

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**11th Day**

**Friday, February 22, 1952**

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

On the Orders of the Day

**Hon. I.C. Nollet** (Minister of Agriculture): — A representative of the Board of Grain Commissioners interviewed us today, and since all hon. members are vitally concerned about the damp grain situation, I wish to tell you that we have been assured the representatives that they will be able to handle the damp wheat problem and there is no likelihood of any of the damp grain spoiling; and we will therefore not have a salvage problem. I should correct that and say 'damp wheat'.

**Hon. C.M. Fines** (Provincial Treasurer): — I wish to announce that the province has borrowed \$20 million for a period of 20 years at a rate of interest of 4 per cent. The balance was sold at par. This deal was done privately by a syndicate headed by the Dominion Securities Corporation. The deal is the largest Canadian provincial one ever placed privately in the United States. It is expected that this will look after the borrowing for the next fiscal year, 1952-53, including the refunding which will have to be done during the year. This borrowing is all the more favourable since in recent deals, other provinces have been paying a higher rate for smaller amounts for one-half the length of the term — that is, for 10 years instead of for 20 years.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the fact that something has occurred which affects the privilege of all members of this House was concerned; and I am sure that you did not hear any more yesterday, and it brought up a question which I draw to your attention and draw to the attention of the members of this House.

On the re-broadcast, on the occasion when the Premier was rising to contradict something said by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) my impression was that after the Premier had made his observations that he went on to more or less make other remarks. My impression was that Your Honour was calling him to order. However, the way it came over the radio was a different impression altogether. Things were heard by the radio audience that were not heard by the people on this side of the House, and I am sure by yourself, Mr. Speaker, or you would have intervened.

Now, while you were calling for order, apparently the hon. Premier was talking very closely into the microphone, and his voice was coming over much louder than yours, and one of the things, when you were calling for 'Order! Order!' was that the hon. Premier went right on

**February 22, 1952**

talking into the microphone; and one of the things that I was amazed to hear was in the course of these proceedings, that the Premier uttered the expression 'tissue of lies'.

I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if we had heard that on this side, that remarkable — and I might say impudent — statement, that these facts that were given by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) were a tissue of lies, we would have drawn it to your attention, Your Honour, and I think you would have dealt with it; but you did not hear it, and we did not hear it; and why I bring it up, Mr. Speaker, is this — that, as we go out in the country, somebody is likely to say, at one of our meetings, 'why the Premier branded your speech as a tissue of lies.' We would have said we never heard it, and the people in the country would have said, "Well, we heard it."

Well now, it is getting to be something that should be considered by this Legislature — if the Premier is going to go on talking into the microphone when you call for order, and if he is able to say things to the people of the province that the members of the Legislature do not hear; in other words, it upsets the whole basis of debate, and your chance to regulate it, Mr. Speaker. This is something that has to be given attention to, because it would be an outrageous state of affairs if a person in the Premier's position can say things over the radio that are not heard on this side, but they are heard by all the province, and not heard by Your Honour.

I draw this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure, you, had you heard that outrageous statement by the Premier, would have insisted that he resume his seat and obey your order. And I want to say further, that had we, on this side, heard that statement, that ridiculous statement in regard to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that he was handing out a 'tissue of lies', we would have repudiated it with all the energy we could; because it was an uncalled for statement.

What the member for Maple Creek said yesterday was substantiated over and over again in this House; and for the Premier to say that over the radio was quite uncalled for.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) of course has the privilege of drawing something to the attention of this House; but I might say that as long as this radio is going on, something may be picked up by the radio that I, myself, do not hear; and I am going to ask all the members that when I call them to order and try to keep the proceedings of the House in order — and that does not apply only to the Premier — that they will obey the rulings of the House. I had no cognizance of that going over the radio.

**Mr. Tucker:** — This is a matter affecting the privileges of all the members of this Legislature. This is a debate in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is true, and you have drawn it to our attention, and . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, in the light of Your Honour's remarks, so that you may control what does go out over the air, I do suggest that when a person is called to order, you should have some control so that if the member does not obey your order in some way, he shall be cut off the air; because otherwise you have no control over proceedings. That was shown yesterday.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If I enforced the orders, there would be a lot of members of this Legislature that would be named; because there are many, many members of this Legislature who do not obey the call of order, or sometimes, after a specific call of order, they continue speaking. Now, I have no opportunity to go over the radio script; that is already going out, and I cannot help that; and as you draw to the attention of the House, I did not hear the Premier made that statement, and maybe the Premier can explain — I do not know.

**Premier Douglas:** — I wonder if the House would consider going on to Special Order and leaving the answering of questions until later in the day.

**Mr. Speaker:** — When the debate was adjourned, there was an amendment moved by Mr. Cameron, seconded by Mr. McCormack, which I took under consideration. I have decided to allow the amendment, and instead of taking up the time of the Legislature with my remarks, these remarks will be included in the Votes and Proceedings, and the debate now, then, will be on the amendment submitted by Mr. Cameron, seconded by Mr. McCormack.

#### DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 21, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Erb for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Cameron.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank** (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I was very much entertained with the very good speech of the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) yesterday afternoon, and I want to say that I will certainly miss him in this House. He and I have been the same number of years in this Legislature, although he happened to be here four years when I was not here, and I happened to be here four years when he was absent; there was certainly a touch of colour missing.

We hope that his health is not too bad, and that he will live to enjoy very many more years.

**February 22, 1952**

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I thought that the hon. member's speech had a good deal more sense than either of the speeches made by the other two members yesterday afternoon.

for example, the member for Estevan (Mr. McCormack) proceeded to review an old radio speech which he had made just before New Year's; and in addition to the radio speech being not too good, the review itself was exceedingly dull. but, I was taken with one statement which the member for Estevan made in that review, when he called attention to his opening sentence in the radio speech. He said, "Within a few days, a brand new year will begin for all of us," and you know, Mr. Speaker, I believed that that was true, until yesterday afternoon, when the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) put the old cracked record of 191 on again and started it going round and round. We heard the same record of 1951 going round and round, and I thought sure we were back again in 1951.

I will not have the time to deal, in detail, with all the wrong information given to this House by the member for Maple Creek, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that most of it was wrong. I do intend to deal with a few of the items which he touched on yesterday. He mentioned gulf Securities. Mr. Rhubbra, who is one of the officials of Gulf Securities, was getting permits on 14 million acres. Now, I know the member for maple Creek is not too particular, but I must inform the House that the land on which Mr. Rhubbra actually got permits was 9 million acres, not 14 million acres. of course, to him, a mere matter of 5 million acres may be neither here nor there when it comes to producing evidence which is correct. He mentioned the press release of January 22 and May 10. The January 22, 1949 press release said:

"Possibilities of oil development in Saskatchewan have caught the imagination of oil men", Natural Resources Minister, J.H. Brockelbank, said today, "with the result that applications for exploration permits covering about one-third of the Crown mineral rights in the southern half of the province have been received from such interests during the past six weeks."

Now, Mr. Speaker, he went on then to the press release of May 10, 1949. The May 10th release stated that:

“Rights for oil and gas exploration covering more than 21 million acres of Saskatchewan Crown lands had been allotted to oil companies up to the present, Natural Resources Minister Brockelbank announced today,”

And then it goes on to say that new applications were coming in faster than that Department could handle them. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is one trouble that the Liberals never did have — applications coming in faster than they could handle them.

Now the fact of the matter is that, up until May 10th, a good quantity, quite a substantial quantity, of the permits which are now held by Tidewater were included in these amounts; approximately 4 million acres of the permits now held by Tidewater were included in those amounts. And so I do not think there is anything extraordinary about the amount of acreage that was being taken up at that time. The rush for land in Saskatchewan was on and everybody, except the Liberals, was very happy to see it. They had prophesied over and over again that there would be no exploration for oil, that there would be no risk capital put into this province, and certainly they were disappointed to see that risk capital coming in to do the job of exploration here.

The member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), using his fictitious figure of 14 million acres, said that that was the biggest monopoly that had ever been foisted upon the province. In addition to pointing out that it was 9 million acres rather than 14 million, I would also point out that this land went to the Tidewater group, which is composed of four companies and not one company. I would also point out to the members of this House that, previous to the time when we took office, one company held 20 million acres. It is wonderful how quickly a Liberal can forget what he wants to forget, and get all messed up the actual information which he is supposed to keep straight.

The Imperial Oil Company — and I do not want any of the Liberal members quoting me in saying that I have said nasty things, today, about the Imperial Oil Company — is a smart company. They know their business, and because there was a dumb government, dumb enough to give them the kind of a deal they got, was no fault of the Imperial Oil. The Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Tucker), stated, in his speech, that I had said that I would not deal with Imperial Oil Company. What I actually did say was that I would not deal with Imperial Oil Company or any other company on those terms; and it makes an absolute lie out of it, Mr. Speaker, when you quote the first part of that kind of a statement and leave the last part off; but that is the kind of stuff that the Liberals are good at in regard to this exploration programme.

Now do not let it be forgotten either, when my hon. friends over there talk about monopoly, that in this 20 million acres there was not one acre of Crown reserves set up — not one acre of Crown reserves — it was all gone. The royalty was 10 per cent, not 12½ per cent, nor a graduated royalty from 5 to 15 per cent. There was very little work required, and

**February 22, 1952**

There was a long-term in which to do the work. It was an excellent agreement for Imperial Oil, but they had to abandon it. A lot of stories are told about why they abandoned it. In the 'Leader-Post' the other day, on the editorial page, there was the article entitled "Six million dry hold dollars." Hon. members might have noticed one paragraph in that report which reads this way:

"So far, no oil has been found. The hopes of the company's oil seekers as to possibilities in Saskatchewan began to dwindle. At the same time, the results of exploration in Alberta made that province appear a more promising area, and in 1946 the company decided to concentrate its effort there."

That is why Imperial Oil left, because of the development which was taken place in Alberta. And even Imperial Oil is under the necessity of paying some attention to their budget. Even Imperial Oil Company is not in the fortunate position of the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Tucker), or the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), that they can build up a budget out of a hat, with all the money they want and reduce all the taxes at the same time; but when the Imperial Oil Company goes to dig for oil they have to have dollars to do it — real dollars — not those stage dollars that are pulled out of a hat.

The statement was made that Mr. Rhubbra will receive \$1,200,000 a year in royalties if oil is discovered. How do you know, Mr. Speaker? Who knows? If our friends over there are good at knowing these things, there are oil companies that would be willing to give them something for telling where the oil is; but as a matter of fact, if our programme of exploration for oil is no more successful than the Liberal programme, then I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Rhubbra will not get very much out of his over-riding royalties. In fact he will get nothing. and anyway, this money — any money that he may receive or that Gulf Securities may receive — will not be paid out of any share of the proceeds that are coming to the people of the province of Saskatchewan and is not being paid by the oil company. As a matter of fact, a high official in Tidewater stated that they had been in to look over the situation before that time, but he said there had not been, in their opinion, sufficient good geological evidence to make it attractive to them when they took into consideration the other opportunities they had to take on exploration programmes in other places. They could have had this land without an over-riding royalty, and he also stated that they were not particular about doing business that way, and they did not mind paying it to a man who had gone in first. But the important thing to remember is that any of that over-riding royalty that is paid is not paid out of any share that is coming to the people of Saskatchewan.

May I inform the House, too, that as far as I know Saskatchewan is the only province that has made any attempt whatsoever to control the amount of the over-riding royalties, and we do exercise control and we will not allow transfers with unlimited over-riding royalty which may, when you get into production, cause difficulty, and actually could result in shutting

down the field. The member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) also spoke of Barclay Oils, and he said they had a paid-up capital of \$3.00. I do not suppose he knows, Mr. Speaker, that under the ordinary Company Law, companies are usually organized with, as a start, three people who are the directors and they have to own one share each, but that is factual, and most companies are organized on a basis like that at the start.

Actually this particular company, in May, had \$1,053 paid-up capital. Now that still is not very much but again may I point out that to the member for Maple Creek it is apparently just a mere detail that the difference between \$3.00 and \$1,053 is still \$1,050. That was in May. The permit was granted to them in October, but the important thing is, how did they perform? They did a gravity meter survey of that land in 1950 and a seismic survey has been done on it in 1951. That seismic survey cost in the neighbourhood of \$35,000.

He mentioned Albercan, intimating that Albercan was a small and irresponsible company. Albercan, I believe, was organized — I had the information here a minute ago — I think in the United States, but that is not the important part; here is the important thing — in 1951 Albercan spent, on exploration in all of their permits, \$433,307, a fairly substantial exploration programme for one of the medium-sized companies. And in addition, the original holders of these permits — and may I point out to the House that the original holders were neither Shumiatcher nor Havard — did over \$60,000 of work before they assigned them to Albercan.

Now let us come to National Petroleums — and again there is just a slight inaccuracy of 75,000 acres. the member said 600,000 acres; it actually is about 525,000 acres. What have they done? They have done a gravity meter and air magnetometer surveys over the area. Shumiatcher and Havard were the agents for this company and got the permits in the name of national Petroleums. They paid the fees for getting the permits. They organized the company and paid the expenses of organization, and they raised money by looking after the selling of shares in the company. Incidentally, this company is very largely a local company, with local stockholders. They raised about \$40,000, which was put into this work of exploration that I have just mentioned. The member for Maple Creek said they received \$15,000 and 25,000 shares — I think that is what he said. Actually, they received \$8,500 in cash and 1/10 of the shares in the company, or 25,000 shares. Now what has happened subsequently? These permits have been assigned to Charles C. Hay. What were the considerations? A cash consideration of \$100. In addition, \$7,900 and a one per cent royalty to be paid out of oil and gas produced in the area. In other words, National Petroleums will not get that \$7,900 nor the one per cent unless oil or gas is produced in that area. Shumiatcher and Havard have a 10 per cent interest in national Petroleums. Let my hon. friends get out their pencils and figure out 1/10 of what they may get out of that deal.

This might be a good place to spend a moment or two explaining what rights a permittee gets. let it be clear that there is a difference between a permit and a lease. A permit only gives to the holder the right to explore, not the right to produce and take away any of the materials on or under that land. My hon. friend from Maple Creek was very emphatic, two or three times, as others have been, in mentioning the costs of the permits as being 1/10 of a cent an acre. Mr. Speaker, that is pure nonsense. That is just the kind of misrepresentation founded on a little bit of fact which

the Liberals in this province, like to spread around. The fee for issuing the permit is \$250, it is not the price of the permit, it is an office fee. The price of the permit — the real consideration in the permit is that the holder of that permit undertakes to do a job of exploration which may cost him hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars to explore that land; and in exploring the land he explores also the Crown reserves, and I might mention that he also explores the privately held mineral rights for the C.P.R. and the Hudson Bay Company at the same time. He cannot help it, he is the victim of circumstances. But that is the real price that he pays.

