

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
24th Day

Wednesday March 12, 1952

The House met at three o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, referring to the few words that I said before the Session began, yesterday, I was quoted as having said:

"Mr. Nollet said, in the Government's opinion, and he thought it was generally recognized by everyone, that the Federal Government had had complete constitutional and administrative control over contagious animal diseases for four years."

I said "for years" — with the "four" deleted.

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 11, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply).

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last evening I had mentioned a few of the remarks which had been put forward by members on the other side of the House in this debate. I am very sorry that we had to adjourn so early — it was getting near 6 o'clock — because I think we had quite an entertaining afternoon, and possibly something was required to try and dampen down some of the spirits, particularly of my very good friend from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) who came in here with the oil. I was rather looking for him, hoping he would be around with something that would float on top of that a little later in the evening, but unfortunately, I did not see him.

Reference was made to the elections recently in Great Britain, and in some of the other countries that once had Socialist Governments. I really do not think that the Government of this province can get very much comfort from the results of those elections. To go to the two previous elections, to the last one in Ontario, there was some indication that the people in Ontario were swinging to the left, with the C.C.F. gathering strength. In the previous legislature

March 12, 1952

in Ontario the C.C.F. were the official Opposition and they held 22 seats, I think, however, the C.C.F. boom down there has fizzled out the same way it is going to in Saskatchewan. Ontario not only failed to re-elect 20 of its C.C.F. candidates, but its leader, Mr. Jolliffe was even defeated, and, in this area where union labour predominates, I think this is particularly significant. There is very little doubt that a fuller understanding of the dangers involved in Socialist thinking and Socialist theory and practise had everything to do with the results in that election, and really it just confirms the trend that is going on in the English-speaking world today such as Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia. They are swinging away from Socialism. If we look at the Ontario election, there is no other major group that lost votes in Ontario at all, except the C.C.F. and they lost 140,000 votes, or about one quarter of their previous supporters. To look at Saskatchewan, back in 1948, about a thousand well-placed votes in the province would have tumbled these gentlemen out of office that sit across the House here today.

We have rather missed the member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs), and the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy), getting up in this House this session, telling us about these by-elections, mentioning that labour has won. I hope to hear something from them sometime before this session is over, telling us the results of the elections in England, but to date at least, Mr. Speaker, we have not had any word from them. Well, the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) I see is chortling again. If he will just let me finish my speech, then he can get up and make another one himself.

I would like to mention something about the highway problem in my constituency, Mr. Speaker. We have — prior to 1948 (at least prior to the election in 1948) when there was a C.C.F. member sitting in this House, the constituency was accorded a great deal of attention. As a matter of fact, we even got in on a piece of blacktop roads that run south from Regina to North Portal. It comes through Weyburn, so I do not think they could do much else, except extend it down through Estevan. However, if you take a drive over that road today, particularly from Corinne down No. 39 to North Portal, you will find that in a large measure it is pretty well breaking up. Last summer it was just loaded with crews down there, patching here and there, and patching spots all over. It would be very interesting to find out how much money was spent in trying to patch up that road, because it looks very much as if all they put on was a pie-crust, and they were not too interested in what was underneath.

Well, the constituency of Souris-Estevan, which I have the honour to represent in this House, is in the extreme southeast corner of this Province. We are bounded on the south by the United States, on the east by the Province of Manitoba; I have the Premier on the west of me, and around a bit on the north, and my friend from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) has the northern boundary of that constituency. In common with all the other hon. members in this House each year, I have felt it incumbent upon me to bring forward some of the problems with respect to highways.

The constituency has one main highway running throughout its entire length, and several highways running north and south. The constituency is rather long and narrow, and the principal highway bisects it down the centre, running from east to west. Some work, I will say, has been done on Highway No. 18 which runs from the Manitoba boundary right through to the western part of the constituency, and the government crews or the contractor they have there now doing some work (or at least he was there last summer), had constructed and reconstructed and regraded some of the highway as far as the town of Oxbow. I certainly hope that the Minister of Highways does not get any of his government crews back down there. We had a return in this House about a year ago, I believe, and it was tabled, which showed that they spent \$92,000 in expenditures for a government crew building three miles of construction, 10 miles of regrading, and three miles of gravelling, and 27 miles of regravelling. Well, to me that seems to be an exorbitant cost. That was a piece of road that was being built from Carnduff towards Glen Ewen, and I do not think the Minister can honestly tell anybody in my constituency who was down there that his government crews can do the work any cheaper than a contractor can.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — On a point of privilege, I expect the hon. gentleman to at least be honest when he makes a statement of that kind. What you failed to tell them was that it was necessary for our government crew to go over the work that was done the year previous by a contractor, and increase that grade in addition to this other.

Mr. McCormack: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it to the good people that live around Carnduff and Glen Ewen to see what these government crews were doing. They had four bulldozers there, and I do not think they ever had more than one of them running at any time.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Again, Mr. Speaker, that statement is not correct. There was only one bulldozer in the whole crew.

Mr. McCormack: — It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, to anybody who lives down in that part of the country as to where the money is being spent.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — You do not know the difficulty . . .

Mr. McCormack: — Well, you made a speech here the other day and I never interrupted you once, so you let me make mine.

We were rather disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Highways proposed expenditures which he gave this House, I think it was last week, did not provide for any reconstruction of Highway No. 47 which runs north and south through the seat, and particularly for the portion which runs from Estevan to the American border. This piece of highway is particularly important, not only because we have an airport which is just four miles south of Estevan. At that airport, there is a hospital run by the Sisters of St. Joseph which has 46 or 47 beds, I believe. There are about 35 families housed out there. It is also the home of the Estevan Flying Club, and the headquarters of the South Saskatchewan Regiment. We

March 12, 1952

also have several coal mines down in that area which deliver coal on a domestic basis and there are some very fine tourist resorts in that area. As far as 47 is concerned, in the winter time it is virtually impassable, and it is a great source of concern to the people in the town who have people living out at the airport, because the town has to supply it with its fuel and its power, and they are continually having to keep that road open.

The same situation exists with respect to Highway No. 18. I would like to just point out — I am not going to take the time of the House today, because I have not got the time due to the fact that I am sharing this air time with somebody else, — but I would like to point out that within the last three or four days, I have received letters concerning Highway No. 18 and Highway No. 47 from the Torquay Board of Trade, and the letter is signed by Mr. St. Onge, the President, and Mr. Bercum, the Secretary Treasurer; the rural municipality of Cambria from Mr. Vinge, the Secretary Treasurer there, writing on behalf of the council, the customs officers at the border south of Estevan, Mr. Everett Murphy; the reeve on behalf of the R.M. of Estevan No. 5, a letter from the Estevan Board of Trade, signed by the Secretary, Mr. Bannatyne; a letter from Fred N. Perkins, the reeve of the R.M. of Benson; a letter from the Village of Torquay, Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Vinge; a letter from George T. Green who is the operator of one of these tourist establishments, and a letter from the town clerk of the town of Estevan, writing on behalf of the town of Estevan, in addition to one of the coal mine operators, Mr. Jenish.

All these letters express the same feeling, that there is a certain amount of discrimination they feel because nothing is being done with respect to these particular sections of highways, and they are getting in such a condition now that they are virtually impassable. The rocks are sticking up through the roads, and they are wondering when and if something is going to be done. I can certainly tell them that after the next election, when I am sure that these boys sitting on the other side of the House will not be in office. Mr. Speaker, I am positive of that, then these problems will be looked after and these roads will be maintained in the proper manner as they should be.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — As they were before.

Mr. McCormack: — Much better than before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that we have in this province is the decreasing population. We have read in the press about a redistribution bill which is coming through in Ottawa, and I think it should cause every one of us, regardless of what side of the House we are on, a great deal of concern, because if our population keeps on decreasing we are going to end up with a very small representation in the Federal House at Ottawa. The only province in the Dominion of Canada that had a decrease in population during the past 10 years is the Province of Saskatchewan, and it is particularly significant Mr. Speaker, that during seven and a half years of those 10 years, we have had a Socialist C.C.F. Government in power in Saskatchewan, and this is the Government from whom the Socialists, at least, expected such wonderful things. During the

first four years of this period — that is, from 1941 to 1945 — my hon. friends across the way will laugh, but some of us happen to have known something about it — there was a war on, and people were away in war industries and in the armed forces. In the period 1946-1951, however, if we compare Saskatchewan to our neighbouring provinces of Alberta and Manitoba, it shows that these provinces actually made real head-way while Saskatchewan actually lost population. I would just like to give you a couple of the figures: 1946 to 1951 period shows that Alberta had a gain of 133,000 people. Manitoba had a gain of 44,000 people, while the Province of Saskatchewan actually lost 2,000 people.

Premier T.C. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure it was 960.

Mr. McCormack: — Saskatchewan, then, is the only province in Canada to show a decline in population during this period, and it is the only province, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, that has a Socialist Government.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure our hon. friend would not want to misquote the figures, but the official figures by the D.B.S. is 960 of a loss, instead of 2,000.

Mr. McCormack: — I will stand corrected — that is a thousand people. I contend that the lack of comparable industrial development in this Province, Mr. Speaker, under our C.C.F. Government is largely responsible for the loss of population. We all depend for our incomes in this province, directly or indirectly, on agriculture and 85 per cent of our wealth comes from the farms. In order to provide a more balanced economy in the province, we need more industries. Since the end of the war, if we look at the Dominion of Canada we find that Canada had forged ahead faster than ever before in her history, and proportionately to our population, Mr. Speaker, faster than any country in the world.

I would like to refer to a brief extract from an article which appeared in Time Magazine on February 4 of this year. It says:

"Since 1939, Canada has quadrupled her national production, climbing from a lowly par with Norway and Sweden to a point where she nearly triples the output of these Scandinavian countries and rivals that of France. She made a 15 per cent advance in the Canadian standard of living, raising her average income for a family of four to \$4,000 a year, that is \$622 above the corresponding U.S. average. She kept her finances in splendid solvency."

Then it goes on to say that even though we are dwarfed in productivity by the United States that our industry has expanded terrifically to an extent never achieved before by 14 million inhabitants of any country. Then it goes on to list all the wonderful things that the Dominion of Canada has, and the great achievements that it has made. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is particularly unfortunate that we sitting in Saskatchewan here, when all the rest of Canada is going ahead at such a great rate, that we

March 12, 1952

have to sit here, and we are just barely moving. I know that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite like to quote 1944 figures and compare them today. But I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if you and I were to say in 1944 we had \$1 and today we have \$10, we would probably say we are ten times better off. But in the same period while you and I are getting ahead by \$10, somebody else has made \$1,000 (the rest of the country has made \$1,000 in comparison) — we are going to look pretty poor. I would just like to give some figures as to what, in my opinion, is happening in this province. We have about 90 million acres of the pre-Cambrian shield which is potentially a great mineral bearing area . . .

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Have you ever been there?

Mr. McCormack: — We have practically no development — that is where you had better go after the next election — they will not have you around here anyway. We have had practically no development in that area compared with Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, which have similar areas. My feeling is, Mr. Speaker, that the blighting effect of Socialism is the reason that we have not had any great development in this area, when other provinces are.

