

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
10th Day

Thursday, February 21, 1952

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 20, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Erb for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, when it was declared 6 o'clock last evening I had just risen to my feet to speak, so I will continue from there.

Sitting in the legislature, listening to the various speeches that have been delivered since the Throne Speech was introduced, I thought it was rather interesting to watch the developments in the House since the reading of that speech. It was interesting to watch the unfolding of the C.C.F. strategy for the next coming election.

Emphasis, in 1952, is on the farmers. Paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne have been couched in the most delicate phrases — each offering bits of bait — bait primarily designed to make friends and influence voters, particularly farm voters.

In 1950, the Government stressed, as their slogan, "security." The Cabinet Ministers travelled the province in a great campaign, to sell the slogan of security to the farmers. However lack of interest, and disappointingly small attendance at meetings made the C.C.F. realize that perhaps the farmers did not feel too secure; and while they are out making a little jaunt around the rural areas of Saskatchewan, they began to hear rumblings amongst the rural people; rumblings of ever-mounting taxation; rumblings of the ever-increasing cost to operate the schools; rumblings of schools that were closed because of the lack of teachers; rumblings of the rural people struggling to educate their children without qualified teachers. They heard rumblings and discontent from all of the rural municipalities; they heard of alarm with respect to the amount of taxes being drained out of the rural municipalities by other taxing bodies — ever-increasing taxation beginning taken out to support the larger school units; revenues being drained out in the form of public revenue tax; rumblings because the over-all rates of taxation within the municipalities had already become so burdensome that the municipalities could not afford to raise their own municipal mill rate they heard these rumblings, Mr. Speaker — rumblings in an ever-increasing crescendo — rumblings that, to the C.C.F. became frightening. And so, when they came back after their sojourn among the people, after going out to sell the slogan of "security", they returned and put their heads together and came forth with a new one.

So now, in 1952, they are going out to sell the rural people a new slogan, and the slogan this time is "expansion"; and all efforts are to be based on the slogan "Expansion". Now I suppose the term "expansion" can be used under any form of government — communists, who maintain that great expansion can only take place under a communist

government. The socialists used to boast (and I use the word 'used' advisedly, Mr. Speaker) that expansion can only take place under a socialist government. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, in 1944, a great socialist messiah was to lead the people out of the slums of economic bondage imposed by the system of free enterprise; they were to lead them into the promised land through socialism. In 1944, the C.C.F. knew all the economic ills of the people; they were all set out in a little book. In each case the diseases were diagnosed and the prescription was prescribed; and in each case, what was the prescription? Socialization of the means of production. Production for use and not for profit! all contained in a little booklet called the Regina manifesto! That little booklet that outlined all the ills of the province of Saskatchewan, in 1944, and prescribed the basic prescription to overcome that illness, was distributed in every home; and the Regina Manifesto was as familiar in every home as Lydia Pinkham's pills.

That was the situation, in 1944. That slogan of socialism led them to victory, in a landslide; and the socialist messiahs began to put their theories into operation. However, in 1948, when they went to the people, after 4 years had passed, we did not have this promised expansion of the socialists — no, Mr. Speaker, we did not have it — in 1948; but we were on the verge. Apparently the verge was not good enough for the rural people, because they came back into office merely up a hairs breadth.

Now, in 1952, we are beginning to have development; so that slogan once again becomes 'Expansion'. How is this expansion to be brought about, Saskatchewan? Through socialism that was spread, in 1944? Through the socialization of the means of production? Through production for use and not for profit? As these were outlined in the Regina Manifesto? Is this how this great expansion is to take place in Saskatchewan in 1952? In the words of the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer — No. This expansion is not to take place under socialism; it is to take place, Mr. Speaker, under good old private enterprise.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in 1944, the Regina manifesto. In 1952, private enterprise. When I think of the Premier said in his address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the greatest sentence, from the standpoint of the C.C.F. followers, was this, when he said, and I quote:

"Liberals say oil will not be found under a C.C.F. Government. We say oil was not found in Saskatchewan until a C.C.F. Government was there."

That is a very powerful sentence. One member says 'Hear! Hear!' Only one member said that.

I want to say this, in connection with that statement of the Premier's — that the Liberals say oil will not be found under a C.C.F. government, he said, 'we had no oil until we had a C.C.F. government'. Liberalism has always said, and the Liberals have always said, that we would not get oil in Saskatchewan as long as we had a government committed to the socialization of the means of production. So long as we have a government that adheres to the Regina Manifesto. Today, Mr. Speaker, we are completely vindicated on that stand. This Government did not get oil development until it threw the Regina Manifesto overboard. They did

not get oil, Mr. Speaker, until they deserted the very principles upon which the movement was founded; that principle of socialization of the means of production. They did not get oil until they surrendered those principles completely and came crawling back to take refuge at the bosom of private enterprise.

It has been a cardinal principle of Liberalism down through the ages that man can reach his greatest stature and can do the greatest work towards the uplifting of his fellow man through a system of private enterprise. We have tasted victory on that principle, and we have tasted defeat; but we have never sacrificed our principle.

In the matter of oil development in the Province of Saskatchewan, today, the C.C.F. are right back to where the Liberals have always been — on the side of private enterprise. The C.C.F. today have sacrificed their cardinal principle — the principle of the socialization of the means of production; and they have sacrificed it, Mr. Speaker, because they have not the intestinal fortitude to stand behind it and face the people in the forthcoming election.

Now that this high bred government — half socialist and half free enterprise — has undertaken to develop the resources of the province . . .

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend what he is reading from? Is that a quotation?

Mr. Cameron: — Now, Mr. Premier, you had all the time you wished on the air, and I did not interrupt you. Now I would like at least that courtesy applied to me. I do not think I have ever interfered with a speaker when he was speaking in this House and I would appreciate that same courtesy.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Well, the air time is long, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not being discourteous. I am merely pointing out to my hon. friend that it is against the rules of the House to read his speech, but if he wants to continue it is all right with me.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, may I say this — I have yet to read a speech in this House. I have—as the Premier used, as the Minister of Agriculture used, yesterday — and my goodness, if anybody read a speech it was the Minister of Agriculture, a speech that he was not familiar with, a speech that someone had prepared for him, apparently during the night — I merely have some typewritten headings which I intend to follow; and I regret that the Premier cannot stand me glancing down, apparently, once in a while, to see what those headings are.

Now, to get back to what I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before that interruption. I was saying that this half socialist and half free enterprise government that we have today set about to develop our natural resources under a policy of free enterprise. Now then, let us examine the record in regard to the development that we have had since they came back to the principle of private enterprise; and I have been following that

development quite closely; and I have been interested in press reports that have been issued, from time to time, from the various departments; and I noticed a press report on January 22, 1949, in which the Minister of Natural Resources stated that the possibilities of oil development in Saskatchewan had caught the imagination of oil men. The Minister went on to point out, in this statement, that at the end of January 22, 1949, there were 17,840,000 acres on which there had been applied for, or permits issued, for exploration in oil development — almost 18 million acres had been taken out by January 22, 1949, after this government reverted to private enterprise — after the election of 1948.

On May 10, here is another clipping and I wish to read a piece from that particular clipping. It says:

“Oil interest booming. Companies lease land. 21 million acres already allotted. New applications coming into the department faster than the department can handle them.”

This was a statement of the Minister. On June 16 he says:

“Big exploration planned for oil in Saskatchewan. One of the biggest deals in the history of Canada was concluded this week — some 10 ½ million acres taken out.”

Now then, the Minister says, on January 22nd, that there were 16 million acres applied for; May 10, 21 million acres; June 16, another 10½ million acres.

Well, when we saw those clippings we became interested and began to ask questions in the House regarding this development. We were told, in this Legislature, that a man by the name of Rhubbra from Ontario had come into the province and secured an interest in some 14 million acres. He got these large concessions at a very nominal fee — a fee that worked out to approximately 1/10 of a cent an acre. Then we found out from information drawn out from the various Ministers that these large acreages were lately sold, and that on each deal he got a 2½ per cent overriding royalty. We pointed out, at that time, that if those were the condition, then this man stood to make millions out of the development throughout the province. The Provincial Treasurer, at that time, said, “we may have invited this man in, but when this particular man came into the Province of Saskatchewan there was not another oil man interested, either within the province, or outside of its boundaries”; and he said further, “just as you would go to a brokerage to buy a house, we asked this man to get this development started.”

Hon. C.M. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, that statement is absolutely false. What I stated at the time — if the hon. gentlemen will just keep quiet for a moment I will tell you. What I stated at the time, Mr. Speaker — (sit down till I get finished) — was, last year, in replying to the hon. gentleman, I pointed out that the Tidewater Oil Company people and the Sohio Oil Company people both told me that just as they would go to a broker, so, too, they had gone to this gentleman to get this started — or rather, he had gone to them and they had made the deal. Now I had nothing to do with inviting Mr. Rhubbra here. As I stated, I knew nothing about Mr. Rhubbra; never

met the man in my life. The hon. gentleman's statement is absolutely false and I am going to ask that he withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Minister is correcting a statement and he has a right to that privilege. He is on a point of privilege.

Mr. Cameron: — All right, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Treasurer has just said the Tidewater firm informed him that they preferred to go to Mr. Rhubbra. They could probably do business a little quicker, a little simpler, and get things developing a little faster. That is the understand I take from his statement. I will accept that statement, because it is in line with my own thinking, which I am going to prove in a few minutes.

Now, to get back to the matter in question. When we were questioning the Minister of Natural Resources as to when these permits were issued to Mr. Rhubbra, he said that they were not issued prior to this great development, and he said:

"The first permit granted to Mr. Rhubbra was issued April 1, 1949, and that the application was probably made in April or March, or even in February."

