare, go on to Buffalo Narrows, to Portage La Loche. If he still has money, go to Snake Lake. Those are some of the places where we need roads.

In regard to the fur situation in the north; as you know, Mr. Speaker, some people have all the luck in the world, and that does not necessarily mean they have brains; and others, not so good. We have a Fur Marketing Service in the north, established by this Government, and we have to sell our muskrats and beavers to the Government. And then was started a conservation scheme, as they call it – conservation blocks. I have stated before, and I will state again, I am certainly in favour of conservation, whether it is muskrats, game, or anything else; but when this conservation scheme was set up, you had to send your pelts to the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service. They told us that they would pay more money for furs. That is quite all right, Mr. Speaker; and I have also heard that any money made from Crown Corporations would go to services, and this and that. That is quite all right.

I do not want to go back into the history of the old Fish Board. We all know what happened to that, and I will stand here and compliment the Government on the attitude they have, today, in regard to the Saskatchewan Fish Marketing Service. The Fish Marketing Service showed a profit, I believe, of around \$2,000 in rough figures, for the year ending 1950 — \$2,805.51. I can state, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen who dealt with the Saskatchewan Fish Board got a good price because they did not make much profit on this Marketing service — \$2,805.51. I do not mind anybody making a profit; that is fine. The fishermen who had anything to do with the Saskatchewan Fish Marketing Service are satisfied, as far as I know.

Now, to get back to the rat business. The surplus for the period

ending September 1950, the total surplus earned by the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service to date is \$188,119.94. I have the balance sheets here, and, Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of hay! This year alone, they made \$37,452.88 – not bad, not bad at all! I hope, Mr. Speaker – “humanity first”; I hope that every trapper that contributed to this amount to date, \$188,119.94, gets a rake-off; this money should be given to the trappers. How is it done? Commissions on sales – that has nothing to do with that profit, Mr. Speaker. Commission on sales was \$79,395.32; brokerage and lotting fees, \$19,918.59; service charges, \$1,950.63. That is quite all right; but what I would like to see is this extra big profit here – the Fish Marketing Service, \$2,000 in a year; Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service, \$37,452.88. Well, I do not know, it does not add up, to my way of looking at it. The trappers are not getting everything they should get and I, personally, have sold furs, many furs, through the Saskatchewan Marketing Service. That is quite all right. They told us – I mean when I say ‘they’, Mr. Speaker, the Government – that Hudson’s Bay, the traders, were stealing the furs, you might as well say. They weren’t paying enough for them. Well, Mr. Speaker, this marketing service has paid good prices in the last two years. I can say that, but they still have that profit; they could have paid better prices. And, Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject, the last time that I bought rats – that was when this Government took over – I paid \$4 a rat. What are they paying today? Well, I do not know. I have not got the figures, Mr. Speaker, on the average for the rat that was sold last spring; but if they are paying more than any other Company, why is the compulsion feature in it? I have heard the old excuse – “To keep track of the rats, we have got to know where they come from.” I have also heard that the Federal Government designed that scheme. I went to the Federal, Mr. Speaker, and got a copy of the agreement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, and I did not see any compulsory features in it; they did not tell us that we had to sell our rats in a certain way.

There is another little item, Mr. Speaker. This government gets \$30,000 in regard to conservation projects – not bad either, considering the amount spent in the North; not bad at all. I won’t state, because I do not know, how much has been spent by this Government in regard to conservation projects; but I know one thing, Mr. Speaker, that it is not 1/10th of that \$30,000 in Athabasca seat.

As I was saying, at the start – some people are lucky and some people are not. This Government, up to last year, laid the claim or statement to the effect that this conservation scheme brought the rat population up, consequently, more money in the country. A good argument. And I have another little argument, Mr. Speaker. I believe, last year, the rat population, or whatever you want to call it, went down. We did not get as many rats, and like my friend Dundas here, I will do a little bit of predicting. You are not going to get the rats this year that you got last year, Mr. Speaker, conservation or no conservation. We know, in the North, that rats will not live in low water. They go by high water and low water. Low water – no rats; high water – rats. Rabbits – every seven years, when they die off. The same thing with rabbits. Long-haired fur will come in, and there won’t be any rabbits. You will have the water fur – mink and muskrats and beaver. When the otter fur – I call it right now – is in, you have not got the profits. So, Mr. Speaker, when I said some people are lucky, they certainly are. They have had high water up until last spring – that is the reason they had so many rats.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Crown Corporations, I have heard a lot in regard to Crown Corporations. I have heard “throw them out the window”,

March 1, 1951

and heard them trying to drag them back in, and everything else. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be quite honest; I believe what I say. I have friends, I have relations, in fact I think, for the benefit of the public as a whole, the Power Commission is 100 per cent. The same thing for the Telephones – for one reason, I use it for nothing over here.

Bus Lines – maybe if I pat the bus lines on the back the Minister of Highways might whisper to the Minister of Natural Resources here, and we might get some roads, so we'll say the bus lines are all right.

Well, now, the next thing is the Airways. They will say, "Well, Marion has got an aeroplane, sure he is going to stand by the Airways"; and they are right. I sure am.

And not to get away from the subject – while I am on it, I want to congratulate the Government on their Ambulance Service; and not only that, I want the Government to know, and I want the people to know, that the boys who handle those planes go out any time, night or day. The people do not realize what risks they are taking; but they have not had any trouble, and I want to congratulate those pilots, especially those in the Air Ambulances. While I am on Airways, I might as well tell the truth – what we want, Mr. Speaker, and I – I am talking for the Government right now; but they do not know it; but what we want, Mr. Speaker, are some more air-strips in the North, and I will give you my reasons for these. We need one at Snake Lake, and one at Portage la Loche. The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is, in a few words, that a machine with pontoons cannot take the load that the machine with wheels can take; consequently more pay-loads, more money for the Government, and more money for the Saskatchewan Airways. But there is one reservation to that, Mr. Speaker. If the Government decided to give us some roads and give us the air-strips, I will hope it does not happen like it did the last time, in regard to air-strips: just before, in fact during, an election. I mean it sincerely. We should have airstrips and roads and it would be for the benefit of everybody concerned. So I want to say here again, I am in favour of the Power Commission, Telephones, Bus Lines and Saskatchewan Airways. And, as far as the brick plant at Estevan is concerned, my friend, the member for Estevan (Mr. McCormack) might not like it, so he can go out the window with it. The woollen factory or whatever you call it – that can go out of the window. In fact, the rest – and I want to be quoted right on this – the rest can all go out the window, and I am not going to haul them back in either.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Welfare – I think he wants a shot in the arm. He seems to enjoy it so we'll let him have a few facts, and I hope the Minister will realize when I say facts, I mean facts.

I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to go into this too far, but the Minister of Social Welfare has a grin on his face sometimes that kind of half makes you mad. So if he wants it, we'll give it to him. First of all, I believe that his Department is handled through the Minister of Natural Resources, that is, through the administrative offices in Prince Albert. In fact, I think that all Departments of the Government are placed in that building in Prince Albert and they have an administrator there, and it is no good. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that social welfare or social aid is something that goes to people who cannot help themselves; something for the needy, the destitute; and by that I mean that there is a certain number of people, it does not matter where it is or whether they are Metis, Englishmen or Frenchmen, in any constituency, you will have to help.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to recite a case here (and as I said before, I did not intend to do it) about one of our Metis, and I can give the Minister of Social Welfare this man's name. He went to the hospital and the doctor found there that he had to send him south for an operation. This man was operated on, in fact I think it was done in Prince Albert or Saskatoon, but the wind-up of the thing is that, as soon as this man could navigate or could walk – he was not cured by any means, because I can tell you in a few short words, Mr. Speaker, that part of this man's stomach was cut out. I do not know what he had, but he was not a well man. So he got into Prince Albert and asked where he could go to see if he could get any help from the Government. That was fine. He was told by a certain party to go to that building and find someone there. He did. I do not know the reason, but the wind-up of the story was that this man was told, "You are okay now; you do not need any aid; you do not need any relief or social aid (or whatever they call it). You get back home and go trapping." Now I would like to see anybody go trapping that had just had their stomach taken out. It takes a few years to get back on your feet. So, Mr. Speaker, this case was taken up; and what does that man get today? I won't say he gets \$10, I won't say he gets \$15; but I am sure it is not \$20 a month, to support a family.

We have other cases, Mr. Speaker, where people who are sick cannot make a living and they get \$10 a month; \$15 a month is the highest. I would like to see any of you prairie boys here try and live on \$15 a month. These people have families, too. Now, Mr. Speaker, "humanity first". I have heard that slogan. Well, let it be applied.

With regard to schools, Mr. Speaker, I give credit where credit is due. I do not admit that the Minister of Education, just because he is a C.C.F.'er or whatever you want to call him; I do not like to hear that we are not getting anything from his Department. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has done a lot for the North, and I want to give credit where credit is due. In fact, I could possibly say better than that, but I do not want to be ganged on from behind. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like, while I am on that subject, Education – and I am not patting the Minister of Education for this, it is just common sense; but I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, help in education for the boys and girls that get up to grade 8 and have no way of getting a higher education. I would like to see the Government get them to high school, that is, the bona fide and the needy ones, and the ones that have not got that help today. These children, these Metis pupils, would come back, Mr. Speaker, and help their people. I am sure that with the help of any Government you could not get better teachers or workers, and they would come back and help their own people along. And if the Government would do that, Mr. Speaker, you would not have the Metis problems you have today, in the province. You would not have, Mr. Speaker – no disrespect to you, sir – to move them from Lestock to Green Lake and from Green Lake back to Lestock, and all over. You would save money in the long run, Mr. Speaker, if this Government would do what they could in regard to the Metis people – give them a break, give them a chance to better themselves.

I went to a show the other day, Mr. Speaker. The name of the show was "The Mudlark". I would like you, Mr. Speaker, or your Government to come up North and see these children. We have plenty of mudlarks. We do not have to go back to Queen Victoria's time; we have them today, in this province. Education is the foundation, Mr. Speaker, of everything good in a human being. No education, and you have ignorance and everything vile in a human being.

March 1, 1951

The good ones that have no education are an exception. What we want, Mr. Speaker, as I say to the Minister of Education, is not necessarily a high school in the North; but let him make a survey, through his teachers, and any teacher that has a qualified student who is willing and capable of learning, give him, by way of a grant or any way you want, enough to help him along.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of education, I may add that the Indian Department – this has nothing to do with the province, this is a Federal matter; the Indian Department have one residential school in my district in Athabasca, and I have yet to hear an Indian criticize that school. They get along fine; but they are in the same shape we are – we have not got the high schools or the chance to go ahead, and that applies to the Federal Government too.

Mr. Speaker, looking at the Minister of Education, I believe I should support the budget. Looking at the balance of the Ministers, I am not going to support the budget.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I understand that the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) wishes to share part of this radio time with me . . .

Mr. Loptson: — That doesn't make any difference, go right ahead.

Mr. Cameron: — I won't be able to cover all of the matters I had hoped to speak on. I was interested, however, in the address delivered the other day by the Minister of Natural Resources, not so much for what he had to say, but rather for what he neglected to say. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that last year the Leader of the Opposition expressed alarm about the manner in which some of our oil and gas reservations were being portioned out in the province of Saskatchewan. He quoted from press reports that would indicate that a Mr. Rubbra from Toronto, formerly of Lethbridge and Medicine Hat, had secured oil rights to some 14 million acres, and since some of these announcements had come from Government sources, he asked in this House for full explanation.

The Minister of Natural Resources, when dealing with his estimates, attempted, to some degree, to give that explanation. I think the information that we got at that time we can briefly sum up in this regard. First, that in the issuing of permits for gas and oil development, not too much consideration was given to the financial ability or the ability of the applicant to do the work, but rather, after discussing the number of acres which he wanted, and after accepting the prescribed fee, and the deposit and the guarantee that a certain amount of preliminary survey work would be done, in most cases he was able to obtain his permit.

The Minister revealed, in connection with this Mr. Rubbra, that permits had been granted in the name of Gulf Securities – and Gulf Securities, I might say, is merely the trade name for Mr. Rubbra – and he had been granted permits covering nine million acres, and that he had paid as a fee for that nine million acres, some \$9,000. In other words, he had paid as a fee, to the Department of Natural Resources, for nine million acres, 1/10th of a cent an acre: 1/10th of a cent an acre to Mr. Rubbra, and the farmers of the province

are expected to pay three cents an acre in which to claim the mineral rights which they now have. Mr. Rubbra put up the cash deposit of \$36,000. Some of the maps indicated that Mr. Rubbra had 14 million acres. However, somewhere during the discussion we appear to have lost five million acres. It would appear that Mr. Rubbra dropped it and Sohio picked it up.

Now, why this Government should give out over one-quarter of the potential gas and oil area of this province to one man is beyond, sometimes, our understanding; more so, when, before they formed the Government, they hollered to high heaven, up and down this province, because the Imperial Oil had at one time obtained a permit for five million acres. The Imperial Oil have drilled something in the neighbourhood of 30 wells in their search for oil. However, Mr. Rubbra got his acreage. What did he do with it? Did he undertake to develop this acreage, find resources for the province?

Information secured from the Minister on estimates, last year, revealed that on June 25, 1949, Mr. Rubbra secured permits on five million acres. On June 27, 1949, he assigned these five million acres to Tidewater. Tidewater is a legitimate oil firm. Then, within a few days more, he assigned another four million acres to Tidewater. Now, what were the terms of this assignment? According to the Minister, Mr. Rubbra got first 2½ per cent over-riding royalty. Then he got a cash consideration. I do not know if we obtained what the cash consideration was, but you can be sure it was much in excess of the \$9,000 which he paid for them. You can be certain also, that he got his \$36,000 deposit back, not from the Department of Natural Resources, but Tidewater would have to assume that obligation and naturally reimburse Mr. Rubbra for his \$36,000. And now Mr. Rubbra has had no money invested. He is not responsible for development of gas or oil and he comes out, within a few days, with a 2½ per cent over-riding royalty, plus a substantial cash amount. In other words, if on this five million acres, or this 14 million acres, whichever it is, there is even average production found in this area of one or two or three wells of 50,000 or 60,000 barrels a day, or even 50 or 60 barrels a day, even a normal output of oil, Mr. Rubbra will stand to make hundreds of millions of dollars.

About this time, too, along came another gentleman from Toronto – Mr. Wilton. Mr. Rubbra was not the only man – Mr. Wilton, according to information we received, obtained permits to three to four million acres. He did not do any developing work either. He assigned his to other companies, and the consideration must have been considerable because Mr. Wilton decided that since he had done so well in oil, he had better get into uranium.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, at the last Session we asked for and obtained information about the Saskatchewan uranium development. You will recall that a Mr. Toby stumbled on the uranium find in Northern Saskatchewan. He obtained a 25 square mile concession. Uranium is what the world craves today. Uranium is so scarce and so essential to national defence that the Canadian Government are guaranteeing prices up to 1958 of from \$4.60 to \$6 a pound for this ore. That is the ore in the rock. The United States is doing likewise, and I have with me a clipping which I just cut out of the "Leader-Post" last night, in which the American government, in a desperate hunt for uranium, for new sources are offering bonuses of \$36,000 to anyone who happens to discover a new development, and they are offering for the first 10,000 tons delivered over and above the regular price a bonus of \$3.50 per pound, in a desperate try to get this rarest of metals which we need so desperately at the present time for national defence.

March 1, 1951

There was considerable excitement, naturally, when uranium was discovered in Saskatchewan, and it is only natural that all the mining firms should become interested. We understand that they did. There was a great scramble to obtain concessions in Northern Saskatchewan for uranium development. Along comes another gentleman about this time – a Mr. Richardson. In the midst of this excitement Mr. Richardson obtained uranium concessions on 143 square miles. Mr. Wilton, whom I mentioned on the oil, got into the uranium picture; he got concessions. Along comes a Mr. Maurice E. Young from Toronto, and he obtained concessions. A Joseph Herschorn, Toronto, came up and obtained concessions, and about this time there was a firm organized in the province of Saskatchewan, and incorporated, in order to obtain concessions and do development work in Saskatchewan's uranium area. It was incorporated in the name of Search Corporation. It was incorporated with Dr. Shumiatcher as Vice-president and solicitor. Dr. Shumiatcher, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, was the executive assistant to the Premier, legal adviser to the Cabinet and a member of the C.C.F. Natural Resources Committee. Search Corporation received some of these concessions in the uranium area.