If we go into the figures that have been given with respect to manufacturing industries, we find that from 1944 to 1949 the number of people employed in such industries in Manitoba increased by over a thousand, by over 4,000 in Alberta, and decreased by nearly 1,500 in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We have heard a lot too, Mr. Speaker, about the development of our oil and gas reserves. Last year, while we had about \$200 million being spent in gas and oil development in Canada, in western Canada, according to recent figures, the Province of Alberta had about 195 oil drilling units working in the province, and Saskatchewan had 26, I believe, and I think it is the belief of most thinking people in this province, that if we had a government in office which capital was not afraid of, that there is no reason why we would not have as many oil drilling rigs in this province as they have in the Province of Alberta today. I am going to say this again, that the real test is whether we have progressed or not at the same rate, the real test is whether we have progressed at the same rate as our neighbouring provinces. And there is no doubt in my mind that our development in this province has been retarded by a C.C.F. Socialist Government. That is a government which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, has as its objective the eradication of capitalism and the establishment of a socialistic state in which the natural resources and principal means of production would be ultimately owned and controlled by the Government. Did somebody say "Hear! Hear!" over there? Just one, eh? Well, there are not many Socialists left in that bunch. I think they are a little bit on the self-seeking side these days instead of being Socialists.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. Government leaders in this province, recently at least, have been assuring people that if they come in and invest their money in our mineral and oil resources in this province that any contracts they make with such people will be honoured, but they still maintain on the statute books, Mr. Speaker, legislation by which they can expropriate or take over without the owners consent any oil well or

any minerals or manufacturing establishment, and they also have legislation by which they can and have increased royalties even though they contracted with certain people with respect to royalties. The Premier was up at Saskatoon, I think, and if I have got the newspaper clipping correctly at that time he boasted quite recently about the Provincial Government's action in taking over the box factory for an alleged breach of some labour laws which has never been proved in any court. They just went in and took the thing over. He also implied that such action would be taken again, if the government felt like doing so, and thought it necessary to do so.

Premier Douglas: — Obviously you disagree with that action of the Government?

Mr. McCormack: — In view of the following action which your own Minister of Natural Resources took, when he had a little bit of labour trouble, he went up there and he said, "If you do not like it, if you don't act the way we want, we will close the place down", and you would have taken the place over if somebody had said that, or anybody else had said that.

Premier Douglas: — You have not answered the question. Did you disagree with that?

Mr. McCormack: — But I still say that the result of this legislation and basic attitude of the C.C.F. was exactly what might have been expected, and people with money to invest in this province, Mr. Speaker, are just not coming in because they do not trust these people, over here, no matter what they say, and I doubt if there are very many people that would trust them, no matter what they say.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McCormack: — I do not think there is the wholehearted search for development going on in this province today . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McCormack: — Certainly, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Is that the reason why the Imperial Oil paid \$48,000 for permits just recently?

Mr. McCormack: — That might be the same reason why Mr. Rhubbra got about 9 million acres of land in this province for one-tenth of a cent an acre.

Mr. Speaker, every year the C.C.F. on the other side of this House have stood up to a man and voted for the Regina Manifesto, and I think it can be called the Bible of the C.C.F. Party. I think it was the Premier last year who said that it was the greatest political document in Canadian history. I am going to say this, as long as it remains the basic philosophy of the Saskatchewan Government, we are not going to have the industrial expansion to which we are entitled in comparison to the rest

March 12, 1952

of Canada. In fact, if we can get rid of this fear of socialistic expropriation that we are going to get this capital flooding into this country. I also feel sure that after the C.C.F. are booted out this summer, and I do not think there is any doubt about that if they call an election . . .

Premier Douglas: — Like Gravelbourg.

Mr. McCormack: — If you had got enough votes in Gravelbourg except the measly 79 you got, you would have gone to the country last summer — but you did not have the guts to do it. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, that if this Liberal Government gets in, as it will after the next election, that we are going to have increased development within this province which will yield increased revenues out of which more can and will be done to help these social services that have been established in this province. I still think the whole question before the voters of this province, today, the electors of this province, is whether we are going to lag behind under a Socialistic Government, or whether we are going to go ahead and experience a great industrial boom under a Liberal Government which believes in free enterprise, and letting Saskatchewan take its proper place . . . There is somebody chortling over there — it looks like the member for Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan). He won't be there after the next election, so he might as well have a good time now.

I would like to give you some facts about the Dominion of Canada, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to take up too much time of the House in respect to it. I just wanted to mention that I entirely disagree with what the Minister of Labour had to say the other day. I know he got up and explained it, but he still did say that he did not think we should have immigrants coming into this country, scrambling for jobs with the unemployed. My own personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that we need immigration into this country; we need lots of it, and when we are sitting here with 14 million people and there are other countries of this world that are over-populated, if we are going to have any form of security in this country at all, we have got to give these people a chance to go someplace else. We have got to build our own population up, and take time to let these other people see that we do not want to hog everything for ourselves. I think that the Province of Saskatchewan has a dazzling future. Saskatchewan, I think, can share in the development that is going on in the rest of Canada, but I think the first thing we have to do is get rid of this monstrosity of a government, with its hordes of heelers and nitwits and imported planners, and all the rest of the people they have brought in here.

The Leader of the Independent Party yesterday wanted to know what the difference was between the C.C.F. and the Liberal Party. I would just like to tell him. He gave a record of all the payments that were made by the Federal Government to people in this province. He said that the Federal Government made these payments. Well, the Liberal Party believes in giving service, and they believe in social services — they have always been in the vanguard of social services — and the Liberal Party is willing to give the people and the people of the Province all the social services that they are willing and able to pay for.

But Socialism, and I would like to see how many people on the other side still believe in this — Socialism means the operation or the ownership of all the means of production and distribution. They were going to make profits out of all these Crown Corporations they set up. They are wriggling a little bit now, you see; a lot of them are headed for private enterprise where they can make a living after they get trimmed the next election.

Premier Douglas: — You were afraid we would.

Mr. McCormack: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the question of the discovery of oil in the province. You know, down in my part of the country we are still very interested in oil discoveries, and the large portion of the people who own their own land are looking at their titles to see if they have got their mineral rights. I said in this House earlier this year, I have said it for the last two years, that I think that in any case where the owner of the surface rights who does not own the minerals — that he should get a proportion of what discoveries are made, what comes up out of the ground to compensate him adequately for the loss and damage to his surface rights. That is my opinion. Now, we have had a great deal of discussion recently about the Farm Implement Legislation, to protect the farmers from the implement people going around taking them for a ride when they sell them implements. But there was not one thing done by this government to stop these lease sharks running around the country and buying up leases on mineral rights at 10 cents an acre. There was not a thing done by anybody. The Premier of Manitoba got up and made a statement on it, and I have the clip-ins right here, but there was not a thing done by any of the members on the other side of the house, nor any member of the Government. And today a lot of farmers, — and principally because of this 3 cent an acre mineral tax that has been piled on — they leased their land out for very small sums, their oil rights, and today a lot of them even have transferred their minerals — transferred their mineral rights for a few hundred dollars to some of these smart gentlemen going around the country and talking them into giving up their mineral rights and putting documents in front of them which they do not understand.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Free enterprise.

Mr. McCormack: — What did your Government do? Not a thing about it. And you are the Minister of Agriculture, and you never went out and told one farmer about the releases.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am sure the hon. member does not wish to misrepresent, but we did something about surface rights in the Lloydminster area.

Mr. McCormack: — Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I just want to refer to another matter that came up in this House. I was rather amused at the speech that was made by the Minister of Natural Resources. If you will remember a little earlier, the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), outlined what to me at least, appeared to be a very unusual, and I think scandalous situation with regard to the handing out of large acreage rights to some of these people, principally a man named Rhubbra, and one in

March 12, 1952

in which our friend, Dr. Shumiatcher — another deal in which he was involved. But do you know what the Minister of Natural Resources did, Mr. Speaker? Did he get up in this House and give a factual explanation of what had happened? No, I will tell you what he did. He did not try to justify the actions of the Government or his department in any manner — at least, he did not to my satisfaction. Instead of that, he got up in this House and gave a long, harangue about some timber deal that some Liberals, or the Federal Liberal Government was alleged to have got into about 1908. Well, imagine! That is about the only answer he can make to this House. I would like to point out to the Minister that there are some of us on this side, many of us in this whole House, who were not even born in 1908.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I'll say you weren't!

Mr. McCormack: — I hardly feel responsible for something that a Government at Ottawa did nine years before I was born, and that is the only satisfactory answer the Minister of Natural Resources could give to this House. He must be very hard pressed for something to say. Well, Mr. Speaker, listening to some of the gentlemen opposite during the past three years here, and particularly in the past few weeks, you would almost think that the Holy Bible had been written, edited, and published exclusively for use of some of the gentlemen opposite. They have tried to tie up the C.C.F., Christianity, Socialism, all in one package. I made an offer here about four years ago, and I would like to make it again, particularly some of the landed gentry who sit on the other side of the House, and who would like to socialize everybody but themselves. If they really believe in Socialism, why don't they get together here — and the 53 of — or the 52 of us we can pool all our resources right here and set an example to the whole Province of Saskatchewan. By Golly, I would end up with a lot of good farm land — I'd be interested in theatres, oil wells, and the Lord knows what I would be into! I certainly have not got any at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We might not have any good law, though.

Mr. McCormack: — Well, we might even be able to teach the Minister of Natural Resources something, but I doubt it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have exhausted my time here today. I realize that the Premier has probably been squirming there. He still has got the seat of his pants to wear out like the member of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) said. However, because this government is the most extravagant, inefficient and incompetent government we have ever had, and because I do not believe in Socialism, and I do not think that half the people over there believe in Socialism, and because I object to discriminatory policies with respect to highways in this Province (your highways came depending on how you vote), I do not intend to support the Budget, and I think possibly, Mr. Speaker, that may have been obvious from the outset.

I am just trying to get as much of this in during my portion of the air time. I was very interested last Saturday when I was home, Mr. Speaker; a young chap came up to me who is in business down there, and he wanted to know if he could get a loan from the Government. I had to tell him that unfortunately I did not have too much influence with the government, and maybe he would have to go to somebody else if he was going to see about getting the loan. He told me he had heard that loans had been made to people in the theatre business. He said he did not have a theatre; he only had a small business and he wanted to get hold of about \$10,000. I had to go into this quite fully with him, because I am certain that he had a misapprehension, if we take the statement that the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) gave to the Committee of this House, I am certain that this gentleman who saw me had a misapprehension as to how he went about getting this money. He wanted to know — he said he was very surprised to hear the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office was lending money on business, and I told him that the Provincial Treasurer had told us that they did not loan money on business until May, 1950. But prior to that time there had been no mercantile loans made. I also pointed out to him that in April, 1950, a man by the name of Bodinoff made an application to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office for a loan. On the 3rd of May the insurance officials recommended that the loaning policy be extended to include mercantile organizations. On the 9th of May, 1950, an appraisal was made — now these are from the Provincial Treasurer's own statements — of the property owned by Mr. Bodinoff which consisted of two theatres in Weyburn. Then on the 19th of July, 1950, a loan was approved and present at the meeting which approved the loan were the directors of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, which consisted of Mr. Fines, Mr. Cadbury, Mr. Valleau, Mr. Thurston and the Manager, Mr. Allore.

Now, the Provincial Treasurer also told us that the directors set aside \$300,000 as the limit for commercial loans, and I believe he told us that about one-half of the total loans of the Insurance Office, which amounted to about \$350,000 at the end of the last year under review was made up of mercantile loans and there were only two mercantile loans made — one was made to Bodinoff in the amount of \$75,000 and the other was made to co-operatives — I think the amount was \$77,000.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to be inaccurate. There were six mercantile loans made.

Mr. McCormack: — But your mercantile loans included mortgages. You said two mercantile loans.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — All of them are secured by mortgages. There were six mercantile loans, all of which were secured by mortgages.

Mr. McCormack: — Well, in any event, Mr. Bodinoff got \$75,000 loan, This loan was approved on July 19, 1950, The Insurance Office was instructed, I assume by Mr. Bodinoff's solicitor, on the 30th of August, as to how this money was to be distributed or dispersed. The mortgage, which is registered, is dated August 30, 1950, and was registered on September 7, 1950, The solicitors for Mr. Bodinoff is the firm of Shumiatcher and McLeod, the same Dr. Shumiatcher we have heard so much about in this legislature before.

March 12, 1952

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, may I again point out that the solicitor in this case was Mr. D.G. McLeod, not Dr. Shumiatcher.