This was in answer to questions on estimates, which is on record in this Legislature.

The Minister further stated that another million acres was granted to Mr. Rhubbra May 20, 1949. He then said June 25 Mr. Rhubbra received another 5 million acres. Now, according to the Minister of Natural Resources, these permits were granted to Mr. Rhubbra during the months of April, May and June 1949. These acreages were granted to Mr. Rhubbra during the time that applications were coming into the department faster than the department could handle them. Now, either the Provincial Treasurer is giving false information; because they do not tell the same story. One says Mr. Rhubbra came into the province before there was any development; the other says there were 18 million acres already applied for on January 22; and when applications were coming in faster than the department could process them, Mr. Rhubbra, in April, May and June, got his acreage. Those are two conflicting stories. We are interested in which one is the correct story. I think if the Provincial Treasurer had stayed within his own department we would not have this confusion existing today. There were 48 million acres of Crown land in the Province of Saskatchewan, according to reports from the Department of Natural Resources — 12 million acres are being retained as Crown reserves, leaving a balance of 36 million acres to be allotted for permit and survey and development. Of this 36 million acres, one man, Mr. Rhubbra, under the name of Gulf Securities, gets 14 million acres, or 38 per cent — practically 40 per cent of all the potential gas and oil acreage in the Province of Saskatchewan — almost 40 per cent. And he got them at a time when, according to the Minister of Natural Resources, that applications were pouring into his department faster than he could take care of them.

This man put up approximately \$14,000 for his acreage or one-tenth of a cent an acre; and he sold them to other legitimate companies, such as Tidewater (which the Provincial Treasurer just spoke of) with 2½ per cent royalty. Now, on the basis of the Fosterton well, if the Fosterton well was brought in on acreage control formerly held by Mr. Rhubbra, and was producing 1,000 barrels a day, do you know that that well alone would be netting Mr. Rhubbra? \$2,000 per month — \$24,000 per year. On the basis of the Fosterton well, every well brought in on this 40 per cent of the complete acreage of the Province of Saskatchewan, will bring to Mr. Rhubbra and his associates, \$24,000 per year — not for one year, nor for five, nor for ten, but for the lifetime of the production of each and every well. If only 50 wells of 1,000 barrels per day are found on this 40 per cent of the entire acreage, this man and his associates will receive \$1,200,000 per year, from these wells. Not for one year, or two, or three, but for the lifetime of the production of these wells.

Here is a man that was brought in to obtain large acreages — 40 per cent of the entire acreage of the province, who, within a few days got his return down for his fee of one-tenth of a cent and sold for 2½ per cent over-riding royalties, to a legitimate oil company. He goes out of the province without any investment, without any intention of developing our natural resources; and sits tight, because on every well produced on that 40 per cent of the total acreage, on the basis of the Fosterton well, will net him \$24,000 a year.

That is the situation in regard to Mr. Rhubbra. He was brought in here — so called because we could not get the oil men interested in development until he did come in, according to the Provincial Treasurer, and according to the Minister of Natural Resources, — brought in when applications were pouring into the department faster than the staff could sort them.

Now then, the Minister of Natural Resources announced in a press statement that there were 36 million acres available, in Saskatchewan. Mr. Rhubbra got an interest in 14 million. There are approximately 18 million that were granted prior to January 22nd. Now 14 million and 18 million make 32 million acres. There is only 36 million acres — 18 million were granted January 22nd; 14 million were given to Mr. Rhubbra during April, May and June, making a total of 32 million acres. Then by April, May and June, in 1949, there was only approximately ¼ million acres left in the Province of Saskatchewan for which the legitimate oil companies could now apply. There is nothing left. And I think that is the key as to why Tidewater went to Mr. Rhubbra to get their acreage; because there was only 4 million left, or approximately something in that neighbourhood, according to the Minister's press statements. We talk about monopolies and cartels. Here is the biggest monopoly that was ever foisted on the people of Saskatchewan. One man, assisted by this government, grabbed all the remaining acreage in Saskatchewan as soon as development began to take place. He took the control of these resources completely out of the hands of the government, so far as apportioning them out was concerned; and he says to the oil companies, "you come in to develop Saskatchewan; you will develop it on my terms and my conditions." And this government talks about developing the people's resources, for the people, by a people's government!

I said, Mr. Speaker, that after Mr. Rhubbra got his acreage, there was in the neighbourhood of 4 to 6 million acres left. Who got some of the remaining acreages? Let us have a look, Mr. Speaker, I traced 4 firms — Albercan, Barclay Oils, Battleford Petroleums — they got a good share of the remainder. Who is Albercan? This company was incorporated February 3, 1949 — and who is the king pin in this Company? Dr. Shumiatcher. This company had a capital of \$3,000 and they got two million acres.

Barclay Oils. This company was organized April 19, 1949. They did a little better — they had a paid up capital, Mr. Speaker, of \$3.00 and they got 100,000 acres. Who is the guiding light of this Company? You have guessed it; I don't have to tell you.

Battleford Petroleums, the third one. This was one of the first ones to come in after these acreages which were left. It was organized December 22, 1948. They got one —mi acres. Our friend, Norman Vincent, that I talked about last year is the key director of this company; and they got a million acres. This would appear to account for a lot of the remaining acreage in Saskatchewan.

I would like to go over the dates again, Mr. Speaker, when these were organized. Albercan, February 3; Barclay Oils, April 19; Battleford Petroleums, April 19.

That is why we asked the question in the Legislature, and demanded an answer, last year, as to when Dr. Shumiatcher resigned. The information given was that he resigned on May 6, 1949.

Well, if he resigned May 6, 1949, during the time that he was in the employ of this government he actively assisted in organizing Albercan Oil Company, Barclay Oil Company, taking up the remaining of the small acreage left in Saskatchewan. Now I have no quarrel with any man for organizing an oil company. I have no quarrel with any man if he comes a solicitor, but was it quite by accident, Mr. Speaker, that these companies were organized while this man was on the payroll of this government, while he was legal adviser to the Premier, adviser to the Cabinet, and adviser to the C.C.F. committee on natural resources?

By the end of May, 1949, there was hardly an acre left to which the private companies could apply, in order to bring oil —dev into Saskatchewan, apart from the freehold acreages held by individuals and companies.

So much for the oil situation in Saskatchewan. Let us now see how this half socialist, half private enterprise government has been doing in the other developments; in the fields of minerals. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that during the last session it was revealed that after uranium was discovered in the north, Saskatchewan was found to have the greatest uranium find in the world and action began to take place. Mining firms became interested in this great find. They did not wait to put in a formal application for concessions in this area — they phoned, they wired, they took planes to come in and get these concessions. The Dominion Government was very much concerned. It was making every effort to encourage the production of uranium. They guaranteed a price of \$6 per pound for this ore in the rock. \$6 per pound, or \$12,000 per ton to

anyone who would go in and find and mine and develop it. The United States was in desperate need of this rare metal.

Hon. Mr. Brockebank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Might I ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker? Was it ore you were talking about at \$6 per pound?

Mr. Cameron: — The United States were offering a bonus of \$36,000 for any firm that found a new mine and were offering a bonus of \$3.50 per pound over and above the regular market price. In Northern Saskatchewan was found the richest uranium find in the world and a ready market was already guaranteed, both by the Dominion and the United States governments, at tremendous prices and it could be produced and sold at that price for years to come. Here, Mr. Speaker, was an opportunity of a lifetime, right on the doorstep of this people's government — an opportunity to really show how the natural resources of the people could be developed by the people, for the people of Saskatchewan. Here was the golden opportunity, a ready market at tremendous prices, the richest uranium find in the world and an opportunity for this people's government to develop these resources for the people. Did they do it, Mr. Speaker? Well, they attempted to do it, and typical of the socialist government and socialist thinking, they quickly ran to find some more experts. They found them. They found them in the person of Mr. Richardson, Mr. Hershorn, Mr. Young. They came into the province. After the smoke had all cleared away, what did we find? The man who had stumbled onto this great discovery obtained 25 square miles in which he could explore uranium. Dr. Shumiatcher, the Premier's personal adviser, picked himself up a few choice acres. Mr. Richardson, Mr. Young, Mr. Hershorn and these other experts grabbed 143 square miles.

Put it another way, Mr. Speaker, they grabbed 143 sections, the largest uranium area in the world in which to do their exploration and development. What did Mr. Young and Mr. Hershorn do with these 143 sections? Did they develop the resources for the people? Well, they organized a company, at any rate. They call themselves "The American-Canadian Uranium Company." When this company was formed they purchased shares at eleven cents each; put up a total of \$90,000. For that \$90,000 they got 83 per cent interest in the company. Then they went out to sell the remaining 17 per cent of the shares. And so they thought, well, the Americans are a little richer than the people of Saskatchewan, perhaps a little more gullible and they crossed the border into the State of New York. They crossed the border into the State of New York to sell the remaining 17 per cent. Were they selling it for eleven cents, or \$1 or \$1.50? No. They were asking \$3.50. They were asking the people of the State of New York to put up \$1,750,000 for a 17 per cent interest in a company that they grabbed 83 per cent in for \$90,000. The Attorney-General of the State of New York heard of this and began to investigate before he permitted the shares to be put on the market in the State of New York. He found this. That the promoters of this company had run afoul of the law before and had served sentences for fraud and these gangsters had taken over and secured 143 sections in our richest uranium area in the world. They obtained these rights, not for the purpose of development, not to bring revenues to the people of Saskatchewan, not with any sense of loyalty to Saskatchewan, or to the Dominion of Canada — they obtained them with one

purpose in mind and one purpose only — to perpetrate their fraud upon innocent people. Last year in this legislature I traced, step by step how these mining claims were allotted by this government — how they were all grouped into one firm, the American-Canadian Uranium Company — and I asked how it was possible for these things to happen in the Province of Saskatchewan. As a result of exposing this fraudulent racket I was ridiculed, you will remember, by the Government of this House. I was accused of throwing mud and the whole affair was laughed off as Liberals propaganda. Apparently, the press of Canada did not think it was Liberals propaganda. The story of this uranium scandal was carried from coast to coast in every leading newspaper. It was carried in leading newspapers across the American continent and it was not long after that until announcements began to appear in the press that complaints had come in regarding people of Saskatchewan who had, in turn, been fleeced by fraudulent stock manipulators. It was not long before the Canadian and American Governments began to have conferences in order to tighten up their rules and regulations so that these fraudulent racketeers could be brought to trial and justice.