Now we have, in the uranium area, Mr. Richardson, Mr. Wilton, Mr. Young, Dr. Shumiatcher and Mr. Hershorn, all with substantial concessions granted by the Department of Natural Resources. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that in a short while things were happening with regard to uranium development in Saskatchewan. In fact, we did not know how much was happening until the Attorney-General of the State of New York revealed the rest of the story. According to the Attorney-General, shortly after this – within some months – another uranium firm was organized, and they called themselves the American-Canadian Uranium Company. Who turned up in the American-Canadian Uranium Company? Our friend Mr. Wilton, our friend Mr. Young, our friend Mr. Herschorn. What is their interest in the American-Canadian Uranium Company? We are told, by press report and by announcements from the Department, that this company has now four 25-square mile concessions, two 18-square mile concessions, two 12-square mile concessions, and 63-odd 50-acre mineral claims – or a total of 189 square miles of uranium concessions in the province of Saskatchewan. Once this company was organized, they began to sell shares in the State of New York.

In order to protect the people of the State of New York, the Attorney-General of that State decided to take a look at this particular company. What did he find? He found this: Search Corporation had sold some of its shares to Mr. Young; Mr. Young had sold some of his shares to American-Canadian Uranium; some of Mr. Richardson's holdings were obtained. The holdings of Mr. Wilton and Mr. Herschorn appeared in this company. Mr. M. Young holds shares in American-Canadian Uranium Company to the extent of 35,000 shares. Mr. Herschorn has 58,334 shares, and they obtained these shares for 11 cents each. And another small group, mostly individuals, hold from 3,000 to 6,000 shares and they paid \$1.50 a share. This group whose names I have mentioned, together with a few in the State of New York, have put up a total of \$90,000 and have secured 83 per cent interest in the company, and they stepped across to the State of New York with the remaining 17 per cent of the shares to be sold. Were they offering them for 11 cents, or were they offering them for \$1.50? Mr. Speaker, they were offering them for \$3.50. In other words, they were asking the resident people of the State of New York to put up \$1,750,000 to obtain a 17 per cent interest in this company. For \$90,000 these organizers got 83 per cent of the stock, and they asked the people of New York to pay \$1,750,000 for a 17 per cent interest.

I want to read from a clipping of the "Leader-Post", in which the Department of Natural Resources is reported to have announced that the AAA and BBB concession blocks of 25 square miles were granted originally by the Department of Natural Resources to Pax Athabasca Uranium Mines Limited, April 1, 1950. The transfers were made by the Company to the American Uranium Company, June 8, 1950. A CCC concession block of 25 square miles was granted to our Mr. Young. He, in turn, transferred ownership to the American-Canadian Company, June 8. Concession FF2 of 18 square miles, was granted to Robert Campbell of Ontario, April 1. He transferred them to Mr. Young April 17; and Mr. Young transferred them to the American-Canadian Company June 8. Block EE2, J.M. Wilton, who received the grant April 1, 1949, from the Department of Natural Resources, transferred it to Mr. M.E. Young, October 17, and Mr. Young transferred it to the American-Canadian Uranium Company on June 8, last year. Concession block ZZ of 25 square miles was granted to Search Corporation, organized as I have said, by the former legal adviser to the Premier. It was granted to Search Corporation, April 1, 1949. It was transferred to Mr. M.E. Young, April 21, 1950; and from there it was transferred to the American-Canadian Uranium Company.

That is how the concessions came into the hands of this company. What else did the Attorney-General find, in his investigation? He found that Mr. Young, whom we had done business with, has a record of convictions and a gaol sentence for fraud and conspiracy in connection with stock manipulation, and Joseph Herschorn, two convictions for violating foreign exchange laws of Canada. That is the situation in regard to American-Canadian Uranium Company: all these concessions, large in size, but so important to national defence and to the interest of the human people of this continent, today, into the hands of a bunch of racketeers, and I have traced the method by which they came into these hands.

So Mr. Speaker, when uranium is so desperately needed both for defence and for civil use in the Dominion Government, the American Government, and when they are paying these tremendous prices in the search for uranium, when Saskatchewan has perhaps the greatest uranium find in the world, how did it happen that Saskatchewan permitted these valuable uranium concessions to fall into the hands of these racketeers? Surely, when we seek a brighter future for Saskatchewan, this development of our natural resources is most important, and thus it becomes a responsibility to use every safeguard to protect those natural resources in the interests of the province and of the people of Saskatchewan. Not only have we a situation in which a select few stand to make millions out of the development of oil and gas reserves, but now we find that large uranium concessions have fallen into the hands of a gang of racketeers.

Now, when I learned that hundreds of square miles of our uranium area had fallen into these hands, I thought surely we must have legislation on our books to prevent such a thing. I could not conceive of such a thing happening, and I obtained a copy of The Mineral Resources Act just to see if we had any protection to prevent this very thing from happening. I want to read from Section 12 of The Mineral Resources Act, "Provision for the Protection of Investors", this section says this:

"12. Where it appears to the Minister:

(a) that a sale of share in any mining company or in any mining property is being advertised, or solicited upon statements which are not in accord with

March 1, 1951

the actual facts and conditions as shown by the report of a resident engineer or of any technical or administrative official of the department or by information on file in the department; or

(b) that any statements of the nature referred to in clause (a) are being published or circulated with the intention of influencing or which may influence such a sale of shares;

And if the Minister considers it advisable in the interest of any person or of the public, he may give or cause to be given such notices, either personal or public, by telegraphic dispatch, letter, bulletin, advertisement, or otherwise as he considers necessary to prevent injury to investors; and it shall not be necessary in any notice so given to refer to this section or to state any fact or reason as preliminary to or leading up to the giving of the notice . . .”

“13. Where a corporation acquires an interest in, or title to, or engages in work on any mining property situate in a natural resources district, it shall forthwith notify the recorder of that district and the Minister, and file with each of them full particulars thereof, and shall also file with each of them, as soon as it is issued, a copy of every prospectus or statement in lieu of prospectus, issued by the corporation.”

I have with me here the prospectus of the American-Canadian Uranium Company, and under these regulations of Section 13, I must assume that since this company was registered in the province of Saskatchewan, it must have deposited with the Department of Natural Resources a copy of its prospectus. Then, knowing the contents of this prospectus, I would like to ask the Minister why his Department did not see fit, under Section 12, to protect the interest of the investor. Why did it have to wait until the Attorney-General of the State of New York saw fit to protect his public there? Now the Minister may say . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Do you want an answer now?

Mr. Cameron: — . . . that they are not registered here under the Provincial Securities Act . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Does the hon. member want an answer to that now?

Mr. Cameron: — No, no . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The answer is very brief; it just is that we have no jurisdiction in New York.

Mr. Cameron: — No, I don’t want an answer now. I don’t want it. I want to complete these questions, and then I would like to get an answer or explanation.

Now, they may say this firm was not registered under the Provincial Securities Act to sell shares in the province of Saskatchewan, and to their knowledge, shares have not been offered to the public of Saskatchewan; but I wish the Minister, too, when he is making his explanation, would explain whether this Section 12, which I read, gives him authority to protect the investors of anywhere who are investing in the industrial development of the province of Saskatchewan. If it gives him that authority, then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask why wasn't that authority exercised? If it does not give him this authority, then surely, in the interests of those people who are attempting to invest in the province of Saskatchewan, we should, with the greatest haste, bring in an amendment to The Natural Resources Act which will give the Minister of Natural Resources the right to protect these investors and their interests in Saskatchewan.

We say this: we are interested in the development of our natural resources. This Government says that they are inviting private capital in to develop the natural resources. We are having some difficulty, Mr. Speaker, to induce private capital to come into this province. One of the hindrances, of course, is the 'Regina Manifesto', which I do not care to go into. At the present time the Government is, apparently, falling over backwards to induce American capital to come into the province to develop its resources.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We are having difficulty in keeping them out.

Mr. Cameron: — Yet we find a situation such as referred to, of Mr. Rubbra with his millions and a 2 1/2 per cent over-riding royalty. We find, now, this scandalous undertaking in the development of our uranium concessions within the province. We ask, Mr. Speaker, and we think we are entitled to, a full explanation of these things that are going on within the uranium concessions in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as I said two years ago in this House, and I want to reiterate it here, one of the things that has been retarding the progress of Saskatchewan in regard to the developing of her resources is that this Government then did not have, nor has it today, a definite, clear-cut policy whereby these legitimate oil companies and mining companies would know where they stood within the province of Saskatchewan, and until such time as this Government formulates some definite, clear-cut policies and guarantees the terms and conditions of those policies, we will only have people such as Rubbra, people such as Hershorn, such as Young, such as Wilton, and these that now have taken advantage of the development of our natural resources. What about these scandalous conditions?

I want to say this, Mr. Speaker. I have taken more time than I should have, but I want to say this: we would like to ask the Minister to answer, first, what investigations does his Department make into men who come in to the Department of Natural Resources or to the director of mineral development, and ask for large areas of potential gas and oil reservations? What investigation does he make in regard to the financial stability, the ability to develop these resources, and something about their personal integrity? Were these men such as Mr. Hershorn, Mr. Young, and the others — was any investigation made regarding those, before these large concessions were granted to them? Is there any investigation made regarding those that are applying now for further concession? If not, I think it is time the

March 1, 1951

Department of Natural Resources put to work those regulations in regard to investigating each and every one who puts in an application, in the hope of developing these natural resources properly in Saskatchewan. And I say that, in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, in the interests of Saskatchewan's good name, until the Department of Natural Resources and the Government as a whole, brings into this House regulations which are clear, concise and to the point, which will prevent people from grabbing 14 millions of acres and disposing of it within two days, and going out with a royalty of 2½ per cent, which will prevent large concessions of our uranium areas dropping into the hands of gangsters and having to be brought to our attention by the Attorney-General of New York; I say that until such time as that is being done or will be done, we can look elsewhere than to outside investors to come into the province of Saskatchewan, as a safe and secure bet.

Because of that, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion.

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt my hon. friend when he was speaking, but he used the term . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Order!

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) kindly let me make the rulings — not him.

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, the hon. member just used the term the “scandalous handling of the natural resources” . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I said nothing about scandalous handling. I said the scandalous situation which has occurred — not scandalous handling.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I accept my hon. friend's statement. I only want to say to him that if he or any other member of the House . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I answered your question.

Premier Douglas: — . . . will stand up in their place, and on their responsibility as a member, say that there is any scandalous situation with reference to the handling of these concessions, I am prepared to see that a full and proper investigation is conducted on the request of any member sitting opposite.

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. Premier rose on a question of privilege and took advantage of it to make this speech, which was entirely out of order, Mr. Speaker. I submit that I have just as much right to answer the Premier now, but I would be out of order and I do not intend to. But let the Premier tell the Minister of Natural Resources to answer to this House these charges that have been made.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I think the hon. Premier was perfectly within his rights to speak on behalf of the Government and offer to make a proper investigation in relation to the charges that were made in the speech.

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — The honour of the Government is at stake, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cameron: — I think, since it was my speech, I should make this explanation. The Government seems very ticklish about some of these things. I said, “I am asking for explanations”. I am not making charges. I am asking for explanations in the House because I think that is the legitimate place to ask. All we are asking is that the Minister explain, give us a full explanation on how these things occurred. That is all we have asked for.

Mr. A. Loftson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the cross-questioning and answers very much, and I can see that there is not much left for me to say on the situation. However, this being the first time I have risen in this House at this Session, I think it is quite in order that I should express my congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer for the presentation he made of his budget speech. I was rather disappointed, however, to see that he had to raise the debt of the Province in such a buoyant time as we are going through. We were expecting him to have reduced it rather than increase it.

I want to also express my appreciation to the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) for the able manner in which he tore that speech apart. He brought the explanation of that elaborate document down to earth, I think, in a more able manner than possibly it had been done on previous occasions; that is, he brought it down more in line with the average man’s understanding.

I want to say, to start with, that we on this side of the House have a duty to perform to the people of Saskatchewan. Our duty, as I can see it, is to bring to light any maladministration or any mistakes that the administration have overlooked themselves, so that not only the people might know about it but the Government might know about it, too. I am not throwing any reflection on the integrity of any member or any Minister of the Crown. I have always taken the position that, once a man is nominated and he accepts the position of representing the people of a constituency, he goes out to do the best job he can for the people he represents; and I think that situation applies to everybody, no matter what party line he belongs to.

I do believe that the Ministers, when they are appointed as administrators of the affairs of the Province, likewise accept that position in every sincerity and in the hope of being able to do a good job. But the difficulty comes, as a rule, in the ability and the foresight of the individual in carrying out the duty that he has undertaken to do. We have all, I believe, an objective to aim at; at least we have an end of the road we hope to reach. I do not think there is very much difference in what we hope to accomplish; that is, we will agree we want to do certain things that are good for the people of Saskatchewan. I think my hon. friends to your right believe that is what they are doing. We want to do the very same thing; but we believe that our way of doing it is much better than the way they are doing it. For that reason we are here in order to try to point out the mistakes they are making that we might eliminate, if we were on that side of the House.

March 1, 1951

Now a great many things have come to light as a result of our investigation towards that goal. We have found that a great deal of maladministration has cropped up. I do not think that the Ministers themselves really realize, in some instances, that their plans have gone astray. I think that the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), who just sat down, gave them a very fair illustration of what has happened in the Natural Resources Department; but possibly my hon. friends the Ministers themselves did not know what was going on. We have found that also in regard to the establishment of the Crown Corporations, and I do not think it goes without notice of the Ministers themselves, as well as us on this side of the House, that these planners and special advisers that the Government took on to guard themselves against mistakes, for some reason or other found that the Ministers themselves were rather easy marks to handle, and when the opportunity came they just helped themselves to what they wanted. They ran things to their own benefit, they helped themselves to their choice of the natural resources and when they had grabbed all they wanted they just sent in their resignations and they were out; and there was not anything the Ministers could do about it. Some of these resigned servants are now developing these resources; some are out on luxury retirement on their gains, in Florida or some other part of the United States, having a nice little living, who never had anything before.

I do not know whether we have the right to imply that responsibility is entirely with the Ministers, although it is their responsibility; but nevertheless it would appear that that is what has happened. I would take, for instance, that sodium sulphate plant. Much has been talked about the establishment of that particular industry. The Premier himself had a great deal to say about it when it was erected, and he, himself, said that there would be about a million and a half of public money invested in that project. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, it was also supposed to make that much money for the Treasury each year. Now, I think that possibly he made a mistake when he said that was the income into the Treasury.

Premier Douglas: — That was income into the Province, I did not say into the Treasury. I just want to correct my hon. friend — I said income into the Province.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, that, I think, is what you meant.

Premier Douglas: — That is what I said.

Mr. Loptson: — Anyway, the expenditure, Mr. Speaker, is far out of all proportion with what it should have been. I think that the planners, or whoever they were, who started to build that plant meant well when they started out, because we find, at least it has come to our notice, that they had gone out to get figures on building that plant from responsible and reliable firms; and, particularly, there was one particular bid that I understand was presented to the Government to build that plant for in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars. The terms of that bid, I understand, were for all new machinery, all new equipment and the materials for the buildings, and those things were all supposed to be new; and, as far as I understand, there is absolutely no question about the reliability of the firm that made that bid. But along comes an individual by the name of Holland who apparently persuaded the Government that he could do better than that, that he could build it for much less, so he was engaged to do the job. Well now, it is rather an unfortunate situation for the Government to get hooked on a

proposition like that, because I presume that this Mr. Holland was just merely a sharp promoter. Anyway, the upshot of the job is (and I am taking the Minister's own words for it) that instead of it costing half a million dollars for all new building and new material, it has cost a million and a half – is that not right? – for old, dilapidated, obsolete machinery and a building that is now shaking to pieces. That is the report on it.

Premier Douglas: — Report from whom?

Mr. Loptson: — I might also say that a similar thing applied to the brick yard. I was offered that brick plant myself for a hundred thousand dollars less than they paid for it, because I could have got it for \$35,000. And this Government just said to the promoter who offered the plant, “Well, there is one thing that you have to take into consideration before we talk the deal at all; that is, you have to take \$50,000 in Government bonds before we talk business.” Well, the man who had the deal was flabbergasted because he had not intended even to talk \$50,000; so he goes back and he says, “I will see you tomorrow.” By that time, he figured that if they were so anxious to get rid of \$50,000 in bonds, it would not be hard to get a fairly good cash payment, so they added \$100,000 to that.

I think they were goats, too, when they put up the woollen mill. I think they got licked at that. They were victims of promoters there. They were victims when they put up the shoe factory – obsolete machinery; they have a lot of that.

Well now, that is the situation in this province. What I am trying to drive at, Mr. Speaker, is that we are sorely in need of roads and sorely in need of gravel on our roads, and those millions that have been squandered in this way, through maladministration of the Crown Corporations, or at least the setting up of them, would have gravelled hundreds and hundreds of miles of roads in my constituency at least, if no other one would have it. I know that what was wasted in the building of the sodium sulphate plant would have gravelled nearly every mile of market road that we have in the Saltcoats constituency. I am not kicking so much about the sodium sulphate plant. It was an ill-advised venture, it I true, because we already had four plants in this province which had been operating for a good many years; but the plant may eventually pay its way. I do not think it will ever pay back the capital that is in it, however, because it is subject to weather conditions; you may have nothing next year, if the weather is not favourable. But, in any event, there was no reason for setting that industry up because we already have four in this province.