And then, when it comes to the end of the permit term, or when he discovers oil or gas in commercial quantities, then he can take leases, but he cannot take leases on those Crown reserves, and under the old regulations, which govern in regard to most of our land at the present time in Saskatchewan, that 25 per cent of Crown reserve, checkerboarded over the area, remains the property of the Crown. Under the new regulations, the Crown reserves vary from 40 to 60 per cent of the Crown-owned mineral rights in any township; and in that case the Crown reserves are not selected until the permittee goes to lease, and then there is a system whereby he selects what he wants to lease, and he must leave at least 40 per cent — from 40 to 60 per cent of the land in a township — as Crown reserve.

Mention was made of Search Corporation and a couple of concessions, and these people in Search Corporation — again Shumiatcher and Havard, who are apparently being made the whipping boys for the Liberal party in the province — were supposed to have made some big and easy money out of these concessions. Here is the story on ZZ concession. It was 12 square miles, they paid \$500 for it, they posted a \$500 bond to guarantee work, and they sold it for \$1,000 cash and shares in a company which they were supposed to get and never did get. What is the story in regard to LL concession? It is 25 square miles and there was a \$500 fee for it. They put in work on it, the first year, of \$9,508 and put up a bond of \$500. They assigned it, they received \$7,500 cash, even though they had already put more than \$10,000 cash into it, and 20,000 shares in Northern Uraniums, which also is a local company with several fairly prominent people in the city being shareholders and directors of it . . .

**Hon. Member:** — Liberals as well!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, there are certainly some good Liberals in that company too. but I would suggest to my hon. friends that if any of their friends would like to buy some shares in Northern Uraniums, if they would offer Search Corporation \$500 for these 20,000 shares, they might be surprised and find themselves shareholders in Northern Uraniums. It is a different thing to get up on the platform, or get up in this House, and talk about the \$15,000 and the 25,000 shares worth 40 cents apiece, Mr. Speaker, and I think you could actually have them for 2½ cents apiece — but that is the kind of cloth that is tailored to make the stories that we often hear about these things.

In this concession, 21 claims were staked, and the balance was open to staking on July 2, 1951.



Now the hon. member for Maple Creek said, in his speech, yesterday, it is essential that these names of individuals be brought out. Why? Actually, Mr. Speaker, these people who have, in a small way, done something towards organizing companies, getting together some capital, to provide a service, while the company of the hon. member for Saltcoats, (Mr. Loptson) gets a permit and does not do a thing on it and lets it go. People have got to do the job if it is going to be done, and I think to those local people who have had the courage to go to work to do an exploration job on our resources there is a great deal of credit coming. And people in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, refer to them over and over again as friends of the C.C.F. One of these days the Leader of the Opposition will be saying, "Hear, hear" to a statement that the hon. Senator Thomas H. Wood is a friend of the C.C.F. One of these days he will be saying "Hear, hear" to a statement to the effect that some of the leading Liberals connected with McCallum Hill and company are friends of the C.C.F. But unless he gets a little more sense into his policies and a little better understanding with regard to the mineral and oil resources of the province of Saskatchewan, he will probably force even those people to have a complete lack of confidence in him and in his group.

Senator Wood came to my office representing a company which could hardly be called a friend of the C.C.F. and got a permit to explore for oil. Likewise the company called Canadian Devonian, in which the Hills of Regina are very prominent, have got a permit in one of the best areas of the province, down by Estevan, so that I do not know why my hon. friends want to distort the facts when they talk about this situation of the friends of the C.C.F.

And then the member for Maple Creek referred to Mr. Young and Mr. Hirshorn as fraudulent racketeers. I do not think he would do that outside of this House, I think he was covering in the shelter of legislative immunity when he said that here. Joseph Hirshorn is undoubtedly a very smart businessman, but I want to tell you this, that he has a record of organization and development of mining companies all across Canada. Preston E.D. mines is one of the outstanding Canadian mines with which he is connected. He has had several other successful ventures all across Canada. As far as Mr. M.E. Young is concerned, I informed the House last year that this man was a veteran of the first world war, that he was in the brokerage business in Toronto, and in the crash of 1929 he, together with hundreds of others, was caught, and action was taken against half a dozen or so of them and he was one of the unfortunate ones against whom action was taken. He went to jail, he paid the price. But I want to also point out to my hon. friends that, afterwards, he was in the army during the second world war and he was an officer of high rank, representing the Canadian government in the city of Washington.

These are the people that my hon. friends referred to, in the shelter of this House, as fraudulent racketeers. Actually they would like to call everybody who dares to come into this province and invest money by names that would frighten them away from this province.

**Mr. Tucker** (Leader of the Opposition): — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. As Your Honour of course knows, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources has no right to make such a charge of disloyalty against the members of the Opposition. He is

**February 22, 1952**

imputing motives to us that we would like to keep people out of the province. He said that and I ask that you ask him to withdraw, Mr. Speaker, because his statement, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely false and the Minister knows it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that actions speak louder than words.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I know that my opinions probably be distasteful to my hon. friends, but I still have the right to express my opinions, and it certainly is my considered opinion that the Liberal politicians, in this province and otherwise throughout Canada, and the Liberals press, has done everything they can to prevent capital coming to develop the resources of this province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — If you will not make the hon. member withdraw that — I say it is a lie and he knows it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may know what his own opinions are — I sometimes doubt it — but he does not know what my opinions are, and when I express my opinions he cannot tell me that those are not my opinions. They are my opinions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition was saying something about motives, and I was just coming to that subject, because this strange behaviour of what would otherwise appear to be normal citizens of the province of Saskatchewan is rather hard to understand, and I wonder what are the motives which make the members in the Opposition, particularly some of them, and some of the Liberal campaigners out on the stump, take this line. I think one thing may help to explain it, and I would suggest that the Liberal party in this province is desperate today. Even the 'Star-Phoenix', who certainly cannot be classed as unfriendly to the Liberals, on April 7, 1951, in an editorial, stated as follows — this was just after the close of the last regular session of the House, and I quote:

“The Opposition has been unsuccessful in finding an issue in provincial affairs that will serve as a rallying ground for the opponents of the government.”

They are desperate, Mr. Speaker. They have not been able to find any issue and so they do not depend on logic or fact, they depend on fiction and superstition and ignorance and fear. Those things are their stock-in-trade in their campaigning.

**Hon. Member:** — Mostly ignorance.

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** — Who writes your speeches for you?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — A better man than writes your speeches.

In addition, I am afraid that I have to admit that these are normal Liberal tactics. I have been in politics in this province since 1938 and I have seen quite a bit of it.

**Mr. Egnatoff** (Melfort): — You won't be here much longer.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member for Melfort has not been here for very long, and will not be. I may be short on one end, but he is going to be short on both ends.

It is the tactics that the Liberals have used, to appeal to superstition and fear to frighten people. I think I have informed this House before, but I must bring it to your attention again, that I once was at a public meeting in a campaign when there was a Liberal Cabinet Minister speaking. I was there with another C.C.F. member of the legislature — both of us happen to be veterans of the first world war, the other one served also in the second world war — and that Liberal Cabinet Minister referred to us in the C.C.F. as Nazis. Mr. Speaker, it is kind of dirty — it is a pretty dirty kind of stuff, but those are the tactics they use. And then, to make matters worse, even though I had only been in the legislature a year or so at that time, and that Cabinet Minister had had 10 years, when he was asked to give us an opportunity to reply to that charge, they would not let us say a word. That is the kind of free speech and bullying tactics that the Liberals use whenever they get in a pinch. They won that by-election on those tactics, by frightening the people in that constituency, appealing to their superstition and fear.

The Liberals have a record, and they have not, as I have said, based their appeal to the public on logic or facts. In 1936, there was an article published in the Journal of Economics and Political Science about the Liberal machine in Saskatchewan prior to 1929. Here is an extract, and I do not think when this article was published that there were any libel suits instituted against the writer either. He is speaking about how the Liberal party used to interfere, even in the business of the churches. He said:

“If two ministers were being considered for a local church, he (the boss man) would ask for reports from the party workers in the district in which they were then living. In one such instance one man was reported as having no politics and the other as being an ardent Conservative worker. The word was passed to the members of the party who were on the church nominating committee and the Conservative was not appointed.”

That is the kind of stuff they used to do. He is another one:

“A furniture dealer in a small town might, for instance, be told that if he and his family did not transfer their allegiance from the Conservatives to the Liberals, they would get no government business.”

February 22, 1952

And here is another interesting excerpt:

“The Saskatchewan Liberal machine was efficient, but it was corruption which furnished it with many of its workers, and when it could not win converts by legitimate persuasion, it did not shrink from using corrupt methods. Seldom, though, did it corrupt by buying votes with money, it used a more sophisticated method, when seducing an individual, of offering him a job or a contract and when it tried to seduce a section it offered a road or a public building.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — You must have made a careful study of that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition is proud of the record of the Liberal party or not, if I were him I would not be.

Then we come to something more recent. I said they appealed to fear, and they do too. In 1943, the year in which there should have been an election in the province of Saskatchewan, a civil servant wrote to Mr. Matte, who was head of the Northern Areas Branch at that time, and he wrote this letter about the people in the constituency of my hon. friend from Athabasca, and this is what he said:

“If there were no prospects of an election I would recommend that relief be practically discontinued, although I am sure relief will be needed the last two months of the summer at least.”

Those were the tactics and have been the tactics of the Liberal party. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) made a speech . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I will make one again too.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . on the radio, and I have no doubt that he will make another one, but I doubt if it will be any better than the last one. In that speech he ridiculed the whole organization of the C.C.F. He ridiculed the idea of the people of this province who believe in the C.C.F. taking a \$5.00, \$10.00 or \$20.00 membership. But I want to point out to him that that is one of the fundamental differences between the C.C.F. and the Liberal party, because we get our political financial support from the rank and file people and not from big business. That is where we get it. It comes in by \$5.00 and \$10.00 . . .

**Mr. Lopton** (Saltcoats): — \$500,000?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, that is the kind of stuff the Liberals get from Beauharnois, they got \$700,000. In studying this question of the motives of the Liberal party, it shows how they so distort the facts in regard to our programme of exploration. I come to one more reason — and that is the Liberal record of squandering natural resources in Canada.

Someone on this side of the House made a remark about the Liberals squandering natural resources and the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) interjected "What a joke." I want him to listen to the joke. In 1908 in the House of Commons there was a debate on the forest resources of Western Canada and particularly Saskatchewan. Mr. W.F. MacLean in the House of Commons debate of that year said:

"We are about to build up a forest reservation on the principle that made rich men by a reckless alienation of public lands and we propose to make them richer by buying that land back again which originally belonged to the people."

And the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Oliver, in the Liberal Government at Ottawa said, at that time, or just before that time:

"The purpose of the government in administering timber is to produce revenue."

The Minister of the Interior said that the purpose was to produce revenue. Let us see how they go about producing revenue. On May 19, 1908, Mr. H.B. Ames, who we may rest assured was not a Liberal in that Liberal government, said:

"Within a comparatively short period of 3½ years more than 300,000 square miles of selected timber, that is to say about one-half of the entire area under lease in the western provinces, fell into the hands, not of operators, but of speculators."

To illustrate this point further, Mr. Ames contended that the Burrows-Fraser combination . . . Mr. Speaker, would anybody like to know who the Burrows-Fraser combination was? Burrows was later Senator Burrows. He got his reward. And Fraser was the President of the Liberal Club in Ottawa. There you are. This combination held holdings of 250 blocks and if they were placed end to end they would form a continuous strip of thick timber one mile wide from Montreal to Winnipeg. That is the kind of stuff they dealt in in those days. He goes on to point out and to mention then a —par deal that took place between Big River and Prince Albert. Mr. Ames said:

"There is no such demand as that in the history of the whole department, 500 square miles to be selected out of an area of 7,000 square miles. Both the area of selection and other features in connection with it were most unusual. It is impossible to understand at first sight how the department should have been persuaded to put such a proposition up. Think of the magnitude of it. It meant a monopoly on the timber resources of Prince Albert for practically all time."

Here is how it was advertised. One advertisement in the Manitoba 'Free Press' and one in the Prince Albert 'Advocate', the time allowed from the time the advertisement left Ottawa until the bid got back to Ottawa was 38 days from Ottawa to Ottawa. That meant four weeks for the people of Prince Albert to look their timber over and get in their bids.

**February 22, 1952**

Protests galore poured in to the Minister of Interior. Among them a telegram from the mayor of Prince Albert, who said, in the telegram:

“People of Prince Albert protest against sale of timber berth north of river. Timber limits passing into hands of speculators to the detriment of settlers. J.F. Anstow, Mayor.”

That was addressed to the hon. Clifford Sifton, everybody knows him. And another one to the Hon. Clifford Sifton from the President of the Board of Trade in Prince Albert, John H. Wilson, sending a resolution passed by the Board of Trade, protesting this way of handling the timber, asking for more time and asking for it to be put up in small, 30 square mile blocks instead of 250 square mile blocks. And here is the answer they got from the Minister of Interior:

“As these berths were put up and advertised in the ordinary manner it was not thought advisable to make any change.”

What is the result? Five thousand dollars was bid for the first choice and \$1,000 for the second choice. The person who was successful in getting the first choice had first right to pick about 250 square miles out of the 7,000 square mile area. The man who got second choice could pick up the next 250 square miles. A.W. Fraser, at one time president of the Ottawa Liberal Club, using the name of William Brown of Prince Albert, but acting under the instructions of T.A. Burrows put in a bid in the name of the Big River Lumber Company for the first choice of \$5,000 and again, this time using John McBains's name, he put a tender for the second choice, that was \$1,000. The result was that Mr. Burrows in this way acquired these two berths, comprising 500 square miles with the right of selection out of 7,000 square miles for the sum of \$6,000, or \$12 per square mile or 2 cents per acre. Mr. Ames said in the House of Commons in 1908:

“Today one-half the timber areas in the western provinces are in speculators' hands and for these areas the country has received a mere bagatelle. Our three provinces have been despoiled. The day will come when there will be handed over to these provinces the ragged remnants of the land which should have been theirs long ago, but before that is done practically all timber of value will have been given away. These are the assets which these provinces should have in order to develop themselves to carry on their internal affairs.”