I mention these things, Mr. Speaker, to spike once and for all any attempt on the part of anyone to laugh it off as Liberals propaganda. We do not claim that this government is responsible for the fleecing of these Saskatchewan people by racketeers — no. Neither do we say that this government should police the State of New York. But we do say this, that the neglect on the part of this government to investigate the personal integrity and the financial ability of the applicants before large concessions were granted to them — they neglected to do these things — this is the basic cause which encourages these racketeers — and to that extent we hold this government responsible.

This is not the complete uranium story. Some back again to this great friend of the government's — this adviser to the Premier — his legal adviser — adviser to the Cabinet. Here is a man who is no ordinary civil servant. Here is a man who is drawing a large salary for his ability as a legal adviser. Here is a man who had access to plenty of information. I stated last session that this man obtained in this uranium area concessions from this Government while he was in the employ of this Government. I am going to deal with that -particular phase of it a while in a few moments and I hope you will bear with me until I do. We have documental proof of three of these concessions that were granted by this government. The concession termed 'search one'. The concession termed 'LL'; the concession termed 'ZZ'. These comprise 24 square miles. This man did not resign from the government until May 6th. We have a documented proof of that in this legislature signed by the hon. C.C. Williams, as Provincial Treasurer. That date is correct. It is irrefutable. Registered — records are on file with the Registrar's Office to show that Mr. Shumiatcher incorporated his company on March 8th, 1949. They do not dispute that he was in the employ of this Government on March 8th when this company was incorporated, they do not dispute the fact that he resigned on May 6th. Those facts now, Mr. Speaker, are no longer disputable because the documentary proof is tabled in this House. Then I pointed out that if Mr. Shumiatcher did not leave the employ of this Government until May 6th then I wanted to know when he received this concession of 25 square miles, because I had noted in the press report in connection with the affair of

the American-Canadian Uranium Company that officials of the Department of Natural Resources had announced to the press that Search Corporations was organized and secured its concession on April 1st. That was only a press report. I was not quite sure of that. Then last year, in estimates I stood here and I asked the Minister of Natural Resources the date of several concessions; when they were applied for; when the permits and concessions were issued; to whom were they granted; were they transferred; when were they transferred; and he had his estimates in front of him and was giving me the information and I came to the concession 'ZZ' controlled and owned by Search Corporations and I asked the Minister of Natural Resources, "On what date was concession 'ZZ' granted?" The answer that we got at that time was, April 17th, 1949. Then, I came into the House, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, later that evening . . .

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think the hon. member knows that if that answer was given, April 17th., it was incorrect. that was the date of the application for the concession.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — I am coming to that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of privilege, I think I have the right to prevent statements being made in this House which are entirely wrong, in regard to myself, and if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition groans about it, well, he can keep on groaning. I intend to defend my right to object to that kind of statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — Right, Mr. Speaker. As I say, that is the one question we have not documented proof because it came from the mouth of the Minister of Natural Resources. And if the Minister of Natural Resources chooses today to change that statement it is perfectly all right with me. All that we are asking . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again. It is not a question — the member is giving a wrong impression to the House — it is not a question of whether I intend to change that or not. I said that if that date was given as the date of the issue of the concession it was corrected last session that that was not the date. It is not a case of whether I intended to change it or not.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — All right, Mr. Speaker, a little more of our time gone, but I do not mind. I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that at the same time that we requested this and I asked if it was April 17th, then I said I would ask the Minister of Natural Resources or someone to correct me if this statement was wrong, if this date was wrong. And on two occasions, both in the afternoon and in the evening, I asked for the correct date if this was not correct. Not one member on the government side of the House rose to give me any other information, not one member. They sat in their seats like mice when I asked for that information.

The Premier has been saying that some of these members take the privilege in the House to make statements that they would not dare make on the public platform. He is referring, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that a member cannot be prosecuted or is immune from prosecution for statements made in the House due to the fact that we have allowed freedom of speech in the House of a democratic system. I thought, perhaps,

it might be well, in view of that statement, to go on to the radio and tell the exact story on the air, where I was in the public, as I told in the House. and I went to the radio and I told the exact same story that I told in the House that day. The Leader-Post carried a synopsis of it, dated April 7th 'Mineral Concessions Charged by Cameron'. April 11th the Minister of Natural Resources put a statement in the paper in regards to the radio speech that I gave. The Minister says, 'Charges are False'. And he says this:

"If the press reports of Mr. Cameron's speech are accurate, then Mr. Cameron has apparently deliberately falsified facts for political purposes."

That I had deliberately falsified facts for political purposes, when I stepped on the radio to tell the same story, word for word, that I told in this legislature, when the Minister — the only part of my whole address that he disagreed with was the date on which the permit was issued. He did not say . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I must correct the hon. member. I can say that this was not the only part of his speech that I disagreed with and if he makes that statement here he is making a statement that is wrong. I agreed with, I think, pretty near everything in his speech — disagreed with pretty near everything.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — Well there is a saying, Mr. Speaker, that truth will out'.

Opposition Member: — Leaked out on him that time.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — Now, let's get back to the order of things. There is nothing in this Minister's report to the press that says the Search Corporations was not organized March 8th, 1949. He does not contradict that they got the concession. I do not see it in this press report. He did not say anything about that. He only says that the concession was granted May 12th, 6 days after the resignation of this man.

If that is the stand that is correct today, I will accept it. I will gladly accept it, because, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it does not make a particle of difference. Because, if his company was organized on March 8th, and he resigned on May 6th and got these concessions May 12th, 6 days after he resigned, you cannot organize a company and approach the Government and get concessions within 6 days. The company had been formed, the groundwork had been laid, the applications had been applied for. And the fact that it was signed 6 days after does not change the picture one iota. That is remarkable, Mr. Speaker. I am going to be generous about these things. There is no dispute there.

Let us have a look and see how valuable is this mineral concession that was granted to this legal adviser to the Premier. Records showed last year that he paid \$500 for concession 'ZZ', sold it to another company for \$15,000 and 100,000 full paid up shares of the company thrown in with the bargain. On the sale of this alone he made \$14,500. Not bad pickings.

February 21, 1952

Premier Douglas: — Is the hon. member prepared to substantiate that statement?

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — Those were substantiated last session.

Premier Douglas: — No, no, Mr. Speaker, they were not substantiated. As a matter of fact, those facts are completely incorrect. They take no cognizance of the money which the company spent in exploration work which was some \$7,000. Secondly, they did not get the \$15,000 of which my friend speaks and further, the shares today are practically valueless.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the fact that the gentlemen opposite do not want this figment of fiction punctured. What a ‘tissue of lies’. Mr. Speaker, I say that their statement is a ‘tissue of lies’.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I know it is rather embarrassing, I am trying to be as gentle about it as possible. You know, at times truth does hurt.

Now then, after this man left the employ of the Department he must have retained very close connections with the government because within four months after leaving the employ of the government he picked himself off 600,000 acres in gas and oil leases. He paid \$3,750 for these — the nominal fee. In two days he sold them for \$15,000 in cash and 25,000 shares of the company thrown in for free. In two days he picked himself up a neat little \$11,250 and the shares thrown in for free. Oh, to be a friend of this government.

I happened to pick up a clipping the other day on a report of a banquet or something that was given for Dr. Shumiatcher when he retired. It was an innocent enough little report but it seems to have much more significance. In that report Dr. Shumiatcher, in answer to a toast, said:

“The welfare of the province will remain my principal concern. I shall continue to retain a keen and active interest in its affairs.”

We do not question that statement, having picked up uranium concessions and having picked up 600,000 oil rights which he sold in two days for \$15,000 cash and 25,000 shares. The Premier stated in reference to Mr. Shumiatcher, he had some ‘notable achievements to his credit’. We can agree with that, Mr. Speaker, wholeheartedly. It is not my intention to be unkind to any private individual, Mr. Speaker. I have tried to spare as many individuals as possible. I could have named many more. It is only that I mentioned these because it was essential that these individuals’ names be brought out in order to reveal what has been taking place in regards to our natural resources. I am not concerned about these individuals. What I am concerned about is the flamboyant manner in which these natural resources have been given away to private individuals.

Men who are friends of this government. These men have come in and have received a virtual monopoly on the resources of the Province of Saskatchewan. I have shown how Mr. Rhubbra became the czar of our gas and oil reserves; shown how in the uranium area a group of fraudulent racketeers escaped and picked themselves up 143 sections; shown how an employee of this government had received uranium concessions which he sold for \$14,500 on his highly received oil permits and applications on acreages of oil which he disposed of within a few days, and picked up \$11,250.