Now then, I want to say a little about the profits that are being claimed by this Government on these corporations. While we are not doubting the profits that are being accumulated by the Power Commission, there is no competition there; it cannot lose because if it is going in the red they just raise the rates. Then in the Telephone Department it is the same thing; you will find it was necessary to raise the rates in the Telephone Department, in spite of the fact that the Premier said that there had not been any increase in the telephone rates. The Minister of Labour got up on his feet and admitted there had been an increase of \$2.00 in the switching fees on rural lines. We knew that, when the Minister said there had not been any, there had been an increase to the users of telephones in the cities of some \$3.00 a year, an increase in the business 'phones of some \$9.00 a year. And yet, the Premier gets up on his feet and says that they have made no increase in the rates of

March 1, 1951

the telephones.

I had occasion to check up on the financial set-up and how they arrive at the profits of these Crown Corporations. I noticed rather an interesting item on the sodium sulphate plant. For instance, the inventory for 1948 of the sodium sulphate plant, which I think was stated, if I am right, as being \$51,000 (I am going to give you the thousands) of raw salt in stock, valued at \$51,000. In 1949, I notice it is valued at \$125,000. Now, I happened to pass that plant in 1949. I am not professing to know anything about sodium sulphate, but I talked with one of the employees there. I said, "How do you get your surplus in order to run all the year round?" And he said, "We take it at a certain time of the year and we stock-pile it," and he said that last year they had a nice big stock pile – and that would be the \$51,000 worth. Then he said that in 1949, the harvest was small, and I noticed that there was not a great deal of stock-piling in 1949, — and yet the value of that pile is \$75,000 higher than that of the big pile in 1948. Well, if you are going to increase your value in order to show a profit you can always add the amount necessary in your inventory. It may be difficult for us sitting here in the House to say that it is not worth the value set on it. In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, it is rather amusing, or rather curious to me, when I see the value of the 1949 stock-pile set at \$75,000 more than the value of the pile in 1948 which, to me, was more than twice as big.

Well now, there is a situation that I think we have a right to investigate. We have a right to get the value of the inventories that are being carried on these Crown Corporations. I am interested to know just how the inventory of the Timber Board is made up. I am interested to know where these inventories are. I have been informed that there is an inventory of a certain stock-pile up in the north supposed to amount to a considerable amount of money, but the officials of the local board for the last two years cannot find it. They may be mistaken in the location of some things but apparently in this particular case they have not been able to find this \$18,000 worth of lumber or logs or whatever it is. It is not an awful big amount but just the same, it is our duty to ask the Government to provide us with that information for the benefit of the public.

I am rather dubious about some of the profits they show. As far as the Timber Board is concerned, it is just terrible to see that a turnover of three million and some-odd hundred thousand dollars shows a profit of just \$132,000. What is going to happen when times get a little slack, if that is all the profit you can make when times are as buoyant as they are at the present time?: They tell me that lumber has gone up about \$20 a thousand just during the summer months. That in itself, Mr. Speaker, on their turnover should have shown a million-dollars profit instead of the \$132,000.

Those are things that the public is interested in, and we want to know the actual facts. I think the ministers should want to know, too. They should want to know why they are not making more money on the turnover of lumber at the price they are paying for it. I understand they are paying the lumber men only from \$30 to \$34 a thousand. They are selling it, in many instances, for over \$100 a thousand, a fabulous mark-up. I would suggest, too, that the Government might well set an example; if they would economize properly on this business, they should be reducing the price of lumber. They are asking others to roll back the prices. They are in the best position of anyone that I know, with the fabulous profits that they should have, to start to roll back the prices where they should be.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about something here that I do know a little bit about, and that is the lumber business. I was in the lumber business for several years; and I was the one who broke the combine at that time when I reduced the price \$10 a thousand right across the board. And I know what difficulties I had to deal with when that combine closed me out and I could not buy any lumber from any mill. I fought that and won out; so I can tell my hon. friends something of the lumber business. And it was \$10 a thousand across the board for a twenty-mile radius of where I was in business, and I held it at that; so I know something about rolling back prices.

So much for that. I wanted to say something about the hospitals. I am interested in this hospital business. I think I made the prediction two years ago, in this House, that it seemed unfortunate that the future of the hospital undertaking was threatened by the enormous overhead costs and the administrative dictatorship. I am glad now that my hon. friends over there are beginning to find that my prediction was right. I am glad to hear that the Minister admits that things are not all well with the hospitals, and I am hoping they will find a way to reduce those overhead costs, because we have a lot of expansion to be made in that field. Not only have we got to provide, sooner or later, more old folks' homes throughout this province. There is a dire need for the establishment of old folks' homes, which would relieve a great deal of the expense of the hospitals.

There is another institution that is badly needed in this province, and that is a home for the incurables. I have seen cases of incurables that have been very pitiful, both men and women, who would not be acceptable as ordinary hospital patients. There just does not appear to be any place where these people can go. I know of one particular case of a young man of around 32 or 33 years of age who has to be taken out of his bed in the morning and carried to a chair and he has to be fed, he is so badly crippled with arthritis or something. He has been all over for medical advice and medical attention, but there does not seem to be any help for him. Now his mother, day in and day out, is the only person who can look after him, and her time is tied up to look after this young man who might otherwise be considered hale and hearty, except that he is helpless and cannot even raise his arms to feed himself. I do not doubt that there are many cases similar to that one, and if there are any people who should be looked after and should be provided with a home where they can be properly looked after, it is people who are absolutely helpless and cannot help themselves. I would like to suggest to this Government and any other Government that might take its place, that this is one of the things that we should take care of, and extend assistance to the incurables and the people who are absolutely helpless.

I want now to say a few things about highways. My hon. friend the Minister of Highways is not in his chair. I was rather pleased when he made the remark that he distributed the highway expenditure very equitably throughout the province; and he did not think that any member should have any cause to complain. Having heard him say that, I looked over the appropriation that had been made for the Saltcoats constituency for the year 1950. During that year there were some \$5 million expended on highways in this province on capital and revenue accounts, I understand. The Saltcoats constituency's share appeared to have been the magnificent sum of \$360.64 out of the \$5 million expended — \$360.64. That is what the Saltcoats constituency's fair proportion of the \$5 million was, according to the Hon. Minister of Highways.

Well now, I am not going to complain very much. We did not get very much before I came into the House, because it appears that they had not

March 1, 1951

had anything from 1944 until the election year of 1948. Then they got very busy and they let three contracts all at once; and I appreciate that, in spite of the fact that the election did not go their way, they completed those contracts.

I am going to ask the Minister to take note that we have three links in the Saltcoats constituency that are of very great importance. There is the extension of No. 8 to connect up with No. 10 tying it through to Kamsack. There is the link of No. 9 to No. 14 which would serve not only Yorkton but Melville and Regina. Those links are really important. We need another link between No. 22 and No. 14, which might be best located between Esterhazy and Bredenbury. That road is used an awful lot on account of the train service that they have, and I would like the Hon. Minister of Highways to take this into consideration when he distributes his next year's appropriation.

Well now, I was going to say something else. I did not intend to say very much, because there has been a lot said; but there is another thing I wish to say before I am through with the Minister of Highways. It is a remark that he made – was it yesterday he made his speech or the day before? – yesterday. I noticed in the “Leader-Post”, and I guess they reported it right, in speaking of the waterworks supply for Regina, and I quote:

“Reviewing the history of the drive to get additional water supply from the South Saskatchewan River for Regina Mr. Douglas said, ‘The last information we have from the P.F.R.A. is that they intend to drain into the Buffalo Pound Lake reservoir as much of the Qu’Appelle watershed as possible. This includes Moose Jaw Creek, the stream into which Moose Jaw dumps its sewage.’”

Well now, I do not know anything about that. Then he goes on further:

“This may make good fertilizer for Regina lawns and gardens, but I would hesitate to advise it be used for drinking.”

Well, I do not blame him. But who is responsible? That is the question. The P.F.R.A. apparently have been good enough to agree to assist in getting this thing, but, on investigation, I find that it was this Government that hired Professor Forsberg of Saskatchewan University to report on this plan; and not only that, but Mr. Schaeffer, the Chief Sanitary Inspector of this Government, also endorsed it. Well now, Mr. Speaker, what is the use of hiring inspectors or having inspectors if the Ministers are going to get up on their feet and say that their inspection is no good and their report is not accepted? Either one or the other has no place in the service of this Government. Either the Minister's judgment is no good or these high officials who are being paid by this Government are no good.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. At no time did I intimate that I was dissatisfied with the report of Professor Forsberg. His work was to investigate the possibility of bringing water from the South Saskatchewan River to Buffalo Pound Lake, and I simply repeated the pledge made by Dr. McCusker, and also quoted an editorial in the “Leader-Post” that told of the mountain water that was going to be brought into Buffalo Pound Lake to feed Regina. That is different from the sewage from the City of Moose Jaw.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, but did you not say something about the sewage being run into it.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I did, you are perfectly right.

Mr. Loptson: — Well then apparently your sanitary inspector approves of it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The sanitary inspector comes under my Department. He made no recommendation to bring in that stuff at all.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, would my hon. friend explain why Mr. Schaeffer of the Sanitary Division of the Department of Health has approved of this plan?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege; he has not approved of the water referred to by the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Loptson: — Well anyway, that is the plan and he has approved it, and it has already been stated by the Mayor of Regina that that plan has been approved and it has been 'okayed.'

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Would the hon. member mind quoting from that part of the Forsberg report in which he makes a recommendation that surface waters be used?

Mr. Loptson: — He makes a recommendation of the plan and the sanitary inspector has already approved it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Did you ever read the Forsberg report?

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I have the report. I imagine that the Minister has it and he says it is all right; and the sanitary inspector has it, and he says it is all right.

Premier Douglas: — Where did you get your information? Your source of information is bad; it must be Liberal Headquarters again.

Mr. Loptson: — Oh yes, then the Mayor of Regina must be wrong. He does not know nearly as much about it as the Hon. Minister of Highways; we should not expect him to, of course.

There are other things that have come to light since we have come to this Session, and one is the fact that we have at last come to the bottom of who is responsible for the teachers in our schools. There has been a considerable amount of concern expressed down in our part of the country and in other parts of the province, about teachers being allowed to teach subversive doctrines in their schools, and there is a considerable amount of it being done. There is not a big percentage of teachers that does that; but there are some, and I have been asked time and again, by people who object to that sort of teaching, why those teachers are allowed to hold a teacher's certificate. I asked the hon. Minister of Education the other day, in the Public Accounts Committee, who was responsible for allowing these teachers to continue teaching communistic doctrines in our schools, and the Minister of

March 1, 1951

Education boldly got up and said, "I'll take personal responsibility." Well now, I admire him for his courage. We know a communist when he says he is a communist; but the most dangerous communist is the one who says he is something else and preaches communism in season and out. They are the most dangerous. I have no fault to find with a man who believes in communism. If that is his belief that is his privilege. But I have fault to find with a man who calls himself a liberal, conservative or a socialist or whatever it is and yet preaches communist doctrine in season and out. There is nobody that I detest more than the man who is double-faced or double-talking. I like a man to stand on his feet for his convictions, whatever they may be.

I want to say this to my hon. friend the Minister of Education. If he thinks it is all right to teach communistic doctrines in the schools, that is his right; he has the right of that conviction. But I want to ask him if he also holds the belief of the Minister of Education of Soviet Russia insofar as the basic teaching of communist doctrines is concerned – does he agree with that? If he does not, then I do not think he should allow it to be taught. I am going to quote from a remark of the Minister of Education of the U.S.S.R. Government. This remark is part of a speech made by the Minister of Education, G. Lewiskewski. It was made in Prague on September 9th, last fall or the fall before, I am not sure; and this is what he says:

We hate Christianity and christians, even the best of them must be looked upon as our worst enemies. They preach the love of our neighbours and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. Down with the love of our neighbours! What we want is hatred. We must learn how to hate, and it is only then we shall conquer the world."

Now, that is a quotation from a speech made by the Minister of Education of the Russian Government; and I want to say that it is hardly in accordance with the belief of the people of Saskatchewan when that doctrine is being taught to our children in the school.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I must deny, I have never heard such an irresponsible, outrageous, asinine statement made in this House before.

Premier Douglas: — He is an asinine person.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, of course, anything that is quoted contrary to their policy is outrageous, we must expect that; but that is something I have the verification for.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. If the hon. member insists that that doctrine is being taught in the schools of Saskatchewan today, I must ask that he withdraw it.

Mr. Loptson: — I am not saying that they – at least I do not think my hon. friend knows what these people are being taught by teachers that are irresponsible, and I do not think that my hon. friend would allow them to have their certificates and teach what some of them are teaching . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege. If the hon. member knows the name of any teacher then it is his duty and his responsibility to place that name before me.

Mr. Loptson: — My hon. friend told me in the Committee on Public Accounts, when I told him that there were people who were teaching subversive doctrines in the schools, that he took full responsibility for it.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, that was not the statement I made at all. I want to repeat again, Mr. Speaker, if he knows of these people, if he has any sense of decency or responsibility, then he will place the names of those people before me.

Mr. Loptson: — My hon. friend is elaborating on it now. I will leave it to the members of the Committee of Public Accounts.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — So will I.

Mr. Loptson: — I stood up on my feet and I said, “Who is responsible for allowing these people to be teaching subversive doctrines in the schools; and not only in our public schools, it is being taught in the normal schools and in the universities.”

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege. When the hon. member makes the statement that that is being taught in the normal schools, it is false and ridiculous.

Mr. Loptson: — My hon. friend had better investigate it then.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made a direct charge that that doctrine is being taught in the normal schools in this province, and I ask him either to substantiate or withdraw that statement.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, there are men who know better than I what is going on in the normal schools and the name was drawn to his attention in the Public Accounts Committee and he said that he had not heard any report of that particular individual.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, is the member going to withdraw?

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member for Saltcoats will either have to withdraw the statement or accept responsibility.

Mr. Loptson: — Oh, I am not taking any — I will take back the statement if you want me to do that, I am just saying what is generally known. I am not a normal student.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, is the statement being withdrawn or not?

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has made definite statements and they must be either withdrawn or he must accept responsibility of saying them.

March 1, 1951

Mr. Loptson: — I did. I told you I would withdraw it.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has stated on more than one occasion in this House, when other statements have been made, particularly on the Government side, that if the member is willing to take responsibility for it, if that is his opinion, then he is entitled to state it. You have stated that over and over again. Now, my colleague who is just speaking brought to your attention that communists were teaching in the schools, and he suggested that they probably taught what they believed, and he is entitled to that opinion that they probably would teach what they believed. It is entirely out of order, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that if that is his belief he must withdraw it, it is not in accordance with the rulings you have already made.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Leader of the Opposition is missing the point entirely. The hon. member for Saltcoats made the specific statement against a specific Government institution that subversion was being taught in the normal school. The Minister of Education, rising on a point of privilege, asked that that should be withdrawn or else substantiated, and I think the Minister, who is responsible for that Department, has a perfect right to do so.

Mr. Loptson: — I think you entirely overlooked the preamble of my remarks, I said that it is continually being brought to my notice that these teachings were going on in the schools. I told you that in the first place, that it was being continually brought to my notice that this subversive teaching was going on in the schools.

Now, I want to say another thing. After all, my hon. friends are getting closer and closer to our communist friends. I noticed there was quite a gathering here yesterday, and they were pretty well identified. I do not think you could have found a Liberal among that audience. I do not think you could have found a Conservative in that audience. But I saw lots of them flagging around and showing their C.C.F. memberships. And I heard a lot of them quite boldly say, "I am a communist." And I do not think that you could find any other political belief in that audience; and I was rather expecting that my hon. friend the Minister might have allowed them to come in here and present their case. I was rather expecting it; but apparently he thought better of it. They certainly crowded at the door hard enough, they nearly forced themselves in anyway. The fact that the Ministers are supporting communism, I might say, does not make communism any better. Now they are talking about their hating communists. My hon. friend the Premier made the statement that he did not like communists. Well, I do not like them either; but I would say that in many instances he follows the communist practice and follows the communist practice in oratory sometimes. I was rather surprised when he stood up on the floor of this House and said there were only two points difference between the C.C.F. policy and the communist policy; and why anybody should say . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, that statement is certainly not true.

Mr. Loptson: — It is in the records.

Premier Douglas: — I must ask my friend either to accept my statement that it is not true or produce the record, one of the two.

He cannot make statements simply off-hand like that. I at no time said there were only two points of difference between the communists and the C.C.F.

Mr. Tucker: — Four points.

Premier Douglas: — Neither two points nor four points.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member must either withdraw or substantiate.

Mr. Loftson: — What?

Mr. Speaker: — You accused the Premier of this province of saying that he was only four points removed from communism.

