

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Tenth Legislature
23rd Day

March 3, 1947.

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION — HUDSON BAY ROUTE

Mr. H.O. Hansen (Wilkie) moved, seconded by Mr. Darling (Watrous):

That this Assembly request the Provincial Government to urge the Federal Government:

- (1) To take immediate steps to make full use of the Hudson Bay Route and harbour facilities; and
- (2) To issue a directive to the Departments of Trade and Commerce, and Transport, the Canadian Wheat Board, the National Harbours' Board, and any other agencies concerned, to the effect that all necessary steps be taken to ensure a minimum movement of wheat, via Port Churchill, of 16 million bushels in the 1947 shipping season.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think similar resolutions are moved in the House of Commons at Ottawa from time to time. They, too, are covered in general trends. We want full use of the Hudson Bay route and we asked the Government to do something. Resolutions of the Hudson Bay route, in the House of Commons at Ottawa, in common with other resolutions are usually talked out. However, that didn't occur in 1945.

On October 5th of that year or 15th of that year, the resolution wasn't talked out. The Speaker asked the Hon. Member who had moved the Resolution if he wanted to withdraw it and he didn't so a vote had to be taken. The vote was 105 to 24, 105 for and 24 against. That, to me, is no indication of where the Liberal and Conservative parties stand on this Resolution. I think there was confusion in the camp when the Resolution wasn't talked out and the mover didn't withdraw it. They looked to the West for support and so perhaps they thought that they had better let their Members vote as they pleased on this Resolution and the result was as I indicated.

We want to remember that in the House of Commons we have a considerably greater number of Members from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec than all the rest of Canada put together. The rest of Canada shares 98 Members and only a portion of them come from Western Canada. There are very few Eastern Members that can think as does the Member for Davenport, Mr. MacNickel. He believes, at least he says so, and I believe he is quite sincere in what he says, that if Western farmers can make any saving through the Hudson Bay route they will have more money in their pockets. They will have more money to spend and as long as factories are located in the East, as they are, we will buy more goods from Eastern Canada and they will not suffer as a result of the West using the Hudson Bay route, but they will

March 3, 1947

benefit instead. Not, Mr. MacNickel, I do not think very many of the Members from Eastern Canada think along that line. I think the question of the Hudson Bay route and trade through Churchill is something that we can well talk about and talk about often because it is a thing that will mean a great deal to the farmers of Western Canada and, of course, communities on the plains as well if we could actually get that route open to trade as it should be.

We want to remember that it was in 1610 that Henry Hudson first came into the Hudson Bay and his ship was frozen in for the winter. In 1610 I presume, the first trading took place when Henry Hudson gave to the first Indian who came to look at his white brother for the first time, that is the first Indian of the North, when he gave him a hatchet and a few days afterwards returned and gave Mr. Hudson a few beaver skins for this hatchet and he went his merry way. From then on the Hudson Bay Company has been skinning the people of the North for that skin, the beaver. It is 135 years since the first settlers to western Canada came in through the Hudson Bay, 1812, and from that time on yearning on the part of Western people, for an opening through the Hudson Bay to Europe. Very, very little has been done about it. Much lip service has been paid to it.

I do not criticize Members of this House, of this Legislature, or past Legislatures for anything that they have said, favorable or unfavorable because they are not in a position to do very much about it. They can only ask federal authorities to do so but federal authorities have never done any more than they absolutely had to. It has always been a form of appeasement as far as the West was concerned. For years they squabbled about how they were going to get the money to build this road because they did not want to take money out of the Federal Treasury to build a road for Western Canadian people to Hudson Bay. They finally thought, well we can let the people of Western Canada pay for it by taking certain lands and selling them to raise the money. That was done, the people of Western Canada have paid for that road, paid for facilities and presumably they have paid the \$6 million that was wasted when they first decided to take the road to Nelson instead of Churchill.

I remember federal elections since that time, since the road was built in 1931, I believe that is when it was completed, as a matter of fact before that the two old parties each wanted to take credit for doing more than the other towards the building of that road. But subsequent to the building of the road, I remember federal elections during the campaign where one wanted to take credit for having built the road and then the other. Each of them promising that were they returned to power they would do something to make use of this road. Of course, such has never been their intentions, in my opinion, because they are controlled, as I indicated before, by Eastern Canada. So, today, we have to do everything that we can in order that we can get some trade through that port and some trade over that railway and well we might, because it is going to mean a lot to Western Canada in dollars and cents. We have certain commitments as far as the North is concerned, in that we have taken over or are in the process of taking over airports built by the Government of the United States near Hudson Bay at various points and they are costing us millions of dollars. And what do we want those airports for unless we are going to have some trade along that route that will be for military purposes. There was some talk of using the Hudson Bay route during the first Great War, the War

of 1914-18, but nothing came of it. The thought at that time was that it was a safer shipping lane than the North Atlantic through Montreal and the eastern ports but it didn't happen.

Now I indicated before, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most interesting discussions I have read in the House of Commons was on October 15, 1945 and I want to quote some statements that were put on the record at that time, statements that are supposed to have been made by men who are in the know. I want to quote first, the Imperial Shipping Committee as is recorded on page 1074 and this is what they have to say:

As far as the physical risks are concerned we are convinced that the Hudson Bay route is not more dangerous and in some respects less dangerous than the St. Lawrence route.

We are told by some people, who are opposed to this project, that there is always a certain amount of danger in shipping through the Hudson Bay and mariners that have gone through the strait to Hudson Bay tell us that it is just as safe during the season in which shipping takes place as is the St. Lawrence route.