Mr. McCormack: — The firm is Shumiatcher and McLeod.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — And Mr. McLeod was the solicitor.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McCormack: — Well, I think these are some things that the legislature would like to know and should know, Mr. Speaker. We have another theatre, and this is one thing I had a hard job to convince this young fellow of — although I was trying to be as kind as possible to the Provincial Treasurer. He wanted to know in the first instance — I have been trying to be kind to the gentlemen opposite, but he wanted to know if this loan was made to the theatre in which the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer and Bodinoff and Shumiatcher were interested in, and I said, "No." The Provincial Treasurer told us that was not so. I told him the "Theatre Under the Stars" was incorporated in August, 1949, which was a year — or about eight months — before Mr. Bodinoff made the application to the Government Insurance Office for the loan, and that the Premier, the Provincial Treasurer, Shumiatcher, and Bodinoff did not become directors and active shareholders in the Theatre Under the Stars, apart from Mr. Bodinoff — I believe he was the first instance until October 3, 1930. I think the shares were actually allotted on October 16, 1950. Well, this worries me — what this young fellow asked me — is this, is this Shumiatcher, is he the same fellow that was mixed up with this deal in the Department of Natural Resources. He and an employee in the Natural Resources Department got some uranium concessions from the Government shortly before, or shortly after, as the Minister says, his resignation in 1949. And is this Shumiatcher the same fellow who in 1949 got oil and gas permits covering 600,000 acres of Crown lands from the Natural Resources, and these permits turned up two days later after he got them in the hands of National Petroleum, and he had a very substantial cash profit for them, and 25,000 shares in the company.

Now, I am not going to give anything else, except the dates, Mr. Speaker. I think the facts can speak for themselves, and people can draw the inferences from them.

Before as I said, I do not intend to support this budget. I do not believe in Socialism — I think it is a flop.

Walter A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before I deal with the Budget, I would like to say a word in regard to one of the oldest members of this legislature, in point of service who acted as our chief financial critic, and who, in my opinion, made a very splendid contribution to this debate in his criticism on our behalf of the Budget.

I do not intend, this afternoon, to cover the ground that he covered entirely. I just wish to deal with some outstanding points of the Government's record and of the Budget. Certainly there is very little in the budget by way of relief to the taxpayer. The one helpful proposal was in regard to the paying of the equivalent of taxes to municipalities in respect to commercial corporations owned by the Government.

The Liberal Party has argued for several years now that this should be done. It was recommended almost two years ago by the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Committee, and it is pretty hard to feel that the Government could refuse any longer to carry out something which that committee said had no justification whatever. However, while this proposal will help the urban municipality, it will give little relief to the rural municipalities. There is very little in the budget for them except the belated promise to help in respect to assistance in building and re-building of municipal bridges.

I suppose the outstanding disappointment in the budget was the failure of the Government to remove the Public Revenue Tax. They have said they are going to use it to pay increased school grants. I think, that by so doing they thought they would avoid having to take it off altogether. School grants had to be increased anyway, and if they had not done it this way, they would have had to take it out of increased revenues; by doing it this way, the Government perhaps think they may have something to defend them for not taking it off in the future. As a result the Government can use its increased revenues for other purposes, and now holds out the hope that it will take the tax off next year.

Can anyone be sure, Mr. Speaker, that if an election is held this summer and the C.C.F. manage to win, that the Public Revenue Tax will be removed? The people of the Province have not forgotten the definite and reiterated assurances of the C.C.F. leaders, including the Premier himself, that when they got elected the education tax would be removed when they had other revenues to take its place. Now at the time they made this promise, the education tax amounted to about \$4 1/4 million. Since then their revenues have increased by \$37 million, and that promise has not been carried out, Mr. Speaker. It has been absolutely ignored. Now if they can get by without taking the Public Revenue Tax off on this promise, which is not nearly as explicit as that in regard to the education tax, what hope has the Province got that we are going to get rid of this Public Revenue Tax?

One excuse given by the Government for not having taken the Public Revenue Tax off now is that they claim that the Britnell Committee said they should take three years to carry it out. This is important enough, Mr. Speaker, that I should think we ought to examine just what the Britnell-Cronkite Committee did say in that regard. The Committee made the following specific recommendations:

- (1) That the Public Revenue Tax be repealed; that as a matter of policy the real property tax field be considered henceforth as belonging exclusively to the municipalities."

March 12, 1952

Now, this was an outright recommendation. In the body of the Report, the following is stated, and I am quoting from the report again:

"Your Committee is of the opinion that it is highly desirable that the municipalities should have one field that they can call their own. Allocation of this field to local units would go far in the direction of developing a feeling of responsibility. They would realize that they have one dependable and significant field of revenue, with reference to which their plans may be made."

I am still quoting from the Report:

"The principle of the real estate tax field should be considered as belonging to municipalities exclusively in practise. It is pretty well conceded in Canada, revenues of a provincial tax on land remain in only three of the other provinces; namely, Alberta, Manitoba and Nova Scotia, and for the last fiscal year available, the combined collections in these three provinces for provincial purposes amounted only to \$442,614."

Only three provinces in Canada, outside of Saskatchewan, collect this Public Revenue Tax and in those three provinces, the combined collection only amounted to \$442,612. Still quoting from the report:

"Abolition of this tax was recommended by a Royal Commission after thorough examination of the fiscal structure of the province."

Notice this, Mr. Speaker:

"The present is a reasonably opportune time for securing this field to municipalities. Provincial revenues are comparatively buoyant and the adjustment could be made with much less shock than in a period of depression."

That is quoting from the report. I draw your attention to where they say definitely 'the present is a reasonably opportune time to do it'. Not three years later. Now then, I read in another part of the report this:

"The responsibility is, of course, that of the Government and of the Legislature. There can be no doubt that the implementing of the proposals would involve an appreciable dislocation of provincial finance. Three years, in the opinion of your Committee, would be a reasonable period in which to implement all the proposals advanced in this part, if the Government should decide to proceed by progressive stages."

Mr. Speaker, note the phrase "if the Government decides to proceed by progressive stages", then the three years would be all right. Now that is not the recommendation. They say it should be done at once. Now the Government is trying to get out of the report of its own committee.

In regard to public debt, the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) pointed out that the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) had omitted tables from his Budget Speech in regard to the debt of the province, and asked why that had happened. Well, I suggest the reason they were omitted was because they would show that our debt has increased; it has gone up almost \$16 million since December 31, 1948. The Provincial Treasurer included the tables when the debt was going down by payments of other people. These payments from other people altogether totalled over \$82 million. Then, through them there was a reduction of public debt, but only by \$53 million at that time. In other words, the public debt did not come down by as much as other people paid in indirect liabilities of the Government. It fell short by \$28 million of the amount which they paid. The people have paid those debts off, which had been guaranteed by the Government — such people as the Wheat Pool, farmers for Seed Grain, and so on. They paid off a total of \$82 million — the debt only came down by \$53 million. Now it is starting to go up again, and the Provincial Treasurer very conveniently leaves out of his budget speech these tables which show that the increase since 1948 has been \$16 million.

In view of the fact that the debt is increasing, and has been increasing since 1948, I could not help but smile when looking over the report of the speech made by the Premier at Wawota, reported in June 18, 1948. Here is another sort of promise held out, for a suggestion. It had no foundation that ever, in fact, whatever, as is shown by what is happening today. Here is, what the Premier said, and I quote:

"We feel that the complete debt could be eliminated in perhaps another two terms of office."

That is what the Premier said, and this is the goal to which the Premier said the C.C.F. Government is working. Well, if they are working towards it, they are certainly going backwards instead of forwards.

Now in regard to the budget — one of the striking things about it is its size. It is not realized by many people that it has actually increased as much as it has, because the figures have been for the last two years, and are now being kept on a net basis, whereas three years ago they were kept on a gross basis. In other words, before this change was made, for example, expenditures made on old age pensions were included in the totals, and the amounts paid including the 75 per cent, paid by the Federal Government towards old-age pensions was included in the total.

Now, the way the budget is made up only the 25 per cent paid by the Government is included, and so it brings down the total very much. This is explained in the public accounts. I am not suggesting there is any attempt to deceive — it is just a matter of understanding the effect of the public accounts. It is explained on Page 578 of the 1950-51 Public Accounts where it gives the amount of expenditures which must be added, in

March 12, 1952

order to make a fair comparison with previous years. If one looks at that table, one will see that to get a comparable figure with the \$29,800,000 spent on revenue account in 1943-44, one must add \$8,460,000 to the \$55,800,000 of expenditures in the 1950-51 budget, or rather 1950-51 public accounts. That brings it up to a total of \$64,300,000 expenditure on a comparable basis on revenue account.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the increase from 1943-44 to 1950-51 was from \$29,800,000 to \$64,300,000; an increase of \$35 million or more than doubled in seven years. Now, if we add to that the expenditures on capital account we get these figures; 1943-44 there was spent by the Government of this province \$30,149,000. There was spent in 1950-51 \$79,939,000 or nearly 80 million; this is from the public accounts for 1950-51. That is an increase of nearly \$50 million in seven years; an increase at the rate of \$7 million per year in expenditures every year since this government has been in office.

Now, sometimes an attempt has been made to explain it all by the increase in the cost-of-living, and I thought I would deal with that for a moment. The cost-of-living index as at April 1, 1944 was 119.1. On April 1, 1951 it was 181.8 — an increase of 52 per cent. Now, this would have warranted an increase in the budget of \$15 1/2 million, not \$50 million, Mr. Speaker. If one takes the estimates for 1952-53 just tabled, and allows for supplementaries, add 6 million (and they were over \$6 million last year), and over \$8 million the year before — you get the following figures as the probable total expenditures by this government for the coming year on a gross basis; 1943-44, as I have already said, \$30,149,000; in 1952-53, \$94 million; an increase of over 300 per cent. This is more than the total farm cash income of Saskatchewan farmers in 1938 — \$11 million dollars more than the total Saskatchewan farm cash income in 1947; the total farm cash income in 1936 was only \$25 million more than this. It was not until 1941, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan's cash farm income rose to \$180.8 million. That is not even twice as much as our Provincial Government will likely spend this coming year.

C.C.F. speakers and canvassers talk continually about the 'thirties and why more was not done in the 'thirties; they want more credit for the fact that more is being done now than was being done in the 'thirties. I ask you, or any other person, is that an honest argument? How could a Government spend more than the total farm cash income? On the basis on which the public accounts are now kept (the net basis) the average receipts of our government for the nine years (1935-1943 inclusive) was slightly over \$20 million. The average annual receipts of the government from 1944-1950 inclusive, during the seven years the average receipts were \$43 million — more than double in every year of those seven years, as compared with the previous nine years — \$23 million on the average every year more. On a gross basis the increased amount this government has to spend would be even more striking.

Now, are we getting value for this vastly increased expenditure? From \$30 million to a likely expenditure of \$94 million? An estimated expenditure is \$88 million without taking into account supplementaries. Farmers keep asking me what they are getting out of this increased

expenditure, and I am bound to say, Mr. Speaker, that I find it very difficult to explain that they are getting very much. I see in our neighbouring province, Manitoba, that the farmers are getting, some real benefit from governmental expenditures. There 46 per cent of the farmers are already getting the benefit of cheap electric power; and they have a programme under which 85 per cent of their farmers will be connected with high line electricity within the next five years — 85 per cent. Now this programme is going ahead so fast because the Manitoba Government takes electricity right to the farm buildings without cost to the farmers, and he only pays half the capital cost of that farm electrification programme in his electric light rates, and the other half is carried by the province as a whole. Now that is why they are able, even though the farmer does not have to pay \$600 or \$700 as he does in Saskatchewan to get connected, to charge so much lower rates for this electricity to the farmer, than they have to charge in Saskatchewan.