Mr. Loftson: — Well, he admits that.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Premier got up and denied it.

Mr. Loftson: — No, he admits the four points, he thought I said, “Two points.” He denied that, but I said there were four points.

Mr. Speaker: — I heard what the Premier said and he did not acknowledge four points either. The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. Loftson: — Mr. Speaker, I do not care whether I withdraw it or not, because he has already admitted there were four points, but I will withdraw it anyway, to suit you. But I cannot see any reason why we should be so anxious to change the system we have here, in view of the records that we have very lately, issued by the Statistics department of this country. I think this capitalistic system is a most wonderful system insofar as the well-being of the people is concerned, as far as the high standard of living and the well-being of the people. Let me just refer to some recently published statistics. What country in the world, except the United States which is another capitalistic country, can show that there is a new home completed every six minutes, night and day? What country can you say can compare with that, where ten out of thirteen homes, rural and urban, are electrically equipped? where five out of seven homes have telephones? where nineteen out of twenty homes have radios? where seven out of ten have washing machines, and three out of five families own their own cars?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And one divorce in every two.

Mr. Loftson: — Now, do you suppose that your system could do better? Or are you going to take away from some of these fellows and share it with the ones who have not got it?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ramble away here just to take up time. I am sorry I could not accept the challenge of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Health on this wheat question, but I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that you will allow me latitude when we come to that wheat resolution, for I would feel very much put out if I could not satisfy my hon. friend the Minister of Public Health, because I know something of his record as far as wheat is concerned and, while we do not always agree on everything, we might be able to agree after I got through with him. I would not want to lose the

March 1, 1951

opportunity of convincing him of the fact that he is all wet in some of the cases; and certainly he should have known better than to say some of the things that he said. That, of course, goes without saying; we sometimes do that.

That is about all I am going to say now, Mr. Speaker, and I assure you I will not support the budget because I do not think it is a very good budget. I think that we should have some money in the Treasury set up, if the natural resources had been properly handled, if we had an oil policy here that would not scare everybody out of the province except a few of the big corporations who are in here scouting for information. I had a little experience in trying to organize a company for exploration purposes. It cost me and my friends some money to take a lease from this Government. I went to every good C.C.F'er around my locality to see if he would put a little money in there and we would drill a hole and see if we could find gas, and the answer I got invariably was, "We are not going to put up for the C.C.F. Government, but if you want to go to Alberta and dig a well you can get all the money you want." And so I did. I took the C.C.F. money and I put it into Alberta.

The whole point of the situation is that this Government has no political right to make any agreement with either private or big companies on oil rights. They are abusing their political rights when they deviate from the platform of the party. The C.C.F. platform specifically states that they (the Government) will go along and develop our natural resources. It also specifically states that they are going to eradicate all capitalists. When the Minister of Natural Resources and the Premier go out and assure these men that their investment is going to be safe, it is only going to be safe as long as they do not reap any benefit from it. But I'd hate to see what may happen if they hit a good gusher in Saskatchewan. Then the Premier might not be in his seat very long when that crowd calls a convention and say, "Here, we are going to develop this ourselves, now that they have found it". The Hon. Minister of Natural Resources could very well be removed too, and somebody else put in there to carry out the policy of the party. And you know that I am not talking any nonsense when I say that. Either you are a capitalist supporter or you are a Socialist that does not allow capital to make any gains on our natural resources. That is quite natural, and I rather feel sorry for some of those men who are misled in those things. The only things that they have to hope for is to keep on scouting around, getting information, in the hope that this Government will be kicked out, which, of course, it would be if it ever goes to the country. We may then reap some benefit from our natural resources, and I think my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources realizes that. But there is not much hope for anybody to get anything out of natural resources here, and if the people vote for those things they should have them. They voted this Government into power not to give the natural resources away, but to develop them for the people. I have just been explaining how they have been giving them away. Well, that does not mean anything, of course, because you can cancel the leases tomorrow if you want to. You have the Act in the Statutes; so it does not make any difference whether you give them away as far as that is concerned, but do not let anybody think that you intend that your agreement cannot be broken.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Maybe my hon. friend may cancel them, we won't.

Mr. Loptson: — Would my hon. friend say that you are going to change your policy then and let those agreements go, and the investment is all right?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We stay by our agreements.

Mr. Loptson: — Would you say that you have repudiated the manifesto of the C.C.F. Party?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We stay by our agreements.

Mr. Loptson: — The Premier himself stood on the floor of the House, last year, when all the rest of you voted 100 per cent in favour of eradicating all capitalism in this province, after spending three-quarters of an hour just a minute or two before telling the investors how safe they were in this province in investing their money; right here on the floor of this House, all done within half an hour. He stood up and told the investors they were absolutely safe investing their money here, then he turned around and said that the C.C.F. Manifesto is the best political document that ever was put on paper. And then came the vote on the amendment which said you would eradicate every vestige of capitalism, and you all stood up and voted for it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in an administration of that kind I have no faith, and I am going to vote against the Budget.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I suppose it would be in order for me to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on his budget, and I do so quite heartily, for the able and eloquent manner in which he presented it. There was not anything very remarkable about it, except that a lot of money was involved.

I have no particular objection to a budget because it happens to be large. I think, in these times of high revenue and cheap money, that you need a high budget. The important thing is the way in which this money is spent. As long as it is spent wisely and distributed fairly, I do not see much objection to a large budget.

This debate has gone on quite a few days now and most of the things you can say here now are more or less like threshing old straw. Of course, one man might take a little different angle to another, but there is not an awful lot left to be said in this debate.

I spoke here on the other debate some time ago, and I mentioned that I was not getting much money spent on highways in my constituency, and I find that I am not the only one; there seem to be lots of them, even on the other side of the house. When speaking the other day, the hon. member for Bengough gave the Government great credit for all the highways they had built in his constituency since they came into office, yet he would like very much to have some more money spent there this year on highways. Now, I wish the hon. gentleman all the luck in the world, because I do not think it makes a bit of difference to me, I will not get any of it anyway up in my constituency.

March 1, 1951

The hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), speaking here the other day, was I think the only one out of all the members who have spoken so far who tried to justify the Public Revenue Tax. Most members have not gone so far as to try to justify it, but he did. He thought the tax was quite justified because the Government returned certain moneys to the municipalities and they should pay that Public Revenue Tax. Now, we all know the origin of this tax. We all know its history, and it has been said time and again in this House that this tax was imposed by the Liberals, that they had been advised to withdraw it by a previous Commission, and why did not they do it? Well, I do not see that two wrongs ever make a right, and I do not think there ever was a time in the history of this province when the Government could afford to withdraw that tax as well as they can now. The revenues were never so high as they are now, even with the budget that was presented here the other day. The Provincial Treasurer said that they can carry on without the imposition of new taxes, so that should indicate that the revenues of the province are at an all-time high. They must be.

I think that we all agree that local self-governments are the very basis of the democratic system. They have certain functions to perform – and I think that these local units should be placed in a position to discharge the responsibility which this concept of democracy imposes, and I do not believe it is fair for a senior government to invade the only field of revenue that the rural municipalities have, that is, the tax on the land. I do not think so; and I hope that the Government will see fit, inside of the next year or two, to abolish that tax.

The hon. Minister of Public Health, speaking here some time ago, said that if the Dominion Government had discharged their obligations, had kept their promises, we would have had a province-wide health plan in Saskatchewan long before this. Well, the hon. Minister no doubt is aware that a good many municipalities and local units in this country have already solved their own health problem. We have, I believe 200 rural municipalities in this country that have their own health plans, and they work very well. I know we have one. We have had a health plan in our municipality for fifteen years. It is paid for, of course, out of taxes – it is not free; every man pays to that plan according to the amount of his assessment. If a man has a section of land he pays four times as much as a man who has one quarter-section of land, and, I think, in that way we are better Socialists than the Saskatchewan Government is, because their Hospitalization Plan is a flat rate. No matter how much you are worth you pay \$10 for hospitalization; no matter how hard up you are you pay \$10 for hospitalization, and so on.

These local plans, I think, should be encouraged and extended, and I think that, with a little help from the Government to get them started, with a little financial assistance perhaps and a little advice, the plan could be made so attractive that no municipality could afford to stay out of it. It would be a great deal less worry for the Government. They would not have a great big top-heavy concern that they have to worry about all the time. This thing would be under local management and the local people would be handling their own money. They would save it and look after it, and they would keep the costs down to a fraction of what it would be under Government jurisdiction.

I was very glad to hear the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) say, the other day, that the potash beds in the Unity area were leased for developing. I was very happy to hear that. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that will turn into a great business up there, a resource that is going

to be of great value not only to Saskatchewan but, I believe, to the whole North American continent. The extent of those fields is immense. I think we all know that. I think that is the greatest deposit of potash known anywhere in the world, and I was very glad to know that we have some hope now of having those potash beds developed.

Another thing the hon. Minister said that day was that democratic institutions thrive on criticism; and I was rather amazed, you know, when I think that over, that some of our Saskatchewan democratic institutions (I supposed you would call our Crown Corporations democratic institutions) have not thrived or gotten along better than they have. I would like to say that it has not been for lack of criticism. I do not intend to say very much about Crown Corporations. I know that there are many of the Saskatchewan Crown Corporations that are making a success and that no one would ever want to scrap. I would mention the Power Corporation, the Telephones and the Transportation Corporation, in particular. Now these things are all public utilities and the measure of their success has been, and will continue to be, that they are public utilities and they are not up against competition from any private enterprises of any kind. Now, the insurance business is a good deal the same. A great volume of business comes in to the Insurance Office that cannot go anywhere else. Automobile insurance, insurance on public institutions that receive a Government grant, and things like that, all have to go to the Government Insurance Office. It creates a great volume of business, and they have a monopoly on that part of the business.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that most of these Crown Corporations, unless they are a monopoly or a partial monopoly, have not been so successful. I notice the boot factory has been closed some years ago; the same thing with the tannery. There are lots of boot factories in Canada, lots of tanneries in Canada, so these two Government Corporations had to go up against the competition of private enterprise, and they could not stand it. The woollen mill is not getting along so well either, for the very same reason that they are up against strong competition from private enterprise. I think that government in business, if they would stay with public utilities, would get along much better and they would serve the people much better, too. I believe that.

The hon. member from Bengough speaking here, the other day, said something about the woollen mill. He said the balance sheet did not tell the whole story. I think I can agree with him on that. He did not say that the woollen mill was up against the competition of private enterprise; that is one thing he did not say. He gave the Government a lot of credit for the development of our natural resources in this Province. Well, there has been considerable development in my own part of the country, but I have never seen a Government oil drill up there yet, drilling an oil well. They did not strike the gas field there; they did not discover the potash and the salt up in that country. It was all done by private enterprise, every bit of it. The mere fact that the Government granted them leases and allowed them to do it is no credit to the Government; any government anywhere does that.

I was pleased to note in this House that up to the present there has not been as much criticism of our great neighbour to the south, the United States, as there was last year. However, yesterday, the Hon. Minister of Labour, when speaking in this House, did say some rather queer things about the United States. He did give them grudging credit for what good they had

March 1, 1951

done under their Marshall Plan, but he said that this was all eaten up by the territorial grab that they had made back in the 19th century. He even dug up the old Alaska boundary dispute, something that had been forgotten by most people years ago. The Alaska boundary dispute was a poor deal; there is no question about that. It was something like the wheat deal we made with the socialist Government of Britain. That was a bad deal, too.

Premier Douglas: — Who made it?

Mr. Horsman: — I would hesitate, Mr. Speaker, to try to stir up any resentment or anything of that kind between Canada and the United States, and I believe some people do try to do that very thing. I often think about the boundary between these two countries. I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think anyone can disagree with me on this – I believe, and always have believed, that that boundary between Canada and the United States is the greatest example of international goodwill and friendship that there is anywhere in the world, or ever has been. I often wonder – and I may have said this before some time, I do not mind repeating it; I cannot help but wonder how long we would exist here as a free nation if on the other side of that imaginary line there was the Soviet Government of Russia.

I have not much more to say, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to take much more time. The hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) spoke at some length the other day, made a very fine speech, too though I couldn't hear him too well; but I think he made a very good speech. He did say this: he was talking about “yattering” back and forth across the House. There is a certain amount of that done here I must admit. I do not think the offenders are much worse on one side than they are on the other. It is a thing I do not believe in myself, and I do not blame the hon. member for criticizing the other people for doing it. I do not think he does it either. But he said that if we had television in this Chamber the actions of the Liberals would so disgust their supporters that they would never be re-elected. You know, it is a funny thing that you can always see the faults of somebody else when you are looking at a distance, you cannot see the thing that is right in front of you, that is the amazing thing. You have all read Robert Burns' poems no doubt – the great Scottish poet. He was a Scotsman, you know, and there are some Scotsmen who have some wisdom . . .

Premier Douglas: — I take it that present company is excepted.

Mr. Horsman: — . . . and he said many wise things. Some of his works would compare with Shakespeare. One time, you know, he was in church – he used to go to church at Paisley – and he was sitting in his seat and just in front of him was a lady, a very fancy lady, all dressed up who thought she was perfect, you know – lots of people do think they are perfect. She had on a very nice bonnet, and she thought there was nothing wrong with the bonnet. But Burns was sitting up close enough to her to notice that there was a louse crawling around on this lady's bonnet (she was quite unconscious of this, of course) and that inspired him to write a poem. I remember a couple of the lines of that poem, they go like this:

“O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us
To see oursels as others see us!
It wad frae mony a blunder free us
And foolish notion . . .”

Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like first, to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer in bringing down, may I say, probably a people's budget — yes, a budget that has, I believe, regard to the welfare and the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, and not probably a few capitalists or industrialists. I want to say that again, in this particular budget, the great progress that we have made in this country in the past five years is continuing that progress on further. Although at times the Opposition may criticize (and I know the press will, too) that these are dangerous times, that we should not be spending as much money, there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to say and it is that social services in this country have only been extended in times of war. In times of peace social services have always receded further back, back and back.

I will recall, in the '30's — and I have been secretary-treasurer of a municipality there since 1935, and I know that in times of peace and when God gave us plenty, those were the times that social services were the lowest, probably, in the history of Saskatchewan and of Canada; I remember the time when social aid was granted out to families consisting of six or seven at the rate of \$2 per month. So I agree with a budget that is carrying on the progress that has been carried on in the past five years in the province of Saskatchewan. I couldn't see the criticism of the Opposition pointed at us. They will go down every department — they want more of everything. They want taxes cancelled on the one hand, and more highways, more hospitals, finer hospitalization, more for education on the other: reduce the taxes, and then they will vote against the budget because it is too high.

I am going to start out on a few departments and just point out the great progress that we have made in the last few years. For example, take Education. If I look over Education in 1943-44, the Liberal administration of that date spent the sum of \$2,843,000 or close to \$3 million. In 1950-51 we spent, on Education, in that department, over \$7 1/2 million. In other words, where they were spending \$3, we were, in 1950-51 spending \$7 1/2 and I would like to compare again the budgets. The budget of 1943-44 under the Liberal administration was \$30 million and our 1950-51 budget of \$55 million. We increased our budget from 1944 to 1950 by some 80 per cent. Yet, on Education, where they were spending close to \$3; in 1950 we were spending \$7 1/2, which is considerably more than 100 per cent increase in the budget, on Education. If I check over the notes that I have made when each of the members of the Opposition was speaking, every one of them has been talking on education, and it looks as if they want more money spent on education. They would like more grants to be given to the school districts. They want other educational aids to be increased; but then when they come to the end of their speeches, they say, "Mr. Speaker, we will vote against the educational portion of the budget because it is too high". Well, I don't know who they are appealing to. That kind of argument couldn't convince us, and I am sure that it doesn't convince the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

May I point out, that in this year's budget on Education, the increase or allotted portion of the budget has gone further ahead, and that is one of the reasons that I agree with the budget that has been brought down.

Now I will go on to Health, and on Health, in 1943-44 they were spending approximately \$947,000, or close to a million dollars. In 1950-51,

March 1, 1951

on those same services, we were spending \$7 1/2 million. In other words, where on Health they were barely spending \$1, we were, in 1950-51, spending \$7 1/2, and increasing it further in the new budget. Yet, anyone speaking on Health from the Opposition side, pointed out to us that we should extend the services further. I would like to point to the hon. member for Salt coats. He mentioned that we should build homes for the incurable; we should have more homes for the aged, and I believe that we should. In fact as far as I know, we on this side of the House, and our colleagues in the Federal House in Ottawa, have been fighting for a number of years for a pension for the incurables, and grants to aid in the building of proper homes. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, what did the members of the Opposition do when they were in power in the province of Saskatchewan? How many homes for the incurable did they build in that day? How many hospitals did they build in those days? And I will still come back and insist, Mr. Speaker, that our budget of today is not any greater than the budget of 1943-44, as far as purchasing power is concerned. I intend to use that, and use it plenty, because any man in the province of Saskatchewan knows that \$30 million, in 1943-44, would buy every bit as many goods in that day as your \$55 or \$57 or \$58 million dollar budget will buy today. Therefore I insist that whatever it has been possible for this Government to do in the past five years – and I mean every year – I believe that the Liberal administration of their day, with their budget, could have bought the same amount of goods, the same miles of highways, the same construction of hospitals, and so on. Yet we find that they didn't do a thing, practically, in their day.