Then Mr. Dalglish, in 1931 — Mr. Dalglish is the president of the Dalglish Shipping Company — has this to say:

I loaded the first ship at Churchill eight years ago with wheat and anyone who says that Port Churchill will not, in the course of time, become one of the world's great ports does not know what he is talking about.

There are those who believe that it is possible to make Churchill a year-round port. That, of course, is not possible at the present time with facilities as they are, but I believe that something can be done. That was even indicated by a gentleman, who was at one time Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Gardiner, when he says that it could at least be stretched to six months. I am positive that it can, from any information that I have had on the subject. I know that during the discussion in the House of Commons at Ottawa on October 15, 1945, Dan McIvor, Liberal Member for Fort William, asked the question as to whether or not something couldn't be done to keep that sea lane open with atomic energy. I am going to say today, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that something can be done as soon as we arrive at the time that the people who are now in control of the destinies of the people of North America will do something towards using atomic energy for the good of the people rather than for human destruction. I think that is possible.

I have seen one writer say this, that if atomic energy were used for the good of the people we could so change the climate of this country that we could spend our Christmas on the shores of Hudson Bay. How far we can go with atomic energy we do not know, but it has immense possibilities. As to whether or not Mr. McIvor was serious or not I do not know but he did pose that question in the House of Commons on that day during that debate.

Now I want to quote a statement from Dr. Robert Bell, who is a fellow of the Royal Society and he has this to say:

After returning from the Port in 1881, it is impossible that there should be at any time in the 12 months difficulty in navigating Hudson Straits, but there upon tide

March 3, 1947

water in regard to the bay itself there is no date for the opening or closing of navigation because the Bay is open all the year-round like the ocean in corresponding latitudes.

It is strictly correct to say that the Bay is open during the winter. There is a marginal line along the shallow water that never extends so far, but that a man on the beach can see the open water on a clear morning. Bay ice, being light and rotten after it breaks away from the shore, offers little obstruction to the steamship. Through modern technology, we have at the present time certain safety devices that could be used in navigation if it was necessary as far as the Hudson Bay is concerned and the Straits. There are a number of safety devices that could be used. There is radar, there is the gyro compass and so on and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that inasmuch as I have been informed, there are quite a number of corvettes that have been recommissioned since the War, that some of this equipment could be taken from those boats and used on boats in and out of Hudson Bay if that is necessary. I am sure that we can get the necessary instruments if we want to go about it in the right way. You take in all the years since the Hudson Bay road has been completed, we have only shipped through the Port of Churchill 24 million bushels of wheat and as far as incoming goods is concerned we have only had a pittance in the way of shipments. It has never been given a fair trial and the purpose of our Resolution, this afternoon, is that the Government now, this year, do something about it that we might know whether the Port of Churchill is feasible and should be used. It is all right for people of eastern Canada to argue that we have two great railways here and we do not want to take trapping away from them and things like that. We are going to take work away from people in eastern Canada if we have too much traffic running the other way. I do not think it is a good argument. I feel that it would be just the same for the people in the West to say that all the goods that come from eastern Canada and go to Europe should go through the Hudson Bay. Just as sensible but we don't do that and I think eastern Canada, through the Government at Ottawa, should be put in the spot at least as far as the minimum shipment of grain this year is concerned. Then, too, cattle shipments could be made.

I pointed out in my speech last year and I understand the freight haul is three days shorter, as far as grain is concerned, by way of Churchill. Certainly if that is true then cattle going to Great Britain by way of Churchill would be in better condition when they arrive there than they are being shipped as they are to Montreal and eastern ports today. They have the sheltered water of the Hudson Bay until they get out into the open ocean and then it is not so far across to the other side.

Then we want to think about our internal economy, too, Mr. Speaker. If the Hudson Bay route is made full use of, is there any reason why the small villages will grow into towns and towns into cities, along the road from The Pas to Churchill. Mr. MacNickel predicts, or predicted when he made his speech in the House of Commons, that The Pas would some day, if full use was made of the route, grow to a city the size of Prince Albert or even Edmonton. You see we have great mining fields, great potentialities there that have hardly been touched and a Hudson Bay railway runs near those fields. Some day those mines will be open. We have fish in the North, lots of fish and there will be room for expansion in that industry too. Then we have our

timber or a certain amount of it for certain purposes. It is also possible, I am sure, that if we used the Hudson Bay route, the way it should be used, that we could have coast-wide sailing along the coast of Canada from the Hudson Bay to some of the eastern seaports. I think it has many possibilities if we will look into them thoroughly.

I mentioned a while ago, Mr. Speaker, that we only have a few Members of the House of Commons in western Canada and there is not very much that has been done as far as the West is concerned with respect to the Hudson Bay route, but yet if my memory serves me right, 60 per cent of the freight that is hauled over our two great railways originates in western Canada. One of the most lucrative hauls is from Winnipeg to the head of the Lakes, Fort William or Port Arthur. Full trains leave Winnipeg and do not have to stop to set off cars and their full trains arrive at the other end. That, too, would obtain if we shipped grain over the Hudson Bay route the way we should.

I have seen some figures with respect to costs in The Pas and I find it varies greatly as between one year's operations and another. We are not charged too much for box cars. I suppose Hon. Members know that all the rolling stock that we use on the Hudson Bay route is rented from the Canadian National Railways. We only pay \$1.50 per day for box cars and only \$25 a day for a locomotive. Well, now if large locomotives are used and those locomotives properly loaded, it should be one of the cheapest hauls in the Dominion of Canada from The Pas, at least 510 miles to Churchill because there will be full trains. They do not have to stop to set off cars or pick up cars for they go right through. I think another thing that points to the fact, that it will be cheap as far as the people of western Canada are concerned, is the fact that along that line there are very few railway sections, very few. I forget the number now and thinking about the fact that it doesn't cost very much to keep up the road bed. All in all a very reasonable proposition as far as western Canada is concerned in as much as we haven't any bonds to pay and I suppose it is the only railway in Canada on which there is no bond indebtedness which we have to pay interest on.