That is one outstanding example of how the Liberals handled natural resources for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there is another one more recently. The Canadian National Railways has approximately three million acres of oil rights in the Province of Saskatchewan. These lands were given to the railway companies that finally went into the pot to stir up the brew that we call the Canadian National Railway today. The lands were taken over by the C.N.R. and therefore, through taking over the railways and these lands, they come back again as publicly owned lands, — about three million acres. They have the mineral rights for those lands. Does anyone know what has happened to the

mineral rights in connection with those lands? The Hon. Leader of the Opposition had a news item in the paper on February 11th this year. He was down at Swift Current on a nominating convention and the headline was, "Tucker Accuses Government of Iron Curtain Tactics." I want to take him down and show him an iron curtain in the House of Commons. Mr. Wright, C.C.F. member for Melfort, moved in the House of Commons for a copy of any agreement or agreements made between the Canadian National Railway and Imperial Oil Company Limited in regard to the exploration and development of mineral oil resources on the said company's land. I can just picture any member on the other side of the House moving a motion for a return to produce any of the agreements that we have made with the oil companies in this province and not get it. Mr. Speaker, the ceiling would not be high enough to hold them. They would be wild, even wilder than they are now. They had a recorded vote on this motion in the House. How did they vote? Well, there are so many Liberals in the House of Commons at Ottawa that I am not going to read all of their names, but there are a few local ones here. And the people who voted against giving this information, the people who voted against the motion; Baker, Liberal member for the Battlefords; Boucher, Liberal member for Rosthern; Dewar, for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley; Ferrie for Mackenzie; Helme for Prince Albert and McCusker for Regina; Studer for Maple Creek; Whiteside for Swift Current and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition had been at Ottawa I would also have been able to read out the name Tucker. He would have voted with his friends and would have refused to give to the people of Saskatchewan this information.

**Mr. Egnatoff** (Melfort): — Will the hon. Minister permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank**: — If it is a short one and not a speech.

**Mr. Egnatoff**: — No, it is a short one Mr. Minister. Would your government table in this House any agreements made between any of your Crown Corporations and any other parties? The Government Insurance, for instance, agreements with any private individual, the loans you have made to them?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank**: — That is a question I think will be sufficiently dealt with but I want to point out to this House — may I point out to this House that this is a question of three million acres of oil lands belonging to the people of Canada, and what interest have we in them? This province, and other neighbouring provinces, gave that three million acres of land to these railway companies to help them with their capitalization to get them here. In other words, a subsidy to get railway service and cheap railway service. What do they do now? They have these mineral rights which, on three million acres could turn out to be extremely valuable because they are like our Crown reserves, checkerboarded over a great part of the province, and they refuse to say anything about it. But I understand that they have leased these to Imperial Oil and again I want to make it clear that this is no criticism of the Imperial Oil Company. They are good business people, but again we have a dumb enough Liberal government to go into this kind of a deal at Ottawa. Lease these oil rights to them for three cents an acre, not even a dime an acre, no Crown reserves — all gone — and I do not know what there is, Mr. Speaker, about work commitments. I do not know that there is any work commitment on them, I do not know what the royalty is,

**February 22, 1952**

it may be one per cent of five per cent of 10 per cent royalty, I do not know what the term is. You cannot find out because of the Liberal iron curtain in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

In the state of Texas many, many years ago there was set aside two million acres earmarked for a specific purpose, for a university, and this two million acres included the mineral rights. Though the United States is certainly famous for its free enterprise we can learn something there. The state of Texas did not lease this land at three cents an acre without any reserves. The state of Texas held onto this and from sales of that land they have made \$65 million. The total fund that has been accumulated from that two million acres of university land has been \$175 million. They have built and equipped a university that will accommodate 15,000 people going to it. This three million acres of C.N.R. land, if properly handled, could do a lot to help out the railway company and so help out our freight rates instead of having to bounce them up every time we turn around.

And I think there is a good deal of that argument applicable to the C.P.R. land too. The C.P.R. has over 3½ million acres and if that land too was handled so as to get the best revenue, that is earmarked, or should be earmarked to help the operation of the railway, then probably we could get along without so many increases in freight rates. And so I think it is a normal procedure and a natural motive for the Liberal Party that, because of their record of giving away resources in Canada, they love to smear their opponents with the same kind of stuff.

Another factor is the failure, the absolute failure of the Liberal Party to get a job of exploration done in this province. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, in his speech in this House at the opening of the debate, said:

“The 1944 oil production was \$46,000 in Saskatchewan and in Alberta at the same time it was \$20 million.”

The point that struck me funny, Mr. Speaker, they have never been cursed with a Liberal Government in Alberta since 1921. At 1944 Saskatchewan had hardly had anything else but a Liberal Government. And our oil production was \$46,000 worth. Alberta was \$20 million. What were the Liberals doing before 1944? Do they think that they can kid the public of this province that the good Lord just piled those oil resources in here since the C.C.F. took office. If ever there was a government who should be quiet about its record of achievement in exploration it is the former Liberal government of this province. Let us take a comparison another way. In the 10 years from 1934 to 1943, Alberta had 574 oil wells drilled — 574. That was not a Liberal government there. In Saskatchewan, where we had a Liberal government in the same 10 years, how many? 129 against 574, and of those 129 wells, 58 were less than 250 feet deep. 31 more of them were between 250 and 500 feet deep, 8 of them were between 500 and 1,000 feet and only five of the 129 wells were over 3,000 feet deep, in Saskatchewan prior to 1944. From 1944 to 1949; 358 wells — put that down, 358. In 1950; 124 wells and in 1951, 401 wells. That includes, in all cases, coreholes as well, shallow coreholes.

From 1900 to 1943 the total number of wells drilled in the 43 years, 184. And the total amount of oil produced in Saskatchewan prior



to 1944 was less than 400 barrels. Don't anybody ask me what year it was produced in because it does not matter very much. That was the total production from 1905 to 1943 inclusive.

These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who talk about getting great development for the Province of Saskatchewan. Where have they been? What have they been doing? They do not know what is going on here. The seismic surveys that have gone on in this province are amazing. A total, drilled; 4,500,000 feet of drilling, that is 850 miles of drilling in seismic for oil as well as other minerals too, let us look at the 1944 production and the 1951 production. In metals, \$18 million in 1944; \$39 million in 1951. Non-metallics; \$1 million in 1944, almost 3 million in 1951. In fuels — that includes coal and natural gas and petroleum, \$2 million.

**Mr. Loptson** (Saltcoats): — Hon. Minister, I have a question. How many mines are producing?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank**: — The question has no relation to what I am talking about at the moment.

**Mr. Loptson**: — I would like to know where — you do not dare to answer.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank**: — The fuels, Mr. Speaker, increase from \$2 million to over \$6 million. And the other odds and ends from \$800,000 to \$2½ million. Or, taking a grand total in 1944, the grand total in -production of minerals, after Liberal government ever since — I do not know — \$22 million only. In 1951, \$50 million produced. The 'Star-Phoenix' had an editorial on February 5th. Mr. Ross, the manager of Sohio Oil Company was up at Saskatoon speaking to the Board of Trade. Shortly afterwards they had this editorial that says:

“The exploration programme which Sohio Petroleum Company has mapped out for Saskatchewan is remarkable. A company does not enter into a programme of this scope or keep it up unless it is convinced that there is a good prospect of success. A Company like Sohio can choose many fields whereat to employ its capital. It is encouraging to the people of Saskatchewan to know that they selected this province for such an all-out effort. It is even more encouraging to know that their programme will be continued.”

One company — one company in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has drilled 22 miles of wildcat wells. That is the total depth if they were all in one big hole, 22 miles for one company. And the discoveries which we have had in Saskatchewan which have been so begrudgingly acknowledged by the members in the Opposition, who probably the day before had been telling somebody there were not going to be any as long as there was a C.C.F. government here. Down at Dahinda a very interesting show of oil, not commercial because of the formation it is in, but good light oil. At Tompkins, both oil and gas; more exploration and work has got to be done there. At Coleville,

**February 22, 1952**

an excellent field of black oil where there are now over 20 wells dug, including three gas wells. At Brock, where a gas field of apparently major proportions is developing, a new strike at Fosterton and then the last one was the gas strike at Elrose. And so, it seems to me, that if we want to look for the reason of why the Liberals are like this, why they take this line of argument which is so fictional, why they talk about these fraudulent racketeers, is to distract the attention from their own failures in the past. So they are normal Liberal tactics and in desperation they throw mud. We have the record of the old Liberal machine in this province, their record of the handling of resources and their record of failure to get exploration done in this province. Liberals today make some very far-fetched statements about everything under the sun. I was reading over the radio speech of the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and he said, referring to some of these oil and gas discoveries,

“Without A.C.F. Government these discoveries might have been made several years ago.”

Mr. Speaker, they never had anything done about exploration when they were here; they never got anything going. And then it was not good enough for him saying it once, Mr. Speaker, he had to go on later and say:

“If we had not been handicapped by a C.C.F. government it is reasonable to assume our oil — prod in this province would be much greater than it is.”

Four hundred barrels in 1943, from 1905 is the Liberal record of oil production, barely enough to oil the Liberal machine — there would certainly be no surplus. The hon. gentleman is very versatile, and he does not just stay with natural resources. And so he made another statement there that I cannot help but repeat to the members of this House, because if any of them were not listening to it, I am sure they will enjoy it now. He said:

“Had the Liberals won the election (that is in 1944), you could have prepaid hospitalization at least one, if not two, years earlier.”

Mr. Speaker, in 1933 the late Hon. J.M. Uhrich, then Minister of Public Health, 1933, I think it was just before the election of 1934 anyway, told the municipal men at Saskatoon — but it was 1933, he was a Liberal member, he was not a Minister. No, it was not 1946. Dr. Uhrich said to those people at Saskatoon, in the middle thirties, “We will give you state medicine.” That is what he said. They got elected in 1934 and by 1944 what had they done? Nothing. They had passed the necessary provisions for free cancer treatment and had not yet put it into effect. One step in 10 years and then they did not get that one done. I think the people of this province will have a good laugh when they hear the hon. members say that we could have had prepaid hospitalization at least one or two years earlier if we had elected a Liberal government in 1944.

The hon. member for Estevan (Mr. McCormack), as everyone knows, also made a radio speech and made some rather far-fetched statements in it too. Referring to the mineral rights he said:

“Most of these farmers, because of the three-cent mineral tax, were more easily induced to lease their minerals because they thought they would lose their minerals anyway if they did not pay the tax.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) sitting over there and saying, “It’s true, it’s true, it’s true,” does not make it true. That is not the last word in conclusive evidence. The actual fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba where there is no mineral tax yet, the proportion of mineral rights privately owned leased at 10 cents an acre is just about the same as it is here. As a matter of fact, I think the member’s logic is completely wrong because I think that if the mineral tax did one thing it brought to the attention of these people that they had some valuable property there which many of them never knew they had before, and it is valuable property. It must be valuable property because if you listen to the hon. members of the Opposition talking about what we are doing with it, it is extremely valuable property. And they have promised, or I understand they have promised, to do away with the mineral rights tax. That is, Mr. Speaker, they are promising that an, of course, the greatest beneficiaries will be their friends, the C.P.R. and the Hudson Bay Company.

**Mr. Tucker** (Leader of the Opposition): — On a question of privilege. Surely the member . . . Our programme is very clear and the hon. member, if he purports to deal with it should make sure of it. Now we say “only in regard to farmers” and when he says what he did he knows he is saying something untrue, but anything at all to smear up — anything at all, it does not matter.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is having a rather difficult job squirming around all of these corners and skating on thin ice, riding the fence and keeping an ear to the ground. But I understood they were going to do away with the mineral rights tax. Then they do recognize, I understand, they recognize that the mineral rights tax then is just a tax insofar as the C.P.R. mineral rights are concerned and the Hudson Bay mineral rights are concerned, and I am glad to get that admission from them that that is a just tax in regard to those mineral rights, because, naturally, if they did not consider that just, they would do away with it. Of course, I wonder a little bit in the case where one individual may hold 20 quarter sections of mineral rights, just where they would draw the line between the C.P.R. and the farmer. Do all the farmers, big and little, or only the little fellows, escape from the mineral rights tax? But, of course, not people know that . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Will you permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, you are going to have a chance to speak. Mr. Speaker, if I wanted an intelligent answer to my question I would not be asking the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson).l

As a matter of fact, the meeting of the Manitoba Union of municipalities asked the Manitoba government a year ago to impose a Mineral Rights Tax. My friends do not know that.

The hon. member for Estevan (Mr. McCormack) — I am sorry he is not in his seat, but he said something like this — I think I have got

**February 22, 1952**

his speech here. He said:

“Early in 1948 the Canadian Pacific Railway commenced court action to have the Mineral Taxation Act declared un-constitutional and in July 1948 acquired a court injunction to restrain the Minister from further action.”

That was in July 1948. I am just quoting this, Mr. Speaker, to try to get people to be a little more careful with their statements. Then he goes on to say:

“In October 1949, or nearly two years later, the government by order-in-council suspended forfeiture proceedings in respect to all mineral rights until the disposition of the court action taken by the C.P.R. and also provided upon conditions for the redressment of forfeited lands.”

Now, what is the true story in regard to that? well, it is a lot different from that, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) quoted the order-in-council and so I assume that he must have had a copy of this order-in-council. The order-in-council is dated October 14, 1949, and it starts out this way:

“The executive council has under consideration a report from the Minister of Natural Resources and Industrial Development dated October 12, stating as follows:

‘By order, on the 6th day of July, this injunction was issued, restraining the minister.’

“And the report of the Minister stated this:

‘That upon the issuance of the said Order’, (that was in July, the 6th of July), ‘it was decided that not only forfeiture proceedings in respect to the minerals owned by the plaintiffs in the said action, but in respect of all minerals, irrespective of who the owner may be, would be suspended until the disposition of the said action. And since that said time no forfeitures under the said Act have occurred.’”

And the member tried to make out that it was nearly two years after the injunction was issued before the procedures stopped in connection with other minerals. It was stopped immediately the injunction was issued and no further action was taken. And in January of 1949 a statement was in the press to that effect as well. I think my hon. friends over there who are lawyers had better look into the ability of the member for Estevan to read law if that is the way he reads an order-in-council, because he may become a menace to his clients. Anybody that makes such a mess as that at reading law needs checking up.

There has been a great deal said about the C.C.F. government and what it might do with regard to mining companies and oil companies. May I remind this House that, as far as I know, there is only one government in Canada that has expropriated the mining company and that government is the Dominion Liberal government. They are the only government to expropriate the mines and just a little while ago there was a letter in Toronto 'Saturday Night' from a shareholder, on the 16th of February, complaining about being expropriated by the Federal Government. It was expropriated from the shareholders of the El Dorado Mining and Refining Company and my hon. friends sitting over there do not need proof of that at all.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You did not deal with the government's action under the circumstances, or don't you approve of them? Do you not approve of them taking the mine over?

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would sit down I would point out to him that his friends at Ottawa, the great champions of private enterprise, I cannot conceive of those champions of private enterprise having to admit that they had to expropriate El Dorado because of the failure of private enterprise to do the job. Surely my hon. friend would not confess that kind of a weakness in a system he has believed in for so long.