I am going to go back to Health again. Where they were spending \$1 – and mind you, if we increased the expenditure in Health according to the increase in the budget, we should not be spending any more than \$2 today; but we were spending \$7 1/2 in 1950-51 for every \$1 they used to spend in 1943-44.

Secondly, we have been fair to our people in the province of Saskatchewan. We have done, I believe, all that we can do. Yet the members of the Opposition will rise, one after the other, and will criticize, for example, the Health Department because we are not, probably, doing enough for the people, although, as far as the budget is concerned, in expenditures, we are spending \$8 practically to their \$1. Then, after they get through with that, they say, "We will vote against the budget because the budget is too high." But I say that you can't have the cake and eat it at the same time.

Going on the next department – that is the Department of Social welfare, I see that, in 1943-44, the Liberal Government of that day was spending, to aid the unfortunate peoples of this province, a sum close to \$1 1/4 million. In 1950-51, the Department of Social Welfare was spending \$4 1/2 million. In other words, where they used to grant to the unfortunate people, in their time, \$1.25; we are giving, or have been giving, in the past year, \$4.50, or a little better than three times as much. Yet I noticed that when the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Marion) rose, he especially criticized the Minister of Social Welfare because we were not doing enough – we should be spending more money; but when he concluded his debate, he said, "I will vote against the budget because it is too high." Yet, under their administration, I believe, the Metis of his area were only getting \$1.25, whereas at the present time, we are spending approximately \$4.50 for every \$1.25 they were spending. That isn't enough – and mind you, I believe that we members on this

side of the House agree that that is not enough. We would like to spend more, and I am hoping that the boys on the opposite side of the House, who have very valuable friends in Ottawa, can probably press Ottawa a bit to hand over some aid to the provinces, and, in turn, we could help the people of Saskatchewan; but I believe the Opposition knows that we are doing all we possibly can do for our people of Saskatchewan.

Going on to Agriculture, I notice that in Agriculture, where in 1943-44 the Liberal Government of that day was spending \$1 to aid the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan, last year we were spending approximately \$10 to their \$1. While our budget has increased from \$30 to \$55 million, or only by 80 per cent, our expenditures to help the farmers of this province have increased by 1,000 per cent. Yet, again, I noticed that when any members of the Opposition rise up, they point out that we should be spending more money for Agriculture. But the moment they get through with that “more” stuff, they say they are going to vote against the budget because the budget is too high.

The Department of Highways is the one that probably gets the most criticism from the Opposition. Yet, if we were judging the Department of Highways correctly, I believe that is one of the departments that has done a very very fine job in the province of Saskatchewan, and may I point out the expenditure in that particular department. Again, where in 1943-44 they were spending \$3.30, we are today spending around \$11, or three times as much as they spent in 1943-44. Yet, some of the members of the Opposition will say, “oh yes, you admitted that you have more money;” but I still want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that our purchasing budget today of \$58 million is not any greater than the purchasing budget of their day, which was \$30 million. I believe for their \$30 million, if they had spent their money right, in their day they should have been doing the very same thing that our Minister of Highways is doing today. Yet, no matter where you travel throughout the province of Saskatchewan, today, and I have travelled a bit, a great portion of the highway has been rebuilt up to standard, or a new highway built . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Not in Cannington.

Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, I believe Cannington is getting plenty too. I would like to point out that only three or four years ago, when I was driving, for example, from my hometown of Canora, the roads were fairly rough. They were low – in fact, in the municipality, today, for which I work, the municipality builds better roads than the Liberal Government of that day built highways in the province of Saskatchewan. In fact, we have one road, north of Norquay, Saskatchewan, that I have had many people ask me what number highway that was, still thinking that that is one of the old Liberal highways, and it happens to be just a municipal road. A person would have to be blind, today, in fact, to criticize the Minister of Highways for the extensive highway system that he has built in the province of Saskatchewan. In fact – and I know that I may get sort of a laugh from the Opposition because I always boast about the highways in the Canora constituency; I have a reason to, because we didn’t have a thing up until 1944 when the C.C.F. came into power. So when some of these members from the Opposition speak about bad roads in the north, they have my sympathy, because we wallowed in the mud for some 35 years until the C.C.F., in 1944, came to our rescue.

March 1, 1951

Today, we have a fine highway system within the Canora constituency. In fact, if I want to drive to Regina, today, I can drive from Canora to beyond Melville, in fact up to Duff, on one of the finest highways in Western Canada. Then we fall down again into the old Liberal ditch. You have to take your foot off the accelerator and then rumble on a Liberal road for probably 40 or 50 miles; and then we get up on top of another fine highway from the Qu'Appelle valley and drive all the way into the city of Regina, and I believe that, by next year, the highway system will be extended. Mind you, I am sure that the Minister of Highways is not going to spend money the same way as the Liberals did – wherever there was pressure from groups. If there was a pressure group in the south-west corner, they got a bit of a highway, and then if the next greatest pressure group was up in the northeast, then they shot a bit of road there; but I am glad that our Minister of Highways has a plan and he is following a definite plan. I may say that we up at Canora, Yorkton, and Melville, are fairly fortunate that we are in on a planned road. You can't get away from it because those are the important cities and towns into the northeast, and although some of the members of the Opposition say that the Liberal members don't get any roads, and I remember, last year, the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) was complaining that he wasn't getting enough – he got plenty this year, because one of the trails from the northeast that is being built up to standard goes on from Canora, Yorkton, Melville, Balcarres, the Qu'Appelle Valley, and on into the city of Regina.

I should like to point out again, on the question of blacktop (I believe I have said it here in the House before) that we have caught up with the blacktop programme of Manitoba, and Manitoba was half blacktop highways, within its province, before we started. Yet, on the Opposition, practically every member who gets up has highways to criticize. I notice, for example, the hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) criticized the highways. The hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) criticized the highway system, and yet he is getting, as far as I can see, some wonderful highway system within his constituency – one of the best; and better than he could ever have got under any Liberal administration. And I notice that practically every member has something to say in connection with highways.

Now I will leave highways alone, and go onto Power. Since it is 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I will leave off here – to continue at 8 o'clock.

The Assembly resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member for Moosomin craves the indulgence of the House to make a statement.

Mr. A.H. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and the hon. member for Canora for allowing me a few moments, before proceeding with our budget debate this evening, to bring to the attention of this House a very regrettable incident which happened in my constituency, in the town of Moosomin, last night, in a fire which caused the death of three people and caused property damage estimated at \$150,000.

I sincerely hope, and I am sure, that the Government will take all steps possible to help out. I am sure the Department of Social Welfare will take immediate steps to ascertain what help may be given.

I should like also, at this time, to express my thanks for the very early action which the Canadian Red Cross have taken in supplying clothing and bedding for those people who lost their homes in this fire.

Premier Douglas: — I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that every member of the House would like to express to the people of Moosomin, through the member for Moosomin, our deepest sympathy at this tragedy which has happened in that constituency, and I hope he will convey to the people of that district the sympathy and feeling of sorrow of all members sitting on this side of the House, and I am sure that goes for all members in the House. I would like to say to him, too, that I believe Mr. Sturdy has already been in touch with our social welfare people, asking them to move in there and do anything we can, and I would like to say to the member from Moosomin, if he has any communications from the people down there as to anything further we can do in the matter of helping these people in any way, shape or form, that I am sure he has only to correspond with myself or with the Minister that is particularly interested, and we would be glad to do anything that we can.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that, ever since the Estevan fire, we have had a feeling that there ought to be some sort of a trust fund in the province. After the Estevan fire we had quite a bit of money left over and the people of Estevan have been very good. The committee that were handling that fund have, from time to time, made payments or made donations to help various places where there have been fires. I don't know whether they have any money left or not; if they have any, the chances are they would be very glad to send it along to help those people at Moosomin; but it raises the whole question which will be coming up later. The Minister of Social Welfare will be bringing up later the matter of having a standing trust fund in the province to which contributions could come from a general province-wide appeal, and if it is not all used up in a time of fire, or something similar, for instance, the Kamsack cyclone which took place a few years ago; if it is not all used up to meet the particular needs of that situation it would stay in a trust fund and could be used to help meet situations like this. I am just sorry that that fund is not already established, but there will be legislation coming down, at this Session of the Legislature, to deal with the very kind of situation that has so unfortunately happened in the constituency of my hon. friend.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the Premier for his kind remarks, and to assure him that I have been in contact with the people concerned in Moosomin, and have asked them to let me know if there is anything that can be done; and if anything comes to my attention I will certainly get in touch with either the Premier or the Minister of Social Welfare.

Mr. Kuziak (continuing debate): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to say a word of two in connection with the tragedy at Moosomin. The hon. member for Moosomin walked across the House and showed us the headlines in the paper and it certainly was a shock.

March 1, 1951

Speaking before we left off, I believe I had touched on the Department of Highways, and I want to say again, that, as I drive anywhere through the province, I am surprised that this Government has done as much as it has in connection with the highways, with the small budgets that we have had in the past.

I want now to touch on some of the criticisms levelled from the Opposition, this afternoon, against this side of the House. I would like to point out to the hon. member from Athabasca, although he isn't here, that first, I want to compliment him on the constructive criticism that he has given. I am glad to see that he is now behind our Fish Marketing Service up in the north. I remember in the last two years, especially on Crown Corporations, every time the Fish Marketing Board was being taken up, they threw or levelled criticism at the Fish Marketing Board, and that it "stunk" pretty bad, even in this House. But I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the members opposite, that this Government admits that at times it does make mistakes. I want to point out that, in the past five years, we have been doing things. We haven't been sitting, like the Governments of the past did, in this province; and though there might have been certain criticisms, even in the Fish Marketing Board, we were always ready to try and remedy some of those deficiencies; but I see that now the hon. member for Athabasca, speaking on the Fish Marketing Service, thought it was exceptionally good. I am pretty sure that the members of the Opposition, in time, will rise up, too, in the House here and mention some of the other Crown Corporations that we have, and will praise them, too, in the future.

I want to point out, in connection with the Fish Marketing Service (and the hon. member for Athabasca did that, too) that the fishermen who marketed their fish through the Fish Marketing Service got paid and paid very well. I want to point especially to two lakes up in the north. I am informed, for example, that at Beaver Lake, for fish being marketed through the Saskatchewan Fish Marketing Service, the fishermen received nine cents a pound; on another lake where we have the fish dealers operating (and that is on Dore Lake) for that same fish the fishermen only received five cents per pound, almost one-half. It was pointed out to me, too, that the cost of transportation on Dore Lake was about a half-cent per pound more than it is on Beaver Lake. Anyway, the fishermen on Beaver Lake received at least 3 1/2 cents per pound more than they received from the private dealers. May I point out, too, that on Dore Lake, last summer, the fishermen brought out some 900,000 pounds of fish, and, if we multiply that by the 3 1/2 cents that they didn't receive, the fishermen there lost \$31,500. If they had been within the range of the Saskatchewan Fish Marketing Service they would have been \$31,500 to the good.

I have a clipping here concerning the condition of the fishermen in Newfoundland. The clipping is from the Halifax "Chronicle-Herald," February 7, 1951, and they state here – W.J. Brown, Progressive-Conservative for St. John West, rising in the House of Commons on that very same day, February 7, 1951, he had this to say, criticizing that the fishermen were cheated by the dealers: "In October of last year", he declared, "inshore fishermen were paid by merchants 4 1/2 cents per lb. while the Dominion Bureau of Statistics report showed the export price was 14.6 cents. In November, the fishermen got 3 1/3 cents, 6 cents, 5 1/2 cents, and 5 cents while the exporter got 12.7 cents; and in December, the fisherman was paid an average

of 5 cents, while the exporter received 16 cents.” “This”, he claimed, showed an exorbitant profit, and some steps should be taken to recompense or rebate.”

I want to point out that this does not happen, today, in the province of Saskatchewan because we have a Government that is thinking of the welfare of the people of the province, including the fishermen; and although the Opposition, in the past, have criticized our attempt to bring about a decent fish marketing service to the fishermen of the north, in fact they told us that the fishermen would vote completely against us, yet I find that since then, wherever the Government has withdrawn the service, the fishermen have got together and have even petitioned the Department of Natural Resources to bring this service back to them. I am glad that the hon. member for Athabasca brought that up and complimented the Government on that service.

Now, the next one that he paid compliment to, was the Fur Marketing Service, although in the past we knew how much criticism we had received as a result of this service. Anything that we may bring up, which is new, trying to aid the people of this province, the Opposition has always hurled unjust criticisms.

I see, too, that the hon. member for Athabasca is 100 per cent behind the Power Commission; he is 100 per cent behind the Telephones, and of course I don't blame him. Going back to the budget I would like to point out again, that, in 1930, for example, the Liberal administration of that day only spent \$297,000 in extending the Power corporation, while, last year, we spent \$5,000,000 and this year, I believe the budget is being raised to \$7,000,000. Although they criticized our budget as being high, I want to point out again that our budget has only increased by some 80 per cent while, in the case of Power we are spending, today, somewhere around 20 times more than what was done under the Liberal administration of the past. The same thing applies to Telephones.

Now the bus line. I remember, two years ago, in fact, one year ago, the Opposition was very critical of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, but now, finding that the people are backing this service, that this service has also produced a profit, they are not so critical. And may I say, the Transportation Company has to compete to a certain extent with the Greyhound Bus Line that is within this province; our wages must be very similar to the wages paid in the other transportations companies, and we are also competing against the railroads. But in spite of all that competition, we are extending service to localities that does not produce a profit in giving that service to those people. So I suppose the Opposition, now, holding its political ear to the ground, knows that the people of the province of Saskatchewan are behind this fine transportation service. Now, this year, we have one of the hon. members saying, “That is fine. We agree with that. We are not going to throw the whole caboodle out the window – that is one that we won't”.

We go on to the Saskatchewan Airways, and, last year and the year before that, again on the hustings throughout the province of Saskatchewan, we had had certain criticisms of the northern Airways that it didn't produce enough of a profit. In fact, some of the speakers had even mentioned in the deferred elections, that some of the members were riding around on these airways free. They were running down the Airways, but they are finding out that

March 1, 1951

these Airways that are going out from Prince Albert into the north are opening up industry and mining throughout the north. Yes, the north's day is coming, under a C.C.F. administration. Now the member for Athabasca realizing finally that this is a wonderful service that we started here some few years ago, and that, today, it is also showing a substantial profit, must say, "This is one Crown Corporation that we are ready and willing to keep and continue". That is another one, that only a year ago or two years ago or three years ago, they were ready to throw out the window; today, they are going to hold it. I am sure that the time is coming for most of the Crown Corporations that we have established, and probably more that will be established, when finally the people are going to force the opinion of the Opposition to keep behind them.

One other service we started, too, some number of years ago, is the Ambulance service, and, of course, the hon. member for Athabasca again, complimented the Government and complimented that particular service, and I don't blame him. It is a wonderful service for those people in the north who, during the time the Liberals and Conservatives were in power, had to either die there or get well by themselves. There was no opportunity of getting out of the north.

Now I notice that he had mentioned the Power Commission, the Telephone, the Bus Line, the Airways and the Ambulance service, but the rest of the Crown Corporations he would also take and throw the whole caboodle out the window. Well, within that caboodle – for example, — I would imagine that he would include the Insurance Office or the insurance business that we have commenced in the province of Saskatchewan, and I believe that, probably, out of the seven or eight Crown Corporations, the Insurance Corporation especially is giving to the people not only the profits that they have produced this year, but I believe it is saving them hundreds of thousands of dollars in reduced premiums on automobile insurance and other insurance. I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan are going to take it lying down when the members say that they will throw this one out the window, and I am going to repeat again that the great insurance companies of Regina or of the Dominion of Canada, will be on the receiving end outside that window to catch that corporation.

I notice, too, that the hon. member for Athabasca wanted more social aid, but, just as I had pointed out here before supper, while the Liberal administration of 1943-44 was only contributing \$1.25 for social aid, we are, today, contributing \$3.50 for social aid. We have gone a long way; but, the boys of the Opposition say, "We want more social aid. We want more money spent on social aid; but we are going to vote against the budget because it is too high." Well, I can't see their point of thinking at all – wanting more money and wanting less money.

The member mentioned that he wanted extended educational aid and so on, but finally he said, "I will not support the budget because it is too high." Well, you can't have lots of money, and the budget not be high.