These are instances, Mr. Speaker, that we are bringing forward because we have the development of the natural resources of this province at heart and we believe that the resources of the people should be developed and the people's interest and rights in those resources should be protected. We believe that this job can only be done where the government elected by the people, that it supposedly has confidence in, does the job in the handing out of these permits and applications and concessions in the proper manner. That is, in going to the legitimate mining firms, in going to the legitimate oil companies and asking the legitimate oil companies to apply for acreages. Going to them and asking them to do that, rather than forcing them to deal with an individual who has got a monopoly control over 14 million acres of the gas and oil reserve of the province. That is putting the legitimate oil company into the position where he has got to go out and deal with him, because he is the man who is in control. They are forced into a position that if they are to obtain permits to develop these oil resources they have to hand over on to this czar a 2½ per cent over-riding royalty on every dollar's worth of oil that is produced in that area. Sure your oil men are coming in. They are coming in because they are determined to develop our natural resources in spite of the czars and the middlemen that have been set up by this Government. We have shown that the oil men will continue to come in and develop because we still have groups of people who believe in loyalty and honesty, determination to develop the resources of Saskatchewan in order that the people can enjoy a better economic standard than they are having to date. And it is that loyalty and integrity and determination that are making them overcome all obstacles that this government has put in their path in an effort to develop these resources.

That is why we are getting development in our province today. That is the reason for it. These are the results, Mr. Speaker, of a government when it changes its stripes; these are the results of a government that has deserted the principle upon which the very foundation of the Party was built; this is a result of a dual personality, an effort to mix up private enterprise with socialism and juggle them together in an effort to come out with something good. Something good can never come out of such a concoction as that. They are as opposite as the poles; there can be no compromise between socialism and private enterprise and if we are going to have the resources of this province developed the only way they will be developed is by private enterprise; and the government has admitted that very thing because, if it had not, if they could have done it under socialism we would have had it done under socialism. There would not have been the need for them to reverse their principles and say to the farmer and to the rural people "No, we are not really socialists, look how we have embraced private enterprise. Why, there should be no

doubts in your mind. We have gone into business on our own. Surely if we could do that, you should have confidence in us. And we say there is room in the Province of Saskatchewan (so they tell us) for a little bit of socialism, a little bit of co-operatives and the major part private enterprise." And they say, "there should be no hatred between these three, there should be no hatred. You people who believe in socialism, we have given you a taste of it; you people who believe in co-operatives you have a few; you people who believe in private enterprise, we are giving you that. We have gone before the oil firms and the mining firms and we have said to them 'we do not discourage you to come in. Come in, you are welcome. We welcome private enterprise.'"

A far cry, Mr. Speaker, from the thirties. a far cry from the '44s when the little booklet, The Regina Manifesto, was the prescription for all Saskatchewan's ills. The only thing that will cure Saskatchewan is the Regina Manifesto; production for use and not for profit. I do not think I have heard that sentence spoken in this legislature in the past two years. It seems to have disappeared completely from the vocabulary of the government of today, disappeared completely! Yes, . . .

Premier Douglas: — You are seldom in the House.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I might inform the Premier that each and every session I go in and sign in the Clerk's office and draw my pay and the statement shows less than three days' absence — I have been here, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — But not in the Chamber.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — I have not only been here, but I have been exercising my rights in this House and I have been bringing to the attention of the people information which the people are vitally interested in, information which the people want to know about and I have been doing that because I have been elected to represent them. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they did not get oil development in Saskatchewan until they threw their manifesto overboard; but, before they threw it overboard, Mr. Speaker, they attached a little string to it. They still retain on the statute books of this province an act which says that the government has the right at any time to confiscate any oil wells, any mines, any farmland, any buildings, anything which the government may desire to take over.

Yes, they have thrown the manifesto overboard, and have anchored it below the water so it is out of sight; but don't forget — that when the time is opportune that anchor will be drawn up and socialism will be brought back in once again to wreck the board, in Saskatchewan.

If they are so sincere as they say they are, then why don't they prove it — in inviting private enterprise? They do not need to say, 'we embrace private enterprise — don't be frightened of it.' Why don't they prove their convictions by eradicating from the statutes that confiscatory legislation? Why don't they do it? We asked that it be done last session. It was not done — it was not done. We saw the spectacle a few years back when they passed a vote of confidence because they did not do away with the Regina Manifesto, that they kept this legislation on the books. We saw the Premier of that day, on the one hand defending

the Regina manifesto as the greatest political document that ever had been written — and on the other hand making a desperate effort to protect the private enterprise against the results of socialism; a dual personality — riding two horses.

Now today, for the farm population they are going to set up a Royal Commission to see what is wrong with agriculture. Well, they knew in 1944; why, they came into my seat in 1944 by the hordes, and every household was called on and they were asked, "How many children have you, Mrs. Jones?" "Four," she replied. "That is splendid — have you a bathtub in your house?" "No, we haven't." "Well, now, isn't that a shame that you should have to send those darling little kiddies behind the wood-shed to take a bath in the washtub?" Then they go to the one and say, "Have you electricity in your home?" "No, we haven't." "Well, now, isn't that a shame."

They promised electricity up and down that province. They came into my area and particularly around Mendham, only ten miles from the power line, and they said, "You elect us and we will bring your power into Mendham" — a distance of 10 miles. In 1948 we interviewed them again as a delegation. They said, 'Hold on, boys — it's coming. I am sure we will reach there by 1952.' We have patiently waited from 1948 to 1952 to have the power line extended a distance of 10 miles to serve the town of Mendham, but they tell me now in that area, "Yes, we have every confidence, because we are hearing on all occasions that as soon as the weather breaks they are bringing in the power."

Mr. Kuziak (Canora): — What did the Liberals do for 35 years?

Mr. Cameron: — Then they say this: "How far are you from a doctor, Mrs. Jones?" Some of my people have had to reply "65 miles, sir." "Well, well, isn't that terrible that you should be 65 miles from a doctor. You elect us, and you will have your medical centres right here." Today, after eight years of C.C.F. government, my people in Richmound and all through that area are still asking to be brought at least some of the medical services into their area so that they still won't have to go 65 miles away. They said, if nothing else, at least establish a nurse at this area. So we had a delegation on that and they said, "Yes, they would investigate it." And they did. they sent a very fine nurse out, one of the nicest ladies I think I have ever had the privilege of working with. She made a thorough investigation and she asked for the co-operation of these people and they gave it willingly. They said, "All that we are asking is that you make the decision whether or not it is feasible to put a nurse in this area"; and I have the result of her report. She said due to the smallness of the population she could not see how a nurse would be kept fully occupied in that area, and I think she was justified in that regard; and she added this: "I think that what the people in this area need is not a nurse, but an all-weather highway linking them up with Highway 21 so that they can get to medical centres." We are still waiting for that.

They began to push the highway north after 1944 — a splendid highway they built too — I give them every credit for it. It went as far as Fox Valley. They happened to be working there the day of

the election. Two days after the election, Mr. Speaker, the crew and the equipment and everything was gone — in 1948 — and we have not seen hide nor hair of them since then. We have been down here with petitions and petitions and with delegations crying for at least a start on the completion of No. 21 highway, from Fox Valley north, but today, Mr. Speaker, our hopes are raised, because we had a meeting with those people not long ago and they said "No, look, I believe at last we are going to get it, because we are hearing it on good authority that, come the spring and the roads open up, the crews are coming in and they are going to build that highway." So, my people have hopes once again.

Now then, we have been very interested in where the Trans-Canada highway is going in Maple Creek. I saw press reports where the Trans-Canada highway had been surveyed as far as Tompkins — oh, that was away last year — last fall or early spring; and I began enquiring as to where the highway is going through the seat of Maple Creek. I wrote in to the Minister of Highways and asked him. He wrote a very kindly letter and said that the surveys are being made at the present time and as soon as we have any information he would let me know. That was months ago. To this very day we still do not know where the Trans-Canada highway is going to cross the seat of Maple Creek. It stops, Mr. Speaker, right at the eastern boundary, and for three years we still cannot find where it is going. We have had delegations up to interview the Minister; they still say they do not know where it is going. That is the only area in the province that does not know where the Trans-Canada highway is going.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I would like to point out that the hon. gentleman gave the impression that we had been keeping information from him. Now, that is not correct and he knows it. I gave him the information that was available at that time and I told him that (as he knows today) the survey is being conducted. The area to be worked on next year, of course, is from Swift Current west and we have not completed the survey. He also knows — as anyone does who knows that country — that the terrain is rather rough and there are some difficult problems to overcome. But, when that survey is completed, he will have the information.

Mr. Cameron: — That information, Mr. Speaker, is just as indefinite as the letter I got. I do not think the Minister has added anything to my statement. He says the survey is being made — he told me that six months ago, that the survey was being made — he did not add any new information.

We are very interested in highways in that area and I happened to attend the C.C.F. nominating convention at Fox Valley when it was held this fall. I went down in the evening to hear the Premier speak, because I enjoy listening to him speak, and the new candidate whom they had just elected — or just nominated — began to speak and he said something like this: "No, I have lived in this country a lifetime and I know the problems of you people. I know that the highways in Fox Valley and north to Leader are disgraceful, but if you elect me I promise you

that I will work day and night for the completion of that highway." Then afterwards, many of my people came to me and asked me this question: "Do we have to elect this member to get No. 21 built?" I said, "No, I hardly think so." they said, "Well, if it is not needed — if he does not have to be elected — he had the Premier sitting with him on the platform. Why did he not ask the Premier right then for the completion of No. 21? Does he have to be elected to a seat in the Legislature before he could approach his government in the interests of the people? Are we to understand then, that so long as we have a Liberals member and no C.C.F., then we have no voice to go to the Minister?" And they began to question and they thought this: Surely, if that man is prepared to go to bat and speak on behalf of the completion of the highway — surely he did not have to get himself elected in order to do it. And I say this, if we wait until that man is elected before we get No. 21 highway, we are going to wait another 18 or 19 years! That is the situation. Those are the problems that are affecting my rural people and they are going to set up a commission to find out what is wrong with rural Saskatchewan.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, we do not need a Royal Commission. We just need a commission — a commission of any five reeves in my constituency, or any five reeves gathered over the province of Saskatchewan. Those five reeves will tell them in five minutes what the rural population wants in Saskatchewan. They know the problems — they are facing them every day. No, we do not need a Royal Commission to investigate the problems of Saskatchewan.