**Mr. Loptson:** — It was for security reasons, for national defence.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Then my hon. friends admit that when any emergency comes private enterprise is unequal to the task. Is that correct? That is what they say. They just cannot have this think both ways all the time. That is not too easy.

The member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) also mentioned the distribution of gas in his radio speech and he said:

“Distribution is to be a government monopoly. It is still the socialism of the Regina Manifesto.”

I would suggest that he and the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) get together and get themselves straightened out. As a matter of fact the Provincial Treasurer and I were not nearly as tangled up in our facts — one of them says we left the Regina Manifesto and the other fellow says we are still with it.

Then the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), in his speech the other day, said:

“Private enterprise should have a chance to get in to compete in the distribution of gas.”

I think that is what he said. I know that if the Liberals were in power in Saskatchewan today, with the gas fields being developed, they would proceed to make the same unholy mess of it that they made of the power distribution in this province, with all bits and pieces, not using the good sources of power, not using the best distribution system or any-

thing else. So that I wonder that they are opposed to development of resources for the people of Saskatchewan. I wonder if they are opposed to Crown reserves. They never had them when they were in power. The Liberal Government at Ottawa does not have them in the C.N.R. lands. I wonder if they are opposed to a public owned utility like the public utility of natural gas or power. I take it that they must be. They must be opposed to the public ownership of these public utilities. And power or natural gas distribution is not a monopoly by anybody's choice. It is a monopoly by necessity for the simple reason that it is entirely uneconomical to run two sets of electric wires down the street and two sets of gas mains down the streets. We believe that a monopoly, where it is a natural and necessary monopoly, is safest and best and most efficient and most economical, when operated and controlled by the people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one word or two about one of the Liberal promises to the electorate in this province in regard to mineral resources. They have promised a royalty to the owner of the surface rights. I do not think that I ever heard of a political bribe to the electorate that was more misleading and fictitious than this one. The Liberal party has bought the electorate in many, many cases in the past. I have read off in this House the record of grants to municipalities when the only year they got grants was in the year when there is an election on. And here they are offering this as a bribe to the electors of this province. And what is it going to do? Well, first of all, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is generally recognized that the natural resources should belong to the people of the province and the benefits from their exploitation should come to the people of the province. That is, that the best deal for development of those resources should be made.

I want to point out, also, that only a very, very small proportion of the owners of surface rights will have oil discovered or gas discovered on their land. We will have wonderful success if in the next 10 years there are three or four hundred farmers, owners of surface rights, in this province who have oil discovered under their land. And so, in the first place, what the Liberals are promising to the people of Saskatchewan and trying to get everybody to believe is that everybody is going to share in this, when the actual fact will be only, at the very most, a very few hundred people. And if that takes place, those few hundred people might become millionaires.

And where will that money come from if it is a two per cent royalty? It will come either as a higher price for oil products or a reduction in revenue to the people of the province generally, through the government. Of course it is apparent that the Liberals would be delighted to see any action taken that would cut down the revenue of the province of Saskatchewan and therefore compel us to give less service. They do not want a good revenue budget in this province. They want to give away revenue and get rid of it. The Leader of the Opposition says, "The same place as Rhubbra." No, it is not. The Leader of the Opposition, if he believes that, then what they intend to do when they get in office is to take another two per cent royalty out of the company after the agreements have been made. That is the only explanation. Their over-ride royalty to these people comes out of the company. And so if this is going to come out of the same place it means that these people on your left, Mr. Speaker, on your left, are going to abrogate those contracts that have been made with the people that are exploring oil in this province.

And so, there are other questions that arise too. Are they going to go to their friends in the C.P.R. and say, "Now look, here is a farmer that owns the surface rights. You will have to pay him a royalty on the oil from your mineral rights." I wonder what the C.P.R. would tell them to do. I think the C.P.R. would give them a ticket to a station that is often mentioned — a one-way ticket. I wonder if they went to the Hudson Bay Company and said, "Look, you have got the mineral rights and this farmer has got the surface rights and you have got to give him a royalty."

No, Mr. Speaker, there never was anything built up better by the Liberals than this is, to deceive the people and give them nothing in the hopes of getting political support.

And just before I sit down, and I promise you, Mr. Speaker, I am going to sit down right away, there has been a great deal said about industrial development and investment in this province and these are figures taken from table 118, Private and Public Investments in Canada, from 1926 to 1951, published by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and Mr. Howe signed his name in the front of it.

Strange as it may seem, Mr. Speaker, if we take the two dates, 1948 and 1951, Saskatchewan has ranked second in all the provinces of Canada in increased rate of investment between those two years. Second of all the provinces. The speed with which the investment in Saskatchewan is taking place on a percentage-wide basis is second in all Canada. Sometimes that percentage may lead you astray, but if you take the actual dollars, Mr. Speaker, if you take the actual dollars of increase between 1948 and 1951, Saskatchewan takes fourth place in the Dominion of Canada, in actual dollars increased in investment.

So when my hon. friends go out to tell the people the gloomy, dark story about no investment in the province of Saskatchewan and it is going to the dogs, they are thinking of the days when they were in office and when there really was not very much doing. When they produced 400 barrels of oil in 35 years. that is what they are thinking of, Mr. Speaker.

And I do not think I need to say to you that I will oppose the amendment.

**L.L. Trippe** (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to address a few words to you with regard to matters before this House. I know you have permitted us considerable latitude in our discussion, and I do not intend to go as far as some people have gone in this regard. I do not wish to be repetitious, but I have not spoken before in the House during this Session, and I wish, Sir, to review the matters that come to my attention, in a general way.

I would like to comment briefly on the death of the King, and our grave concern over this — our deep sorrow over this, and our hopes that his successor, the Queen, will have a very long and joyful reign. There are many of us in this House who have had the privilege of serving under him as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, and there are also some of us in this House who have had the privilege of serving under his father as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. We know these people very well; we know that in the times when there was extreme danger they were out in the field; they and their heirs, their sons — facing the same dangers, practically, as the ordinary troops. On that account we, who were serving at that time had very particular regard for them, and I am sure that everyone in this Dominion and the other Dominions of the Empire have great regard for the Crown. It is certain that the politicians and the generals and the great men of the day will come and go; their names will be forgotten, but the Crown will always persist, and again I wish to say that we wish the new Queen the very best of luck.

We are engaged today with our forces, in co-operation with the other United Nations, in armed conflict in Korea. Resisting forces which are against us, which we have had to face to get a square deal for the people in South Korea, and if it continues it is going to be a considerable drain on our resources and our manpower, together with the effort that we must make to prepare ourselves, to defend ourselves, in case anyone wishes to perform any other act of aggression. We recognize the need for adequate defence and, perhaps, that adequate defence should mean that we will be fully equal to and a little better prepared than those people who wish to perform any act of aggression on us.

We, together with the United Nations, seek nothing but to defend our position. We have no intention of any aggression on any peoples whatsoever, and as long as they do not have that idea everyone will get along first-class. It is our desire, as mentioned in this House, to aid and assist those under-privileged and hungry people of the Asiatic and European nations, and there has been some comment that perhaps we are not doing that to the best of our ability.

I believe that, taking everything into consideration, Mr. Speaker, we are doing a very good job of that. We and our neighbours to the south are supplying food in large quantities; funds to purchase that food where it is more closely available; and munitions to those people who are preparing to defend themselves, and in that way release them from that obligation and permit them to use that same money that they would . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I am allowing the hon. member a great deal of latitude on the grounds that he did not speak to the main motion. Of course, there is no reason at all why this amendment could not be disposed of, if he is not speaking on the main motion and is speaking before the House again. It is only on that grounds that I am allowing you the latitude I am. It is taken for granted that you will not speak on the main motion.



**Mr. Trippe:** — That is right, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to speak on the main motion. I thought I would consolidate my remarks here and do away with the whole thing.

I believe that with firmness and good-will on the part of ourselves and the United Nations that we will, as has been said achieve a just and lasting peace, but we must certainly in that regard back up the United Nations and take our fair share both in the defence of the Koreans and in the re-establishment which may come later. Our firm resolve should be first, to stop Communist expansion wherever it may occur, and to try and do some business with them that will get them to stay within their own borders. Also, to have no dealings with them as long as they show war-like attitude towards us — or any of their satellites. We do not need them in the United Nations, for the simple reason that they go in there, nothing but to stop the United Nations from doing good and effective business.

In that same way we do not need Red China in the United Nations, because they are today engaged in fighting our troops in Korea, and there is nothing closer to real offensive that they could do to us than that. They have shown a cruel and inhuman attitude towards our prisoners and towards the civilian population of Korea, and I think that is very much out of line, and I am of the firm opinion, myself, that we should fight them forcefully back to the Manchurian border and keep them there. After that time, in conjunction and support with the United Nations, we could see that they have free elections all over Korea and then we could go in there with all our supplies and help, and unite those people and set them on their feet, and really make a nice little democracy of that country.

Today we have been visited by the Peace Council, and I do know just exactly what this Peace Council represents, but I have an idea. I have a clipping here from the Star-Phoenix of April 30, 1951, in which they make some comments on the Labour-Progressive party and their connection with the Peace Movement. They say here:

“The Labour-Progressive Party will nominate a number of candidates in the next provincial election, Nelson Clarke, provincial leader said this morning. He said the party welcomed Premier T.C. Douglas’ statement of opposing rearmament of Germany and Japan, and criticizing Canada’s foreign policy in the Far East. Such statements help to strengthen and encourage the peace forces in the province, and throughout Canada, Mr. Clarke said.

“But the L.P.P. opposed the Government’s policy on oil leases, and the past acceptance of the Federal Government’s trade and fiscal policies, and therefore it would nominate some candidates.

“To the extent that the Saskatchewan Government asked for peace in line with the Premier’s statement, we will give it whole-hearted support, Mr. Clarke says.”

**February 22, 1952**

Well, I do not know if that is the Third Force or not, but perhaps it is. In last night's paper (The Leader-Post) I noticed a little article here — a diary of Dr. Endicott's journey around the country. He is visiting over there now, and I will just quote extracts from it, as it is quite long. He has been in London where he met an organization there that was going to act on lower prices. They met with Monica Fulton, Stalin-peace-prize winner and member of the W.I.D.F. Women's Commission in Korean, who is chairing the meeting, and the next thing they got over to Prague, where Dr. Endicott made a radio broadcast, addressed the Czechoslovakian Peace Committee, and gave a peace conference. Then, the next thing, he turns up in Moscow, where the Soviet Peace Committee gives a reception and welcome for Dr. Endicott.

A few days afterwards, he preached to 2,000 people in Moscow, in the Moscow Baptist Church. At the end they all sang: "God Be with You 'Til we Meet Again." A few days later the Endicott-for-Canada presentation of the Stalin peace prize to George Amando, famous Brazilian poet and member of the World Council for Peace, and he said: "This month in the Soviet Union makes me feel rather humbled about my peace efforts in Canada. I feel that I ought to have worked twice as hard." He said later on that "the Soviet Peace Committee has done a truly heroic job of educating the whole nation on the meaning and great purpose of the International peace movement. Peaceful existence, disarmament and world trade is quite possible as far as this side of the fence is concerned". (That is when he was on the other side of the fence!)

Well, Mr. Speaker, we had a letter from those people and in their brief they suggest among other things, the signing of a pact with the world's five great powers, including United States, Russia, Great Britain, France and the People's Republic of China, for the admission of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations; to reduce armaments and to trade. There are a great many of these things that we could be in favour of, but unfortunately we cannot do that while we are fighting these people. If they would withdraw their armed forces and show a disposition to deal with us in a good and reasonable way, I am sure that we would be more willing for the United Nations to deal with them.

They propose that we ban the Atomic Bomb and make an agreement among the five world powers for disarmament, those being the only persons who would be able to start a world-war. Well, we are in favour of that, Mr. Speaker; in fact, the United Nations have gone a long ways to do that, only to be flouted by the fact that the Russians would not permit proper inspection of their potentials to make the atomic bomb. The people who really make the atomic bomb and know how to do it, are those people who really make the atomic bomb and know how to do it, are those people in this continent who would be most willing to scrap everything in the war-like potentials, and use all those resources to the peaceful use of the atomic energy, if they could be assured in any reasonable way that the Russians would cease making these bombs for military purposes. They have agreed to that whole-heartedly, and every member of the United Nations has agreed to it except Russia and her satellites, and as soon as they permit neutral inspection behind their liens, this tremendous amount of money that we throw into this expensive war material could be stopped at once.

I note that the Peace Council advocates controlled supervision, and in that respect, if they would use a little of that influences on the Russians, where Dr. Endicott is working at the present time, perhaps we would all be in agreement, and that would be a very good thing. They do make one slight error, Mr. Speaker, and that is their proposals are in accord with the backing of the vast majority of the people in the province of Saskatchewan. I do not think this is the case, because I do not think the vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan know very much about this, or have seen very much about the literature.

Mention has been made about the uncontrolled inflation which is taking place today. I cannot say that I am in agreement with that idea that there is uncontrolled inflation. I believe that we are taking the very best and most effective steps that can be used to control any inflationary tendencies. There is really only one thing that you can do to stop inflation, and that is to get less money in circulation and produce more goods. The Federal Government have come forward in every way possible to limit the amount of money in circulation — that is, they are taxing it off and when they get it taxed off they do not issue more money to go out into circulation. That is about the best thing they can do there. As far as our production is concerned, the farmers in this country have gone forward and have produced abundantly and very well. Their products are in abundance, and in fact the hard truth is that just at this moment some of them are going down when their costs are very high in other regards. These are people who work long hours and hard, and produce for a reward, the greatest amount of production that they can possibly get with the up-to-date machinery and everything they have at their command. If everyone else would follow the farmers' example and produce to the very maximum capacity, this matter of inflation would not bother us very much.

We have had some discussion in this House with regard to grain, and particularly with regard to wheat. There has been some mention of the fact that the farmers may be stuck with some damp grain this year, and I and other members who have very close association with the farmers of this province are very glad to hear the Minister's statement today that this situation is not as bad as has been made out. I do trust that the majority of this grain will be taken care of. It is a very hard thing indeed for the farmers to be left with damp grain on his hands in the Spring. There is nothing very much that he can do with it. His capacity of bins and one thing and another does not permit him to spread it out and dry it. It must be spread over thinly and would take a great quantity of space in order to do any good at that. Practically the only way that this can be dried in large quantities is with the commercial driers installed in the elevators and at the terminals. We have tried various types, and I am afraid, Sir, that the farmers are going to be victimized with a lot of these trashy driers, a good deal the same as they were done with certain swathers and other machinery, immediately after the war when machinery was so scarce. Even now today we find that considerable quantities of this grain have been dried, and spoiled the milling and germination qualities of it.