Going on further, I noticed that the hon. member for Saltcoats dwelt considerably, too, on Crown Corporations, and of course his criticism is the same. Any corporation that is making a very good profit, they criticize it because it should be a utility and it shouldn't make a profit. The corporation that probably shows a very small profit, they criticize it because the profit should be greater, and the corporation that is only starting up,

and hasn't got into high gear yet, and has lost a little money – why, they criticize it because it has lost money. I noticed that the hon. member for Saltcoats, too, wants homes in the province of Saskatchewan built for the incurables. He wants homes for the aged people. I see he wants a lot more highways than he has, but finally, before he sat down, he said, "I am going to vote against the budget because the budget is too high."

Now one other member that I would like to touch on is the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman). I noticed, too, that he wants more highways, more money for roads, but then he turns around and goes even a little further than the other fellows. He wants the Public Revenue Tax cut off. He wants half the taxes sliced but a lot more money for all the services; and then he says he is going to vote against the budget because the budget is too high. Well, I don't know who these people are talking to. They must think that the people of Saskatchewan, as well as the members sitting on this side of the House, have no power of thinking at all. I can't see their contradictory arguments. In one place – spend more money; in another place – spend less money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, just as I said at the start of my speech, that I believe this is a budget that is continuing the great progress that we have carried on in the past five years, a progress that we are intending to continue on into the future. It is a great "people's budget" and I certainly intend to vote for it.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would like to do is to make a few comments with regard to the speech made by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), this afternoon. I am rather sorry he is not in his seat. He apparently objects to persons or companies getting permits to explore for oil or concessions to explore for minerals and having the right to assign them to another party. Now, I would say, to the hon. members opposite that if the Liberal Party believes that, if they believe that they should not have the right of assignment, let them now state that no assignments would be granted if they were in power. I know they won't state it. I know they don't believe that assignments should be withheld; but they can get up in this House and try to make out that assignments are improper.

At this point, I can remember the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) being so glad that there was an agreement in regard to potash, and I want to tell him and I want to tell the member for Maple Creek that most people who were concerned with it knew that, when the Beta people took the agreement for the exploration and development of potash, an assignment would be requested in the not too distant future, for the simple reasons that that company has not the financial assets necessary to do that development work. Are my hon. friends going to refuse the right of assignment, refuse the opportunity to this company composed largely of Saskatchewan people to get a permit to do the organization work? The end result I expect will be that Beta shareholders will benefit by an arrangement under that assignment. I want to ask my hon. friends if they object to it.

March 1, 1951

I can tell the member for Maple Creek that all permits and concessions to explore for natural resources have been properly let to persons fully qualified to make the application for them, and, also, as long as this Government is in power the right to assign such grants will be maintained. That right will be maintained because it is a common and accepted and well-established practice in business and industry all over this country and many others as well.

Then the member for Maple Creek mentioned the fact that an individual who is connected with a company that holds some mineral rights in Saskatchewan, has been taken to task by the authorities in New York State for his practices in selling shares. You know, when I saw that news item in the paper some months ago, it occurred to me at that time that this was something that our hon. friends in the Opposition would take up and wave around – and they certainly have done it. But, surely, Mr. Speaker, he does not expect us to police the State of New York! I would say, however, that if any member knows of any person selling shares or stock in Saskatchewan contrary to the laws of this province, then let him report it to the proper authorities and it will be taken care of. Let me repeat the statement of the Premier with which I agree:

“That if any member of the Assembly is willing to stand up in his place and charge that scandalous circumstances exist in regard to the handling of natural resources, I will see that there is a thorough public investigation.”

And remember, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was very quick to assure the House that he was not making any charges. All he was doing was throwing about a whole lot of mud in the hopes that some of it would stick. I want to compliment the member for Maple Creek for doing a very good job of a dirty task; but I can't have too much respect for people who take those tactics, who try to throw about suspicion and by asking leading questions cast all the reflections they can on the people who are administering natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, having spoken of the member for Maple Creek, I could now say that I never was in gaol, I could now say that I never had to flee from justice, and I could now say that I never had to leave my country in the dead of night – and it was that kind of thing that he was saying. I want to assure the House that as far as my knowledge is concerned, the hon. member was never in gaol, never had to flee from justice nor to leave his country in the dead of night. But I do not appreciate that kind of talk. It sounded to me very much like the words of a former Minister of Education in the province of Saskatchewan who established for himself in the short time he was here a very good record as a muck-raker. That is enough on that subject.

The member for Wilkie said that, in his opinion, it was not fair that a senior government should invade the only tax field of a municipality. Mr. Speaker, we didn't. It was my hon. friend's party who made that invasion. They were the aggressors, and they occupied for a long, long time that field of taxation; but again, they think if they keep saying it often enough they will maybe get the idea across to the people of this province that we were the invaders instead of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) made some very interesting remarks, this afternoon. I see him behind the rail and I am glad he is here. There is one thing about the hon. member for Saltcoat's remarks – they are always most pleasantly made, however far from the mark they may be.

He said the Power Corporation is a monopoly, that it just can't lose. Yet, when he we a Liberal Government, they were more skilful, apparently, along those lines, and were able to have it lose, year after year. The hon. member for Saltcoats also – and I was very sorry he did this because I don't think he is the kind of a chap who wants to do this sort of thing – almost suggested that we were falsifying the inventories in the Timber Board. That is what he suggested. Well, now, I want to assure him that I don't go out and take the inventory; that the people who go out and do the work of taking that inventory have no interest in regard to the surplus that I have to report to the Committee on Crown Corporations. They are people who are removed entirely from that field. I don't think it was very kind for the hon. member to suggest that they would do that kind of a thing – that they would actually go out and falsify an inventory. They just don't do that. And, incidentally, I would be the first to get after them if they did.

The hon. member for Saltcoats also made some very hard remarks about the teachers of this province. The Liberal Government has always been quite unfriendly to teachers in this province, and has given them a very bad deal . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I did not cast any slurring remark on the teacher. I said there were a few odd teachers who were being complained about to me.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member made the statement in the way he said it. That is correct, and I am willing to accept it in that way. But I would say to my hon. friend that a friend of his, who isn't a member of this Legislature, had courage to name a teacher and to say words like that outside of this Legislature to the effect, I think, that a certain teacher shouldn't have a certificate. And he had to pay something for it. I would suggest to the hon. member that if knows any teachers who are subversive, whether it be the hon. member sitting behind him or any other teacher, that he go out in public without protection and expose him and report him to the school board.

Mr. Loptson: — The inspector should do that. It is his responsibility, all right.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, yet his colleagues expect us to police the State of New York. The Liberal Party is full of contradictions.

Then, we had the spectacle, this afternoon, of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Marion) and his seat-mate getting off on opposite tracks. The hon. member for Athabasca said it was a most terrible thing for one of these Crown Corporations that had a total turnover of business during its history of around \$8 million, to make \$188,000 surplus. He said that was terrible. Then the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) got up and said

March 1, 1951

the Timber Board has a turnover of over \$3 million and it is just a disgrace that it only had a surplus of \$132,000. Now, what do they want? If they do not know themselves, I don't think it will be possible for us to satisfy them for the simple reason they don't know.

I want to say to my friend from Athabasca, now that he is in, that I did enjoy his speech this afternoon. I don't know if we will be allowed to count his vote one-twelfth for the budget when the division comes or not, but that is the way he split himself up. I want to remind him, however, that there is no fur auction company that I know of which operates on the basis of refunding the commissions to the people for whom they sell the furs. During all the years in the past, not only the dealers but also the fur auction companies have been making their hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars out of the fur trade, and I never had heard him, in all my time in this House (and I sat here with the hon. gentlemen), protest against the money that private industry, private business was making out of the trappers. I never heard that protest on one occasion.

I will tell you what we are doing for the trapper. The old custom in handling furs was that the first general sale of the season would not be held until the month of January, and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the best season for trapping the upland fur is November, December and probably the early part of January. About that time of the year the fur ceases to be prime and it is more difficult getting around, the snow being deeper, and so November and December is the big trapping season for upland fur. The trapper gets the fur and he wants to sell it. There has been no general sale, there has been no price established and so it was very easy for the trade to distribute prices and to be a very depressive influence on the market so that the trappers would be convinced that the price of furs was not high. Then they have their fur sale in January. They have bought all their furs from the trappers then, and if the trappers find the furs have gone up, well, it is all over anyway and gone.

We hold our general fur sale in December, usually in the middle of December, and immediately after that general fur sale a broadcast goes out all over the North as to the prices received at that fur sale. They broadcast over the Department of Natural Resources radio programme at Prince Albert, which you can hear every night at a quarter to six, and the prices are usually put over that programme two or three times. They are put over the Fur Marketing Service programme. They are given plenty of publicity with the result that the trapper knows something about the value of his furs. He is out in the bush; he has his radio; he knows what is going on. When he comes to sell his furs, therefore, if he is going to sell them to a dealer, he is in a much better position, much closer to being on equal terms with the dealer, and because of that trappers have received a great deal more for their upland fur. It is interesting that, right after the last December sale, a certain dealer in the province was talking to the manager of the Fur Marketing Service – and it wasn't my hon. friend over here, it was another dealer – by telephone, and the manager reported the prices, which were very excellent at the December sale. The man on the other end of the phone said, "Well, I'll have to hurry up and get out on the trail and buy some furs." But, he apparently forgot that one of our objects is to inform the trappers and they, too, were going to know about these prices. And so, I think that we should not forget that there is a job to do in the fur business.

I want to tell my hon. friend also, that the regulations under the Northern Conservation programme are regulations which have been jointly agreed to by the Dominion Government and the Province and it is in those regulations that the furs are required not to be sold but to be delivered to the Department of Natural Resources for sale through the Fur Marketing Services: that is, the muskrat and beaver furs. I want to say, further, that over a year ago I wrote to the Minister in charge of the Indian Affairs Branch at Ottawa and asked him what he thought about changing that regulation, and he wrote back and distinctly said, "We do not want to see any change in that at the present time."

Now, to come back to my hon. friend from Saltcoats – and I am sorry he has left his seat. I guess he thought I had finished with him; but you can't deal with an amiable gentleman like he is in such a short time. He talked about highways in Saltcoats constituency. He said, "How much did we get spent in Saltcoats constituency in 1950 for construction?" and the answer was that nothing was spent on construction in 1950. Then he went on to say that there was very little spent since 1944. Well, since 1944 the hon. member for Saltcoats has been favoured. There has been spent in his constituency by the Department of Highways on grading, reconstruction, gravelling and regravelling \$733,000 – nearly three-quarters of a million in the Saltcoats constituency.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That was when "Joe" was there.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, no. There were lots of big sums spent and there were 46 miles of grading. There were 18 miles of reconstruction in different years. In that period of years (I haven't got the breakdown) there was a total of construction and reconstruction of 64 miles; gravelling, 78 miles. That is a lot of miles for one constituency, one small constituency like the member represents. And regravelling, 13 miles – a total of gravelling and regravelling of 92 miles. So you see, even the hon. member for Saltcoats didn't come off too badly in connection with the work done on the highways in his constituency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ever since 1944 the Liberals have been complaining long and loud and loud and long about the increased budgets of the Province of Saskatchewan. Everyone has heard their complaints ever since 1944 and do you know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) cleared the Government of all responsibility in that respect the other day when he spoke on the budget. He said, "This was the seventh budget of the C.C.F. Government and year after year revenues had been buoyant and increasing." Then he said, listen: "Such a condition certainly could not be said to be due to anything the present Government has done." Then, we had nothing to do with these high budgets. Now, you just can't make a statement like that, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand and then everybody go blaming the Government for the high budget in the next minute. The two things don't get together, and I wish my hon. friend would make up his mind. As a matter of fact, I just can't understand why the hon. members opposite get up one after another and speak and end up by saying, "I'm going to vote against the motion." It is pretty hard to understand why they do that kind of thing. I am going to tell them tonight, if I can, some of the things that they are voting against. Now, actually I don't believe that what the hon. member said about us having no responsibility for the high budget is true. I think he was off the beam on that. I think we deserve either the blame or the credit

March 1, 1951

Mr. Danielson: — In common with the rest over there, he misrepresents me. I said they had no responsibility for the higher revenues they had been able to collect from the people. That was brought about by conditions they had nothing to do about. He's simply befuddling and be-muddling my speech. They can't resist doing that. Regardless of what I said he's got it twisted and distorted to make it mean what he wants it to.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member kindly resume his seat. He has said that he did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Here's what he is reported in the "Leader-Post" as saying — if he didn't say it as I read it, I am sorry; but here's what he is reported in the "Leader-Post" as saying. This is all one sentence: "This was the seventh budget of the C.C.F. Government and year after year revenues have been buoyant and increasing." That's what he said. And referring to the budgets and referring to the buoyancy and increasing revenues and the increasing budgets that he has been talking about, about the good fortune of the Government, he then goes on to say, "Such a condition certainly could not be said to be due to anything the present Government has done."

Mr. Danielson: — That's wrong.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member cannot be held responsible for the interpretation the reporters put on it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I should have the official record. But, anyway, seeing the hon. member for Arm River does not agree with what I just read out, I want to say that I do not agree with it either, because I do not think it is true. I do think we were responsible to a small extent, at least. But here's the official document, and I shall read what he did say: "I don't think there is any public treasury in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan that has had, shall I say, the good fortune and good luck that the present Provincial Treasurer is getting. This, I think, is the seventh budget he has introduced into this House and every time, every year, year after year he has been able to report that the revenues of this province have gone up, that they are increasing practically every year, and I think that that is a record in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan, although it certainly cannot be said, Mr. Speaker, that it is due to anything this Government has done or has been doing for this last seven years."

Mr. Danielson: — Go on and read the next sentence.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, that is the end of the paragraph. There's the whole paragraph, right from one end to the other. And I can only interpret that as the member, in an unguarded moment, saying that the Government was not responsible for the growth of the budget from year to year and the larger budgets.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that's your interpretation.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is my interpretation of what the hon. member said, and I think in an unguarded moment, as I say, it slipped out. On guard, he never would have thought of such a thing. And

it is true that to a great extent the increase in the budget has not been our fault. It has been to a large extent – the fault of the policy of the Dominion Government in regard to price control, with increasing prices. I do say, however, that that budget as it stands today is at least to a small extent as it is because of the action that this Government has taken. It could not be so big or so good without either some of the actions we have taken or without further taxation on the people of the province.

The Liberal Government was practically giving away the resources of this province when we took office.

Mr. Danielson: — They would have to go some to beat you.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Instead of a couple of hundred thousand in royalties from our quartz mining, we are getting a million and a quarter. They were giving it away. And the clay resources of this province: they were literally throwing them out the window. They weren't collecting any royalty at all. And that doesn't mention some of the others they were throwing away, either. They weren't collecting any royalty at all on the clay of Saskatchewan. For the last 30 years there has been talk about the high quality clay in this province and the resource belonging to the people, and the Liberal Government was letting it get away without any benefit from it whatsoever. We on the contrary are getting quite a substantial revenue from clay in this province. The same thing can be said of timber. We are now making I would say pretty close to twice as much revenue out of our timber resources as we were when there was a Liberal Government in power. The size of this budget and the good qualities of this budget are to some extent due to the actions taken by this Government.

The hon. member for Arm River also spoke as if the debt reduction which has taken place in this province was just an accident. I can tell him some of the debt reduction that took place in this province that was not an accident. And, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I have got to do that very unpopular thing – go back to the records. And you know, even the "Leader-Post" is not right in this. They had an editorial in the "Leader-Post" of February 26 which was entitled "Two Oppositions in the House." And it said: "The Government is entitled to put in a defence." I want to say, "Thank you" for that broad and generous statement from the editor of the "Leader-Post." At last he has admitted it. He has been acting as if we weren't entitled to say a word in our defence. And then he says:

"But the C.C.F. appears to go on the theory that attack is the best form of defence. Since the Opposition goes on the air with its attack the C.C.F. Government seems to feel that it must use its air-time attacking the Liberals."

And then listen to what the "Leader-Post" says about what the Liberal members put on the air this afternoon:

"Thus at a cost to taxpayers of something like Five Thousand Dollars a year for Legislative broadcasts the air is deluged with verbal pyrotechniques" (whatever those are) "the place for which is more properly on the hustings than in the Legislature."

March 1, 1951

The "Leader-Post" used to be the only means of publicity in this city and for this Legislature and they loved the monopoly they had. They don't like the radio broadcasts from this Legislature, because it has broken that monopoly and what goes out on the radio they must report correctly, and there is a lot better reporting in regard to what goes out on the radio. The "Leader-Post" doesn't need to lecture me, nor anybody else, about those "Verbal pyrotechniques" which were better out on the hustings. I was in this House long before there was a radio broadcast established here, and there are some people I know and can see who indulge in plenty of those pyrotechniques even without a radio; and if it suited the "Leader-Post" they reported them, and if it didn't suit them they didn't report them. All the "Leader-Post" is objecting to now is the fact that we can compare the record of the Liberal Government with the record of the C.C.F. Government, can compare the records of the two political parties and the "Leader-Post" can't stop the people of Saskatchewan from listening. That is what they object to. They object to an extension of free speech. And so, with a proper degree of sadness, I refer to some of the records of the Liberal Party in the Journals.