In view of what I have said, Mr. Speaker, in view of this bungling of the development of our natural resources, I believe that I am fully justified in moving, seconded by Mr. McCormack:

That the following words be added to the Address:

"We respectfully submit to Your Honour that this Assembly regrets the manner in which Your Honour's present advisers have administered the mineral and oil resources of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Discussion on Point of Order

Premier Douglas: — There has already been an amendment with regard to the abolition of the public revenue tax and further assistance to municipalities and school district; and while my own opinion was that that was a budgetary matter, Your Honour held that it was in order. It seems to me that this amendment, which says, "We respectfully submit to Your Honour that this Assembly regrets the manner in which Your Honour's present advisers have administered the mineral and oil resources. It would seem to me that the omnibus amendment that was first moved and later defeated would cover this. I do not think the matter, from our point of view, is particularly important, as to whether it is in order or not; but in view of the fact that other amendments may be coming up on other motions, I

think Your Honour might take under consideration as to whether or not this is in order.

Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that when there is a motion of lack of confidence in the government moved, on general grounds, that the government has lost the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan, then, of course, it has always been regarded and has been done repeatedly in this House that motions regretting certain specific matters have been moved and debated and put before the Assembly. Now I looked through the books before this amendment was drafted; and amendments like this have been put in more than once while Your Honour has been in the chair; and I do submit that this — I do not want to take a great deal of time over the point — but I do submit that we are entitled to make representations to His Honour. In the first place, that his present advisers have lost the confidence of the people; the Assembly has disposed of that; and now we come forward with a specific motion that we regret the manner in which one specific matter has been handled. Now, conceivably, just as a matter of argument, the Government might make an error in one matter and still retain general confidence. They are not the same thing at all. The first thing is that they have lost the confidence of the people altogether; now, we come along and say we regret the manner in which they have handled the mineral and oil resources of the province. That is one specific matter and I submit that His Honour is entitled to have the opinion of this Assembly on that point as to whether this Assembly approves of the way in which His Honour's advisers have handled that particular matter.

Mr. Speaker: — The way I look at this is, that it is simply a repetition. You could go on indefinitely bringing in amendments of this kind. When this is disposed of you can bring in a regret that they did not do something else; and when that is disposed of you can regret something else again; and, as a matter of fact, you have submitted one specific amendment which deals with a specific matter; and it can go on indefinitely. The only grounds that I could rule it out on is that it is repetition and I would take it under advisement.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to confine myself exclusively to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate will go on, on the main motion until I take this under consideration.

Mr. McCormack: — I will speak on the main motion, in any event, Mr. Speaker, and I will confine myself very closely to the remarks, and follow the remarks of the member who has just taken his seat. Now, sometime between Christmas and New Years I made a radio broadcast and it has been referred to in this House (I think possibly the Premier was referring to me at one time when he said that he wished the member for Souris-Estevan, if he had anything to say, would have the courage to get up and say it instead of mumbling into my collar).

Well, I am not particularly frightened of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, either in this House or out of it. I realize there are a lot of things said in the heat of debate that possibly would be better left unsaid. However, I have been a lot of places that I think possibly the Premier has not even been and I never had too much difficulty establishing that I was not afraid to stand up and say something.

Now I would like to refer particularly to this radio broadcast that I made because the Premier said I was getting into a radio broadcasting booth where nobody could get at me. Well, I think as the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) pointed out, there are lots of opportunities for people to get at those who are in radio booths — far more opportunities for them to get at them than in this House. However, I am going to take some portions of that radio broadcast, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and refer to them and just find out what, if anything, in that radio broadcast was incorrect. Now, the broadcast started out by referring to the fact that this was a brand new year starting. Well, that is a very logical thing to say on the 28th of December and I don't think they can take any great objection to that. Well, I was going to say with respect to the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E.H. Walker) the quantity of Walkers has increased in this House, but the quality has remained the same.

I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that even the holiday season had not cooled the excitement about oil, because I personally think that down in the Estevan district — and almost entirely through my constituency (with all due respects to the member from Elrose (Mr. Willis) I think we are sitting on the hottest part of the province as far as oil is concerned and I said this — and I am going to quote from the radio address:

“A large proportion of the privately-owned land in Saskatchewan does not give the surface owner ownership of the mineral rights.”

and I do not think anybody could take exception to that; then I went on to say this, Mr. Speaker:

“I have attended on many occasions, that in cases of this nature (that is, where valuable mineral oil or other discoveries are established) that the farmer or surface owners should receive adequate consideration.”

I have maintained that in this House. I have had in two previous speeches on the budget, 1950 and 1951, advocating this and I can refer to the press clippings, if that has to be established, from the Oxbow Herald, the Gazette and the Estevan Mercury. I will admit they are local papers. It did appear in the Leader-Post, but I have not got that clipping with me at the present time. I also went on to say this:

“Present government regulations protect them only with respect to damage to the surface, or to the area of the surface utilized and developing and operating production of subsurface or mineral possibilities.”

Well it is known to the Minister of Natural Resources, and I think known to every member of this House, that if the owner of the surface rights does not own mineral rights, all he gets at the present time is some form of compensation for the area of the surface taken; and certainly he does not get any share of the production out of the subsurface minerals. I do not think there can be any question about that first paragraph in this radio address, Mr. Speaker. I do not necessarily want to refer to it all — I am prepared to, but I do not think I should take up the time in the House to read the entire radio address. However, I went on to say this — I want to find, though, just what portions in this radio address that the people opposite do not agree with — what has not already been substantiated in this House; and I just want to give any member opposite the chance to deal with me later in a most appropriate manner — or something like that — I think the Premier said that was what he was going to do to me.

I went on to say this, Mr. Speaker. I said:

“I think that every land-owner, where mineral rights are not included in his title, should get some share of any royalties earned. In other words, he should be adequately compensated for damage done to his land and should be entitled to a small percentage of the value of the minerals or oil produced.”

And I have maintained that, as I said before, on two previous occasions in this legislature, in the budgets of 1950 and 1951. I do not think there can be any objections to that statement. I went on to say this, Mr. Speaker:

“Many farmers who own their own minerals have leased them for a paltry 10 cents per acre per year and may have handed over a small portion to some smart operator purchasing leases, or have even sold completely their mineral rights for small sums. Most of these farmers, because of the 3 cent mineral tax per acre were more easily induced to lease their minerals because they thought they would lose their minerals anyway if they did not pay their tax.”

Now, that is my opinion, and I believe this to be true and I believe that any member of this House that gets out among the people who own their mineral rights on their land agree that there was quite a feeling amongst the farmers that some smart bird came along — or some legitimate oil company came along — and offered them ten cents per acre per year for a ten-year lease, on which they get 12½ per cent of the production if anything is found. I can see no particular objection to the lease, Mr. Speaker, but I do think that in view of the fact that within the past two years in my area, leases are now up to seven and eight dollars for the first year and one dollar per acre per year after, I do not think — and most farmers will tell you — that they would ever have leased in the first place if they had thought they were

going to lose their mineral rights because of this three cents per acre tax imposed by the mineral taxation act, which has been on since the 1st of January, 1945.

And I went on in this radio broadcast to say this:

"A three cent per acre tax is imposed by the C.C.F. Government's brain-child, called the Mineral Taxation Act. What is the history and purpose of the Mineral Taxation Act? You will remember that the C.C.F. Government, immediately after being elected, called a special session in the fall of 1944. At this session the Mineral Taxation Act was passed. A revised Act was later substituted in 1948."

Now, this is a complete statement of fact, Mr. Speaker. The statute books show that the Act was originally passed in the fall of 1944 at the second session of the legislature and it is also established that there was a revised Act passed in 1948.

I went on to explain this, Mr. Speaker, and I said that it provided for three cents per acre per year, upon all privately owned minerals, or fifty cents per acre tax where an area becomes a producing area.

Now, down in my particular part of the country, right around the coal fields, there is a fifty cent per acre tax on what is considered to be the producing area in the coal fields. I said this:

"The Act also provides for the tax not to exceed 10 mills on the assessed value placed on the minerals"
...

and that is also provided for in the Act, Mr. Speaker, that there can be a 10 mill assessment on the value of the minerals, whatever those minerals can be established to be. And I quoted the former C.C.F. Minister of natural resources and I said this:

"The former C.C.F. Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Phelps, in a radio broadcast reported in the Commonwealth of December 13, 1944, said:

'The new Mineral Taxation Act, also introduced during the special session, was perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation from this Department. This tax will impose a fee of three cents per acre on all land where the mineral rights are retained by private companies or individuals. It is a new tax — the only one of its kind produced during the session and is the first step by this Department in restoring the natural resources of the people'"

February 21, 1952

That is a matter of fact. That is a quotation of Mr. Phelps' which has already been recorded, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think any member on the Government side of the House could take issue with that statement.