Something has been said about making loans to farmers on un-threshed grain. Well, that has been done — I do not suppose there is a district in the country that has more un-threshed grain than the place where I come from, and the arrangements have been made that the banks loan the farmers this money. But some suggestion has been made that this

should be interest-free. Well, the farmers' organizations did not recommend this, for this reason, that a person who had marketed their grain and did not need a loan would, thus, through the Wheat Board, be paying interest for people who did borrow money. People who did not benefit would be paying interest for people who did, and it was thought that a reasonable rate of interest would be established, and that those who benefited by those loans would pay this interest and they would not need the money for very long. The Government, in order to see that no one lost any money guaranteed 25 per cent of these loans. I believe that was a very good thing, because it could be possible that farmers with grain un-threshed would get into a position (a few of them, but not very many), where they did not get this grain off in the spring. If it came very wet in the spring and rained time after time, and got this grain down into the mud and it commenced to grow, it could just be possible that a few of these loans might be lost, and so in guaranteeing the loan to the loan agencies at 25 per cent, it makes it practically a good deal.

A Royal Commission has been set up on agriculture, and as far as I can see I cannot see any good and valid reason for doing that. Every year we have a meeting of Reeves and Councillors of all the municipalities in this country, and last year they were in Regina. The year before they were in Saskatoon, and this year they are going to be in Saskatoon. Just at the time of the last session they were down here in Regina at the city hall. A lot of us went down there, and we heard everything about what they wanted and what they thought was good. They passed resolutions — every member of the government knows what they were. They are well-advised on just what the needs of the farmers are, and if they are not well-advised, all they had to do was to go down and sit in for a few minutes, and they would soon be told. But, in spite of that, in spite of the recommendations of the Britnell Report, it was thought advisable to hold meetings all over the country and call the farmers together again this year. I do not think those meetings were held for much of any purpose, except to tone the farmers down on their demands a little bit. The farmers knew that they wanted certain services from this government, and it seemed at the time the government was not in a position to give them, and so they held these meetings, it seems to me, to try and argue them out of it.

Someone has suggested that one of the railway lines was giving better service than the other in the movement of grain, and so I took the trouble to look this up, and find out just what the situation was. Considering the mileage of lines and the box-cars available for service, it looks to me as if they were both giving just exactly the same service. The intimation was made that the C.P.R. did not give the service that the C.N.R. did, and it was using its box-cars for some other purpose, but taking the largest elevator company in Saskatchewan, which is the Pool, with 1,168 elevators, with them distributed just about evenly on both the railway lines, the position at February 12 was that 247 elevators were plugged on the C.P.R., and 231 on the C.N.R. — very little difference — 16 difference.

So it seems that they are both serving them quite well. I know that as a matter of overall policy, there are not any of us getting the service that we should get, but the matter of fact is that this grain is down there. I saw a circular to the Pool to their agents which says, "Do not have over two cars of damp grain in your elevator at any one time, because everyone of these facilities are booked to capacity until sometime in June, and this grain comes down there and stands around in cars, and as we all know, that as soon as we get warm weather it will spoil in a matter of a few days."

Now, the reason it did not get down there in the fall — someone said a lot more of this should be moved. It was quite late before we knew we were going to have a lot of damp grain, and even when we knew it and there was a lot of damp grain left, a warm spell came along at that time of the year and it was not possible to ship even in November, a very large quantity of damp grain. Unless that grain is frozen, it is liable to heat in the cars — the railway companies will take it only at the owner's risk, and it seemed impossible to move large quantities. Everyone knew it was there. As soon as they were able to move it, they took it down in tremendous quantities, and have been drying it night and day ever since. I am very pleased to know that we are going to be in a little better position in regard to that damp grain.

We looked for development of power in this country in the hopes that we can give our farming population better rural electrification, and the policy of this party is to subsidize that a little bit, such as is done in Manitoba, in order to give more farmers better rural electrification and keep them on their land. The only perhaps large amount of power that can be developed should be hydro, and in that connection I have a table here that shows hydro development in the Dominion, from 1945-55. There has been a tremendous development. The hydro development has gone up by 60 per cent. We say the year 1955 because these projects are under construction, and are anticipated up to that time. The capacity as at 1945 was 10 and 3/10 million horsepower, and, Mr. Speaker, if you can get that water to working for you, you really help industry out an awful lot. But at the end of 1955 they expect to have 16½ million horsepower — perhaps 17 million, and the gain in 1951 alone was 778,000 horsepower.

Well, we wonder where that is, and how Saskatchewan is doing, but we find out that up at Island Falls is our large power plant location (this supplies power for one of the mining companies). I believe it is Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting, and that is within this province, Island Falls, which has an installed horsepower capacity of 109,000 horsepower. Well, the listed horsepower capacity of the provinces shows Saskatchewan as 111,000 horsepower, so that must be just about all there is.

So we look over these provinces and wonder just what is going to be done about increasing that. We see what the increase in 1951 was, and all of the provinces except Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia had increases in that year; the total of them added up to 778,000 horsepower, as I have said, but Saskatchewan had none. Then we go to the anticipated increase in 1952-53. All of the provinces in this period anticipate an increase, except the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and in the period 1953-54 Saskatchewan anticipates no increase in the hydro installations either. I believe that we should go forward with this, and install more hydro power in this province.

**February 22, 1952**

but in spite of the fact that they do not contemplate installing any more further horsepower in the way of dams, they did collect from this source way up in the northern part of this province (it is used for nothing but running this mining company), by way of water rights this year \$66,647.43, so they find them up there and collect from them anyway.

Well, we should have more mineral production, and something has been said about the mineral production in this province, but when we ask the question in the House a little while ago, we asked the value of base metals produced in the last quarter of 1951, and the reason we asked that was because we had it up to that date, and the answer was “around \$9 million.” Then we said: “What amount of this value is produced by the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company?” The answer was, “All of it.”

Well, that company happened to get into this province, Mr. Speaker, more or less by way of a fluke — before there were any surveys up there, the company was working in what they thought was Manitoba and later on, when the surveys were made they found they were in a little bit of Saskatchewan, and we collect a very substantial tax from them every year, but we do not do very much up there to put any of it back. They are badly in need of a road up there, and I had hoped this province would see its way clear to putting some of that large money they receive in taxation of this mine, back into a road which they wish for very much.

The search for oil and gas goes on, as we hear, and the Minister of Natural Resources said something today about the expropriation of uranium ore by the Dominion Government. As everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, that ore was expropriated because it just had to be. It was found out that people were getting this ore and exporting it, illegally on the side, to countries that we did not ship this ore to. There were people behind the Iron Curtain getting uranium that we needed ourselves, and so of necessity, the Federal Government expropriated this material. If these people had shown a disposition to do this thing rightly and properly, I expect they would be in control of this today.

Well, the search for oil and gas is all right, except that now and before now there has never been enough, and I think we all know the reason for that. The people who had the disposition to come in here and drill for that just did not get a fair deal — did not get a reasonable deal that would cause them to want to put very much money in this province. They had hanging over them the Regina Manifesto which has never been repudiated yet, and just in a late press release, we see that they do not want to change again. So everyone knows that that still hangs over the heads of the people; also the confiscatory legislation passed and on the statute books of this province, by which they can take over anybody's property quite easily.

Well, just lately they have found a little natural gas, and we are all wondering just what the government's policy is on that, and we would like to hear something about the government's policy regard to this natural gas. There has been intimations made, but we do not know very much about it yet. If they are going to develop this natural gas, they had better leave it open to bids, and let people perform the service

who will do it at the best for the most reasonable cost. If the Power Corporation wants to enter into this business, let them compete with other people on the distribution of this gas, and let them make a rate that would be more favourable than anybody else, and then if they want to turn it over to some otherwise responsible people, make the best deal as far as the —pr is concerned, and as far as the consumer is concerned; let them supply the natural gas to the people. In that way, the consumers would get a better deal and the province will get a better deal also. There is some fear that the government may make a monopoly on this gas, and they can do that in a very easy way. All they have to do is say they are going to distribute it, and set their own price for it at the well, and socialize that just about as quick as you could do in any other way.

Some mention has been made that perhaps even this government now is going to give the farmers a little something on royalties for oil in cases where they do not hold the mineral rights, and the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) has spoken on that today; he did not seem to give us very much encouragement, but I thought that we did get an intimation from some other Minister the other day that they were going to do something about this, and if they do, why, we are going to be something in the role of Wordsworth here, and they know what is supposed to have been done by him about the old age pensions. It is sure that if they do anything about this, why, we can get the credit for bringing it about, in regard to the royalties to the farmers on oil. If they do it, I hope they bring down legislation at this session, and I hope that it is fair and reasonable. There is no reason why any Promoter should run around over people's land holdings and make themselves money without ever doing a thing to dig an oil well, while the farmer on the land does not get anything out of it at all. I am sure we will back up something they bring in that is good and reasonable to the farmers in this connection.

The Public Revenue Tax has been mentioned, and in that connection, I suppose they finally got around to where they are going to do a little something about this. If we look back to the record of the Provincial Treasurer when he was a councillor in town here, why, he was all in favour of that in those days, according to The Leader-Post of yesterday. He was right in favour of that idea to get it out of the government, and I suppose he is still in favour of it since it has been called to his attention, and he will probably do something about it now. The pay-rolls and employment industries are record high, and I am sure that is good news to all of us. We are well pleased to see everyone prosperous; particularly the workers and the farmers. It is a hard thing when the working people are not prosperous because a great majority of them may not have any other way to supplement their income, except the actual income of what they earn. They are in a very hard position, indeed, if their income is reduced in any way whatsoever, and it has been the policy of this party to give them every encouragement to see that they are protected in case of sickness, to see that wages must be paid to them promptly and in full, and give them special chances to collect from anyone who does not pay them. But we do know that there is no power within this legislation to legislate prosperity to anybody. That has to be done by production, and the only thing that we can do is stand as referees between the producers and the people that we work for, and try to see that everybody gets a just and fair deal, which I am sure that everyone in this legislature will do.

**February 22, 1952**

The right to sue the Crown is going to be brought into effect, I believe, and that will be a welcome move. It is away overdue as a matter of fact, because we have had some glaring instances since this government has been in power where people were not given the proper right to sue the Crown, and as a result, they got a very miserable deal over it. We had the case of some returned soldiers who had land allotted to them, and subsequently taken away from them. One of these fellows was permitted to sue the Crown. He got a very good and substantial judgment, but it did not look very good, I guess, so the next two of them were refused permission to sue the Crown, and they had to settle out of Court for a small portion of what the fellow got who was permitted to sue.

I hope they pre-date this a little bit, so that fellows like Ivanchuk can get in and get his rights established also under this legislation.

The new tax rental agreement will provide this province with considerable more revenue, and of that we are sure we are all very well pleased. It is a result of Liberal policies, of course, that the province was able to get that, and if we were as tough politically on these people as they would like to be on us, I suppose it would not be anywhere near as generous.

We have had in this province, as has been said, a certain grave loss of population, which has distressed all of us, I am sure, and in this connection I just today got a letter from my constituency, written by one of the fellows in that district, and he said: (I will just summarize it in a general way):

“We have just lost a lot of population, and we hope something will be done to keep the young people on the farm, and the people in the province.”

He sends me a clipping from the paper, and this is quite revealing to me, Mr. Speaker, because I was not quite aware myself that this was the condition. This article goes on to show that while other parts of the province may have lost population, the northern part of this province really gained. I will just read a short quotation here:

“There is one section of the province which has experienced something in the nature of a boom, as the census figures indicate. North Battleford is almost in the heart of that area, for it is in the Saskatchewan northland. The cities and towns of Saskatchewan’s northern area recorded a gain of 55 per cent which has been unmatched anywhere in this province, or Manitoba, and exceeded only in Alberta, where development of new oil resources have been a major influence.

“North Battleford heads the list of all places large enough to be incorporated as a city, with an increase of 57 per cent since 1941. Prince Albert made the largest gain of any city large enough to



support a daily newspaper at 36 per cent. Nipawin holds the further distinction of being the town where the automobile bonspiel is located and has acquired new claim to fame. In 1941-51 period it registered the greatest percentage of gain in any town or city in Saskatchewan or Manitoba — up 133 per cent.

“On a percentage basis, all of the top gains have been made along the northern fringe — two of this city’s neighbours have grown impressively — Lloydminster, which has shared in the oil discoveries and their development has shot up; Meadow Lake has advanced 101 per cent; over in the east Hudson Bay Junction has expanded 99 per cent.”

Well, that goes to show you, Mr. Speaker, that if all cities did as well as we do up there, they would hold their population pretty well.

The proposition has been brought up that we pay something on the Government Corporations engaged in commercial business in lieu of tax, and we are fully in support of that over here. We are in support of it if it is done on a good and equitable basis. If it is something near equal to what the other people have to pay engaged in the same occupation, and if it is not — if it is just a matter of a grant, there is a chance for little political favouritism, and we do not like that very much.

In the matter of education, health, crown corporations, highways, and the Turtleford seat, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve those items for the budget debate, and I may say that I will vote for the amendment, and against the motion.

The House resumed at 8 o’clock p.m.

**Mr. Loptson** (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a good time to add my congratulations to those who have spoken before; particularly to the mover and seconder, because I realize they had a pretty difficult time to find anything good to say about the Speech from the Throne, which, of course, they were naturally expected to do. But they made a pretty fair job of it. There is quite a lot in that that we could talk on, but I am going to confine my remarks pretty much to the amendment to the Address, and reserve my rights and come back on the Address if I so please, so I would appreciate it, your Honour, if you will draw my attention if I should happen to wander off.

Now, I listened to the speech this afternoon from the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank), and I was hoping to get something out of it that would pep me up a little bit, but I have been scrutinizing it since he quit, and really have not anything that I can be ‘hepped’ up about. Most of it has been said before in this House, except for the fact that he went way back to the last century to find something that the Liberals had done at that time, in order to justify something they had done this time, so I would just like to take a little time to review

what has been done with regard to our natural resources in the north, since we do not exactly have to confine ourselves to oil alone, and by the time I get through with that question maybe the Minister will be in his seat. Now, whatever might have been done by the Liberals 'way back in 1905 or 1900 is neither here nor there as far as we are concerned today.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Loptson:** — But I would like to draw to the attention of the House that since the C.C.F. Government has been in power, the north country has been pretty well socialized. They started by socializing the fishing industry; they started by socializing the forest products, and they socialized to a great extent the fur production. If you went back to the record of production of those industries before the war, I think you would see that it stands just as favourable as it is today, in spite of the fact that it should be many times more now. It is significant to see what is going on there; but in order to see the picture right, you pretty well have to travel through the area where they are doing their work, to see the scatter machinery, jeeps, trucks, bull-dozers and Caterpillars, and what not all mover the north country which they are using for the transportation of forest products. If you go and check up on their mills, you find a lot of them are dilapidated, and some are only partly working, and some of them are not working at all.