The investment is entirely our own and the only real charges that have to be made are the actual costs of operation. Anything above that is an overcharge and should be a saving as far as people of Western Canada are concerned and should accrue to their benefit.

I want to quote, again, from the Imperial Shipping Committee, page 1080 of Hansard, of the date before. Here they are dealing with insurance. Insurance as far as shipping through the Hudson Bay is concerned has always been very excessive, very high rates have been charged. On the goods that came in last year it was twice as high as goods shipped to the port of Montreal. I wonder if Hon. Members know just what the make-up of the Imperial Shipping Committee has been. The Committee is comprised of representatives of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, South Africa and India, two ship owners, one ship builder, one manufacturer and one merchant. I shall only read you one paragraph. Paragraph 15 from the report of 1939, July 19th, 1939, with respect to insurance and this is what they say in paragraph 15:

In view of the very small number of cargoes available for transport from Churchill in 1937 and 1938, the Joint Hull Committee have not been able to see their way to

March 3, 1947

recommend to the underwriters a further reduction in the premium for suspending the warranty for the coming season 1939 and the rates to be charged will be the same as in 1938. But in the consultation with our chairman the Joint Hull Committee have taken note of the fact that there are already at Churchill for shipment from the 1938 seasons crop some eight cargoes of wheat and they have agreed that if some 20 cargoes of wheat in all are brought away from Churchill in 1939 and no serious loss occurs, they will be prepared to give favorable consideration to the question of recommending a further reduction in 1940 from the rates of premium chargeable in 1939.

Again, Mr. Speaker, indicating that we must have a minimum such as asked for in our resolution today, in order to prove that wheat can be shipped out through Churchill with no greater loss and without any more danger than to the Port of Montreal. If that is done as indicated in this report, and I hope it is correct, then insurance charges must be brought down. But as long as we only bring token shipments, four or five million bushels through that port per year, sufficient to try and appease the farmers of the western country, then the insurance rate will not go down.

One of the reasons why, in the Resolution this afternoon, we stated we wanted a minimum 16 million bushels in this; that unless there are a minimum of 16 million bushels going through the port, that port is going to show a deficit again. It only showed a profit or a surplus in 1943 and that was not through the shipping of wheat but because there was a War on and the United States' airports on Canadian soil had to have goods and it did show a surplus in that year, a total surplus of \$119,000. That, compared with Halifax, which in the same year showed a surplus of \$186,000 and not too great for Halifax. This year, too, as far as we are now able to learn, we will only get a token shipment through that port. Unless the Government at Ottawa decides they are going to do something about it and issue a directive to the various departments concerned. We can't expect the National Harbors Board to do much about it. That is not their business. And by the way, the Hon. Members here perhaps do not know that the Federal Minister of Transport, the Hon. Lionel Chevrier, is the chairman of the Harbors Commission.

We have been told that there will be two and a half million bushels in the elevator at Churchill and there will possibly be another 2 million available for shipment this year. Well, that is not enough; that is not enough, Mr. Speaker, four and a half million bushels. When are we going to give that Port a fair trial is the question that the people are beginning to ask.

I want to quote, too, Mr. Speaker, from Capt. D.J. Munroe, a captain of the Royal Navy, who has also been a nautical assessor for the Court of Scotland. He had made some study of northern navigation, including the Hudson Bay and the Strait, and shipping through there over the North Atlantic. He is very enthusiastic.

I have in my hand a paper that he wrote on the Highland Hydro Electric Bill and in that he also deals with the Port of Churchill. One of his pet subjects is the Port of Cromarty in Scotland. He believes that Cromarty should be to Churchill what Liverpool is to Montreal and dealing with that he has this to say:

He believes that we Canadian people should establish in the Port of Cromarty, or at least on the other side of the ocean, a great grain elevator, so that when we decide to make full use of the Hudson Bay route we would ship all the wheat possible through that port during the short shipping season, if it shall remain short. We all know that unless the wheat is sold before it goes into transit, or at least it must be sold before it gets to the other side, it cannot be transported over the ocean. Those are the regulations today — we do not have to worry about them because England is in great need and Europe is in great need of wheat and in small shipments that we might make — whether it is four and a half million or 17 million, no doubt can be readily taken care of. But he looks to the day when we are going to make full use of the Port and we are going to be living under normal conditions. We will then want to ship a lot more wheat across in a given time than they are willing to take and absorb on the other side when it arrives. So he suggested we build a great grain elevator here to store grain, not only to the British Isles but to Europe, as necessity arises. I think there is a point that we might be thinking of as far as the future is concerned. But this is what he has to say with respect to the unique Port of Hudson Bay, as he calls it, the unique Port of Churchill:

Port Churchill was developed and completed before the War broke out at a cost of eight million sterling. It is an excellent deep water harbor with direct rail connections with the grain belt. The distance from the centre of the grain belt via Churchill and the present routes by rail and water transport down the Great Lakes is over 1,000 miles in Port Churchill's favor. It is probably not realized by many that three quarters of all the grain that leaves Canada for European ports passes through USA Atlantic ports.

I don't know how correct he is there, but we know that a lot passes through.