Then I quoted from the Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker, and I will red that. I had this to say:

"The Commonwealth, which is a C.C.F. party paper, and apparently reflects the official opinion of the C.C.F. party, had this to say on November 4, 1945:

'The Mineral Taxation Act provided for a tax of three cents per acre per year. If the owner of the mineral rights does not pay the tax, these mineral rights revert to the Crown — that is, to the Government of the province. The Act also provides for a tax not to exceed 10 mills on the dollar value of minerals as shown on the assessment roll.'

"And the commonwealth goes on to say this:

'It is expected that:

(1) Greatly increased revenues from taxation will come to the Provincial Treasury from those best able to pay it.

(2) Mineral rights over large areas will revert to the crown.'"

That is also a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. The Commonwealth apparently reflects the official position of the C.C.F. party, and apparently they anticipated that through this three cent per acre per year, that the province would get back a lot of mineral rights that people would not bother paying the three cents per acre tax on.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCormack: — And I think the next paragraph in this radio speech is a logical inference from the statement of the former Minister of Natural Resources, and the statement which appeared in the Commonwealth. I said this:

"We can all see that, from this the principal object of the Mineral Taxation Act was the expropriation of these mineral rights by the C.C.F. Government. Unfortunately, because of this tax many farmers were stampeded into leasing and in some cases, transferring potentially valuable mineral rights for a very small fraction of what could be obtained for them today."

Now that is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. Since the oil interest has become quite acute there have been people going around the country who have apparently no intention of developing any minerals themselves, but they have been buying up these leases and buying up half-interest in leases, and they will go to a man who has already signed a lease — say he has signed one for ten cents an acre with a legitimate oil company on a quarter-section of land — and they go to him and say: "Well, now, you have a 12½ per cent lease here — we will take 6¼ per cent of it and will give you \$100 or \$150 for your 6¼ per cent." They do not tell him that what he is signing, in effect, is a transfer of 50 per cent of his minerals; and any farmer will tell you that if it had not been in the first instance for this mineral taxation that they would never have signed any leases.

Then I went on, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — I take it when the hon. member is going over the speech, clause by clause, that he is not taking any silence on our part to mean that we agree with the conclusions which he is drawing by the statements he is making — or does he want us to interrupt him when we think he has come to a false statement?

Mr. McCormack: — Well, I will go over it again, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I merely asked my hon. friend if he wants us to stop him when he comes to the places where we think he is making an incorrect statement. He started out by saying that he was going to go over it, clause by clause, and I do not want him to think that silence means that we are agreeing with the statements contained.

Mr. Speaker: — If a member rises on a point of privilege, it is something that affects himself. It does not mean that every time you disagree with something the speaker is saying, that you should get up and contradict him. That opportunity, of course, will be given in the debate.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I did not rise on a point of privilege. I rose to ask my hon. friend a question — as to whether or not he expected us to interrupt him when we came to these places, because he started his speech by saying that he was going over these clauses one by one and he would like us to tell him where we think they are wrong. I think that the very first sentence on the top of Page 3 is a completely erroneous statement. I do not want to argue it now, during my hon. friend's speech, but I do not want him, at the end of his speech, to say, "I have gone over this clause by clause and nobody has found anything wrong with it."

Mr. McCormack: — Well, I will answer the hon. Minister's question, Mr. Speaker, I do not care whether he interrupts now or whether he deals with me . . .

February 21, 1952

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member can agree to answer questions, or he can refuse. That is the prerogative of the speaker.

Mr. McCormack: — That is right, Mr. Speaker. I am just answering the Premier. I do not particularly care whether he wants to interrupt me clause by clause and say he does not agree with that, or whether he wants to do it himself. I am quite sure that if there is anything wrong with what I am saying that I will be hearing about it from somebody opposite anyway.

Regarding the next two clauses in this radio address, Mr. Speaker. I dealt with the C.P.R. taking court action and the Attorney-General referred to it again the other day; and that is now before the court, so I do not think we can take any cognizance of it at the present time; but I would just like to refer to the fact that because of certain proceedings which were taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway company, there was re-investment procedure put through by the government to allow these minerals to be re-invested in people who may have lost them during this period. I said this, Mr. Speaker:

“That in October 1949, that is nearly two years after the Canadian Pacific Railway instituted these proceedings, the government, by order-in-council, suspended forfeiture proceedings in respect to all amendments until the disposition of the court action taken by the C.P.R.; and also provided, upon conditions, for the re-vestment of forfeited minerals in the persons from whom they were forfeited.”

I do not think anyone can take any exception to the statement. I went on to say this:

“Meanwhile, however, thousands of acres of privately-owned minerals were leased or purchased outright for paltry sums and — as far as can be ascertained — not one word of warning was given to the farmers of this province by a responsible Cabinet Minister.”

Premier Douglas: — That is not a correct statement of fact, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCormack: — Well, I will be very pleased — I have never been able to find any statement that was made with respect to this, Mr. Speaker, by a responsible Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCormack: — I pointed out in the radio address that this was in direct contrast, if my statement is correct and I am willing to be corrected, I pointed out that, in Manitoba, the Premier of Manitoba came out in the Winnipeg Tribune, Tuesday, June 18, 1951,

and had this to say. This is the report:

“Farmers southeast of Winnipeg were advised last week to reject offers of 10 cents an acre per year for oil leases on their land.”

This took place at the Union of Manitoba Municipalities district convention.

“The Deputy Minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs reported that the Provincial Government had received certain offers on land. Mr. Fisher’s advice to the farmers there was ‘wait and see.’ He said, ‘if there is any prospect of oil, the price will jump considerably and 10 cents will be chicken feed.’”

Premier Douglas Campbell said this:

“Oil leases are going to be of tremendous importance to a great many farm families in these times. With the present oil fever abroad, do not let that fever jockey farm families out of their land rights.”

Hon. Member: — What did Tommy Douglas say?

Mr. McCormack: — Nothing. Oswald MacKay, another gentleman who was at this municipal convention, said this, “Do not sign at 10 cents; do not be a fool like I was.” But the Premier of Manitoba also said this:

“A lot higher than 10 cents an acre is being offered in some parts, and in addition 12½ per cent of any oil found.”

He advised people to read the fine print in the lease offered to them and protect themselves from damage to their land from exploration or drilling; to take a share in any oil found on the land; to get a good payment per acre — \$1 per acre is being paid in the western part of the province — and frequently, \$5 an acre on the Saskatchewan border.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, is what the Premier of Manitoba did, and I referred to that in this radio broadcast.

And I went on to say this:

“Now that is how the average person who owns minerals under his land has been treated. What has happened to the many acres of minerals which are owned by the Government are represented in the titles as ‘minerals in the Crown.’

I went on to say this, Mr. Speaker — I do not want to be repetitious, but some of my remarks followed the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) — some of the statements he made here today and which have already been established in this House. I said this:

“After much probing by Opposition members, (and I do not think the Minister of Natural Resources, or any of the members in the front benches of the Government can say there has not been a lot of probing in this matter in the past two years.) After much probing by Opposition members in the legislature, some startling instances of how the C.C.F. looked after their friends, have come to light.

“An employee of the C.C.F. Government, who was legal adviser to the Premier, legal adviser to the Cabinet, a member of the Natural Resources Committee of the C.C.F. party, organized the company known as Search Corporations. This company was incorporated on the 8th of March, 1949. Another position that this gentleman held was legal counsel to the executive council and he was also a member of the Economic Planning and Advisory Board” . . .

And I might just point out, Mr. Speaker, that I might have mentioned in that radio broadcast that as a member of this Economic Advisory and Planning Board they were given access to all files and records and everything in every department of Government, which goes quite a bit farther than what I said in this radio address.

And then on the 17th of April, 1949 — I think it came up in one of the questions here this afternoon — and I am going to refer to that. Several weeks before he resigned his position with the Government his company obtained potentially valuable uranium concessions from the Government. At least this is the information that the Minister of Natural Resources gave the legislature. I can remember that day, Mr. Speaker . . . I said:

“Later in a press statement the Minister said the concession was not granted on April 17th, but on May 12th, 6 days after the resignation. In any event certain corporations had been incorporated prior to the termination of his employment and obviously with the object of going into the business of acquiring mineral resources.”

I do not think there is any question about that. We have a copy of the agreement, withdrawal of the area under Section 48, 47A of the Quartz Mining regulations and the agreement was dated March 15th, 1949. But there is a slip attached to it saying this:

"Concession agreement signed by the Deputy Minister on May 12th, 1949, and ante dated to March 15th, 1949, in order that the agreement should cover a full three years."

Now, I am in no position to quarrel with that, but we are merely going by the explanation that was given in the House. In any event what I said was this:

"That it does not really make too much difference whether it was 6 days before or 6 days after. There is no question about the fact that this was organized specifically with the purpose of going into and getting interested in natural resources. He also bought a concession known as 'LL' as well as 'ZZ' and search No. 1, which is referred to in sessional paper 116, of 1950."

I went on to say this, Mr. Speaker:

"Just to show how valuable these concessions are, one concession which was obtained for \$500 was late sold to another company — the selling price was \$15,000 for 100,000 fully paid up shares. That is a profit of \$14,500 in cash, plus the shares."

Premier Douglas: — Might I ask my hon. friend a question? Did he have any information, at that time, as to how much this company had spent on exploration, and whether they ever got this \$15,000?