I just had a return showing the number of mills that our money has been paid out for, and it is not a very pretty picture. The mill at Big River, of course, is a new mill and a lot of money has had to be spent in order to build it, and whether it will be justified or not remains to be seen; but up to date it has not done very much, according to the returns tabled in this House. I find they handled about (at least they give that mill credit for) five million feet, which represents about two years' production; a mill that should turn out about 10 million feet a year. Then we see the returns, which will be discussed, I presume, in Crown Corporations Committees, do not compare very favourable with the Government or the province to the east of us. Last year's production does not reflect much credit on the activity of the north in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member asked the Speaker to remind him if he was transgressing. I believe the rule we have been following is that anyone who did not speak on the main motion is being allowed a certain amount of latitude, but you have already signified your intention of speaking on the main motion. You were going to confine yourself to the -amendment, so if you are leading up to it, it is all right.

**Mr. Loptson:** — No, this is the Natural Resources — the wood product is natural resources, and I just wanted to draw it to the attention of the House that . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you will notice, the amendment does not say anything about Natural Resources. It confines itself to the mineral and oil resources.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, then, if that is the case, I will dispense with this until later. I understood that it took natural resources as a whole — with lots to talk about.

Then, first of all, I want to check up on some of the statements that the Minister made this afternoon, and one of the things he did was to concentrate pretty much on criticizing the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) for what he had said yesterday; and one of the things that seem to be a bone of contention is the fact that this man Rhubbra and his associates had got the largest acreages in the province. No company, nor individual, had got such a monopoly. He maintained that Rhubbra only had 9 million acres, and he said that the member for maple Creek said that he had got 14 million acres, which made a difference of about 5 million acres.

Well now, I took a little time to check up on this thing, and there is no secret of where these 14 million acres are. As a matter of fact, I think during the last Session it was fully proven that Mr. Rhubbra did get 14 million acres in this way — that he had got a permit for 9 million acres, but he had an option of 5 million acres besides that.

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

**Mr. Loptson:** — Now it turns out that he must have had an option — or at least he got compensation in the way of over-riding royalties for 10,550,000 acres, -because in the statement of his company's financial standing he is stated as having a royalty on 10,550,000 acres. So he must have picked up these 1,550,000 acres from some place to make that up, in addition to the 9 million that he had a permit for. Well, I think the way he obtained the rest of this 14 million acres was accounted for during the last Session. The -Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) admitted that he had made application for the balance of this acreage, and, through an agreement, the terms of which may not have been known to the —min, later relinquished or withdrew the application to make it possible for Tidewater or Sohio to pick it up. What the consideration may have been in that deal may not be known to the Minister, and I do not suppose he has any right to delve into it to find out what the consideration was; but I imagine that he did not drop it for nothing, since he had an absolute monopoly on 14 million acres, and these companies required it for their business.

So I think it is fair to say that the statement of the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) is correct when he said that Rhubbra had 14 million acres. He had a permit for 9 million, and than had an application in for 5 million more, and in consideration for dropping these permits, the application and making it possible for these companies to apply for these permits direct, he got an over-riding royalty on 1,550,000 acres, plus whatever amount of consideration that may have been agreed upon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is useless for any of us to try to make out that men who are in that kind of a game are doing things for nothing. They are dealing in millions, and everybody expects to receive millions in return. You go into the oil fields of Alberta today. There is no use talking in the hundreds with anybody there. You cannot even talk hundreds in repairs for your machines — nothing less than thousands, hundred-thousands, millions. That game is a game of millions, not a small amount of money; and when small fellows go into it, it is pretty hard for them to get along without have some consideration from the Government.

**February 22, 1952**

Now, the Minister made the remark that small companies had done well. That is, he appreciated what they have done. And I agree with him, because it was the small companies that started the oil movement in this province, plus the fact that this Government, after the 1948 election, when they saw they were so near defeat on their Socialistic policies on oil —development, deleted the clause they had in their lease agreements. They deleted the cancellation clause.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — What Clause?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Clause 19 in the agreement that you asked the Imperial Oil Company to sign. It was not the term of the lease that the Imperial refused to sign; it was Clause 19 at the bottom in red type, where the —min reserved the right, notwithstanding anything in this agreement, to cancel any or all of these lease on 30-days' notice at the end of any calendar year. When this Government is talking as they are talking about the Imperial Oil Company wanting everything for nothing, and that they do not do business that way, they are not telling the truth. But they do not like to have to pay high-binding promoters a large amount of over-riding royalties. They want to do business direct with the Government. And this agreement was not asking for 2 million acres. The agreement calls for about 2,000,000 acres — I may be wrong; but it is not over 2 million acres. It sets out the townships, sets out the ranges and everything was satisfactory except Clause 19, and when these gentlemen get up on their feet and say that the Imperial Oil Company walked out because they wanted to grab all the natural resources of this province, they are not telling the truth. The only area they asked for in that agreement was out west, pretty much in the area where the oil is discovered now. They are kicking about the Liberals, saying that they should have had oil before this; but I am going to say tonight, that had this viscous Imperial Oil Company been allowed to continue its exploration in 1945, they probably would have had oil long ago.

And not only that; you had a little independent company operating in this province, an independent company composed of local Saskatchewan citizens — some 2,500 shareholders who put up about \$80,00 or \$90,000 — or was it more than that? It might have been, -because they had drilled 30 wells which must have cost them close to a million dollars. They were the first ones to locate gas of any quantity. I have never in this House heard their name mentioned, when the Ministers have been blowing about the gas and oil that has been discovered in this province, and it is Data Petroleum. They never mentioned that little company, although they were responsible for setting the oil boom going in Saskatchewan. They discovered gas — as a matter of fact, the Government is buying gas from them. They have one of the biggest wells in the province. They are distributing gas in unity; there were responsible for locating the salt which is perhaps the finest plant in Western Canada; they were responsible for locating the Potash which is now under development. But what did the Government do to them? When that little company was struggling to raise money to keep on developing a large acreage that they had procured under development permits about a million acres of their holdings, this Government orders an investigation of their affairs. I understand the Attorney-General refused to sign the order for the investigation.

**Hon. Mr. Corman** (Attorney General): — That is not correct.

**Mr. Loptson**: — Yes, it is.

**Hon. Mr. Corman**: — It is not correct that I refused to sign it. I was not in the province at the time.

**Mr. Loptson**: — Well, I was going to give you credit for having refused to sign it.

**Hon. Mr. Corman**: — Well, I will take all the credit that's coming, but I did not refuse to sign it.

**Mr. Loptson**: — Then the credit is not your.

**Hon. Mr. Corman**: — I just want to keep the record straight — I do not know which way I was quoted, but I did not refuse to sign it.

**Mr. Loptson**: — You would not want the credit then, for refusing to sign it, eh?

**Hon. Mr. Corman**: — I am stating facts.

**Mr. Loptson**: — But anyway, the blame goes on your Deputy Provincial Secretary for having signed an order for an official investigation. What did they do? they did not send a man to check up and investigate their books. they just sent the squad in to close up their office, seize their books without any notice, close up their bank account so they could not even pay their employees, tied them up for months, and then, when everything was cleared, the investigation was completed, (that was their "Bill of Rights"), and when the smoke was all cleared up, the books were released, no prosecution was made, but they were minus over a million acres of their holdings. I will show you a map of it; this is what they took; this is what they have now; this gas well has been taken away from them since. I am holding the map up to you, so that the Minister of Natural Resources can see. They also took a block of land away from here. Well, now, that is what happened to that little company of local shareholders in this province, who did all the spade-work and pioneer work, and brought the oil boom as we are enjoying it at the present time. We are hoping we will get gas and oil out of it. At the present time we cannot say that we have. We are just being teased; but where there is smoke, there is generally fire some place.

Who was behind this thing? Dr. Shumiatcher (and he was then an employee of the Government and an adviser of the Premier) — he had access to all these things in the Natural Resourced Department. He, apparently, was the man who did the prosecuting.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank**: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman just how he knows that Dr. Shumiatcher had access to things in the Department of Natural Resources, because I want to tell you he is talking through his hat! He never worked for the Department of natural Resources.

**Mr. Loptson**: — Now see here, Dr. Shumiatcher was, for a number of years employed by the C.C.F. Government as legal counsel of the Executive Council, and a member of the legal council to the Economic Advisory and Planning Board, which was set up by the C.C.F. Government. He could hardly be considered an ordinary civil servant. Is that not right?

**Some Hon. Member:** — Who wrote that? You did?

**Mr. Loptson:** — He had access to every department of the Government, as a private adviser to the Premier. Now, where did this oil acreage go to? We find that it landed in the possession of Albercan Petroleums. Dr. Shumiatcher at the same time was their solicitor. He gets a job there (I do not know whether he is a shareholder or not), but his job, they say, pays about \$18,000 a year plus his expenses, which is worth-while. But that is the reward that this Government gave to this local company which the Minister is now praising for the work they have done. I understand there was oil located by a group somewhere west of the present oil find — Fosterton. I understand that they have both gas and oil there; but whatever became of them, I do not know.

But the thing seems to be that this government thinks it more convenient to deal with men who can get a good slice out of the big companies, because they can afford to pay. Now, we are interested to know who got the slice. The Provincial Treasurer says that these companies prefer to pay a 2½ per cent over-riding royalty. Well, I would like to suggest that had this Government had any consideration for the farmer, and the companies were willing to pay this over-riding 2½ per cent royalty, it would have been a lot more legitimate to give it to the man who owns the farm on which oil was found, than to hand it to high-binging promoters. I would think that that would be a far more practical thing to do. The farmer would appreciate that, but then there would not have been the slices to be divided among these associates of Mr. Rhubbra, and consequently, it was more profitable to deal in that way because some people were getting a big slice out of it.

Now what slice might there be in this deal? There has never been anything said in this House about the possibility of a fairly substantial cash consideration. Let us at least be practical about this thing. These companies had been paying the farmer from 10 to 25 cents an acre for free-hold leases, which was costing them in the neighbourhood of 80 cents to \$1.00 an acre, by the time they had paid the man out in the field to collect the leases, by the time they paid the searches made in the Land Titles Office, and by the time they had paid for the caveats and registering them.

Well, then, could we not surmise that if these companies had paid Rhubbra and his associates even the half of that amount by getting a whole block, without all this trouble, of 9 million acres, or even 14 million acres, they would be quite prepared to pay them 50 cents an acre for it? Well, it was a nice little bit of money — \$5 million or \$7 million; whichever way you would like to figure it. But I would say that, if I wanted the acreage, then I would be prepared to pay at least half as much as I would have to pay for free-hold, and get it all in one lump sum. And I think, if it came right down to real facts, that is where the big pay-off is — not so much in the 2 ½ per cent over-riding royalty, but in the large sum of actual cash that these men got out of these monopolies — these holdings of the Crown lands of this province. And I am going to tell the people out in the country that, and I think I am justified in doing so. Every farmer knows that oil companies have been out there, hungry for leases. They have been buying their free-holds, and they know that it is

costing them in the neighbourhood of 80¢ to \$1.00 an acre, when they had it all set up, and that it would have been quite cheap for them to pay Rhubbra and his associates even nearly as much as the free-hold would cost them.

Now, what has it cost this Government? In view of the fact that we found oil and we found gas, particularly gas, had you left these small companies to operate in 1945 and develop this gas, even saying that you chased the Imperial Oil Company out; had you let Bata go ahead and develop their leases, and let another small company (and there are lots that are ready to go if this Government would give them any encouragement), you would have had gas five years ago, and the city of Saskatoon would have been enjoying industrial development that Edmonton is enjoying today. Over \$100 millions is slated for Edmonton's industrial development this year; some of it has already started.

I would ask the member from Saskatoon what he has to say to his electors about the loss they have sustained as a result of the C.C.F. policy in this province! He can very well go and ask himself how he is going to justify it. You know the gas is there; it is right at the door-step of Saskatoon. You know it now and it was there five years ago when the oil boom started after the war. You knew it was there in 1945, because it was already located, and you defied anybody putting money into it because of your Socialistic policy. As a result of that, Saskatoon has lost all the industrial development that was justly theirs.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Rosthern too!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Saskatoon is the natural industrial centre in Saskatchewan, because of its river water. You cannot bring industry into Regina because of lack of water. You may be able to bring offices, but you can to Saskatoon where the water is in abundance that is required for industrial development. For instance, the refineries, the chemical plants that are being built in Edmonton at the present time should have come to Saskatoon. They had to be where there was water. I know there are a lot of people who would like to see Regina grow, but we must be practical about this. There are natural advantages in Saskatoon that lend themselves to the development of an industrial centre.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Don't leave out Prince Albert, please!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, you might have had it in Prince Albert too, and you are responsible for that, too. You might have had gas developed so that Prince Albert might have been the centre of a big industry. The quicker you see the fallacy of the policy of the Government of this province, the quicker you get down to basic facts and get something done. You have not got oil in Saskatchewan yet. All you have got is a teaser. You have got gas and you can develop that if you go after it. I am still doubtful if you are going to get very much oil until this Government is out of power. It is all right; they can laugh at that. I am going to tell you right now, if the oil companies produce oil and the Government does carry out its policies and take it over for the people, and develop it themselves, the oil Companies have no comeback, because they know what the C.C.F. policy is. You know your legislation — you know your policy — or will I have to tell you. Here is one of your policies. I quote:

“He says the C.C.F. is democratic” — false or true.

No. 6 — “The C.C.F. is controlled by higher ups and will led to dictatorship.”

That is false.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Do you say it is true or false?

**Mr. Loptson:** — No, the C.C.F. say it is false. Here is No. 6 again:

“The entire C.C.F. policy is formulated by the people’s convention. No person and no small group in the C.C.F. has power to make or change this programme. Any authority held by the C.C.F. office a, (that includes the Government) is constantly subject to the approval of the convention. The C.C.F. type of organization is the only true protection against dictatorship.”

That is true — they say that is true. Now, then, what right have you to make the kind of a deal that you are making with the oil companies?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question. Does the Liberal policy, or the Liberal Party, believe in that policy of having their programme controlled by conventions, or do you believe that it should be controlled by higher ups?

**Mr. Loptson:** — We have a policy — the Liberal policy is a party of private enterprise and our conventions have been controlled, and have been conducted along that policy. The C.C.F. policy is based on socialism and public ownership, and consequently their convention is truly conducted along that policy. And when the boys come to the C.C.F. convention after we have a good oil-field, I am going to be right with them to see that it is socialized, because that is the policy under which the oil companies have undertaken to drill and bring the oil in here. I do not blame them.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is the policy we were elected on.