The Minister argued that Saskatchewan is not as thickly settled as Manitoba, and I agree that parts of it are too sparsely settled to think of bringing farm electrification to those parts, but there is a great portion of Saskatchewan that is thickly enough settled to warrant such a program, and if those parts that warrant such a programme are slightly more sparsely settled than similar parts in Manitoba, it warrants more help from the Government, not less. It has been the experience of all of Europe, except Great Britain, the experience of Nova Scotia, Ontario and Manitoba, that you cannot get a proper farm electrification programme unless you have scarce government subsidization, and that is particularly true in areas where you have relatively sparse settlement as we have on the western plains.

It is certainly easier to go ahead with a programme if you do not have to ask the farmer to put up \$600 or \$700 to get connected, as you do in Saskatchewan. The farmer in Manitoba files the application, and all he has to do then is wire his own house. Why in the world is it that this Government, spending far more money than Manitoba cannot do as much for the farmers as the Manitoba Government is doing? What is the record of connections? The Minister said there was some difficulty in getting materials after the war. Well, if there was any difficulty getting materials for the first few years after the war, I say not to the Minister, but to other people (because the Minister has not made this dishonest claim) — the Minister has never pretended that it would have been possible during the years of depression, and the years of war, to go ahead with a great farm electrification programme, but some C.C.F. speakers and canvassers have made that dishonest claim, and so I am only taking the period from 1947 on, and during that time Manitoba made connections to farmers of over 24,000 while Saskatchewan made 6,757. There is the record of connection.

Now there is another thing I would draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that practically nothing was done in regard to farm electrification, although we demanded it and demanded it from 1945 on, until this Government almost got beaten in 1948, and then they put the present Minister in charge and began to take some steps in that direction. And so I do not think too much credit can be taken by the C.C.F. They did it in fear of their political life.

March 12, 1952

One of the reasons for the lack of farm electrifications in the past — (I am glad the Minister did not make this claim, either), was lack of hydro power. Well, it is quite properly pointed out that you can now generate electricity from natural gas, or from the use of very efficient systems with steam outfits cheaper than you can generate it from some of the hydro electric developments which are today being built. For example, in Saskatoon we have been generating electricity in that steam plant, after having to haul the coal the long distance we have to haul it, for about .9 a kilowatt, so that not having the power (water power) was not such a hindrance as some people made out.

In regard to another matter that farmers are dissatisfied with is the fact that they are still paying the education and hospitalization tax on their farm fuels and greases. They are taxed upon production; farmers in Alberta and Manitoba do not pay such a tax, and if you are farming any amount of land with a tractor, it amounts to quite a substantial tax. This Government, although it is increasing its expenditures at the rate of an average of \$7 million per year, still exacts that tax out of the farmers.

Farmers are still under obligation to pay three cents an acre mineral tax, and as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack), that had no small part in making many farmers sign over their mineral rights, because they did not want to have to pay a tax on something they were not too sure they owned. Some people managed to get control of mineral rights they otherwise would not have had control of, and this government, by its action, certainly played right into the hands of those people.

I have already referred to the Public Revenue Tax. In regard for example, to a municipality, with an assessment of \$4 million, it means that that municipality has to collect even in a poor crop year, or a year of crop failure, from its people on their land or their homes, \$8,000 and send it in to this Government, with its swollen revenues — and while the Government is expanding its expenditures at the rate of an average of \$7 million every year. Is it any wonder that the farmers feel that this Government does not care about them? Is it any wonder that wherever you go, the farmers say, "We are through with this Government?" Well, that is what we hear, anyway.

Our farmers need better market roads; they need them more than ever now when they are relying on cars and trucks to get to town. They see the Federal grants — grants from the Dominion Government increased, including the constitutional subsidy, to \$24 million during the coming year. That is \$15 million more than the Patterson Government ever received — \$15 million more from the Federal Government. They see the estimated receipts from car licenses up by \$1 million over the Patterson Government's highest receipts; they see estimated receipts from the tax on gas up by almost \$5 million. They still have to pay the Public Revenue Tax, under which \$1 3/4 million will be collected, and from those increased revenues alone, the Government will receive \$21 million more.

How much help extra is going to be given to municipalities? According to the speech by the Minister of Highways, the only increase contemplated is in regard to assistance in respect to municipal bridges. If one includes, Mr. Speaker, secondary highways, the total help to rural municipalities and L.I.D.'s in the way of direct grants for bridge work, to assist with the construction and maintenance of roads, including secondary roads, is to be around \$1 1/2 million; less than the amount of the Public Revenue Tax they are holding back from the municipalities. The Minister of Highways seems to think our farmers should be very grateful for this treatment. His government is planning to spend \$58 million more than the Patterson Government spent, and only plans to increase assistance to municipalities by approximately from \$600,000 to \$1,600,000, an increase of \$1 million on an increased expenditure of \$58,000,000. The Minister sought to excuse himself with the time-worn excuse, by going back to 1943-44, when we were in the midst of the greatest war that mankind has ever seen. When machinery was not available — when the boys who might have manned it were either overseas, or in the armed services, or in war industry. Yet he brings that out as an excuse, and tries to give credit to himself because he is doing more than was done in 1943-44. Well, that is not fooling anybody in the province, Mr. Speaker. They are not fooled by these stupid and dishonest arguments.

Now, in regard to schools. We are told that a thousand rural schools have been closed. We are told that 558 are being kept open by study supervisors; that 433 are staffed by partly qualified teachers. Farmers have seen their school taxes rising steadily on their farms, but at the same time are seeing their schools closing or being staffed in increasing numbers by more or less untrained people. They know that teachers have been leaving the Province in hundreds — that 630 teachers left this province in the last two years. They know that 163 less people are in training this year to become teachers in the normal schools and the College of Education than the previous year. Why should our people, Mr. Speaker, put up with that state of affairs? There is no use of the Minister of Education thinking that they are highly satisfied with it.

And what does the Government propose to do about the situation? Estimated receipts from education tax, interest on investment of school lands, funds, education funds, the receipts from school lands, and miscellaneous receipts of the Department of Education, from these items the total is \$9 1/4 million. And what did they do? In order to raise the grant by \$1 1/2 million to \$8 1/2 million, they hang on to \$1 1/2 million of the Public Revenue Tax money. Here the receipts from these educational items amount to \$9 1/4 million dollars, and they have to take municipal money in order to raise the grants to \$8 1/2 million. Does anybody suppose that the taxpayers of this province are going to be satisfied with that state of affairs?

Now then, what would the Liberal Government do? I would say (my friend from Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) may laugh at that) but I think the people of the province want to know. As soon after our election, as soon as possible — at the first session we will abolish the Public Revenue Tax. We will abolish the mineral tax on land owned by farmers. We will at once abolish the educational and hospitalization tax on farm fuels and

March 12, 1952

greases. We will inaugurate a scheme of subsidization of farm electrification along the line followed in Manitoba. We will maintain school grants at the level provided at the present estimates. The cost of doing these things will not exceed \$6 million. This would mean that the increased grant from the Federal Government would be diverted in its entirety to relieving the tax burden on our farmers and municipalities, both urban and rural, in assisting to bring electricity to our farmers in assisting our schools with increased grants on an equalization basis, and in assisting the municipalities in building better market roads.

It is the custom of C.C.F. canvassers to take entire credit for money administered by this Government. For example, old-age pensions and hospital grants. At the same time they pretend the Federal Government at Ottawa has been doing nothing. Leaving aside the work done by the Federal Government directly to promote social welfare, such as family allowances, crop-failure bonus payments, payments towards unemployment insurance, the programme to assist veterans; a contribution was made to the payments administered by the province.

To get some idea of these payments, let us look at the last table in the printed budget speech, where it gives the comparative statement of the gross revenue of the province on revenue account. We find the Dominion of Canada subsidy accounts for \$22.85 per capita, and taxation was \$26.21, but in the miscellaneous receipts there is included \$7.90 per capita to cover payments towards old-age pensions, blind pensions, assistance for education and health. Now, adding those to the \$22.85 we get a total paid by the Federal Government of \$30.82 towards this Government, to assist it to carry on its work. That is \$4.50 more per capita that is raised by taxation that is paid by the people of this province. I admit that \$2 million of that was due under the constitution, but taking that off what do we get? We this situation, that 36.5 per cent of the money spent by this Government, covered by the Budget Speech in the 1950-51 estimates, was paid by the Federal Government to this government, under the financial agreement, or under legislation providing for payment of part of the old-age pensions or otherwise; in other words, more than one-third of the expenditure of this Government were handed to them by the Federal Government, not under any obligation in the constitution, but by virtue of the fact that they are assisting in those services, such as health services, old-age pensions, and so on.

When the C.C.F. speakers and canvassers go out and try to take all credit for what this Government has done, let it be remembered that over 36 per cent of the expenditures being handled by this Government comes from the Federal Government, which is under no constitutional obligation to pay them.

Now I was not surprised to see the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines), this man who has been increasing our expenditures on an average by \$7 million every year — laugh at my suggestion that we were going to give same help to the farmers. But I suppose he will come up tomorrow with the suggestion (or whenever he speaks next), and ask where the money is going, to come from.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — He says, "Hear! Hear!" Well, I will tell him. The increase in payments by the Dominion Government amounts to \$4 million. The balance we can easily make up by ceasing to increase expenditures at the rate of \$7 million per year. We will cease to use people working for the Government for political purposes. We will cease to put out party propaganda at public expense. We will cease to waste public funds. Let me give some examples of what I mean:

Take for example — and a very good example — of a sheer waste of public funds — is this book that was circulated by the Minister of Agriculture at a cost to the people of this province of \$4,950. In the front of it appears "With the Compliments of the Hon. I.C. Nollet, Minister of Agriculture". We are told that he sent out 2,200 over this province. Now, there are some good ideas in this book, but there are also some ideas that I submit, Mr. Speaker, we should not be spending public money on, in circulating it all over the province. I am going to read a paragraph, Mr. Speaker, but I will not read the whole paragraph, because there are some things in this paragraph that I would not want to read over the air. I will leave them out. Here is what is in this book, sent out at public expense, by the Minister of Agriculture:

"Vigorous birth-control campaigns, using all educational and advertising techniques, should also be organized by individual countries. Contraception should, of course, be voluntary. There is more than a little merit in the suggestion made many years ago by H.L. Menchen of sterilization bonuses, small but adequate amounts of money to be paid to anyone, especially the males, who would agree to the simple sterilization operation . . .

Now I leave something out here, and go on:

"Since such a bonus would appeal primarily to the world's shiftless, it would probably have a favourable, selective influence. In the point of view of society, it certainly would be preferable to pay permanently indigent individuals, many of whom would be physically and psychologically marginal, \$50 or \$100, rather than to support their off-spring that by both genetic and social inheritance would tend to perpetuate the shiftless."

We are spending public money to send that sort of thing broadcast over this Province. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that any Liberal Government will not waste public money like that.

March 12, 1952

Take another item. Mr. Black, head of our industrial development — he goes about the province making political speeches. He went down to Yorkton last March, and made what I would consider a political speech. His bill of expense amounted to \$22 and some cents; that does not allow for salary he was paid on that work. His voucher, I think, indicated that he was supposed to be there on business of some sort for the Government. Now let us see what he did while he was in Yorkton. March 1 he made a speech, reported in the Yorkton Enterprise.

Premier Douglas: — Would my hon. friend tell us who he made the speech to?

Mr. Tucker: — I will tell you later — he made it to the Chamber of Commerce, and this is what he said: Mr. Black spoke on the part that the Provincial Government plays in the industrial development of Saskatchewan, and said:

"The Government in some quarters has received severe criticism which he claimed, was not coming to them."

He said he wanted to tell briefly what this C.C.F. Government had done, and then he went on:

"I would like to ask you if the Government going into business has hurt any of you?" We only took over industries which might be called monopolies, and which the Government felt might serve the public better if operated by them."

C.C.F. Propaganda — that's all . . . then he went on to say:

"We in the C.C.F. feel we have a job to do."