In 1941, there was a motion in the House which "recommended to the Government that it consider ways and means by which farmers may be permitted to return seed grains they had received since 1935 on a bushel-for-bushel basis." It came to a recorded vote and I find one Liberal voting with the C.C.F. group: it was the member from Morse at that time, Mr. Hyde. And on the other list of names of those present I see Messrs. Dundas and Danielson voting against the motion. That is the record.

Mr. Danielson: — Is that all of them?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is not all of them. Now, all the other Liberals except one voted against the motion. Then we go to 1943 and we have heard a lot about the municipalities from my hon. friends opposite. They can weep crocodile tears as big as baseballs about the municipalities. Mr. Burton moved a motion in the House in 1943, seconded, Mr. Speaker, by Your Honour, "That this Assembly recommend that the Government give consideration to the advisability of implementing a plan for adjustment and collection of advances made for direct relief, winter maintenance, seed and seeding supplies, as recommended in a resolution asked at the recent convention of Saskatchewan rural Municipalities as follows:

'That we request the Provincial and Dominion Governments to cancel all direct relief and winter maintenance up to the end of 1940 and all seed and seeding supplies up to the end of 1937 and that the seed and seeding advances for 1938 be adjusted by the Government accepting 50 per cent of the principal as full payment and that this convention urge upon the Provincial Government the necessity of passing legislation at this session of the Legislature whereby 10 per cent of the adjusted amount of the advances for 1938 be paid along with the current taxes before any exemption certificate is issued according to Section 357 of The Rural Municipality Act; and that consideration be given to those who have already paid their advances.'

There you have it! Cancellation of direct relief and winter maintenance up to the end of 1940; cancellation of seed and seeding supplies up to the end of 1937; settlement of the 1938 seed grain on a 50-50 basis, and the Convention of Rural Municipalities was also good enough to recommend to the Government that they provide each year that at least 10 per cent of the account for that 1938 seed grain would have to be paid with the taxes before an exemption certificate would be issued. And on the recorded vote we find again Mr. Ben Hyde, the member for Morse, voting with the C.C.F. group and on the other side we have Messrs. Donaldson, McDonald, McMahon, Dundas, Pinder, Proctor, Staines, Taggart, McVicar, Danielson, Knowles, Johnson, Fraser, even Mr. Roseland, the Social Creditor, voted against that motion. So I think there is a certain amount of debt reduction that has taken place in this province for which we in the C.C.F. are responsible and of which we are proud.

The hon. member for Meadow Lake made some rather light references to the Big River Mill the other day, and I know he didn't mean to lead anybody astray; but he was on the air and he referred to the Big River Mill as a "million dollar baby." I hope he has looked in the report which he has received and has noticed that the million dollar baby only cost \$341,000 – just over a third of the million dollars. Now, that is not very good shooting; not very accurate.

Mr. Lofts: — On a point of privilege: is the mill operating?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I'll answer the question, but I didn't get the point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, the mill doesn't operate in the winter time because it has to have the open water and at this time of the year there is ice on the water; most people know that and we don't operate the mill. But in addition to referring to it as a "million dollar baby" he also referred to the contracts or the tenders which were called for, for logging 34 million feet of timber. And I am afraid – I don't think he intended to do it – that he left the impression with the House that this mill, costing as he said, about a million dollars (though it cost only \$341,000), was built for the purpose of harvesting 34 million feet of timber. Now, the actual timber is someplace between 80 and 110 million; and the other point was that the hon. member thought that the private mills out in the bush would be more efficient. Well, that is a matter of opinion, but certainly the private mills wouldn't have as good equipment, couldn't have the gang saw which gives a much higher yield. Now, outside of those three points, the value, the amount of timber available and the efficiency, the hon. member I think, was correct on that, and I want to invite him to come and have a look at it next May or June when it is operating and, if he will let us know, we will be very glad – possibly I, or the manager, will be there to meet him.

Mr. Lofts: — Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed when I did go up there, the mill wasn't operating. I would like to have seen it operating when I went up there.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, it will operate, quite likely. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another little matter which has only an indirect connection with the budget and has that indirect connection because it is concerned with the income of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and therefore I would like to deal with it a minute. I got today a letter

March 1, 1951

from the Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce – we're classy up in our part of the country – at Porcupine Plain, giving me a resolution which was passed at a joint meeting of the Council of the Village and this Chamber of Commerce on February 23rd. This resolution reads:

“Whereas thousands of farmers are unable to deliver grain to local elevators because of embargoes and pool elevators, and whereas millions of bushels of grain now in farmers' granaries are in danger of spoiling with the advent of warm weather, and whereas the elevator at Churchill with a capacity of 2 1/2 million bushels of grain and a dryer capacity of a thousand bushels per hour is not in operation, be it resolved that we request the immediate staffing of the elevator with a crew sufficient to receive grain and to operate the grain dryer, and the immediate shipment of grain to Churchill from northern Saskatchewan to relieve the congestion in the area.”

Now, I think that was a very good resolution. I am not absolutely sure, but I assume that the people knew the situation at Churchill; but I do not think that that is a matter which this House might consider doing something about by way of a recommendation to the Federal Government that if there is a dryer there, if there is room for 2½ million bushels of grain, certainly the thing to do is to get that dryer working and get this tough grain on the move and get it into safe storage.

As I said, my hon. friends have stated that they are going to vote against the budget. Let us look at some of the items in the budget, and I would like, too, to look at the Highway Department, because I am kind of proud of our Highway Department. In 1943-44 the budget for highways was \$2,200,000. This year, the total budget for highways, which my hon. friends are going to vote against unless they repent and turn from their evil ways, is \$11,450,000.

There was also some talk about roads in various constituencies. The member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) had something to say about it. Well, I happen to have here a 1943 highway map and in the constituency of Turtleford all the gravel they had was a little bit from Vawn to Mervin that would be about 23 miles, and then right up at Spruce Lake – the hon. member lives at Spruce Lake and he must have had good influence – they had some gravel between St. Walburg and Spruce Lake. But that was all the gravel that was in that constituency, and the present No. 55 Highway between No. 4 and No. 26, according to this map, is marked as dirt road unimproved – and I was over it before it was unimproved and I can assure you it was unimproved and a dirty road. This is what he had. What has he got now? He has got a good gravelled highway all the way from the south border of his constituency right up to Goodsoil, past St. Walburg on past the end of the steel to Loon Lake and on past that to Goodsoil, and, in addition, the connecting road from No. 4 highway over to No. 26 is built to the high modern standard and gravelled, and when he drives in to Battleford he can go in the last few miles on blacktop. And yet, the hon. member for Turtleford, I am afraid, is going to vote against the budget. He wants to go back, apparently, to this kind of thing.

Let us go to the constituency of Meadow Lake. In 1943, there was not one inch or one mile of gravelled highway in the Meadow Lake constituency; not an inch of it, not a bit. Now, No. 4 Highway all the way from the south side of the constituency right by Jackfish Lake, right through Glaslyn, the home town of the hon. member, on north to Meadow Lake, built and gravelled. No. 55, the connecting road between No. 4 and No. 26, which serves his constituency is built and gravelled. Construction is going on No. 55 Highway east. He is going to vote against the budget, to go back to those days when he had no gravel in his constituency.

Mr. Lofts: — May I rise to a point of privilege. How many miles have been build between Shellbrook and Glaslyn in the last couple of years on No. 55 Highway.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, however many miles were built there (and I haven't got the figures at the moment), it is just that many more miles than the Liberal Government ever built there, anyway; so it is all to the good. But, what I want to point out is what these gentlemen mean when they vote against the budget. Do they want to go back to the days when a constituency like Meadow Lake didn't have a mile of gravel road in it? That is what they are voting for when they vote against the progressive budgets designed for the development of this province.

Mr. Danielson: — Too much!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River is really on the road to getting a blacktop road right through the middle of his constituency, and he is going to vote against the budget. It is a pity he doesn't live someplace else than in there if he is going to vote against that blacktop, and I hope that he will tell the people up at Davidson that he got up in this House and voted against the budget that put blacktop on this road. Will he do it? I think he will spread something else around when he gets up to Davidson.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go to my own constituency of Tisdale on this 1943 highway map. On this 1943 highway map, unless it was dry weather I wouldn't get there. And south from my constituency you have got to go south from township 41 to opposite township 30, that is right down to Canora, before you have got any gravel at all. Canora was the jumping-off place where you got into the mud, from there to Hudson Bay. This map is optimistic because it shows a standard earth grade between Endeavour and Hudson Bay, and if any of you people have ever driven that road between Endeavour north to Hudson Bay before it was rebuilt, that is a funny name to call it "a standard earth grade." It was just a trail through the bush full of holes, mudholes, and in terrible condition. We did have some gravel in the Tisdale constituency. There was a piece of road at Hudson Bay where the soil was gravel itself, and so even the Liberals couldn't help but have a gravelled road, and, by golly! — pardon me, Mr. Speaker, they have got it marked on the map of 1943 as "gravelled highway." But even it wasn't a full standard gravelled highway, yet the Liberals were willing to take the credit for the gravel that the Lord put on the road.

March 1, 1951

Now we come over to the west side of the constituency, which is the town of Tisdale and that is quite a long piece from the Manitoba border. My constituency is from the Manitoba border to five miles west of Tisdale, a distance of approximately 100 miles. There are five miles between Tisdale and the western border of the constituency, and that was gravelled. There was a stretch about 12 miles south of Tisdale gravelled, then you got on the mud road and went away down to Wadena. It was gravelled from Tisdale to Nipawin, but only five miles of that was in my constituency. We had only one town, one urban centre, the town of Tisdale, that had a gravelled road connection with the outside world in 1943. What has been done? No. 23 Highway from Crooked River by way of Porcupine Plain and Carragana has been built and completed right through to Bertwell to join No. 9 Highway, and No. 9 Highway has been rebuilt from close to Hudson Bay Junction to the southern border of my constituency, beyond that to Reserve and within a few miles of Endeavour, and shortly we are going to have from Hudson Bay south through Canora on to Regina (if anybody wants to go) a gravelled road all the way.

Opposition Member: — What about the Revenge highway?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Revenge highway? I don't know, I never heard of it. We haven't got any of that in my constituency.

Now, I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that the gravelling of this No. 23 is going on. All the members will have seen this item in the "Leader-Post" of February 21: "Weekes Gravel-Hauling Operation in Full Swing", and I want to congratulate the Minister and his Department for taking advantage of the situation, going into the bush, hauling out the gravel when the road in the forest reserve is frozen up, stockpiling it and having it ready there to crush and to distribute on the road in the spring, rather than have to haul it an additional 25 miles with additional cost. Well, when we have got that done to Hudson Bay and a connection from Bertwell right through to Crooked River and Tisdale will be all gravelled. Then, there is a road from Crooked River north, through Arborfield and into Carrot River which has been built and was in the process of being gravelled last fall and which will be finished in the Spring. The contract is let for the extension of No. 3 Highway east from Crooked River. There was a kind of a road east as far as Mistatim, and it was another one of those Liberal mudholes from start to finish. It never was a road, and it never has been in good shape. That road will go on east there and they are working on it now, at clearing that road. So I can say to the Minister of Highways that the people of Tisdale constituency appreciate the work that has been done in highways since 1944, and I want to tell them, like other members in the Legislature, that we have some other ideas about some more work that can be done there, too.

As I said a few minutes ago, the hon. members spend a great deal of time weeping and crying on account of the rural municipalities. I am not going to quote all of these figures again, but I have with me again the history of municipal grants in the Kinistino constituency from 1935 until 1949; I haven't got it for the last year. I gave them to you before. I know you wouldn't like to have them again and I'm not going to inflict all of them on you again; but I do want to give you some of the highlights. You know, if you have got a sore back and you rub some liniment on it and

one application doesn't cure, you should rub some more on it. And so I think it needs a second application. Now, in 1935-36 these municipalities didn't do too badly. Does my hon. friend from Rosthern, the Leader of the Opposition, remember any memorable event of 1935? In the fall of 1935 there was a Federal election, wasn't there? I think that was the first time he was elected to the House of Commons and the Kinistino constituency, the municipalities – some of these would be in his Federal constituency maybe, I don't know – got \$3,891 in grants that year. Of course, the next year there was no election; they only got \$150.

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege. I would point out to my hon. friend they didn't need to do that in my seat. Every one of my opponents lost their deposit.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is right, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition comes the nearest to Joe Stalin of anybody in this House, the nearest to a one-party election.

Mr. Tucker: — You'd like it to be otherwise if you could.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, we come again to 1938 and the provincial election was on. And in 1938, they did well, \$12,769, and in 1938 they elected a Liberal member in Kinistino, the late Mr. Taylor, who lately passed away. In 1939 there is nothing. No use running after the streetcar once you have caught it, the Liberals say. And so they didn't get it. But to take the whole term together, in the eight or nine years of Liberal administration the average grant per year to these municipalities was \$365. The average grant in the first four years of the C.C.F. term of office was \$1,046. Mr. Speaker, the tears of the Liberals about the plight of the municipalities aren't going to help the municipalities very much. All they ever gave to the municipalities was tears. Their theme song in regard to the municipalities should be that touching little song, "I Can't Give you Anything but Love," and they only give them that at election time.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That's more than you give them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You know, it really gets me down, Mr. Speaker, after I tell the Leader of the Opposition the story of these grants — \$365 the Liberal average; \$1046 the C.C.F. average, he then says, "Love is more than we give them."

Mr. Tucker: — Correction, Mr. Speaker; I didn't say that at all. The hon. member is having hallucinations again. But I will say that when we come to read the record of the next four years after we get into office, which will be about a year from now, it will be an even better record than he has read.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, there is only one thing I can say, the hon. gentleman has got a laudable ambition, but he has got a terrible load in that record of the Liberal Party to drag along with him. And, stout man as he is, I don't think he has got the strength to take it across the finish line.

Mr. Tucker: — We'll see what happens when the election comes.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The election will tell the tale plenty soon enough for my hon. friends. Let us take a look at agriculture, the basic industry of this province, the industry on which the welfare of this province depends, and the Liberal Government in 1943-44 had a budget of \$490,000, less than half a million, for the Department of Agriculture. That is all they thought of the basic industry in this province. This budget to develop and assist the basic industry in this province, which my hon. friends are going to vote against, including the capital as well as the revenue provides \$3,357,000 for Agriculture, nearly eight times as much. The conservation programme has been described by the Minister to this House, also the grasshopper control programme and the extension work that is being carried on by the trained and experienced district agriculture representatives.

All the members of the House got this letter from the Minister of Agriculture, dated February 14th, with copies of "Land-Use Studies" from different municipalities in the province. I wonder if they read them at all! They don't seem to know what is going on, and here you find that through this extension work the people are getting together, they are finding out what is the difficulty in their municipality. Here was a real problem municipality because of the land conditions, No. 169, I believe it is. They studied the question of soil erosion. They find that half of the farmers have soil erosion problems. They study water conservation, and they study what can be done to increase the water holding capacity of the land and how to use the land. They study the problem of use of abandoned lands in the municipality and find 27 quarter-sections in one township, and that is a pretty important problem. Then they endeavoured to get the municipality to take advantage of the earned assistance programme, part of this budget, to improve and put that land in use to benefit the people living in that municipality. The control of weeds, water development projects, field hedges, earned assistance again, recommended grain varieties, farm shelter belts and fruit growing, Bang's disease in cattle (and the programme carried on in that is quite noted) — that is the kind of work that is being carried on by the Department of Agriculture all over this province, and my hon. friends are going to vote against it.

I want to say a word or two in regard to the Department of Public Health, and again I have to mention that there has been some weeping for the municipalities and the local authorities in this province. I want to point out to you that no Liberal Government in the past ever gave a nickel to assist a municipality or a local authority to build a hospital in this province, No Liberal Government at Ottawa gave a nickel until public opinion, aroused by the C.C.F. and led by the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan, forced them to do so.

Let us see something of the record: Arcola (I think that is down in the constituency of Cannington) got a grant for the Brock Union Hospital there; Bienfait (that is in Estevan), a grant of \$15,000 and a loan of \$5,000, all Provincial money. And yet my hon. friend from Estevan will get up and vote against the budget.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — We want to turn you out of office if we can and get a good government.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Let him remember that he is voting against this kind of a programme when he votes against this budget. At

Borden, in the constituency of the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) – I suppose he will vote against the budget – they got a \$3,500 grant.

Mr. Korchinski: — I will vote against the C.C.F.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He will vote against this budget.