**Mr. Loptson:** — If they want to bring oil into this province under that policy then that is fine. They already know where the gas is. This Government has taken control of the gas. This Government can also take control of the oil and have it delivered to their order at the refineries, or they can take over the fields and drill it themselves. Well, taken either way, it is all right; there is a certain amount of profit in it. It is not unprofitable. But that is the policy of this Government, and that is why you are not getting the oil -development that you should be getting. But you do know where the gas is now and there is no excuse for not developing it.

And what it has cost the people of this Province to have a socialistic government, I would not like to start to figure out; but each city, each industrial centre that might have had this gas five years



ago, and even if they get it now, they lost the chance of these large industries which lend themselves to be located here in this Province, which have gone to Alberta, and are not to be had now. Even if you find oil here, you have not the markets that you would have had if you had not waited seven or eight years to get it.

The Minister criticized the Federal Government for letting the C.N.R. mineral rights, I understood him to say, without reservations — that is, to take a portion of the land as we do under the Crown system in the province. I would like to ask him how he proposed to take our reservations out of the C.P.R. or C.N.R. land holdings where there is maybe one section in a township or two sections in a township; where it is broken up and scattered all over.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The C.N.R. land is very often all the odd numbered sections in the township, and the way they could have set up Crown reservations was to take half of every section, and retain it and leave the other half. It would be quite easy.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Would you expect anybody to sink \$100,000 into a hole and only have about four well sites? Would you expect anybody to do that?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They could have done that.

**Mr. Loptson:** — If you imply that, then you do not know much about the expense off drilling for oil, if you think that anybody is going to risk \$100,000 to \$200,000 in a hole that, if he did get something, all he had was about four to eight well sites close in.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, who said, Mr. Speaker, that the company was drilling any wells on this land? Nobody said anything about it. They have already been drilled.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What are they spending on it?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They could sit on half of it just as well as all of it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — What did they take it for? What are they paying lease money for?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Like you are doing most of the time.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They are not in Rhubbra's business. They are not in the business with Rhubbra or Shumiatcher. It is practically impossible to take a reserve out of either the C.P.R. or the C.N.R. lands because they are so sparsely located that you just cannot impose them. If they want to get any consideration in lieu of reservations, they might charge an extra royalty.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You have heard about the uranium . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Now, then, we come back to find that this man Shumiatcher is a fine fellow. He is a pretty smart fellow anyway. He has been able to do pretty well out of his Government. We find some of his

February 22, 1952

associates, both locally and abroad, are mostly fairly well experienced oil operators. He has organized, I think, five companies — and he may have organized more. One of his associates, as has already been mentioned, is Charlie Broughton. Where does he come from?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Working for the Government.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I think he is the Premier's organizer. Well, he is not going to have a very good going this next election, because they tell me that the farmers are pretty much up in the air in the Weyburn constituency. He has been taking some freeholds — leases, from them for these freeholders, and now they find that the leases are worth more money, and they think that they have been pretty badly done up by the Premier's organizer. I wonder how the Premier is going to fix that up with them. But anyway, there is the Search Corporation — I have a list of the directors here. I have got Barclay Oils Limited.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** (Provincial Treasurer): — What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I have got Albercan Petroleums, organized a year before he resigned, and while he was still in the employ of the Government.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Might I ask the hon. gentleman what newspaper he is reading from?

**Mr. Loptson:** — It is a chapter — yes, "Saskatchewan Liberal."

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No wonder he is reading it to us, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Freeholders' oil. This is a real picture; is it not a fact that he has organized all these companies?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, you are trying to argue what Mr. Hood says in that paper must be true.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, he never said anything that he could not back up, you know that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He said a lot of things in 1948 that he did not backup.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I am sure that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Brockelbank) would like to catch him not printing the truth.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I do not want him — you can have him!

**Mr. Loptson:** — But anyway, in numerous of these operations, Dr. Shumiatcher has not only monopolized the natural resources of this province, he has just walked in and taken everything that was of any value for himself and his associates, according to the records. You know, that is a fact, and there is no getting away from it. But the thing is, who are his associates? And that is the question we are asking. Who are his associates? That is what the province wants to know. After all, this talk

about the oil business, the main point is to find out who Shumiatcher's associates are, and how much did they get.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have proven everything that the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) has said. And all that we are asking for is the facts. We want to know, and people are entitled to know, that when one-third of the oil rights of this pr are handed out to one man and some associates, we have a right to know who his associates are and how much of a slice was taken as a result of giving him a monopoly of one-third of the oil rights of this province. The Premier says that there was a security area and a development area. Well, I think that there are some men who really got security; Rhubbra is one, Shumiatcher is another, and Broughton seems to be pretty well fixed. Those men are pretty well local, but Rhubbra is not, and they really got security. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

The whole question of the oil situation is that we, as Opposition, are trying to draw out from this Government the details of his huge deal, and they will not come through. About the only way to get it is through an investigation and so find out how this thing came about. Why was it necessary, as the Provincial Treasurer says, to invite in a man of the type of one Rhubbra, and hand him 14 million acres of oil rights?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, may I again correct the hon. gentleman. Yesterday, I got up to deny that Mr. Rhubbra was invited to come into the province.

**Mr. Loptson:** — But you said that he was invited.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing. Mr. Rhubbra was not invited to come into the province. Mr. Rhubbra came into the province and did his deal.

**Some Hon. Member (Opposition):** — You are confused, you don't know what he did.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Let me tell the story this way. After these little companies, such as Bata Petroleums had discovered oil and gas in this province, I can see the picture of Dr. Shumiatcher, along with Broughton and more of these C.C.F. prominent men, getting together and saying, "Here is a chance for us to make a killing; but since we cannot do it ourselves, we will get a guy in here that knows how." And they could not get a better man than Rhubbra. And they could not get better men than some of these other men that are hooked up with him, because they had already been in the game, and they knew how to go about it. They know how to put just about how much they were prepared to pay. They knew what they were paying for freeholds, and they could very well set the price according to what the freehold was costing, for the Government lease.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Just the way you used to sell hay.

February 22, 1952

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes, and it did not cost the Government half as much as it costs you to put it up now. It cost you \$10.25 a ton just to put in the stack, and it was delivered in the car then for \$6.25 baled.

**Hon. Member (Govt.):** — You are trying to hitch the horse to the hay!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, now, what is this all about and what do we want? What we want, as I said before, is to find out and get a clear picture of what is happening to our natural resources here. The first is, who were Rhubbra's associates; the second is, if, as claimed by the Government, they do not know who they were, why was the deal done with men they did not know? I think that is a fair question. Why was the deal entered into without securities? Why was the deal with Shumiatcher and Havard entered into which was later signed to National Petroleum? Why did that happen, when there were applications there galore rolling into the Natural Resources office, as the Minister said, so fast that he could not take care of them all? Many of those applicants would have gone and developed this land. There has not been anything done on the land that National petroleum has taken a permit out on; nothing but a little survey. That is all it has done.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I stated, this afternoon, that they have done a magnetometer survey and a gravity meter survey.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That does not make any difference. What does that mean? Then, the other thing we want is: what was the relationship between Shumiatcher and the Department of natural Resources before leaving the employ of the Government? What access to the files of the Natural Resources did he have? What happened regarding Bata Petroleum so that Albercan, represented by Shumiatcher, obtained about a million acres of their leases. Why were the uranium deals placed with Hershon and his associates, without some investigation as to his reliability? Doing business with men that the Government of Saskatchewan does not know anything about does not sound real. They say they did not know a thing about them, and still they handed them one-third of the natural resources of this province. The Minister of Natural Resources admits that he had never seen the man and did not know a thing about him. I think he admitted, last session, that he did not even make the deal with Rhubbra. Was the deal really made by the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer? The only way the matter can be cleared up is be an investigation through the Government.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Are you through . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — If this is a point or order, it is quite in order.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the deal with Mr. Rhubbra was made by the Premier and myself?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I said you had never met him, and the Premier said he had never met him, and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Brockelbank) said he never met him.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if he said that he is an unmitigated liar.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I said that you said you did not know him, and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Brockelbank) had never met him. He did not make a deal with him. I said, “Who did make a deal with him?” You said the deal had been made so that you must know something about it. Somebody must have made the deal.

**Some Hon. Member (Opposition):** — The deal was made by the Premier and the public relations committee of the Natural Resources.

**Mr. Loptson:** — He said he did not make the deal. Somebody must have made the deal. The Minister of Natural Resources . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I am insisting that that be withdrawn. I want to say that I never in my life even met Mr. Rhubbra, until the day that he and the representatives of Tidewater and the Sohio Oil Company came to my office months and months after the deal was made. I am going to demand that he withdraw that.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I can withdraw that, because I did not say that he made it. I said that . . .

**Some Hon. Member (Govt.):** — Don’t pull that.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The Minister of Natural Resources says he did not make the deal. Who made the deal? He had nothing to do with it; then who made the deal with Rhubbra? That is the question.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, I never said that. I never said . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, will you admit that you did then?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of privilege, the Department looks after the administration of the resources, and what was the name of this B.L.P. Drilling Company, for example, in which the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) was interest in? I never made the deal with that company. They came to the Department and made their application, and likewise these other people came to the Department and made their application.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, if the Minister did not make the deal, that makes it all the worse. Then the whole deal must have been made with Shumiatcher, and my hon. friend did not know what was in it, or what the terms were.

**Mr. Tucker:** — They are all trying to “rotten egg” it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They are all trying to . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — May I have the floor on a point of privilege? The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) makes some pretty ridiculous statements. When permits are issued, they are issued in

February 22, 1952

accordance with the terms of the regulations and I have at least a rough idea of what the term of the regulations are, and know that those are the terms. So I would suggest that he was wrong when he said that I did not know on what terms they were issued.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Will you admit then, that you have permitted the officials of the office to give one-third of the natural resources to one party, without knowing anything about it? Do you admit that? If you will, then I would say that you hardly qualify to fill your position. Do you admit that you allow your employees that much rope in the office? Why, they can walk away with the whole natural resources of the province, without you even knowing about it.

**Some Hon. Member (Opposition):** — That lets Mr. Fines out, anyway!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Last year I tried to give you a break and say that I did not think you knew what was going on in the office, in the Natural Resources. You would not accept that, last session; now you admit that you do not know what is going on.

**Some Hon. Member (Opposition):** — It sure smells, anyhow!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Oh, it small bad! Well, let us see what we want. Through the Government official investigation, whether such an investigation is to be of value depends entirely on the nature of the investigation, and whether it is designed to get to the bottom of things or to cover up. That, of course, is natural. Unless the persons carrying it out are determined to get to the bottom of the matter, and have the full support of the Government in so doing, little can be accomplished by an investigation. And that is true. For example, unless department records are made available, and civil servants are made to feel that they can make full disclosures without fear of retribution, an investigation could get very little more than the facts that we have already.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You are not a very good reader.

**Mr. Loptson:** —

”Which, to say the least, looks as if the interests (and we are going to make this clear, because there is not gong to be any mistake about this, of what we want so you cannot contradict it) of the province were sacrificed for the benefit of a small group of people, and some of them had been very close to the government itself.”

and that is true. You cannot get a large proportion of the province, without being very, very close to the higher-ups.

“Further an investigation by Royal Commission now would mean that the matter could not be discussed in the coming campaign.”

And it would probably be a very nice thing for the Government if they put a Royal Commission on to whitewash them and shut us up.

“Further, a Royal Commission, just as any other investigating body that endeavours to get the facts could get nowhere without the sincere co-operation of the Government.”

I doubt if it would be possible to get that from this Government. This obviously could not be expected from the present Government, as they are so closely involved with the men it concerns. If elected to office — I think I am safe in saying this, without disclosing any policy of the Liberal Party; if elected to office, the Liberal Party will arrange for an investigation of the circumstances and terms of the deals involving natural resources.

This investigation will receive the full support and co-operation of the government. All necessary assistance will be provided, records will be made available, and civil servants will be assured that they can testify without fear of being dismissed. All proper steps will be taken in the light of the results of such an investigation, in the best interests of the province. Those who have not been involved in any improper deals need have no fear that if it is found that our resources have been handed out, enriching a few persons at the expense of the province as a whole, appropriate action will be taken.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member knows it is accepted parliamentary procedure that no member can read from a document of facts — it does not matter whether it is facts or not; but no member is allowed to read a document that can be made and prepared by someone else.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Okay. This is made by myself, and it is matter of policy . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you are reading from notes, it is all right.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Partly it is notes, and partly a statement; but we want to make these things clear so that there is not going to be any misunderstanding about it. This particular part of my remarks is important, and I have them written out so that there will be no comeback.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on this point, it has been an accepted custom in parliamentary practice that when an important statement has been made by the Government of policies, such as on the budget, it is read as a matter of course. This is representing the fixed policy of the Liberal Party, and he is reading it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. member gives his word to the Chamber that this is his own composition, and that he is just reading it to be sure that there will be no errors, that is accepted.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, that is the purpose and that is what we are after. We are prepared to go this far in an investigation if the Liberal party gets into power. Furthermore, I would like to say that anyone who has suffered as a result of the improper dealings of the government department,

**February 22, 1952**

to come forth and they will be restored to their proper place, and the culprits shall be punished for such improper dealings, because it looks as if there have been some individuals and groups of individuals, who have lot the money they put into development of our resources, in good faith, and they have lost their permits because of lack of co-operation of some officials in the Department, because they wanted those permits for somebody else — that is plain language.

Now, this is the policy of the Liberal government, if they get into power.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Hon. member is continually throwing insinuations that someone has lost their permits because of non-co-operation of the Government. I would suggest that he should name the permit and the occasion.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I did not say they had. I said if there are some that lost their permits.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You have been insinuating that there are.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I said “if” there is anybody that lost their permit as a result of improper dealing through the Department, then they shall be restored to their proper position.

It is rather unfortunate that we should have to be suspicious that there might be somebody higher up included in that, and it is something that I did not have the slightest suspicion of until the Premier of this province brought in that Act amending The Legislative Assembly Act at the last session. The Premier, in his speech, was very indignant about some member on this side of the House making use of it, and passing insinuating remarks about somebody in the Government being implicated in this natural resources situation. I do not know more that could have been done that would have thrown more reflection in the Minister, than the amendment to The Legislative Act, last Session, which immuned all members from prosecution . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — On both sides of the House.

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . by the fact that they may be, directly or indirectly, interested in natural resources. He accuses us of voting for it. Well, maybe I did. I saw the Act go through and the significance of it never entered my mind, which directly throws a reflection on every member of this Government.

**Hon. Member (Government):** — And the Opposition!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, maybe the Opposition too, but you did not have to pass the Act for the member for Saltcoats, because he had no interest in any acreage, nor any holdings, in this province. There wasn't anybody on this side, that I know of, who had to be protected by that Act . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Oh yes there was. There was a little dog!