The route being Port Arthur at the head of the Great Lakes, through the Great Lakes to Buffalo, where 13 trunk railway lines transport it to the Atlantic ports from Boston as far south as Philadelphia.

Now he thinks that is nonsense to transport grain that way to the Old Country.

He also has a paragraph with regard to the ice hazards in the Port, or in the harbor in the Port, or in the harbor and the Hudson Bay. I shall only read you one paragraph of it:

Hudson Bay is not frozen over in winter and the shore ice in the northern part of the Bay only extends to about 230 miles from the shore. The trouble for the navigator is the floating icebergs into the Straits in the early spring. Competent navigators assert that the Straits and the Bay are always open to navigation. In any case the navigation of large ships to Port Churchill presents a few difficulties for four months in the year and none at all for two months; and those months are the important ones as they coincide with the grain carrying season. Radar now solves the question of icebergs.

He also has a paragraph with respect to the shipment of

March 3, 1947

cattle and this is what he says:

In addition to grain there is a big future for store cattle from Canada to the north of Scotland. The rail haul from Alberta to Montreal, Quebec and Halifax is very hard on cattle and the distance to Port Churchill is at least 1,000 miles shorter. The cattle will be saved three days rail haul. The voyage from Port Churchill to Cromarty will be a little less than to Liverpool and Glasgow; and as a large part of the passage will be in the protected water of the Bay the passage will be easier than the longer haul from other ports.

Now the Hon. Members might also be interested in what he has to say in regard to the instruments that are used in navigation, such as radar. In a letter dated January 19th of this year he says:

I have no doubt, but that I can get a loan from the Admiralty, the very latest radar instrument which I understand is a very complicated instrument, weighs a ton; or could probably get, also, a man to operate it on loan who could train others. The Admiralty would do a lot to help us. I am willing to act as general advisor to both agents and others.

Again, the Port, and he says:

The great thing is to prove to the world is that this route is open for a much longer period than is generally accepted at present. If the period is raised to, say, six months or from the beginning of July to the end of December, it will become one of the great shipping routes of the world — of that I have no doubt. Port Churchill and the route through the Straits to the open sea can become the route for all the products leaving the three Prairie Provinces and a part of the United States; and be a big import port as well. But to do this, Canada, especially the provinces, have to get busy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote to the House a few figures with respect to what we are spending in other ports in the Dominion of Canada. I think we could well spend a little more money at Churchill to make that port a greater port and give us a longer shipping season. In a return brought down in the House of Commons on October 15, 1945, I find that from 1935 to 1939 we spent on the Port of Montreal \$7 million; on Vancouver \$2,234,000; on Halifax \$4,954,000 — these, Mr. Speaker, I submit are considerable sums. And then I turn to page 1086 and I believe that the Hon. Member for Provencher in Manitoba has hit the nail on the head. I believe he is a Liberal Member, Mr. Jutras. This is what he has to say:

Two heavy years were 1942 and 1943, but for some reason or another interest in the Port after that time decreased and I fear that the harbor is returning to its prewar fate.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that unless there is agitation on the part of the people of the Dominion of Canada and especially western Canada, that road and port will rot and nothing will be done about it. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if during the Last Great War if there hadn't been a Hudson Bay Route Association

if the rails wouldn't have been torn up from The Pas to Churchill and the elevator would have stood there as a ghost of the past. I want to commend the Hudson Bay Route Association this afternoon for the work they have done. They have done splendid work. Mr. Elias, the secretary, has acted untirely for years and is still willing to carry on in any capacity that he can.

I am happy to say that since the House met last there has been a conference of the western Provincial Governments. At one time I thought that they would never get together because Saskatchewan was more concerned than the other two. Naturally Saskatchewan benefits most. It seems that the Government of Manitoba has not been particularly interested heretofore, but at least they got together with the other two provinces and decided that something should be done about the Hudson Bay route. They not only got together, but they set up a continuing technical committee, which to me, is a worthwhile venture. That committee is still working and it meets from time to time and I am sure they are doing everything they can in order that we might further this project.

Now it is not necessary that I say anything about distances this afternoon. I think we have heard sufficient of that in years past, about what saving there is in rail haul to Churchill as compared with Montreal. As far as the ocean transport is concerned the distance to Churchill is about the same as to Montreal. I think Mr. Speaker, that we have reached a time when we should be prepared to put the public good before the private purse; and that is the purpose of our Resolution this afternoon.

Before I sit down, however, I want to give you a few figures that I have from the Minister of Transport with regard to a few shipments last year. This first one is a comparative statement of rates as between Churchill and the St. Lawrence ports, including insurance on cargo, bulk cargo freight rates, showing a saving of nearly 4 cents per bushel in favor of Churchill on a ship of 10,000 tons carrying 300,000 bushels of wheat valued at \$1.50 per bushel. We find that the total freight on this load of wheat the St. Lawrence way gives eighty-one thousand and some odd dollars. The Churchill route, it is \$92,000, about \$11,000 more. The insurance through Montreal is \$1,125 and running up to \$1,350, depending on what month of the year the cargo was through. By the Churchill we find that insurance is not \$1,125 but \$3,375 without gyro and \$2,531 with gyro. Then the surcharge is the same — \$562 doesn't matter whether the cargo goes through from Montreal or from Churchill. Then there was a war risk charge which was the same as the surcharge — \$562 through either port. But then here's a note: Freight differential rail and water in favor of Churchill against the St. Lawrence and Atlantic ports approximately 3 1/2 cents per bushel, 8 1/4 rail. Now that amounts to \$25,500 on this particular cargo of 300,000 bushels of wheat going the St. Lawrence way and that charge does not appear when it comes to Churchill. So, therefore, the total for St. Lawrence route is nearly \$108,000 whereas through Churchill it is \$96,834 or an approximate saving of 4 cents per bushel on wheat.