The cost of this is being paid by the people of this country, and he says he and the C.C.F. feel we have a job to do. Then he said:

"I did not intend to spend as long as I have on this phase of my remarks."

He apologizes for spending so much time defending the C.C.F. in this speech. Of course, this does not please the Premier. He went on to say, "Tommy Douglas has done more for all the seven provinces of Canada in fighting the two central provinces, than any other man."

Now then, this was a very good propaganda speech; it was much better than most of the Ministers make, but why should the people of this province have to pay people to run around this province and make propaganda speeches for this Government? And that is one of the ways in which we will save money.

Now let me give you another example. The present Minister of Public Health was appointed to this job of staff-training, or something of the sort, and of the things he was supposed to do was train the civil servants in better public relations — training them to be more polite, or something like that, I think. And of course he did such a good job on that, that this man who was paid by the people of this province — he was taken right into the government of the province. Well, he is an old colleague of mine, and I am glad to see him in office for the time being; I would rather see him than some others; but after he left, Mr. Castleden, former C.C.F. member for Yorkton, was taken on the Government payroll. I will not take time to go over all his travellings during the time, and which were paid for by the people of this province, but I will just indicate some of his travelling. During 1950-51 he went to Weyburn (that was a good place to go to, Canora, Carrot River, Green Lake, Mossbank, Moose Jaw, Lestock, North Battleford, Bankend, Wishart — lots of civil servants there, I suppose — Melville Indian Head, Theodore, — lots of civil servants there, too — Francis, Wawota, Moosomin, Kamsack; he went to Lebret twice, to Prince Albert twice, three times to Fort Qu'Appelle (three times as much attention given to Fort Qu'Appelle than North Battleford or Weyburn), but here is the interesting thing; apparently the civil servants in Yorkton really need supervision in regard to being polite, because he went 12 times to Yorkton, during that time. But that is not all — we find he went on a trip to Bethel, Maine, in the United States, in a Government car to attend a Laboratory on Group development (whatever that is). He left on June 21, visited Montreal, Toronto, Buffalo — and got back into the Province in his Government car on July 16 — paid for by the people of this province.

I protest against things like that, Mr. Speaker, where we should have paid some of this money to assist the farmers of this province and other people. Another example of the misuse of public funds, (and I cannot call it anything else than that) — this election booklet called "Progress — 1952" — just an election booklet — election propaganda, trying to extol the virtues of this Government. A similar booklet was put out in 1948 — I do not think it was quite so elaborate, and it cost \$9,946 to put out that bit of election campaigning literature at the expense of the people of this province. An absolutely unjustified expenditure of public funds.

It is in regard to such items as this that we would save money. We all have heard about this imported planner, Mr. G.W. Cadbury, who was brought in to help the members opposite run this Province for several years, and we find that they threw a dinner for him that cost the people of this province \$253. I say this, that if the members of the C.C.F. Party and Government wanted to entertain Mr. Cadbury, they should not have done it at public expense.

When the present Government came into office there were 136 motor vehicles — now there are 626, an increase of almost 500. People know how much it costs to run a motor car, and they also know that the civil service has been increased by 64 per cent. This increase apparently

has been put in motor cars, and the number of inspectors have been increased, and then the present Government thoughtfully provided that if these inspectors, if they were so-minded, could engage in political activities. That is a retrograde step. It is a part of the British idea of Government that civil servants should work for the Government, no matter what party he belongs to, and once they are put under that permission to work politically, what effect does it have? For example, collections are made for the party. A person that may not want to support the C.C.F. at all knows that somebody else is contributing, and it somehow may tell against him if he does not. He knows that somehow or other, somebody else may be doing some political work. He knows that somehow or other that may tell against him when it comes to a question of promotion, and of course it puts the whole civil service under pressure to engage in political action. And what is the effect of it? The effect of that is this: that if the Government changes, many civil servants have pressed into engaging in political work, and that has been brought to the attention of the Government that takes the place; it then endangers the position of the civil service employee who has engaged in political work.

What do the C.C.F. care? How they mistreat the civil servants by actions like this, which does not exist in Great Britain, and was done away with 25 years ago in Canada? The Canadian Civil Service Act today cannot be repealed except by the vote of the Senate, and the House of Commons protects them. There has never been any suggestion by the Liberal Government that it would be repealed. The Canadian Civil Service Commission make the appointment, regardless of politics, and everybody knows that. But what about this Government? Why did they put it in the statutes that civil servants could engage in politics, and then appoint somebody to go around the province contacting them? Well, after all, the people of this Province can see through these things. They understand what this government is trying to do. It is trying to set up the heaviest manned and best equipped political machine that exists in any province in Canada today. That is where a lot of public money has been going that should have been going to help the farmers, and help take off taxes upon the farmers, and help pay grants to keep down the taxes in regard to schools, and so on. We will do away with that misuse of the Civil Service if the Liberals are elected. We will do away with that.

Mr. Kuziak (Canora): — It is a laughing matter!

Mr. Tucker: — . . . this interests me, this laughing about the promises that we make. You know, one of the things that we are told is that there is a tendency for people to judge others according to what is in their own hearts.

Some Hon. Members (Opposition): — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — And these people are so conscious of a long line of unbroken promises on which they got into office that when somebody else comes along and makes some definite promises, which are reasonable, they cannot believe that anybody can be sincere. They could not reflect on themselves worse.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You sound scared already.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, I know some people laugh at sincerity. They do not believe in it. I can understand that after the actions I have seen of some of the hon. members opposite, I am not surprised. Now one of the things they like to indulge in, and I am hearing it all the time, that some of these workers go along, trying to create the impression that if the C.C.F. will be beaten in the next election; they may be adversely affected in regard to mothers' allowances, old-age pensions, or something of the sort. Well, there it is. I tell the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) that he is telling what he knows to be untrue.

Along that line it is sometimes suggested that the hospitalization plan would be involved and endangered. I want to tell the people of this province that this is absolute, unadulterated nonsense. It is put forward by people who figure they have lost the confidence of the people, and are now trying to frighten them into supporting them. If a Liberal Government is elected, no social services will be curtailed; the hospitalization plan will be continued; if we can improve its administration, in consultation with municipalities and hospital authorities and doctors and nurses, we will try to do so, but nobody needs to fear that the election of a Liberal Party means in any way the interference with hospitalization plan, or the carrying on of any social services that are presently being enjoyed by the people of this Province. Let there be no mistake about that.

This campaign of fear and misrepresentation, which the members opposite know in their own hearts is untrue; I hope that the people of the province will recognize it for what it is — a despicable campaign of attempting to create fear. Nor let it be suggested that this represents a change in the policy of the Liberal Party. Let us look at the record of the party. When I consider the record of the Liberal party in this province, and in the Dominion of Canada, I marvel at the cheek and impudence of the members opposite who try to pretend that they are responsible for the social welfare set-up in this province. Here they are — getting over a third of all the money that they handle from the Federal Government itself, under payments which the Federal Government makes because it is part of Liberal policy, and not because it has to.

Some Hon. Member (Government): — . . . what about that Rosthern deal?

Mr. Tucker: — I do not know what you are talking about — the Rosthern deal — I know you would like to bring up something, and I told you you could bring up anything you want against me, but you are not going to scare me from doing my duty for the people of this province. You have tried it and you have failed. That is all. There again — intimidation — an attempt to do that sort of thing.

Let me deal for a moment, with that campaign of intimidation.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — (Interruption)

Mr. Tucker: — Well, when the people of Kelsey constituency get through with the Minister of Natural Resources, he won't be so chipper as he is now.

March 12, 1952

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not even expect to be so chipper as I am now — 20 years from now.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I said when they get through with you at the next election — not 20 years from now, I hope.

Now, I was dealing with the Liberal party's record. I know that the C.C.F. tried to pretend in booklets they put out, that they were responsible for the free T.B. treatment in this Province; they tried to steal the credit for that, but the fact remains that it was introduced by the Liberals. And they tried to take credit for the plan for free cancer treatment, the basis of this was inaugurated under the regime of the co-operative government; and then the full plan was put through this House in 1944, when as the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) showed estimates of \$215,000 were provided to start the plan in operation. Have they not tried to take credit for that? I never have been anything quite so dishonest in public life, as this attempt to take credit for the T.B. plan, and for the free cancer treatment. People who will do that, of course, will as you might expect, do almost anything, and some of the things which have happened under this Government should not have surprised the people of this Province.

Approximately one-half of the municipalities of this province had free hospital, or provision for free hospital or doctor treatment at the time this Government was elected, and the Liberal Party introduced the mothers' Allowances in the province; it introduced workmen's compensation; it introduced the old-age pensions; the blind pensions in this province and these people have the sheer effrontery to run around and tell people, "Don't put us out; you may lose your old-age pension; don't put us out." That is the sort of thing they go around telling. I want to tell them — this will not work. The people of this province know probably a good deal more about the history of the province than they are given credit for.

Now, let us look at the record of our party at Ottawa. You know, people speak very harshly about people with no pride of ancestry. While I was listening to the Minister of Natural Resources, trying to make out that members of all the old parties were either machine-ridden or foolish, or almost everything else that he could think of, so far as I was concerned, I thought of some people that I, as a Canadian, am pretty proud of, regardless of politics. Sir John A., the first Prime Minister of this country; Sir Wilfred Laurier, who did so much to build it up; I thought of my own father, for example; and I thought of other great men who were pioneers in this country and province, and when those people were pointed out and said to be not nearly as intelligent and enlightened as the people who happen to belong to the C.C.F. today, I just wondered what people must have been thinking of the Minister of Natural Resources, and what a lot of people who heard him might have thought — even people who belong to the C.C.F. party, and who had not such a low opinion of their own fathers as he seems to feel they should have.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Hanley): —(Interruption)

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I will not say anything to the member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker), because he knows that it is now or never as far as Hanley is concerned.

Hon. Members (Opposition): — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — Now, in regard to the record of our party — old-age pension; pensions for the blind; unemployment insurance; family allowances; the veterans' assistance; (I am very interested in that, and had some small share in it, and as far as I am concerned, am very proud that I had that chance to be of service to my fellow service men).

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . birth control.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, if you would look after your Department a little bit more, and not undertake to educate the people in birth-control, it would be better for this province.

Then we have the old-age assistance plan. It is sheer nonsense for the C.C.F. to attempt to claim credit for these measures. They were passed by Liberal Governments . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I am sure that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not going to leave the impression with the Public that I favour birth-control. He read certain extracts, but he did not read my covering correspondence, Mr. Speaker, and I went to say here and now that as a Christian and a Roman Catholic, I am absolutely opposed to any form of birth-control.

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): — Why did you send out the book, then?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I want to put that right on the records of this House, and if I have to take any religious instructions, I do not need to take it from the hon. members opposite.

Mr. Tucker: — Now, I do not think this is the place to discuss religion at all, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is what you are trying to do.

Mr. Tucker: — What I said was this, that if the Minister would look after his department, and not try to educate people in birth-control, it would be better for the province. What more is it, to send out a book at public expense containing these things, if it is not an attempt to educate people in that? I do not care what the Minister may say about his personal beliefs, but I say that a book like that containing those ideas should not be circulated at public expense. I do not care if the Minister does not believe in it or not; if he does not believe in it, then he should all the more not have sent it out.

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): — Try to tell the agriculturists that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

March 12, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — If you had just kept quiet, this would not have happened.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — (Interruption)

Mr. Tucker: — And I will tell you some more, if you want it. There is another book too, which you sent out with a letter referring to the Road to Survival, indicating that you must have read it, or you would not have referred to it in the letter sending out "The Pursuit of Plenty" a year later.

Will the Minister just explain why he sent out a letter, when he sent out the "Pursuit of Plenty", indicating that this book, "Road to Survival" was worth studying? Now, just keep on interfering, and you will get some more, Mr. Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I do not agree, Mr. Speaker. Why did Dr. Archibald invite Professor Vogt up to Canada to speak and lecture to the agriculturists in Ottawa? There are quite a lot of things that the Leader of the Opposition does not know . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I suggest you speak after I get through . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You'll hear about this, don't worry.