Mr. Korchinski: — Against the C.C.F.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — There are no votes taken in this House, Mr. Speaker, for or against the C.C.F. Oh, no! We vote for or against this budget, and whatever my hon. friends say, they are going to have to stand up and be counted as to whether or not they are for this kind of a programme or for the old Liberal programme of do nothing at all. I do not blame them for not liking that prospect. I am not surprised that they squirm in their seats at the idea of having to get up and vote against these things.

Mr. Korchinski: — We are just waiting to get the floor to vote against them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Come back to Estevan and Gainsborough, a grant committed (it was not paid at this time, maybe it is now) of \$10,000. Goodsoil, in the constituency of my hon. friend from Turtleford, \$8,500 of Provincial money; Grenfell, in the constituency of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, \$6,000; Hafford, back again to the Redberry constituency, \$20,000 for a hospital at Hafford; Imperial – my hon. friend from Arm River is going to vote against the kind of a programme that gives to one of his towns \$10,000 for the construction and equipping of a hospital.

Mr. Danielson: — That is the same place.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Kamsack, my hon. friend from Pelly constituency (Mr. Banks), if he votes against this budget, he is going to vote against the kind of a programme that provided his town with \$40,000 to help them build a hospital; Kipling, that is back in Cannington constituency, and my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) will be voting likely against the policy that gave the Kipling Union Hospital a \$10,000 grant; Leoville, in Meadow Lake constituency \$6,000; Maryfield, back again in Cannington, \$10,000; Meadow Lake, my hon. friend from Meadow Lake will probably get up and vote against the policy which gave to the Meadow Lake Union Hospital \$25,000 to build and equip that hospital; North Battleford, grant committed of \$25,000, the maximum grant committed for Notre Dame hospital – and my hon. friend is going to vote against the budget, so probably it cannot be paid if he manages to defeat the budget.

Mr. Tucker: — We will have a Government that will do better.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Prelate, in the Maple Creek constituency, \$10,000 and my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) will get up and vote against that kind of business; Redvers, back again in Cannington constituency, \$20,000; Saltcoats, a small grant of \$2,000; Spiritwood, in Meadow Lake constituency, \$78,500 in grants and loans; Turtleford, Riverside Memorial Hospital, \$10,000 in grants, and an additional grant approved of \$25,000, all Provincial money – and my hon.

March 1, 1951

friend from Turtleford will get up and vote against that kind of a programme; Unity, Unity Union Hospital, \$6,000 grant and a loan of \$18,000, all Provincial money, all out of the budget that Liberals in this House in the past have voted against; Waldheim – where is Waldheim? Anybody near Waldheim? My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition will get up in his seat as bold as brass and vote against the policy which gave that little town a grant of \$3,000 for a nursing home, and his predecessors in this province never gave a nickel; Wawota Union Hospital, I think that is back again in Cannington, another \$10,000 grant; Wolseley, in Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, \$8,000 grant.

But I thought, to be fair, Mr. Speaker, that before the hon. members are asked to stand up and vote on this question, they should understand fully and completely the policy which they are going to vote against if they vote against this budget, and that is why I am taking a considerable amount of trouble to explain this to them.

I want to say a word about rural electrification. Mr. Speaker, in rural electrification there may be a “hot seat” for the Liberals. In the first place, from 1929, it took them ten years to get the programme started, and then from 1940-44, they averaged five and two-fifths farms electrified per year.

Mr. Tucker: — They supported the war effort, too.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Five and two-fifths farms electrified per year. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition in this House, I think stood up and told us what Manitoba had done ahead of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tucker: — Not during the war.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Manitoba had a war.

Mr. Tucker: — Manitoba did not do very much during the war either; they supported the war effort too.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The war only started in 1939, and the record prior to 1939 is worse than five and two-fifths farms per year. The truth of the matter is that even though, when we took over, there was a great deal of other work to do with regard to getting the Power Corporation in shape so as to serve the country, and it was not possible to go very fast with rural electrification at the start, even so, the average for the time that the C.C.F. Government has been in is 835 compared to $5 \frac{2}{5}$ – just 155 times the Liberal average. If there is anything which my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition should leave alone, insofar as the Liberal record is concerned, it is that question of rural electrification because, as I say, there is a hot seat there for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Tucker: — Your record is not very good either.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, Mr. Speaker, just a passing reference to Natural Resources.

Mr. Danielson: — Tell us something about oil.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — In 1943-44, the Liberal Government thought that the Natural Resources of the province was only worth a vote of \$645,000. We are putting into it, out of this budget, \$2,396,000. They are going to vote against a development plan in the Department of Natural Resources. I did have something here about some of our natural resources. I cannot get my fingers on it yet; but it concerned one branch of the department, the Resources Utilization Branch. They have proven up hundreds of thousands of tons of valuable clay; they have worked up plans for the beneficiation of our native bentonite in Saskatchewan, so that it will be suitable for use as drilling mud. A full-scale test with that bentonite drilling mud will be carried on shortly in this province. That Branch has carried on work in regard to the various types of clay, the sewer type or pottery type of clay, the ball clay which is a finer grade of clay, the china clay or kaolin. Work is going on in all these fields, and also in connection with magnesium sulphates. It will be interesting to the hon. members to know that the United States government is trying to get opened up again the magnesium plant down in the Gulf of Mexico which takes magnesium from the sea water, because it is a mineral that is in short supply, and, of course, when you are using a lot of steel there is need for a lot of magnesium for the beneficiation of the steel. We have in this province some deposits of magnesium which are quite rich: Big Quill Lake, Little Manitou and the Big Manitou lakes over at the west boundary. Work is going on with regard to the possibility of producing magnesium from these lakes. That Branch alone is doing a great deal to get development of our natural resources, because it is finding out the possible uses of those resources which we have.

I want to say a few words about Education, Mr. Speaker, and in education I am going to stay in my own constituency; I am going to stay to the Hudson Bay school unit. In 1945-46, (that was before the unit was formed), there were 152 pupils in grade 8 and 149 in grades 9 to 12 in that area covered by the Hudson Bay school unit. In 1950-51, those figures had increased to 214 in grade 8 and 294 in grades 9 to 12, an increase of 62 per cent in grade 8 in the number of students, and an increase of 145 per cent in the high school students. I want to tell my hon. friends that that did not happen by accident, there was a reason for that progress being made.

When the unit was formed, the grade 11 work was only taught in four schools and grade 12 in two schools in that area. At the present time we have five schools giving grade 11, four giving grade 12. The unit board pays an allowance, 50 cents per teaching day, to its students to finance attendance at high schools, if the high school is outside of their own district.

Mr. Lofts: — How far?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — One mile outside of their own district, outside of their own school district.

Mr. Lofts: — If a pupil lives a mile from his own high school he will get this allowance?

March 1, 1951

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — A mile over the border from the district in which the high school is located, and they would get the assistance to transport them to school.

In the period that the unit has been in operation, 319 pupils have benefited from that help. What does this 50 cents a day assistance mean? To a farmer who has a son or a daughter who has to go away to high school, it means \$100 a year. That would be 20 mills a year on a \$5,000 assessed farm. That is quite a contribution, 20 mills. And if there was not a unit he would have to pay school fees of from \$20 to \$50 a year for that pupil to attend school. The hon. member for Cannington shakes his head; but most school districts find when they provide educational services in their district, they want fees for any pupils that come in from outside; and that would be another four to 10 mills on that kind of an assessment. In this school unit, in 1945, they had 65 operating classrooms, now they have 94. That district just did not have educational services that it needed. It is true the district has been growing, and some of those additional rooms are necessary because of the growth of the community; but not all of them. Some of the communities were going without.

Then there are the new school buildings in the unit: Hudson Bay Junction has a new eight-room school; Porcupine Plain has seven new rooms, built since the unit was in operation; Weekes has four new rooms; Carragana, three; Somme, two, Prairie River, one; Reserve, one; and there are 17 new rural schools. That makes 43 new schools in that school unit, which only had 65 schools in 1945. Then there were major repairs to three schools; 12 teacherages have been built and eight barns.

The expenditures for new schools in the period from 1945 to 1950, in that unit, has been \$296,000, and not one debenture issued. They have spent \$34,000 on equipment, and they needed it, because many of the rural schools in that area had home-made desks, made out of spruce or something like that. They have spent \$57,000 on repairs, making the total of new schools, school equipment and repairs \$388,000. This is an illustration of what can be done in a school unit when the people get together and work together; and also when there is a Government in power that recognizes the needs of the community and gives grants in accordance with the needs.

The proceeds from taxes: in 1949, in this school unit, the net proceeds from taxes were \$88,000; the net grants received by the unit \$147,000. Grants were 63 per cent of revenue. In 1948, the figures are \$78,000 for net tax proceeds and \$137,000 for net grants.

I think that is enough, Mr. Speaker, except this: there were 13 school districts in that unit with an assessment of less than \$25,000. Some of my hon. friends talk about school districts and school grants where there is an assessment of \$100,000 or \$150,000. There were 13 there with less than \$25,000, 18 between \$25,000 and \$50,000 assessment and 15 between \$50,000 and \$75,000 assessment — and a good deal of that situation developed because of the land settlement policy, followed by the former Liberal Government, of taking settlers into districts of the North which were not fit for settlement, putting them on that land and hoping that they would make a living. The Liberals did it.

Mr. Loptson: — The Tories did it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh yes, the Tories did it, and then the Liberals did it. They are both tarred with the same brush. They might as well have been sitting together then and they do sit together now whenever it is convenient for them to do so.

Mr. Lofts: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, would it be fair to ask the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, when he is talking about schools, which I am very interested in: He mentioned Hudson Bay, Meadow Lake and Medstead and I think they are the lowest assessed units in the province. I quite agree with what he has said; I am quite familiar with some of this stuff. Will he compare that with some of their higher assessed units in the province? I would like to make this quite plain, Mr. Speaker, I am not against the school unit, I am with it; but I would just like to have him make those comparisons.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the grants, of course, the total grants paid by the Provincial Government have increased very greatly. I do not know the exact proportion of increase, but it must be getting close to three times what it was when the Liberals left office; and it is true that most of the increase has been in those districts which have lower assessments. But even in the richer districts, there has been a substantial increase in the grants paid.

Now, that comes right back to the question of the municipalities again. My hon. friends, together with some other people throughout the province of Saskatchewan, are always saying, “Land is taxed too high.” Have they changed their tune? Do they not agree that land taxation is too high? They want us to take off the Public Revenue Tax and all that; they are not very enthusiastic about it. Maybe they read this editorial in the “Leader-Post,” their guide and mentor, dated February 28. It says it is worthy of examination (and it is), after the speech made by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr). One paragraph in this editorial is very interesting, it says:

“Since the portion of hospitalization cost paid by the Alberta municipalities is based on property values, this distributes the burden in accordance with the ability to pay, in contrast to Saskatchewan’s direct hospitalization tax.”

And so, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal, if he wants to beat the C.C.F., he can beat it with the stick against land taxation or for land taxation, it does not matter to him which side he is on. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the budget and I sincerely hope and pray that I have been successful in bringing to repentance some of my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. H. Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I am just going to work off the preliminaries a little tonight, because I feel we have had a real good night’s enjoyment tonight, we have had a real show.

When my hon. friend, the member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) spoke earlier in the evening, I thought then that he gave His Majesty’s Opposition

March 1, 1951

a real shellacking, but when the hon. Minister of Natural Resources got up, I think he gave them the “double-whammy,” so I do not know. After all we have heard tonight I am sure that nearly all the members on this side of the House must have sore sides from laughing, because we have heard some of the records tonight that have gone down in history, and I am sure that it has been a real show.

However, I would like to pass on my compliments and congratulations to the hon. Provincial Treasurer in bringing down a balanced budget. It is true our Liberal friends are crying again about the high cost of this budget. It is always too high. It always has been too high as long as I have been sitting in the House. They have always been yelling and yapping and crying about we are paying out too much. And yet, as our friends have proven to them tonight, if you are going to get anywhere you have to spend money. You cannot get anything if you do not spend money, and they know it just as well as I do. And every time we show them the improvements that we are making it does not matter – we are spending too much money and the whole country is going to wrack and ruin. That is what they have been preaching and that is what they are crying about all the time.

Now, after some of the records which the hon. speakers before me have told this House, I am sure I am not going to repeat them because it would only be repetition and would only take too much time. But I cannot see, for the life of me, anybody who has heard the records of the past Liberal Government of this province (if there is any man or woman a supporter of the Liberal Party after tonight), I do not know how they ever expect to be returned to office in this province again. Because there is a record I think they cannot erase, no matter what they do nor how they try to do it. It is a matter of just trying to bamboozle the electors of our province, and I think they are past-masters at doing that; but I think they have a job on their hands and I do not think they are going to be very, very successful in doing it.

Now, according to our friends, this \$58 million budget is far too much. Well, I do not agree with them. It is not far too much. You can ask any housewife in this province today how far her dollar goes to what it did ten years ago. Ask any housewife. You do not have to be a mathematician. Ask any housewife, or any working man’s wife, how far her husband’s wages go today to what they did ten years ago. We know what it costs to build houses; we know what it costs to build roads; we know what it costs to build automobiles and drive them, and so on and so forth, to what it did ten years ago, and it is absolutely nonsense talking about the budget being too high today in comparison to what it was when the Liberals were in power.

At least there is one thing, Mr. Speaker. We are doing something and getting somewhere by the spending of the public’s money. That is one thing, according to some of the reports we have heard tonight, the Liberals never did do. When I hear my hon. friend the Minister of Natural Resources telling us they did not have an inch of gravelled roads in the Meadow Lake constituency a few years ago, well, surely to gosh that makes you think. I do not know what the hon. member from Meadow Lake is going to do about it, or a lot of the others that have heard all these reports tonight, because, after all is said and done, they cannot deny it. There is no intelligent man or woman or elector in this Province can absolutely deny those facts

when we can prove with figures and facts that these things are being done. They are there before our eyes every day and every time we look around. How in the world can they get up in their seats and deny that sort of thing? I do not know. They must take us for a lot of dummies but I do not know who are the biggest damn dummies, them or us; but there is something going to come out of the bag one of these days. They cannot take it forever and not come out.

Now, I got quite a great kick out of the hon. member from Athabasca's speech, this afternoon. After hearing several of the Opposition speakers all through the debate this last two weeks, well I thought it was quite a relief to hear an Opposition member praise most of the work that this Government has done, which he did this afternoon. I think he is to be congratulated, because we do know that at least one member of the Opposition has his eyes open, and he is not going around with smoked glasses on. He is at least admitting there is something that this Government has done, so I would advise, in a kindly way and spirit, that our hon. friends in the Opposition should take their smoked glasses off and probably in future put clear glass ones on, they might see a bit more.

Mr. Tucker: — What colour have you got on?

Mr. Gibbs: — They are plain, but you will get yours tomorrow, so it will be all right. You do not need to worry about me.

I would just like to pass on, Mr. Speaker, and congratulate every Minister, their Departments and their staffs on the good work they have done since we have come in power in this province in 1944. That goes right across the board. I think it is a wonderful achievement. It is a wonderful performance, and I do not think any Liberal Party in this province can live down the performance that this progressive Government has done in spending the people's money . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . and the people's money was made to spend – sure, “Hear, hear;” but I am sorry to say that when our Liberal friends were in office they only thought that the natural resources or anything else that they did in the province was done for the Liberal Party. But it is rather different today – it is done for all the people of the province by the people's government. We probably do not have as many “heelers” as the Liberal Party had in their regime . . . Oh, they do not like that; but I am convinced that is about the truth.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I congratulate, too, the Hon. Minister of Highways. I think he is doing a darned good job, and there is no doubt about it that his Department gets some of the most severe criticism that possibly is thrown over to this side of the House. I want to say that I have no kick in my constituency, I have no kick whatsoever. We are getting roads, probably not getting all that we can get, because you cannot build them overnight. We are getting the Trans-Canada Highway through, and I am glad to report that in 1951 the Trans-Canada Highway will probably be completed Herbert to Uren and reconditioning of the grade from Herbert west for a distance of about 12 miles, which will connect up to the blacktop past

March 1, 1951

Rush Lake. Then, in 1951, we are expecting, if everything goes right, that we shall have blacktop right through from Moose Jaw to Swift Current. So that is pretty good.

I do not think we would have seen one-quarter of it if the Liberal Party had been in power, because they would have said, "There is a war on." Every time we get up and start talking about what they did a few years ago they say there was a war on. There was not a war on for thirty-five years. We all know that. We know there have been two bad ones, but there has not been a war for all of thirty-five years; but they were spending nought at all a few years ago. They were spending it probably on their Liberal friends and the Liberal Party and thinking they were doing a service to the province. But we are getting some benefits today, Mr. Speaker; and they have to admit that; they cannot get away from the fact.

However, Mr. Speaker, I said I would just get over with the preliminaries. I might have a few minutes on the air tomorrow and, with that, I would like to adjourn the debate.

(Debate Adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 11 o'clock, p.m.