Mr. McCormack: — Well, I was going by the March 31st, 1950, issue of the Leader-Post, where those statements were brought out in this Legislature and nobody ever brought up the question at that time. Now, if the Premier has any information with respect to how much they paid out for exploration, or how much they got — or how much they did not get — I think it would be very interesting to let us have that information in the House.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. gentleman made the statement, not I. He made the statement that these people got \$15,000; I will very gladly give the information.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McCormack: — I will be very pleased to have it if the Premier can give us that information. This same man, Mr. Speaker, on November 23rd of the same year, obtained oil and gas permits from the Department of Natural Resources, covering 600,000 acres of Crown lands. They purchased these permits for \$3,750 — just two days after they got the permits they sold the permits to National Petroleum for \$15,000 in cash and 25,000 shares in the company. Here again — in two days — they

February 21, 1952

made a profit of \$11,250 and got 25,000 shares in the company. If anyone wants to know where we got that information, I can tell them. It comes from a business house report, and it says this:

“This company was incorporated under the laws of Saskatchewan, September 22, 1949, with an authorized capital of \$250,000 — 250,000 shares.”

There is a notice here in the Saskatchewan Gazette:

“Interviewed January 23rd, 1950, R.H. Havard stated that he was the managing director of the company. Offices were maintained at 201 Westman Chambers, Regina. Havard stated that the other officers of the company were Charles D. Broughton, farmer of Saskatchewan, as president; Norman Sandomirsky of Regina, as a director; other directors are Dr. R. Anderson, Regina, J.G Street, Secretary-treasurer, and Mrs. J. Cates as the Secretary of the company.”

Now I can go on with more information. It says:

“Of the authorized shares, Havard reported that 100,000 shares had been issued and fully paid in. Of the shares R.H. Havard and M.C. Shumiatcher received 25,000 between them for the permits which they held and which were turned over to the company; the other shares are reported to have been purchased for cash at 40 cents per share.”

Now, 25,000 shares at 40 cents per share — about \$11,250 — that is a fairly substantial profit.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, those were shares in what company, may I ask?

Mr. McCormack: — National Petroleums Limited. I think the copy of the agreement is on file with the provincial secretary, Mr. Speaker, showing that transaction.

I also went on to say, in that speech, Mr. Speaker:

“The C.C.F. government also granted 10½ million acres of gas and oil concessions to a small group known as Gulf Securities and some associates . . .”²⁸

Hon. Member: — Undisclosed associates.

Mr. McCormack: —

“ . . . undisclosed associates. These permits cost one-tenth of a cent per acre. Within a few days the permits on this 10½ million acres were transferred to oil companies for a substantial amount of cash and an over-riding royalty of 2 ½ per cent.”

I do not think I have to explain what an over-riding royalty of 2½ per cent is. I did that in the broadcast. And I said, as well, in the broadcast, that if oil was found any one of these men would become multi-millionaires.

I was quite generous with them. I said only one-quarter of the potential gas and oil acreage was involved. I understand now that it is between 35 and 40 per cent, Mr. Speaker. I went on to say this:

“This is, of course, only part of the sorry record of the C.C.F.’s handling of the natural resources and these transactions are all the more strange because they are being defended by a government which professes to be interested in reserving the mineral resources of the province for the use and benefit of all the people in the province and not just a select few.”

You know, Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested to read the report in the Star-Phoenix, March 3, 1942, and in an address that the present Minister of Natural Resources made in this Legislature, he had this to say:

“Even now, when oil is the very lifeblood of mechanized warfare, the government hands over to private corporations the right to this essential natural resource in large areas of this province.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Without any Crown reserves.

Mr. McCormack: — It does not say that. It goes on:

“These companies will be developing these new fields and will be producing oil there for a profit because the heritage of the people has been given to them in return for a mess of pottage.”

Hon. Member: — Who said that?

Mr. McCormack: — The Hon. J. H. Brockelbank — not the Hon. J. H. Brockelbank at that time.

Hon. Member: — What was the date of that? Have you got the date?

Mr. McCormack: — March 3, 1942. Things have changed since then, I guess!

I went on to say this, Mr. Speaker:

“Now the friends of the C.C.F. apparently have been generously treated by them; but how has the government treated the average farmer who has been lucky enough to retain his own mineral rights. To every farmer who owns his own mineral rights, the C.C.F. say: ‘you must pay us three cents an acre every year in order to keep your rights; and if you do not, we will expropriate.’

“Last year the government collected about \$150,000, mainly from farmers, on this three cents per acre tax. I think that figure is substantially correct; I am not sure of the exact details.

“There are about 18 million acres of land in the province where the mineral rights are held by ordinary individuals, and if the mineral tax, the validity of which is now before the courts, is proven to be legal, then people who own their own mineral rights will be paying the C.C.F. government half a million dollars every year through this three cent tax.”

I do not think there can be any question about that statement about the amount of money, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be collected, or the fact that the farmer is told, in this Act, that they will send him out a notice; and, at the end of 6 months, if this mineral tax is not paid, their minerals will be forfeited. And I went on to contrast the way the farmers have been treated with the way that these few friends of the C.C.F. government had been treated, Mr. Speaker. I said this — and I agree 100 per cent with it — and I am sure that many of the members opposite would like to agree with it too. I said:

“Surely, aside from every other issue, this handling of the province’s natural resources will defeat the C.C.F. government in the next election.”

I do not want to go by without referring to this part, because it is something else that is factual, Mr. Speaker. I said this:

“Many of you will remember that at a Liberals convention in Saskatoon, last year, a resolution was passed advocating exemption of farmers’ land from the three cent per acre mineral tax, and a return to the farmers of any mineral rights taken away from them by the C.C.F. government and this resolution will be implemented after the defeat of the C.C.F. government next summer.”

Now I can read the rest of it, Mr. Speaker; it does not deal with any of the debate on this. I did point out that the C.C.F. had lost 140,000 votes in Ontario in the recent election. No other party lost substantially in the number of votes, but the C.C.F. lost 140,000, which is a great many. I am quite confident, Mr. Speaker, that they will lose here.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You did not mention Gravelbourg.

Mr. McCormack: — No, I did not; and if you had been so confident after the Gravelbourg by-election, you would have called an election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to close now; and I will say this — I have enjoyed you being in the chair during the four sessions that I have been here. I am very sorry that you cannot continue there after this year — we are going to miss you, I am sure — but I thought that somebody from the Government side, seeing it is your last year, would at least have said how sorry they will be that you are leaving; and I do not mean by that, that you are not going to run again.

However, with that, I think you can be assured that I will support this amendment.

Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with others in commenting on the sudden death of our late King, and I had the pleasure of meeting him when he was in this country some few years ago.

I also want to say that I am delighted that Mr. Patterson was elevated to the Lieutenant Governor of this province. If I had had the opportunity of becoming Lieutenant Governor of this province I would have refused, because I would not repeat what the C.C.F. put into my mouth; I would not lower myself to that degree.

However, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I must say to the hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley that I think this is a very severe criticism of the position of the Lieutenant governor.

Mr. Dundas: — Mr. Speaker, my political career has dated back since Walter Scott was first elected Premier of this Province. I was on the committee that was appointed to select the parliament buildings for the Province of Saskatchewan; and being just a boy at that time and with not very many Liberals down our way — they were all Conservatives — they asked me to go and represent that part of the country as a Liberal. I did so and we got criticized severely because we picked this site here, because the people of Regina wanted us to have the parliament buildings

February 21, 1952

on Victoria Park and I am sure the criticism was also severe, too, because we bought this property here from the Liberals. There were no C.C.F.'s at that time; I am sure there were only Liberals and Conservatives.

However, I may say that in 1900, when Mr. Premier Martin was our leader, I campaigned for that gentleman too; and then I campaigned for the Hon. Charles Dunning. In those times the Liberals controlled the legislature for a great many years, and I am sure that if the C.C.F. had been in power at that time, our country would not have prospered as it did. However, I might say that then along came Mr. Gardiner and I supported him, as Liberal leader at that time.

In 1921 I was asked to let my name go before the Liberal convention as a Liberal candidate and I refused. I refused again, in 1925; and, in 1933, to campaign in the 1934 election. My opponent at that time was the Hon. Mr. Sturdy as a C.C.F. candidate and Mr. Nicholl, the Tory of Indian Head. Mr. Sturdy knows how he came out there; because he put \$100 into the coffers of the Provincial Government; but I will say that he was a decent chap on the hustings. I will say that. He did not ridicule me or the Tory party, because he was, at that time, in a losing battle. I might say, in 1938, at that election there was no C.C.F. candidate running; there was a Social Credit and a Conservative and I got — in 1933 — 1,476 of a majority; and, in 1938, I got 1,993 of a majority. That is not bad for an old garage man.

In the election of 1944 I was defeated; and, Mr. Speaker, I took my defeat like a gentleman. I was contacted, when I got home, by three or four people and they said, "Well, you got defeated." I said to them, "Well I am not the only one that ever got defeated." Anyway I went up to congratulate Mr. Burgess at his committee rooms and they asked me to say a few words and I spoke for about 15 minutes and when I was winding up I said, "You know, there is always a brighter day coming;" and in that election I never made any difference to Mr. Burgess. He and I were good friends and I did not interfere with him carrying out his duties as a member. I told them, at that occasion, that the people, if they wanted Mr. Burgess to represent them for the next four years, that I would give him all the assistance that I could. I might say that it was a fair deal. He took me out in 1944; but I took him out in 1948. That is not a bad record. I have fought four campaigns and won three. That is not a bad record for anyone.

However, I might say that I was told, in the 1948 election, that Mr. Douglas and Mr. Corman had made the statement — it was the C.C.F. that told me this — that Mr. Burgess could not be beat. I do not know if that is right or not, but the C.C.F. told me that; and I said, "You tell Mr. Douglas and Mr. Corman that the man or woman is not born yet that cannot be beaten," and he will know about that now.

Premier Douglas: — May I assure my hon. friend that I have been long enough in politics that I have never made such a statement. There is not anyone who cannot be beaten.

Mr. Dundas: — All right, but I heard that you and Mr. Corman both made the statement the same night.

However, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been here for a long time — for 14 years — as a member of this Legislature, and I have never seen yet such a squirmer and a wiggler as the Premier of this Province. He can sure squirm — I don't know how he does not wear his pants out.

I am, Mr. Speaker, I think speaking with some authority because I have been living in Saskatchewan for nearly 67 years — 67 years on the 26th of March — and that is a long time to live in a province — especially during the last eight years with a C.C.F. government. I think that is quite a record and I might say that when the convention was called for the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, I was advised by my doctor that I was not fit to run in an election; that my health was not of the best — and I might say that the young gentleman who has taken my place — Doug MacFarlane of Peebles — is a man 23 years old, a man of reputation as a cattle breeder and a swine breeder and a wonderful farmer; and I am sure that I will do everything in my power to elect him and I am sure he will be elected in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. I will, Mr. Speaker, give him all the assistance that I can and I am sure that assistance will be of some good.

I might say that I have, in this legislature, advocated — I was the first one to advocate — purple gas. I went to Mr. Dunn and Mr. MacKenzie, his deputy, and I said, "we are having lots of trouble making out reports that you use so much in your truck and so much in your car; they are taking affidavits that they do not know whether they are right or whether they are wrong," and I told them we should be able to use purple gas or some coloured gas for farmers. Then they had to pay so much money all the time — they had so much money tied up with the government and then they got it back after they took their affidavit that they used so much in their car and in their truck. I also advocated that the driver's license should not have to be carried by the person; that when you have your car and you have your license on your car — you break down and borrow another car — and you were liable when anyone asked you for your driver's license; and I advocated that 48 hours be given to all drivers to deliver that license to the police — city police or mounted police — and I think that was a good thing also.

I might say that I have given great thought and I have given the people of the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency the best that I have had; and I told the people in 1948 — and they know this too — that it mattered not to me, when I was elected in 1934, that I did not just look after the Liberals; that I looked after the C.C.F. and the Tories and the social Credit, just gave them the same consideration as I did my supporters. That was my policy laid down and when there were between three and four thousand people at my home town in 1934 when I was elected, I told them that — that I was going to look after everybody; and I have carried that policy out ever since.

I was the first one in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley that every time I was visiting around, when I came into a town where the municipal clerk was located, I always called there and asked him if there was anything I could help him with, or give him any information

with regard to the policies of the government; and that has done a great deal also.

I might say that I have the confidence of the people in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. I want to say that no one can win an election by himself. He has to have his supporters and his followers; and I might say that they have given me wonderful support and wonderful cooperation and I want to say to the people of the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley that I thank them for what they have done for me; and I hope they will continue to do that for my successor; and I am sure that after that, he will be here to represent the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency.

I might say that you hear a lot about the social services — the cancer clinic, the T.B., the Mothers' allowance, the old age pension, etc., but that was all put in before the C.C.F. were ever thought of. The Liberals put that in. I remember, in 1936-37, when Mr. Patterson was Premier that I know of two fellows whose fare he paid in to the cancer clinic — and he paid their hotel bills also — because they were so poor — from Lac Vert — two men that used to live in my home town — that he paid their fare and their hotel bills because they were in serious condition. I might say, also, that the mothers' allowance was put in by the Liberal government; the maternity grant was also put in; the T.B. was put in by the Liberals, the free treatment of T.B.; and I am sure that you people would like to take all the credit for that. They say "free hospitalization", "free medical services." There is nothing free. Somebody has to pay for it. You do not get something for nothing! I have told them lots of times they cannot pick money off gooseberry trees. Those fellows think they can pick it off gooseberry trees, but they cannot do it. Somebody has to pay for it.

Now then, I heard Mr. Douglas speaking, in 1944, and he said that he was going to look after the incapacitated; that the government would pay for the wants of the incapacitated. We had a woman in my home town that was 28 years bed-ridden; and there was another woman that was badly used up by rheumatism. The secretary of the town wrote up to the government and said he understood they were paying all the people that were incapacitated. Word came back that the had to be the responsibility of the town and the government would pay half of what the bill was. Well, in 1944, I heard Mr. Douglas himself say that they would look after the incapacitated. That was only half. You do not need to say that you fulfilled all your promises; you say the Liberals never fulfilled theirs. I do not think you fulfilled half of what you promised in 1944. You know I have good ears and I do not forget very often.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to direct my remarks to the Minister of Highways. I do not think he knows any more about highways than the highways know about him. He said they had built all the highways. Since I was elected in 1934, we built all No. 16 highway — from, Kennedy right to the No. 33 junction. We built a good road. I looked after all that road for Billy Patterson, being his seat and my seat. I built roads. I built lots of them. My seatmate here, the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) and myself are the only ones, I think, in this House that have ever built highways — and good ones too! I might say

that we built quite a few highways at fort Qu'Appelle. We built a highway from B-Say-Tah Point west for them to get to the Indian reservation.

I might say, also, that I was looking aft the highway from Lebret to Katepwa . . .

Hon. Member: — That is where you made your money.

Mr. Dundas: — And, Mr. Speaker, we made No. 56 highway from Indian Head to Katepwa; and I am sure we built it in the right place. If you do not build that other highway before the election is announced, you sure will not build it afterwards, because the Liberals will be looking after that.

Mr. Speaker, we built No. 35 highway too. We built the road from my home town to Montmartre through the Indian reservation — the highway.

Hon. Member: — That was an Indian trail

Mr. Dundas: — I think I did a great service to the people of that constituency; and also in regard to government bridges — when we were in we built all the government bridges — you people only build 50 per cent.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — No you did not.

Mr. Dundas: — Yes you do. You only build 50 per cent; and we built them all.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — You hardly built any.

Mr. Dundas: — I have a letter from Fillmore municipality, No. 96, telling about a bridge worth \$3,050 and they had to pay \$1,525. We built all the government bridges that were government bridges. There are a lot of government bridges in this province.

Hon. Member: — You will soon be taking credit for the Saskatchewan Landing bridge.

Mr. Dundas: — I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we will, in the near future, have an election, I guess — whether they might continue on till 1953 . . .

Premier Douglas: — 1954.

Mr. Dundas: — Oh, yes — 1955 maybe. But the quicker you come the quicker you will get beat. I might say, also, that the government's policy in regard to young people starting farming, has brought an attitude from the people of the province that the policy of the 33-year lease with all the school lands and government lands — and the people that want to sell their land would not sell it with this government in unless they get the cash. They will not sell it unless they get the cash. You cannot

February 21, 1952

get anybody to give a loan on a farm in this province outside of the Federal Farm Loan Board. They are the only ones that are lending money; and they are a little sceptical because you are in here.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — They know we won't cancel the taxes.

Mr. Dundas: — I have taken an interest in politics for a great many years; I have lived in Saskatchewan longer, I think, than anyone in this Legislature; and I have lived in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley for 67 years on March 26th; and I know a lot about Saskatchewan — more than any one of you fellows know about Saskatchewan. You don't know anything about it. I have had more ups and downs and been broke more times than any guy in this Legislature; and I am still going under my own power, so I think that I have done a wonderful job — and a wonderful job this last 7½ years — oh, that has been terrible! But, nevertheless, we will come back to our good old days after the election and you will know that there is a campaigner, providing my health permits, and I will be helping the candidate that has taken my place and although my health has not been so good the past year and a half or two years, but nevertheless I will do my best to elect a Liberal in that part of the country.

I might say that your candidate that you have at the present time is not half as hard a nut to crack as the one that I cracked, because he is not in the same class as Gordon Burgess, so we will have an easy time putting him out; and I am sure that I will be there trying to do that and I will do my duty.

I believe in Liberalism. They told me, in 1944, "if you had been a C.C.F.'er you could have been elected." I said, "I have a principle." I do not throw my principle away, because I do not care about being elected. I have a principle and I do not think there are very many over there with many principles. they think nobody has any brains, only them. Boy, we have more brains over there than they have in the whole bunch over there. Why look at the nice looking people who have been sitting over here for 8 years, looking into the faces of those — and can still take nourishment. I am a wonderful chap!

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude. You will hear from me a little later on.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — I ask leave of the Assembly to adjourn the debate.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I noted that the hon. member said that, owing to ill health he is not going to be able to run again. He has been a long and faithful public servant in the Province of Saskatchewan. He may have built some terrible roads over which some of us have had to travel, but we have forgiven him for that long ago, and his jovial disposition and good nature, together with the exuberance that he brings to this Chamber, always comes like a breath of fresh air. I know that members on all sides of the House will hear with regret the fact that he is dropping out of public life. Of course, he will be active in the campaign. I know that.

There was one statement he made tonight that I can assure everyone is true, and that is when he said he treated everybody alike; I do not think that was true in the matter of giving out Liberal jobs or Liberal contracts, but it was remarkable — in the 'thirties, I remember calling on a man who was a supporter of the political party to which I belong and he said, "I can vote against anybody except Beef Dundas, because anybody who is in trouble can go to Beef. I went to him once when I got a chance to truck some cattle and did not have any tires for my truck. He put them on and said, "Forget about the money, my boy; you come back and fix it up when you can." He had friends all over that constituency and he had a large personal vote because of his own kindliness and his own magnanimity and I know that members in all parts of the House will be sorry to see him dropping out.

Of course, the same goes for the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Loft) who has said that he is not going to stand because of business reasons. He has not been so long in public life, but we have been delighted to have him here this last term and will be very sorry if he is not with us. Of course we may have another session and have the opportunity of seeing these gentlemen again; but in case there is not another session we are sorry that they will not be with the five or six who will be sitting over there after the election.

I would like to move the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:45 o'clock p.m.