Mr. Tucker: — All right, I expect to hear about it. I would like to hear about it — I would like to hear why public money is used to circulate things like that. I would just like to hear about it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You bet you'll hear about it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Tucker: — I was saying that on these measures . . . the Federal Government will be spending \$771 million on them this year; that is more than \$2 million today. Here is a party which I am proud to belong to, because its record of service to this country, and to the people of this country, with this record that is not bettered in the world anywhere, and what is the proof of that? The proof is not those beautiful books put out, with beautiful pictures. You can get similar books from the Soviet Union today — nicer pictures than you have got even in your "Progress — 1952" — nicer pictures, but that does not prove that conditions are better there. The thing that proves whether conditions are better or not, is where do the people want to go, and what are they trying to get away from? The fact that people will sometimes risk their lives to get away from these Socialist states and get to Canada — that is the proof that things are better here than over there — not in beautiful books; and I say that Canada has been brought up to her present position in the world under either Conservative or Liberal Governments; I am proud of what my country has done, and what our country has done, ever since it has been started, and when the C.C.F. try to pretend that other people have not the desire to serve their fellow-man, and have not got a record such as I just put on record here, and use public funds to try and scare people into voting for them — then as far as I am concerned, I am going to stand up and face all the threats that can be made as to what is going to be done to me; I am still going to go ahead and tell people what I think about these things. This thing has been laughed at. I refer to an example of jeering at me.

Mr. Kuziak (Canora): — Poor fellow!

Mr. Tucker: — I am not worried — I am not asking for sympathy. I am glad of it, because you people are showing yourselves up for what you are. Now, just let me deal with one thing. I, in partnership with somebody else, took a lease on some land on an Indian reserve, with the consent of the Indians, Under that lease — first of all the lease was advertised for sale, and nobody applied for it. This man was farming some land for me, and he came to me and said, "Will you help me out with the finances? Will you go in with me . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Have you ever farmed yourself?

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, I have farmed myself. I will answer that. I have farmed myself. I was born and brought up on a farm. I milked cows; I looked after the horses; I plowed; I walked behind the harrow; I put up hay; when we did not have power equipment, I stooked; I drove a binder; I looked after horses and cattle; I drew feed when it was 30 below; yes, I have farmed, and it would be a better thing for this province if there were more farmers in the present Government.

Some Hon. Members (Government): — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — I am glad that I got "Hear! Hear!" from someplace over there.

Premier Douglas: — That's three to one for you!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I was dealing with the attack upon myself. I do know it was brought out that I was interested in farming. This ineffable sheet, the Commonwealth, had something in it that in a way jeered me because I was a farmer. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not ashamed of having been a farmer, and of being directly interested in farming today. Well, that amuses some of the members opposite. I want to tell them that my grandfather was a pioneer . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — Who wants to know about your grandfather?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, whether you like to hear it or not — well, I am not going to be sorry that you are leaving. You are just pre-staging what is going to happen to you at the hands of the people.

My grandfather came to this country and started to farm in Ontario — Gray country over 100 years ago; my father came to the Portage Plains and took up a farm there in 1889; I was born and brought up on the farm and farmed until I enlisted when was 18 years of age, and as soon as I got back from overseas and was able to earn and save a little bit of money, I naturally did what anyone of that background would do — I invested it in buying a piece of land up at Rosthern. I have been directly interested in farming for the last 25 years. Well, that amuses the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet). Well, that that will be interesting to the farmers of this province. I was a member of the Wheat Pool for the last 25 years, and I am just as much interested in farming today as any farmer in this House — directly interested in it, and when this young man came to me and said, "Here is a piece of land that nobody else has applied for;

March 12, 1952

let's go in together and make it part of our farm unit," I do not see anything wrong with that. I was not infringing on the Legislative Assembly Act; it was from the Federal Government with the consent of the Indians.

I do not know what is so funny about it to cause the laugh from the Minister of Agriculture — I do not know what is so funny about that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I do not know what you are so worried about.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I am not worried at all; I am just dealing with your attitude towards myself, and this has been talked about — it has been thrown at me by two Ministers of the Crown since this session started. This very thing — I was accused of having had land grants — an absolute lie, that's all.

Here is this deal — we cleared the land of bush, and there was fairly heavy bush on it; we break it up, we pay a quarter of the crop, we pay the taxes, and we give that land back, all cleared and under cultivation to the Indians in seven years. Isn't that a terrible thing for me to undertake something like that? Well, I suppose — it seems to amuse these people on the other side. Is it any wonder that anyone who has been interested in farming all his life, born and brought up a farmer, that he likes to have some interest in farming, even though he goes into some other profession. This should be the last legislature in the whole of Canada, for anyone who takes an interest in farming and engages in farming, that he should be laughed at for that reason.

Well, I will say this (the Minister of Agriculture continues to jeer), that I did not have any land leased from a government of which I was a member.

Now then, I said that the best proof of whether conditions are good in the country is whether you want to go to that country, or whether you want to get away from it. Now, my hon. friend from Estevan (Mr. McCormack) has dealt with that situation, but one of the things sometimes overlooked as we talk about the decrease (the Premier took great pains to have it make clear that the decrease in population in the last five years was less than 1,000). I do not blame him for that, because when it is getting down to figures like that naturally every 1,000 counts.

Premier Douglas: — We did not have anywhere near 100,000 like you did.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, but we left when the depression hit the west; they left during the period of war. I know, the members opposite laugh about the war . . . yes, they laugh about that. Do they really laugh about that? I cannot understand that.

Some Hon. Members (Government): — We are not laughing.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, nobody was laughing. Then I must be hearing things, because I heard a very loud laugh from across the way when I mentioned war.

Mr. Erb: — You even misconstrue laughs.

Some Hon. Member: — You did not leave during the war.

Mr. Tucker: — In regard to this question.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, we are getting a little tired of this, he cannot stop playing the hero, he has commented on his war service so often now that it is becoming a little monotonous.

Mr. Tucker: — I do not think anyone is playing the hero.

Premier Douglas: — I was not referring to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Tucker: — That has even been laughed at by Ministers of this Government — "my" war service; just because I served as a private during the first war, and did not have a commission or something, that was laughed at by the Minister of Social Welfare.

Some Government Members: — Oh no, it was not.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes it was, and my war record was sneered at. Lots of good boys go through the war as a Private.

Mr. Speaker: — It was created by the member for Estevan for making some reference to the member from Milestone; that is what the hon. member was saying.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, the Minister of Social Welfare himself served as a private and I am quite sure that at no time did he remark . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Well, he jeered at my war record.

Premier Douglas: — Well, I am of the opinion that my hon. friend must be super-sensitive.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I am not super-sensitive at all. I can stand a great deal, but the time comes when people should know just the sort of thing that is carried on by the members opposite. I think they should know that this sort of thing of laughing and jeering at people jeering at the war records, jeering at the fact that a person is interested in farming, engaged in farming, jeering at anything to try and belittle people. Well, it is high time that the people of this province knew the sort of people that are sitting in the C.C.F. Party in this province, on the floor of this House. It is high time.

Now then, in regard to, I would say, the best proof of whether a country is a good country to live in or not is whether people leave it or try to come to it.

Some Hon. Members: — (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. The members will kindly refrain from interrupting . . .

March 12, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — I do not mind at all, Mr. Speaker, It just gives me further opportunity to bring to the public attention the sort of thing that we have to put up with here. Now then, I was saying that the suggestion was made that we have only lost less than 1,000 in population in the last five years, but the natural increase, the surplus of births over deaths in Saskatchewan, was in the neighbourhood of 78,000, actually 77,872. In other words, we lost our natural increase plus that 1,000; or in other words we lost, on the average, during the last five years, about 15,000 every year, who left this province. Now can it be pretended that we have had real development during that period, when 15,000 people a year had to leave our province to get work elsewhere? Well, I think that is a complete answer to any figures that may be brought forward to show that we have had development. Especially when we have had such development in all the other provinces around us. It is not for lack of resources, Mr. Speaker, it is not the lack of these. Their own Director of Industrial Development said this in a speech:

"Unquestionably Saskatchewan has much more oil than Alberta. We have minerals the like of which Alberta has not now nor ever will have."

I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I believe that is right, but is it not too bad that here we are, with these great resources, far beyond that of Manitoba or Alberta, and they are going ahead by leaps and bounds and this, the only Socialist province in Canada, is losing population at the rate of 15,000 every year.

Well, I think, and somebody said on the other side of the House, when the people come to vote they are going to say: "We are very much more interested in having our province go ahead in proportion to the ability of its people and its great basic natural resources; we are much more interested in that than in the fortunes of the C.C.F. Party."

I do not say anything about the first three years they were in office, when we were in the midst of scarcities and troubles following the war, but during the last four and a half years, when other parts of Canada forged ahead, all we have had from the C.C.F. has been suggestions that this industry is looking into the situation and another industry is looking into the situation, and that we are on the verge of having some great developments. I was looking over speeches made in 1948; I suppose they will be trotted out again. Then, we were on the verge of getting a pulp factory, we were on the verge of getting a ceramics factory, we were on the verge of great industrial development, and here they are going backwards, when other parts of Canada, as I say, have forged ahead and have increased in population — every one of these provinces, and we have lost population at the rate of 15,000 every year.

There is no use talking about the period before 1946, the period of depression and war which hit all of Canada. There is no use of the C.C.F. doing that. The thing the people will look at will be what happened when the rest of the country, particularly Manitoba and Alberta began to forge ahead. What happened to you? And you are the Socialist Government of Saskatchewan.

Now, somebody said the other day that I had said there would not be any oil discovered while this Government was in office. To

my knowledge, I never said any such thing and never thought it. I will tell you why . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — You back out of a lot of things.

Mr. Tucker: — My attitude is this, I have watched what has happened in countries in the Middle East, for example, where they have the most backward and most untrustworthy governments on the face of the globe, but if they had enough natural resources and enough riches somebody would take that risk, just like they would take any other chance. A Socialist Government is just an extra handicap to the development of a province. They have a basic policy here in this Party which they endorsed at the last convention in the Regina Manifesto. That policy means that they reserve the right to take over any of these natural resources whenever any convention so decides.

Then the Premier writes a letter to these companies and announcements are made that they will not live up to that Socialist programmes. But people who are thinking of investing millions here never know, they fear the C.C.F. may suddenly say: "Well, we insist on living up to our programme," and so people, in their choice between areas of equal riches in regard to natural resources, will say: "We will go to the country or the province where we do not face that risk." But, in spite of that risk, you will get some development. These people know we have great resources and they want to hold a place in the development of those resources if they can. That is all it means. It does not mean we are getting the development we should get. It just means that these people are going ahead, doing the developments on the scale they feel that is justified by the extra risks they are taking in a province like this, which at present is regarded as a Socialist province.

Now, in regard to natural resources. I do not intend to say very much about that, except to make it very plain what our programme will be in that regard. We would administer the oil, gas and mineral resources with the sole purpose in mind in protecting and promoting the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan. Risk capital, knowing it need not fear ultimate confiscation, would enter this province, as it is entering other provinces today, on better terms to the province, because they would not have that extra risk to undergo. We would not make deals such as those made with Rhubbra, under which he stands, and his associates, the identity of which we still do not know, may make large sums of money because they got control of millions of acres of oil land in this province. They were able to turn them over to other companies, with an over-riding royalty retained by themselves.

We will arrange, if elected, Mr. Speaker, for an investigation of the various deals involving our natural resources, concerning which we have not received satisfactory explanations and answers in this House. This investigation will receive the full support and co-operation of a Liberal Government. All necessary assistance will be provided, records will be made available, and all civil servants will be assured that they can testify and produce those records without fear of harming their position or prospects in the civil service.

Some Hon. Members (Opposition): — Hear! Hear!