Here is another foot note: Insurance underwriters inform us that the insurance rates on general cargo for shipment from the United Kingdom to Churchill would be approximately three times more than those charged for Montreal or Halifax. I have another table here from the Minister of Transport which deals with some of the packaged goods that came in last year, mostly

March 3, 1947

whiskey. There were 73,055 pounds of goods and of that there was 56,800 pounds of whiskey. There were curling stones, earthenware, china, stationery, ship models and whiskey. And I want to give you some of the comparative rates as between Churchill and Montreal and I want to take a couple of commodities. Take Regina and the earthenware that came to this city, 882 pounds and the rate was \$1.58, a total of \$13.94. Now then at Churchill we have to pay workers and we have to pay handling charges and that is not paid at the Port of Montreal. There was a workers' charge of 27 cents and a handling charge of 35 cents, total \$14.56. Now, whereas the rate was \$1.58 to Regina by way of Churchill it would have been \$2.41 all rail from Montreal or \$2.27 rail and freight. There was quite a saving there. Now take the same stationery going to Saskatoon. The rate is \$1.53 as against \$2.59 Montreal all rail or rail and water \$2.45. Stationery to Regina — the rate was \$2.36 and the rate all rail from Montreal \$3.58 or rail and water \$3.33. Now what about this whiskey that came to Regina? The rate was \$1.74 or a total of \$459.36 before the workers' and handling charges were put on. The worker and handling charges amounted up to \$483.12. The rate all rail from Montreal was \$1.78. The total would have been \$469 as compared with \$459 before the workers' charges were put on. Now then to Winnipeg — well pardon me, I gave you Winnipeg — I will give you Regina: The rate is \$1.58 as for the earthenware, \$417 as compared with the \$636 all rail from Montreal or \$599 if this was rail and water. The footnote says ocean rates are the same to Churchill and/or Montreal. Ocean insurance rates on merchandise from the United Kingdom to Churchill are double the rates to Montreal. On whiskey approximately, the approximate value of a car is \$9,000. The insurance rate is 1 per cent or \$90 to Montreal or to Churchill it is 2 per cent or \$180. The insurance rates are quite exorbitant as far as shipments to Churchill are concerned. If those insurance rates could be pushed, brought down, I am sure they can, there would be a much more favorable picture. Even now, considerable money can be saved as indicated by these few figures from the Minister of Transport.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to close. I think that I have said sufficient to indicate that unless we western people ask the Federal Government to do something now in a tangible way, that we are going to frustrate the people of western Canada into believing, well, what's the use if nothing can be done. So, therefore, after much investigation, we are asking that they send the minimum of 60,000,000 bushels of wheat through Churchill this year. We might give the roll a fair trial, we might not show a deficit at the end of the year and after that is done, we can decide where do we go from here.

I, therefore, take pleasure in moving this Resolution.

Mr. J.A. Darling (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, there are probably fewer subjects upon which more speeches have been delivered over a longer period of time than the Hudson Bay route. There are probably few investments made on behalf of the people of Canada upon which successive Federal Governments have shown less inclination to capitalize than the investment of the Hudson Bay route. And, it seems to me that there must also be very few projects undertaken by government or under government subsidy, with the aid of Government subsidy, which have been interrupted before full utilization by three armed conflicts as widely spaced in time as the North West Rebellion of '85 and the First Great War of 1914 to 1918 and the recent War of 1939 to 1945. Yet this is true of

the Hudson Bay route. It isn't to be wondered at then that almost in every speech there is reference made to the operation of powerful eastern interest against the utilization of this Prairie seaport. When I use that word 'Prairie seaport' I am reminded of an occasion a good many years ago when a western Member used those words in the House of Commons and his words were greeted with laughter. I think that laughter very clearly indicated the general attitude of eastern interests towards this project, this purely western project.

I have been greatly interested in the contribution which my hon. friend, the Member for Wilkie, has made this afternoon. He has dealt in very considerable detail, first of all with the evidence as to the safety of the navigation through the Hudson Bay and the Hudson Strait, and he has also dealt in detail with the savings in express and freight rates by that route compared with those over the competitive routes. After all, to me it seems that it is stated in its very simplest terms the justification for the Hudson Bay route lies in this — that it brings ocean-going vessels to the nearest possible point within the nearest possible distance to the centre of production in Canada. That is an all important point because the distance from the centre of production in Canada to, for instance, the Port of Montreal is much further than the distance from the centre of production in, to the seaboard in any country with which Canada must compete on the world's market and it places us under very definite disadvantage there. Cost of trade, cost of transportation is, of course, included in the cost of production. That is to say the ultimate cost of laying the goods once produced on the markets of the world enters into the cost of production. And I think that we, in western Canada, have reason to consider very carefully our cost of production. No one will dispute that point. Though there have been many estimates of the cost of producing a bushel of wheat and they varied very greatly, of course, they do vary, in fact they vary as between one locality and another as between one season and another and as between one system of farming and another. But I don't think, at least I have never seen anyone estimate, the cost of production of wheat in a manner that I consider truly reflected the actual cost of production, because they have, one and all, failed to take into account the cost which is represented the depletion of our soils here in western Canada. And while, of course, it would be difficult to arrive at a figure that would properly reflect that loss, I feel that as we have been developing our forests uneconomically, that we have been wasting our capital as represented by our forests and that we have quite naturally, of course, eaten into our capital insofar as mineral production is concerned. So, also, have we been enjoying the standard of living which we have enjoyed as a result of agriculture in Saskatchewan substantially out of our capital as represented by our soil fertility. And anything which can be done to reduce the cost of production is eminently worthwhile. All the effort and all the money and all the time that it has taken to complete the Hudson Bay railway and all the time and all the effort which we may spend from now on to secure the full utilization of that project, has been well spent.