**Mr. Lopton:** — Well, I am not accusing anybody of being implicated in anything, but that Act, in itself, does . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a question of privilege, this shows the kind of thing; we are dealing with facts. As a matter of fact, I had a dog killed; I had a right of action against a man named Mr. Wilderman. He was insured with the Saskatchewan Insurance Office. I was satisfied with the claim against him. They came in to settle the claim that I had against him, and, on his behalf, offered me \$60. I figured I was absolutely justified in taking that compensation because I was taking it from Mr. Wilderman in effect. But, because I did not want, in any way, to even come close to infringing the Legislative Assembly Act, I never in any way cashed that cheque until an amendment was put through that members could deal with the Saskatchewan Insurance Office. Now that is a horse of an entirely different colour than what has been brought up today.

I am not afraid of anything, Mr. Speaker; but let the people on the other side get up and make a clean breast of things.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Some Hon. Member (Opposition):** — People like Shumiatcher!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! There have been enough innuendoes spoken across the floor. If I remember correctly, only a short time ago, the Premier read a statement in this House that every member on the Government side of the House had signed a declaration that they had not taken any benefit out of that particular piece of legislation. I well remember the Premier reading that statement, and the hon. member who is now speaking also heard the statement.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What the Premier said . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Let me finish please. I do not think it becomes any member, on either side of the House, to cast innuendoes on any member of this Legislature. If there is anything wrong, then let them take the proper proceeding.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, just let me deal with this thing. Here is a perfectly valid transaction, as the Provincial Treasurer well knows. He had told members that they can deal safely with the Insurance office, because they were doing business the same as any other insurance office. They stepped in to settle a claim that I have against somebody else, and then a Minister of the Crown tried to throw it across the floor at me. Such a thing is shameful, that is all. It shows just how badly they are driven into a corner; and furthermore, all the Premier said was this, “I am authorized to state, on behalf of the members on this side, that none of them had anything, in anyway, covered by this legislation.” Why, Mr. Speaker, I have been acting for many criminals in my time, as a lawyer, and they always authorize me to state that they are innocent. That does not prove anything, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point that has been raised. The Premier, speaking on Wednesday, February 13, did, on behalf of all the members of this . . .

(interruptions)

February 22, 1952

. . . just a minute. If the Premier did not say that every member on this side had signed a declaration, I will say that tonight. Every member on this side of the House has signed a declaration. Moreover, we are prepared, and are bringing in, amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act which will remove those sections that were put in last year; and we are quite prepared to make them retroactive. Just as soon as the Legislative Counsel gets them ready they will be here, I can assure you.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we brought them in was because a certain gentleman, namely, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) wrote in wanting us to amend the Act, so as to make it perfectly safe for him to collect the insurance on his dog.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) to produce that letter. He is lying. All that I said was this. I wrote to the Attorney General's office and said something to the effect that I think it is safe for me to take settlement through the Insurance office, but, I said, I am not going to take it if, in any way there is any thought — I would rather do without the money for all time. I will not take it. Well now, then what in the world has amending something to do with the Insurance Act got to do with providing that a man like Rhubbra could take an interest, and hold it in secret for some of the members over there? They are entirely different things, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — . . . and when the Provincial Treasurer tried to put this upon me, he is lying, and he knows it; and I tell him to produce the letter in question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — . . . or else it will prove that he is a liar.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Keep cool! Just keep cool!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I do not think we can go on like this. If you are going to have this arguing between individuals, that is no way to carry on this legislature; and if there are certain provoking statements made, sometimes some members will feel pretty badly about it. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) was not justified in making that remark . . .

**Hon. Member:** — Make him take it back then.

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . I did not catch it, or I would have made him take it back.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It was just a sneaking little remark. He thought I would not have the nerve to get up and tell exactly the circumstances, and he would sneak about it, and talk about it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — It was just a sneaking remark; and entirely worthy of the Minister of Natural Resources.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition sits down in his chair and talks about sneaking remarks. If you say, Sir, it was improper for me to make that remark, I will withdraw.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. fines) has just made a statement in this House which has been admittedly untrue . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — What was that?

**Mr. Loptson:** — The statement that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) objected to, and evidently you made an untrue statement.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement. I made no untrue statement here. I stated that the reason the amendment was brought in, last year, to The Legislative Assembly Act was because of a request which came from the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — And I say that that is absolutely untrue! Absolutely untrue!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Does the Leader of the Opposition deny that he ‘phoned the Deputy Attorney General of this Province?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I explained what I said. I said, “Is it, in your opinion, a violation of The Legislative Assembly Act for me to take settlement through the Insurance Office? The Deputy Attorney General told me, “I think it is perfectly safe for you to take settlement.” I said, “Well I wish you would look into it. In my opinion, I would rather not, in any way, even come close.” And so I got an opinion from there. I let the thing drop. I never asked for any amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I sent down to get the documents here, if there is any question about it. This is a letter from the Deputy Attorney General — I hope I have permission to read this — and this is what it says:

“On May 6, 1950, Mr. Walter Tucker, Leader of the Opposition, received a cheque from the Government Insurance Office covering damages caused to him by a man running over his dog, where the car involved was covered by a policy with the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office.”

**Hon. Member (Opposition)** — To whom did the Deputy write that letter?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — He wrote to me, as the Minister in Charge of the Insurance Act. It goes on:

“Mr. Tucker hesitated to cash the cheque as he felt it might disqualify him under the Legislative Assembly Act on the ground that he was indirectly benefiting from a contract with the Crown, so as to conflict with the provision of Section 13(1) and 14 of the Legislative Assembly Act, which reads as follows: (I will not read that) . . .

“He telephoned me as he felt that this Department would be familiar with the interpretation to be placed on The Legislative Assembly Act, but I did not advise him in the matter, but merely pointed out to him the relative sections quoted above, and gave him a few references to interpretation of the words ‘directly’ or ‘indirectly’. I also referred to Section 24 of The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Act, which reads as follows: (I will not read that either) . . .

“Mr. Tucker suggested consideration be given to amending the said Section 24, and he stated that he intended to hold the cheque un-cashed for the time being.

“A number of years ago when a Liberal Government was in power, Mr. Procter was appointed by the court to act as counsel for an accused, and he hesitated to accept payment, and as a result payment was not made to him until an amendment was made to Section 15 of The Legislative Assembly Act by adding thereto the present clause.

“In view of the fact that some doubt might arise as to whether Mr. Tucker could safely accept the cheque, I would suggest that consideration be given to amending Section 24 of the Government Insurance Act of 1946, by adding thereto the words: ‘or receiving payment of a claim in the said Insurance Office’.”

Now that was the letter that came from the Deputy Attorney General, recommending the change; and then we received a letter also from the Attorney General, who suggested that we might widen it up, and gave certain reasons as to why it should be done.

Now this is the thought I had for when the Legislative Assembly Act comes up I intend to say all of this, and a great deal more at that time.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the Provincial Treasurer said I wrote and asked for this . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I never did.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, you did. Don't try to lie out of that now. For goodness sake, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I said . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — You said I wrote a letter asking for an amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act. I said I never wrote any such letter. I said I discussed it with the Deputy Attorney General. The Provincial Treasurer said it was suggested that consideration be given to permitting people to deal safely with the Insurance Office. That suggestion came from the Deputy Attorney General; and I said, if they are going to do business with the people in the province, perhaps it might not be a bad idea. But I never asked for it. I challenge him again to produce any letter I wrote asking for it. I challenge him again to produce it — and if he cannot produce it, I ask him to get up and say that he made a misstatement in this House.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think this thing has gone far enough.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Let him withdraw what he said.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — You withdraw what you said.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Evidently what happened, as the result of certain happenings, the Deputy Attorney General made certain recommendations to the Minister, and as a result of those recommendations, the Act was amended. Now, if that is wrong, you can put it out. And as a result of that Act, I think the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) is using that Act and is casting innuendoes against members of this Legislature and insinuating that they are making profit which was made possible because of the passing of the Act. I think that is all there is to it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, might I point out this further fact, the complete unfairness, because there is some thought that The Legislative Assembly Act should be amended so people could take settlement from the Saskatchewan Insurance Office, that there is an attempt made to use that as justification for saying that they should introduce an amendment that would enable a person to have a secret interest in some mineral or oil rights, and retain their seat in the Legislature. Did anybody ever imagine or hear such a fantastic thing? And the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) is so driven that, in his desperation, he brings out this suggestion about the amendment to the Insurance Act. They are entirely different things, Mr. Speaker; entirely different.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, that discussion has given me quite a lot of time to look for something that I cannot find, but you made the remark that I had thrown in an innuendo. I did not do that. I said the very fact that the Act was brought in threw an innuendo, or at least threw a reflection on every member of this House, including the Government. Bringing that Act into this Legislature threw a slur on

every member of this House. That is its hidden interpretation. That is what it has done. And, you know, we are all human, and this gave us all the right to do as we pleased in regard to natural resources in the province, and it protected us from anything that we might have done in the past in this regard in the province. And while I did not give it much thought when it went through the House, it was simply because I could not think that anyone could be implicated by it. Then, when it was drawn to my attention, about three months ago, by a lawyer who had noticed it, and drew my attention to the importance of it, well, I was thunderstruck.

It implicated me as it did every other member of the House. Now, that is the case, and when the Premier gets up in the House and says he will vouch for every member on that side of the House, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition can do the same here. But the question is whether the Premier's word is any better in this case, when he has an incentive to do it, than it is in the number of statements that he has made in this House and out of this House that are not correct. Those are facts.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that statement should be withdrawn. I think that the hon. gentleman has no right to say that the Premier makes statements in this House and out of this House that are not correct, and I ask that this statement be withdrawn.

**Mr. Loftson:** — Withdraw it if you like, Mr. Speaker, but I know it to be true.

Well, now, we will quite the oil question; but I am going to say a few words about the mines — that is included in the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I was very interested in the Minister of Natural Resources making the remark that Dr. Shumiatcher might be prepared to sell his 25,000 shares in the American Uranium for \$500. I was just wondering how those people felt about the shares they paid \$3.50 a share for, when he is prepared to see his for two cents. The original promoters got their share; Shumiatcher got his share for nothing in part return for the lease, and the rest of it sold for \$3.50 to the public, I understand. Now, if it is right that Mr. Shumiatcher is prepared to sell his shares for two cents, then I am just wondering what kind of a racket went on when they took \$3.50 a share out of the public. That is another thing we might try to find out.

I also want to say that the operations in the mineral resources in this province, which are so much talked about, not only on the hustings, but over the air . . . we have been listening to dialogues about every week about some employee of the Natural Resources office, questioning the Minister of Natural Resources about all these Mineral rights, and how much was being done since this C.C.F. Government came into power. I think about all that has been going on there is what the Federal Government has been doing. They are about the only people that are spending money. The rest are only holding leases, and doing such work as is absolutely necessary to hold the lease. In spite of all that the Government says, there has not been one mine added to the production

in Saskatchewan since this Government came into power. There is only one mine operating, and that is the one that came across the border underground in 1931; there has not been a single hard-rock mine put into operation since, according to returns that have been filed in this House today.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Loptson:** — There is only one which is sinking a shaft, as far as I know. There was one that sunk a shaft which is Nicholson Consolidated, and they had to quit. Nesbitt-Lebina is working because they are adjacent to the Federal Government mine down there at Beaver Lodge. I probably know more about this than the Minister of Natural Resources himself, and when he files a return or statement to me here, I know whether it is right or not, and the one that he filed here, the last time, in respect to what is going on in the development, some of those answers were not exactly according to the facts. These people are just barely holding — holding, why? Hoping that they might get a change of Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I think the hon. member must withdraw that remark, as he distinctly said that the Minister of the Crown had tabled answers that are not according to the facts, and I think he should withdraw that.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They are not exactly according to facts, because there is a difference between

**Mr. Speaker:** — There may be a difference of opinion, but you have made the direct charge that a Minister of the Crown was filing replies that were not according to the facts, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Let us withdraw it, then. That is immaterial. It is only a matter of another mine operating or developing, and we are not going to quarrel about it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! That is not the question at all. Any member knows that, according to the rules, you cannot directly charge a Minister of the Crown, or any other member, of making statements that are not according to the facts.

**Mr. Loptson:** — We will withdraw it for the time being then, and thresh it out later on, Mr. Speaker. But anyway, the fact is that there is nothing going on to speak of — there is absolutely nothing going on, except doing what we call “homesteading” there, and I think the reason for this is, simply, that they are afraid of the Socialist Government. Everybody says we have large uranium prospects, and according to all facts from the mining companies, they are doing practically nothing. The Federal Government is the one that is spending large amounts of money. The next mine to it is Nesbitt-Lebina; and they are sinking a shaft. The Nicholson Consolidated is shut down. Isn't that a fact?

**February 22, 1952**

Who are the other mines that are sinking a shaft? I do not think there is another one at the present time.

Now, that is all the development of our tremendous mineral resources in Saskatchewan; not one single mine has been brought into production. There are only one or two that are even making an attempt to develop a mine, and the rest are just sitting waiting for the next election, to see what happens. That is what is happening. That is the stagnation of our natural resources development in this province, and as long as this outfit is in power, it will continue that way, irrespective of the fact that they have adopted the capitalistic system to invite some of the rich capital in order to try and get development. The boys are ready to go to work. If this Government was defeated tomorrow, instead of having a few drills that you have now scouting around, using up the rental money, there would not be enough drills in North America to comply with the drilling demand in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Kuziak** (Canora): — How many are there in the province of Manitoba?

**Mr. Loptson**: — There are two I know of. And how much oil is there in Manitoba? They are getting oil there now. They just opened a new oil well there at Reston, the other day. We know now and the oil companies know now that there is oil between those two points, Alberta and Manitoba. It has always been known, as far as geologists are concerned, that there is oil in Saskatchewan. I read an article 25 years ago — a report from a meeting that was held in New York, which reported one of the most eminent geologists as saying that there is more oil in the three western provinces than any other place on the North American continent, and he said that, in his opinion, the centre of that pool would be somewhere within the central part of the three provinces, and that placed it in Saskatchewan. That was a statement which made was made 25 years ago, and that is why some oil companies are here, and want to hold their leases. They are trying to spend their rental money, they are trying to do all they can to get the information, and are hoping the election will change the complexion of our political situation, and if it does, boys — won't we go to town! I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, we will have industries — we will have everything booming. Just get these Socialists out, and we will have money in here by the hundreds of millions, because it is waiting on the border!

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the amendment and oppose the motion.

The question being put, it was negatived by 26 votes to 15.

**Mr. Speaker**: — The debate is now on the main motion.

**Mr. WM. S. Thair** (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:00 o'clock p.m.