March 12, 1952

Premier Douglas: — I wish to remind my hon. friend I offered him an investigation last year.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, know. The hon. Premier would have liked very much to have had an investigation under his auspices where, of course, an investigation cannot get any place if the government is not prepared to make all records available, if it is not ready to co-operate, if civil servants might be afraid to come forth with information. Without a government anxious to get at the bottom of these things, even under a most able commission, an investigation might have been, in spite of their best efforts, nothing but a smothering up of the real facts.

What the people of this province want is to get at the bottom of these deals and find out what really happened, and they will never find out unless they change the government and put in a Liberal Government. Those who have not been involved in any improper deals need have no fear, but if it is found that our resources have been handed out to enrich a few selected persons at the expense of the province as a whole, appropriate action will be taken in every way.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? Just exactly what does he mean by "appropriate action?"

Mr. Tucker: — Just exactly what I say, Mr. Speaker. Let the Minister understand that. My final word would be this; if this government is defeated and replaced by a Liberal Government, real development and prosperity will come to our province. It will begin to forge ahead again — yes, again, like it did up until 1931 when we became the third province in point of population in Canada. It will begin to forge ahead again. All will benefit by that prosperity. Our farmers, our working people, our workers in the field of education and health, our children in the schools. We have nothing to lose, by removing this Government from office and the hope of much benefit to the people of this province, by replacing it with a Liberal Government.

I say to the people of Saskatchewan, let us get rid of this Government and begin to go forward together again.

Hon. J.W. Corman (Attorney General, Q.C.): — Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) on the presentation of the Budget. I may say that I did not intend to enter the Budget Debate and I do not intend to speak for more than five or ten minutes. I am not here to follow the two barristers on the opposite side who just sat down. Either they have been answered, or they will be well answered before this session is over. The field for reply is so wide and so inviting that if I entered that field, I am afraid I would not get on to the few things that I feel I should say on the Budget Debate.

I was not amused, but I was interested in the optimism either felt or pretended by my good friend from Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack). He pretends to be confident of a Liberal victory. Now, it may be he is sincere, or he may be whistling in the dark to keep up his own courage, or the courage of his followers, but it is not for that reason I referred to it. I, personally, hope the Liberals will continue to boast — or continue to hold out the — what I might say, the fear of a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan, so as to get the C.C.F.'ers on their toes and working. I am going to preach the gospel of the election being close, because there is only one thing that can beat the C.C.F. in this province and that is complacency, cockiness and too much dependence on the good record of the government, without doing enough work. I really hope that my good friends will continue pretending in any event that there is the danger of a Liberal Government taking over. That is all I have to say in regard to anything that has been said.

My friend from Souris-Estevan referred to — he brought out the old chestnut — I do not think it originated with him — that if he had a few thousand votes to play around with in the right constituencies, he could have defeated enough members on this side of the House to have elected a Liberal Government. That would mean defeating, I suppose seven or eight here. Well, it is a silly game — I say it did not originate with the member — but it is a silly game. Sometimes I do not mind playing silly games. There were 500,000 votes cast in the election of 1948. If he will give me 5,000 out of that half a million, I can defeat every member sitting opposite. If there is any skin of your teeth about it, Mr. Speaker, it is not on this side of the House.

My learned friend from Souris-Estevan spoke in Moose Jaw at a rally not long ago. He was accompanied by a prominent member of the Women's Regina Liberal Association. She spoke on industrial stagnation. My good friend, from press reports, had the good judgment not to mention that in Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker. This lady did not — I understand that, our good friend, Mayor "Scoop" Lewry had to impose a curfew on the sound of hammers and saws so that the good lady could be heard talking about the industrial stagnation, but the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) — the theme of his remarks was that the C.C.F. had lost strength in the rural areas. As two lawyers, I do not think neither of us knows anything about that, but I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to go to the records and to the last object lesson we had was in the by-election in Gravelbourg in July last year, 1951. My good friend, I can refer to him by name as the candidate of that time, Ed Walker, who is now a member, took the seat from the Liberals by a majority, I think it was 77, but the C.C.F. candidate, Mr. Walker, went into the urban centres of Gravelbourg, Mazonod and LaFleche with a majority of dirt farmers behind them of 500. I only mention that, Mr. Speaker. I believe the record probably is more reliable than what either of us lawyers think about it, and that by-election showed that the dirt farmers are still behind the C.C.F. I think, Mr. Speaker, I could enjoy myself in a happy way if I could continue, but I only have a few minutes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Budget Debate a Minister has the opportunity of discussing the work of the department. May I say this in view of the limited time I have, especially this afternoon, I am going to leave most of that for the estimates. I would like to report, however, that we are still doing business at the old stand, and I would like to say

this, that if mistakes are made in my department and they are made in all departments, they have been mistakes of judgment. There have been no mistakes made because of politics or personal favouritism. I believe the House will believe me when I say that. I would like to just make a passing reference to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who, under the Act, come under my jurisdiction or supervision. I may say that our relations with them are excellent. They know that they are expected to enforce the law without fear or favour, with the tolerance, Mr. Speaker, in the way of warning that they feel should be given, but there is absolutely no political interference with the police that enforce the laws in this province. I was told by an officer of the R.C.M.P. outside of the province that every member of the force, every member of the R.C.M.P. in Canada likes to be transferred to Saskatchewan under the C.C.F. Government that now is in power because there is no political interference with their activities.

Might I pay a compliment, or whatever the word is, to the staff with whom I have to work. A Department, Mr. Speaker, is just as strong and no stronger than the quality of the personnel who work in that department. And I want to pay a tribute here to the loyalty, the co-operation and to the public-spiritedness of everyone who is associated with me. That includes my Secretary, the Deputy Attorney-General, it includes all the law officers, it includes the stenographical and clerical help, either in the building or in the my offices we have throughout the Province. It includes the official guardian, the Master of Titles, all our sheriffs, local registrars, the registrars of Land Titles Offices, the coroners, the magistrates, the agents of the Attorney General, and all others; if I have omitted any who work with me in discharging the duties set out in the Attorney General's Act.

Mr. Speaker, attached to my department, or to myself as Minister are a number of Boards or branches. There is the Local Government Board, the Mediation Board and the branch that administers the estates of the mentally incompetent. I do not think that there will be any difference of opinion that those boards and branches are doing a good job in view of the difficulties of their work, and in view in some cases, of the controversial nature of the work they have to do. I want to say that there is the minimum of ministerial interference with the functioning of those boards. I believe that is the way that this legislature, on both sides of the House, want it, and I believe that is the way the people of this Province want it.

Mr. Speaker, if I should pick out the Mediation Board for special mention, it is only because of the nature of its work, work that brings it before the public eye, probably more than some of the other activities of the Department. Now, the Mediation Board has to do with debt adjustment, and with protection to deserving debtors, among other things, it has to do with those. It is, I think, providing a useful service in that regard. I can give this assurance, that as long as this Government remains in power, the Provincial Mediation Board will be maintained as a strong militant force to protect where necessary the weak against the strong. It is well known that rent control comes under the Provincial Mediation Board. I believe there, as in other things, they are doing as good a job as is humanly

possible. Now, poetic justice cannot be achieved in such matters as fixing rents or deciding either for or against evictions — but I believe the decision of the board by and large have been fair to both landlords and tenants, and here I would like to say that the majority of landlords in this province have accepted the necessity for rent control just as the government has been forced to accept it, and have been, the majority of them, playing the game.

I might say that the primary purpose of setting up rent control was protection and security for tenants where necessary and deserving, and the Leasehold Regulation Act, Mr. Speaker, has served that purpose. The percentage increase in rentals in Saskatchewan since our Act was brought into force has been less than in any other province.

As is known, certain constitutional conferences have been held — called by the Prime Minister of Canada, first attended by the Premiers of the different provinces and sub-committees attended by the Attorney General. Whether those conferences are going to be reconvened or not, I do not know. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that just recently a counterpart in the Province of Quebec, Mr. Revard, called Solicitor General there, on February 22 last — that would be within the last two weeks — in a radio address, issued what I consider an ultimatum, not only to the Federal Government, but to the other provinces that Quebec could thwart the will of other provinces, and the Dominion if she so desired. I intended to read the address, but I have not time. In reply to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this province is issuing no ultimatums; but in answer to the ultimatum that has been issued, I want to say that if the constitutional conferences are reconvened, it might as well be known now that as long as there is a C.C.F. Government in power in Saskatchewan, this province will never consent to any formula that gives Quebec or any other province a veto over amendments to the B.N.A. Act. That is our answer to this ultimatum from Quebec, and I think the people in this province will support us in it.

Mr. Tucker: — That's the attitude of the Federal Government, isn't it?

Premier Douglas: — We don't know; they have never stated their attitude . . .

Hon. Mr. Corman: — Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I will just close on a local or a constituency note. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that Moose Jaw will return two C.C.F. mayors. Moose Jaw, along with the rest of the province, has prospered under this Douglas Government, and she is not going back to the days of Liberal administration when Moose Jaw was just dark spot on the map. Now, Mr. Speaker, Moose Jaw has no aspiration to be the largest city in Saskatchewan. We will let Regina and Saskatoon thresh that out, if they care to. Population, Mr. Speaker, whether it be rural population or urban population is not an end in itself. Moose Jaw's ambition is to be a city of happy, contented people, good neighbours, good citizens, with their fair share of prosperity and security, and that ambition has come, Mr. Speaker, closer to realization in the last eight years than ever before. It is hardly necessary for me to say that along with the majority of people in the friendly city, I will support the motion.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate our Provincial Treasurer on the — not only on the way he presented this budget to the legislative Assembly, but on the long term of very excellent service he has given to this province in leading the way and managing the financial affairs of this province. I think this province does owe a debt of gratitude to the Provincial Treasurer for the job he has done. It is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of record, that the successive budgets brought down in this legislature have been good budgets, and have not only brought benefits to the people in this province, but have also enhanced the economic and financial position of this province throughout the Dominion of Canada, and in fact throughout the North American continent. I hope that I may be able at least in a small degree, to bask in some of the reflected glory that falls on the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) for this work, in that the policies in regard to the development of the resources of this Province have probably made a contribution to the successful improvement of the financial and economic position of this province, not only here, but its standing in the financial centres of this continent.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) this afternoon spoke of the booklet "Progress, 1952." He took very strong objection to it. It is a factual report to the people of the province of Saskatchewan; things that have been done in the Province of Saskatchewan during the past years.

Mr. Loftson: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the hon. Minister about the refineries?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, not just now, Mr. Speaker. I have read a good many booklets put out by the Federal Government departments on their work giving what I assumed was, and what I hope was a factual report of the work of those departments, and I believe that the people of Canada appreciate having those booklets so as to know what was being done by the various Departments of health, and welfare, and so on, and so forth, throughout the Federal Government. But, my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, never got up to say that that was political propaganda, and of course, the only hope that my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has to get any place politically in this province is first, that the people of the province will not get the facts with regard to what has been done, and second, that they will only have as a source of information, the speeches that he makes, and his colleagues make, in this House and throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. You know, it would not take a very big book, perhaps this is one of the reasons why the Leader of the Opposition does not like Progress, 1952, because it is quite a large book, and it is worthwhile reading, but it should not take a very big book to hold the achievements of the Liberal Party for eight years. They could certainly save some money. It would cost a lot less to publish that. I know that the Leader of the Opposition was mistaken this afternoon when he said that we laughed and jeered at him, and at the fact that he was a farmer, the fact that he had leased a piece of land from the Department of Indian Affairs. No, he missed the point. We have cause to laugh, but that is not what we were laughing at. What does make us

laugh, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Leader of the Opposition can talk so much about Provincial leases of land and then all of a sudden we find him in the position of being a tenant with less security and probably not as good a deal as we could give him if he were a farmer, and not a member of this legislature. We were not laughing, or jeering at him because he was a farmer. We were not doing that at all. What we do laugh at is the idea that he has to take refuge in things like that every once in a while. We did not laugh and jeer at the war effort, but we do laugh at the fact that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) hardly ever makes a speech except he has to take some refuge in the war effort. I am not going to give you any autobiography . . .