The cheap engineer — or that cheap engineer, I don't know who he was — of the Montreal Harbor Commission, who is reported to have said, "Thank God there is only one St. Lawrence — Montreal has nothing to fear," would have been surprised if he could have heard Mr. Roy Knight, Member of Parliament for Saskatoon City in the House of Commons, tell the House that it would be as reasonable to expect the people living in the

March 3, 1947

Toronto region to ship their products west and north through Churchill to Liverpool as it is to expect people of the West to ship their products through the Port of Montreal, providing those products could be shipped through the Port of Churchill.

Now some mention has been made of distances by the Hon. Member for Wilkie and I think that there is a factor which is sometimes not taken into consideration when we speak of distances from the seaboard. For instance, from Saskatoon to — the saving in mileage as between the Montreal route or the route by way of the Lakes as compared with Churchill from the city of Saskatoon is 1,128 ocean miles and 90 rail miles. From Regina 4,750 miles to Liverpool via Montreal by the Great Lakes route and 3,777 via Churchill; and from Calgary 5,226 miles to Liverpool via Montreal and 4,182 miles via Churchill. Now that really is more or less misleading if we let it go at that. Our railroads are built to provide for east-west traffic and what has become known as the preferential trade area, that is the area which benefits through reduced freight through Churchill, doesn't include such places as Regina or Calgary over existing rails. In fact when I saw the map I was a little disappointed. Only 32 per cent of the agricultural land of Saskatchewan's wheat acreage, rather, comes within the preferential freight area. Much more of western Canada would come within that area with the building of auxiliary lines north and south. Those lines do not exist at present and only 32 per cent of Saskatchewan's wheat area would come within the orbit which might benefit from the shipping of wheat through Hudson Bay.

We, in Canada, are helpless insofar as the exporting or the importing of goods through Churchill is concerned without the co-operation of shipping interests particularly in Britain. We have to attract their business. Ships have been coming into Churchill actually in ballast although there have been a few imports there, but they have been more or less negligible. Ships have been entering Churchill in ballast and that has prevented the full benefits which would naturally accrue, both to the railroad and to the steamship interests if they had been able to bring in cargoes. Even 1,000 tons of cargo in each ship, I am told, which would be far short of a full cargo, would materially assist in balancing up the costs. Now, I was interested to investigate as to what was being done to develop two-way trade with Churchill; and my inquiry has given me some reason for — in fact, I found it rather encouraging. I found that such firms as the Robert Simpson Company, the T. Eaton Company, the Hudson Bay Company, J.H. Ashdown, Army and Navy, Eastern Dry Goods and others, all taking a very definite interest in the Hudson Bay route, with the intention that when regular shipping schedules can be established to make use of that route to import goods. That, I think, is a promising start, that interest is being shown to that extent. I was also glad to learn that efforts are being made to bring about the very desirable development.

Now when we sell wheat to Great Britain, we sell it at a price paid at Fort William, so that the British importers bear the cost of transportation from Fort William to Liverpool. If the wheat were shipped through Churchill, the rail haul would be shorter to Churchill than to Fort William. The Canada Wheat Board at the present time would profit through that shorter haul as much as the British importers would profit through the less costly haul from Churchill to Liverpool as compared with the haul from Fort William to Liverpool. The freight rate from Fort William to Liverpool is 36 cents per bushel and from Churchill

to Liverpool 32 cents per bushel, or a saving of 4 cents per bushel, which would not come to the Canadian farmer or to Saskatchewan or to the Canada Wheat Board, but would go to the British importers. But nevertheless, it does bring Canadian wheat — it does make the purchase of Canadian grain more attractive to the British buyer. The saving if the objective which my hon. friend, the Member for Wilkie, has suggested — the objective of 16 million bushels — were realized, the saving to the Canada Wheat Board, it is estimated, would amount to about \$167,000. That is to say, the Canada Wheat Board would have \$167,000 more money to distribute among western farmers. The British importers, which I presume would be the British Government at the present time, would profit to the extent of \$640,000 and the Canadian Government would profit to the extent of the elimination of the deficit of half a million dollars; so that on the export picture alone the total saving would be \$1,300,000 in round figures, through the export of 16 million bushels of wheat from Churchill.

I was interested to hear the reflections of the Hon. Member for Wilkie on the length of the season which could be expected during which we could be expected to make use of the Churchill Port. He was going somewhat into the field of conjecture, I think, when he referred to what might be accomplished through the use of atomic energy — if that is the descriptive term. I am thinking, today, simply of the year 1947 and I learn that the season which the insurance companies recognize as being safe for navigation in that route. The season opens on August 5th, that is at Churchill and closes on October 10th, which is quite a short season and if we are going to reach our objective of shipping 16 million bushels of wheat to Churchill, then the problem has to be attacked with a certain amount of energy and planning.

The elevator at Churchill has a capacity, I think, my hon. friend stated, of two and one-half million bushels. That elevator should be full of course, at the opening of the shipping season but on October 5th it cannot be expected that there will be any new crop wheat available for shipment to Churchill so that there will be an interval when old wheat must be shipped to the elevator as it is being unloaded until such time as the new wheat can enter the picture. A ten-year average has been examined and it is suggested to me that August 17th is about the earliest date when new wheat could be expected to enter the picture. August 17th seems rather early from my own personal experience but it may be that there are areas where August 17th might be a date when wheat would be going into trade. But in any case there is ample wheat, I believe, in the area tributary to the route which could take up the slack between the 5th of August and the date when we might expect the new wheat to be ready for shipment. The amount of new wheat which it will be possible to ship through that route will depend very largely on the season.

It is estimated that on an early season it may be possible to ship 15 million bushels of new wheat to Churchill in time for shipment while on a late season there might be a drop to as low as 5 million bushels. Now I think we have reason to be very glad that while the authorities have been very slow to make use of the Hudson Bay route, it appears from all that I can learn that they have made a very good job of building the route and of providing facilities at the other end. The elevator there is fully modern and is equipped with four shipping lades with a capacity of 20,000 bushels each so that it doesn't take very long to load a ship with grain. That is very necessary because the ship has a

March 3, 1947

certain length of time, I think it is three days, of free loading time after which it has to pay a charge of \$100 for 24 hours. But there would appear to be little reason for any ship being charged that additional \$100 because a great deal of wheat can be loaded from one of those lades with a capacity of 20,000 bushels an hour. There are also four receiving lades in the elevator and eleven cleaner lades and one dryer lade. That dryer is separate from the elevator and has a capacity of 1,000 bushels an hour. So it would appear that we have facilities fully modern capable of handling the grain with the least possible waste of effort or exertion of hand labor, in fact, there will be hardly any hand labor in connection with it and that should be an attraction to the shipper.

There is perhaps a great deal more that I need to add to this debate, but when I knew that I was going to speak on this subject I wrote to a gentleman whom I know very well, Mr. Walter Streeten, who is president of the Hudson Bay Association. I asked him to give me any information which he could give that would be of interest to me in the time of the debate and he told me that efforts were being made in Britain at the present time, to bring together the forwarding agents of those importers that I mentioned a short time ago, with the Dalgleish Shipping Company representatives and with Mr. Graham Spry, agent general for Saskatchewan, over there with a view to arranging cargoes for shipment to Canada. He told me, also, that Mr. Dalgleish is expected to be in Saskatchewan in about a week's time with a view to satisfying himself as to the number of ships which he will require to reserve for this movement of wheat from the Port of Churchill. I hope that that information is correct, I am quite sure that it was correct at the time it was forwarded to me, but we sometimes find that conditions or circumstances come in the way of plans being materialized. I hope that that is still true and that we will have an opportunity to have the representative of this shipping firm, which has shown sustained interest in the Hudson Bay route, sustained confidence in its practicability and in its safety, that we will have him here in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that there is little more that I need add to this debate. I am satisfied that insofar as we are concerned here in the West, we are taking every practical step which appeals to us as wise or necessary in an endeavor to make the year 1947 a record insofar as the utilization of the Hudson Bay Port is concerned. I feel that the purpose or the value of this Resolution being passed here in this Legislature is to keep everlastingly before the Federal Government and all those who are at all interested or who have any authority in connection with the shipment of grain, to keep before them our determination that we have full use of the Port, which we have finally seen reach a stage of completion after so many years of effort.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I would agree with my colleague who has just taken his seat that a great deal has been said and a great deal more has been written about the Hudson Bay route, Port of Churchill, the Hudson Bay railway than possibly anything else in western Canada for the past six or seven decades.

I think there has been nothing said, this afternoon, that has not been said before, but at the same time it is up to us

in western Canada to keep the interest in this route alive, not to let it lag at all or it is liable to wither up and die as you might say.

I thought that I might start my remarks by giving a brief outline of the history of the route. The Member for Wilkie touched lightly on that, he said the first vessel entered the Hudson Bay in the year 1610. The Hudson Bay Company started operation there in 1670, that is when they first came into the Port of Churchill. I mention that to show that it is not a new route by any means, in fact, it is one of the oldest route on this continent and since that time many ships, large and small, some of them fairly modern ships, none of them large, of course, entered since that time. Now the agitation for this route started back in 1877 and a charter for the Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company was granted in 1880.

I was quite interested when I took over my office two and one-half years ago, to come across an old book in the library, I presume it was left there by Dr. Urick when he went away. Apparently it belonged to Sir John A. McDonald at one time. It is an old book, yellow with age and it has a photoglyptic inside, his name printed in two or three places, but it is titled The Statutes of Canada, the year of 1883. On going through it one day I discovered the following: An Act to unite the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company and the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company into one Corporation. I'll just read one or two clauses in the Act to show you just how long the people of western Canada have been waiting for this route. The preamble says:

Whereas the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company and the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company have, by their petition, prayed for an Act to unite their companies into one company and corporation, and for granting to such company or corporation of all the powers and privileges hereinafter mentioned; and whereas it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows . . .

It is of interest to note that we haven't changed very much from the verbiage of 1883. It goes on and says:

The capital stock of the company should be four millions of dollars.

But here is an interesting clause, the last one in the Act. It says:

The railway shall be commenced within three years and completed within ten years after the passing of this Act.

Now the date of assent to that Act was May 25th, 1883, so that will give the House an idea of just how long the people of western Canada have been talking about this route and how long it has taken to come into actual operation.