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege. If he is referring to me as taking refuge in the war effort, referring to it, he knows he is not telling the truth.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! If I understood the remark correctly, he was not referring to you individually.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to the service of the hon. Leader of the Opposition in the army during either war. It's a matter of fact, he and I have one thing in common, and this has raised my opinion of him a little bit. He, in the first world war was a private, and he was able to hold that rank, I understand, and so did I. So we have got something in common, that way. What he was doing was taking political refuge in the war. "Well, you could not do things when the war was on." And he objected to using comparisons of war and pre-war times in regard to grants to municipalities. But the funny thing about it was that no matter what kind of a depression we had, no matter what kind of a war we had, on election year they could make plenty of grants to municipalities. The war only counted, or the depression only counted when there was no election in the offing.

Then he told us that they were going to give some help to the farmers if and when they are ever elected to office in the Province of Saskatchewan. Well, it will take a lot more than words to convince a lot of farmers in this Province that that is true. The farmers of this province remember the dire straits they were in with regard to the seed grain debt, and they remember too, their request to the Provincial Government and the little and insufficient action which they received from the Liberal Government here in Regina, and they know what kind of treatment they have received from the C.C.F. Government.

Then he said, "Let us look very carefully at the record of the Liberal Government at Ottawa." Well, that is a very interesting thing to do too, Mr. Speaker. We quoted quite a lot of things — old age pensions, and everybody knows that the Liberal Government came through with old-age pensions on a political sick-bed, as it were. When the devil is sick, the devil a saint would be, and he was a saint long enough to put through the old-age pensions in the Dominion of Canada. And with regard to family allowances, I would just like to remind this House . . .

March 12, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. member says everybody knows — well, I certainly do not know that, because I know that the old-age pension was passed in 1927, the Liberals had a clear majority, and they did not ally Mr. Woodsworth, or anybody else . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, that was not a point of privilege. The Leader of the Opposition . . .

Mr. Tucker: — It was as much a point of privilege as you people raise all the time.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Leader of the Opposition was just bragging about his lack of knowledge.

Mr. Tucker: — Have I the same rights as they have got, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, you have allowed points of privilege. . . on a point of privilege again, I rose on a question of privilege to say that I do not know something that the hon. member said I knew. He said everybody knew it. Now, when he is suggesting to you that that was not a question of privilege, you have allowed members opposite to raise questions of privilege, including the Minister of Natural Resources, on less ground than that.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. leader of the Opposition was allowed just as much privilege as I have allowed anybody else.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that the Leader of the Opposition should not brag about not knowing these things, because the people of Saskatchewan and a lot of the people in Canada know it, and know it very well indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) is not in his seat. The other day when he was speaking, he did a lot of proposing, and of course it could not help but come into my mind that he was proposing to that fair lady, the electorate of Saskatchewan. I am afraid, in spite of all the proposals there is little prospect of him getting married. I think the lady is going to continue to turn him down. But did a very good job of it. While he was on the radio he proposed to do this and do that, and then later in his speech it all went off like a damp squib, as it were. In his speech he said, "I propose to show this House that everything that this Government has done has decreased in physical production." Again he says, "This Government hopes to get a large amount of revenue out of the natural resources."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have some information on that kind of thing, and I think it would be interesting to look some of it up. He tells us that in the Annual Report of the Natural Resources — he took the Annual Report of the Department of Natural Resources and proceeded to show that production had gone down. Some of these things, I will not have time to deal with tonight but I hope to finish on that tomorrow. But at the present time I want to take this particular reference which he made to mining when he said, "In the eight years that the C.C.F. has been in office, not a single mine has been put into production," Of course, it is very interesting to note that the Liberals had 34 years of office and only one mine.

We have a long piece to go before that. Then he dealt with the figures of production, and he pointed out that the production of gold and silver had done down — incidentally, he made some mistakes and said ounces of copper instead of pounds, and he said one thousand instead of one million on silver, and that sort of thing, but that is a small matter. I would suggest that he correct those figures in his speech, or they will be very ridiculous figures if they are printed in the record like that.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — They are all right in the record.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, I have the record here, and your figures are not correct. You state here, "In 1950, it dropped" — that is about gold. "In 1944 they produced in silver, 1,736 ounces." Now, the right figure is 1,736,000 ounces, I am trying to tell my hon. friend there is something wrong with that, and if he let this go out . . .

Mr. Loptson: — My comparison was the same — the comparison is the same.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is how he backs up. It is true that the production of metals during the war from this mine was higher than it has been since the war, measured in ounces and pounds of gold, silver, copper and zinc. That is correct, but there is a reason for it. This mill at Flin Flon is built to handle 5,000 tons per day of ore. That is the rated capacity of the mill. During the war as much as 6,100 tons per day were milled, but this greater tonnage overloaded the plant, causing metal recovery to drop and was stopped as soon as the war was over, and since the war they have been on a constant average production that is within a very few tons of 5,000 tons a day right through. Then, a mining company of course has many other things to consider too. They are using ore both from Saskatchewan and Manitoba. During this period of time there was a small mine on the Manitoba side which came into production, and the ore from that was trucked to the mill at Flon Flon. While they were working at that, and cleaning out that mine, that small ore body, that was one of the reasons for a further reduction of using the ore from Saskatchewan. You cannot use it from both sides at the same time. There is another thing the company is interested in watching, and that is the profits per share, because we must realize that these people are not in the business just to produce copper and lead, zinc and so forth. They are there to make profits for their shareholders and so, considering the reserves of ore they had, and the making of profits, the income tax structure — they have to pay attention to that too. Then, during this recent period, the last two or three years, when prices of metal have gone up to a very considerable extent, it put the company in a position where they could economically mine ore of a much lower value, and this is best illustrated in a report on their reserves. In 1939 they had 27 million ton of reserve ore, and the average copper content of that reserve ore was 2.23. Now, they have only 20 million tons of reserve, instead of 27 million — in 1950, that is — but the grade had gone up from 2.23 to 3.04, so naturally what they were doing, while the price was high, was taking out these bodies of ore which were lower in grade because at those prices they could make a profit at it, and if the price went down they could not even mine them. The same thing applies to zinc, only in zinc their ore reserves have increased in quality over one per cent from 4.2 per cent of zinc to 4.34 per cent zinc. Not one per cent, pardon me — one-tenth of one per cent. But a very substantial

March 12, 1952

increase in the quality of the ore. And so when it comes to reading these figures, there are a lot of these things to take into consideration.

My hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) loves to use something like this, but most people will realize that no matter what government was in power, this is the thing that would have been done, and the company, besides being interested in making profit, are also interested in maintaining not only the life of the mine, but the life of that community of Flin Flon, and that community probably has another 20 years of life, even without the discovery of any more ore bodies in the area that can be used there.

It is very interesting to know that my hon. friend did not continue with other minerals after he had dealt with gold, silver, copper and zinc. He never told us that there was any coal mined in Saskatchewan at all, but the number of tons of coal produced in 1944, 1,393,000 tons — in 1951, 2,235,000 tons. It all comes from down in the Estevan constituency.

Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — In spite of you.

Mr. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — If it is less, it is our fault; if it is more it is in spite of us.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) says "if it is less, it is our fault — if it is more, it is in spite of us." That is the typical attitude of the Liberal Opposition. Well put.

Mr. McCormack: — I happen to know something about it. I have had some experience.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — In sodium sulphate — my hon. friend has had some experience all right down there in the coal fields — on sodium sulphate, 96,000 tons in 1944, 188,000 tons in 1951. Now my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) forgot there was such a thing as oil at all. He did not tell us that in the Province of Saskatchewan in 1942 and in 1943 and in 1944 the Province produced no oil at all, no oil at all, and that in 1951 in the calendar 1 1/4 million barrels of oil . . .

Mr. Loptson: — 23,000.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The same comparison with regard to natural gas, from 138,000 — pardon me, 138 million cubic feet to 869 million cubic feet. He dealt also with some of the other resources, lumber; and fish, but I want to deal with those tomorrow. I just want to say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, if I can before 6 o'clock in regard to some of the other work.

He gave us to understand that there was nothing done except this one mine. I want to tell this legislature that during the past few years there has been more prospecting done, more claims staked, in the last calendar year over 2,000 claims. For the last two years we have broken records for the number of claims staked in the Province of Saskatchewan. Some member on the other side of the House made fun of the prospectors' assistance plan. I think they said this was the only province that was giving these fellows a free trip to the North and so forth. Well, there is one other province in Canada that is pretty prominent in the production of minerals that adopted, copied this programme from Saskatchewan, and that is the Province of British Columbia. That have copied more than that from us. And what has been done in the last few years? The development of Nisto on Black Lake, adits and drifts, a great many hundreds of thousands of dollars spent there. Unfortunately, they have not yet struck the luck that will make it a mine. Nicholson Mine, near Goldfield — a shaft and underground drifts, thousands of feet of them. Goldfield's uranium — an underground adit is being pushed through right now. Nesbit-Labine, near Goldfields — are shaft-sinking at the present time.

Mr. Loptson: — It is the only one doing any work.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh no, my hon. friend does not know anything about it. Cinch Lake Mines will sink a shaft this year. Rix-Athabaska has an edit in now, and will sink a shaft immediately this spring. Then Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company has two concessions in the Province of Saskatchewan, and they have been doing a lot of work, and that work has been showing good results, and they have made some very good — have uncovered some very good signs of ore. Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, I believe, are sinking a shaft on what I am sure will be a new mine close to Beaver Lake. The St. Joseph Lead and Zinc Company have done extensive diamond drilling, and a shaft will likely be sunk this year. Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company have many claims, and have done many thousand feet of diamond drilling. The Mining Corporation of Canada has a concession, and has a work programme to put into effect. Then we come to El Dorado. El Dorado has sunk two shafts and at the present time a third one, a five-compartment shaft, is being sunk and the mill is being built this year.

When my hon. friend was talking about El Dorado, he said that the reason the Federal Government had to take El Dorado over was because they were afraid the enemy might get the uranium. I think that the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) was joking. I do not think he really believed that the private company of El Dorado was prepared to turn this stuff over to the enemy. Of course, there are two reasons, probably, why the Government took it over. One was because they could not get enough action out of the private companies to do the job, and they wanted to go ahead regardless of the will of people to invest money in it or not. It was a necessity during that time. But, of course, they are keeping it on now, and the El Dorado has also made the statement that if they find on their area gold or silver, or nickel or copper, or zinc or lead, they will mine it and produce it the same as any other company would do. They have done a great job of development in that particular area, but those other companies are also doing a good job, and it is safe to say

March 12, 1952

that it is very likely indeed that in this area, among this group, there will be at least a couple of mines developed in addition to El Dorado. Then there is the Charlebois Lake area. The Charlebois Lake area, which incidentally was discovered by a prospector operating under the prospectors' assistance plan. Charlebois Lake uranium, Consolidated Mining and Smelting, Dee Exploration, and Partridge and Associates are in there, and they have done there — they worked last summer, and they did 15,000 feet of diamond drilling. Dr. Mawdsley made his survey there, and in his report he says:

"The work done in the area up until the end of August, 1951, has confirmed the presence of at least six widely separated bodies having an aggregate tonnage of at least 1,000 tons per vertical foot; whose aggregate grade would run possibly .2 per cent uranium oxide."

Mr. Speaker: — May I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the time.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, well, I will ask for adjournment in a minute or two, Mr. Speaker.

"The tonnage of materials now indicate with an average grade of .08 per cent, which incidentally is minable, is many times one thousand tons per vertical foot."

So in the Charlebois Lake area too, there are excellent prospects that there will be one or two or more mines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on account of the fact that it is six o'clock, I think probably I had better ask leave to adjourn the debate.

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