The company has received 18,000 acres of land and they received that grant in Manitoba and the North West Territories to aid in the cost of construction and later on MacKenzie and Mann, we all recall that firm, they built many railways in

March 3, 1947

western Canada. Later on they bought the company and the charter and although they did a great deal of construction work in the Prairies, British Columbia, they never got as far as the Hudson Bay Railway and the charter was cancelled in 1908. The Great Northern Railway, that is something I didn't know until comparatively recently, built the lines from Hudson Bay Junction to The Pas. Now back about 1908 there was considerable agitation again and the Federal Government sold 14 million acres in the three Prairie Provinces and raised \$42.5 million between the years 1908 and 1918. Construction was actually started in 1911 from The Pas to Fort Nelson for at least 24 miles and \$6 million was spent at the latter Fort before construction was stopped in 1917. It is of interest to recall that in 1922 there was considerable agitation on the part of some of the senior government in Ottawa to tear up the rails and that quite a controversy resulted, which fortunately, of course, was not proceeded with. In 1923 Boards of Trades, a farmer's organization, the Bay Association — and they were quite active — got up a petition signed by 175,000 people and the construction was finally resumed on this road in 1926. The terminal, however, was changed from Nelson to Churchill.

Most of us in this House can recall when Sir Frederick Palmer, Consulting Engineer from Great Britain, was brought out and after an extensive study advised that the terminal be changed. That was done, the road was completed in 1929 and the first commercial shipments started in 1931.

The costs up to just a year ago — it is of interest to know just how much money has been spent on this route — the construction costs of the Hudson Bay Railway alone was \$32.5 million. The terminal work at Churchill \$13 million, terminal work at Nelson, which was later abandoned, \$6 million, a total cost of \$51.5 million. That is the amount that western Canada, through the sale of 42.5 million acres, has invested in Churchill and the Hudson Bay Railway. The facilities there are excellent, they are quite extensive. I have a list of them here and it won't take a moment to go through them.

The Terminal Elevator with a capacity of 2.5 million bushels, with the most up-to-date loading and unloading equipment, the port with a frontage of 1,855 feet berthing accommodation for four vessels on the eastern side of the harbor, tracks on the wharf, floating derrick of 20 ton capacity, scows for removing ships ballast, electric light insulations available, two locomotive trains of 15 to 20 ton capacity, modern freight sheds 500 x 200 feet, open area on the wharf for storing 40,000 tons of coal, cattle pens for 20 carloads of cattle. That is something perhaps we are bound to forget, the facilities there for loading cattle, they can take care of 20 carloads at one time. Fresh water reservoir of 20 million gallon capacity. The townsite is under the control of the Manitoba Government and the railway itself is being operated by the CNR for the Dominion Government. Now the use made of the Port up to the present time I am sure would be of interest to this House.

From 1931 to 1945 there has been 24 million bushels of grain shipped from this harbor to Churchill, 780 head of cattle, 1,000 tons of general cargo, 34,000 tons of war material. Here is roughly the imports: 10,000 tons of general cargo and 5,000 tons of coal. These figures indicate approximately 22 million tons of exports and 15,000 of imports, a ratio of about 1 to 14 hundred. This does not necessarily indicate the chances of the

route although it has been used as an argument against it. The majority of this tonnage moved during the early '30s when western Canada's purchasing power was to a low ebb, the fact that which combined with the fact that the route was new does not give a fair picture of the possibilities. Now something has been said about tariff this afternoon by both the mover and seconder of the Resolution and I don't propose to go into that very much. However, there are some interesting figures, comparative figures, and I'll just pick out some here and there.

Here are some: Winnipeg to Liverpool via Montreal and the Great Lakes is 4,392 miles, via Churchill 3,919, a difference of approximately 480. Regina to Liverpool via Montreal and the Great Lakes, 4,750, via Churchill 3,769, a difference of almost 1,000 miles. The same applies to Prince Albert via Churchill 4,878 and via Montreal 3,773, a difference of almost 1,100 miles. Here are some of the commodities, here are the rates on livestock to Montreal and Churchill at The Pas. I will just mention two or three places here: St. Boniface to Montreal \$1.70 per hundred, to Churchill \$1.16, a saving of 54 cents a hundred; Prince Albert to Montreal \$2.47, to Churchill \$1, a saving of \$1.27 a hundred; Regina to Montreal \$2.14, Churchill \$1.04, a saving of \$1.10. Now here is something of interest if averaged up these 10 points, Calgary, Edmonton, Yorkton, Swan River and the average reduction is \$102.18 per car or 51.9 cents per hundred pounds, that is the saving on livestock. Here is one more, dairy products, butter and dressed poultry to Montreal and Churchill. Winnipeg to Montreal per hundred pounds — \$1.61, to Churchill \$1.67; it costs a little more in that case. Prince Albert to Montreal \$2.28 per hundred, to Churchill \$1.38; Regina \$2.06 to Montreal, to Churchill \$1.47 and the average freight rate reduction to Churchill on these commodities is \$286.82 per car or 57.3 cents per hundred pounds. The same, Mr. Speaker, I could go on with figures, the rates on eggs, carloads to Montreal and Churchill, however, I will not take the time of House to go into it any further.

There is another point that has not been brought up this afternoon and that is the tributary area that can take advantage of this port. Mr. Stevenson in Saskatoon, speaking in 1942, expressed the situation very well and he said this:

One favorite criticism of the port development is that this port has no hinterland and that for a distance of 250 miles in any direction from Churchill nothing but barren land and muskeg can be found.

This is undoubtedly true, but a fair answer to the same is to ask the critic to extend the radius of a circle to 1,200 miles and you then find that in that area you have included not only Manitoba and Saskatchewan but all of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota and Wisconsin, together with all of Montana and a great part of Wyoming, Nebraska and Iowa. Thus, Butte in Montana is 150 miles nearer to Churchill than it is to Chicago. There is some food for thought here, Mr. Speaker, and eventually we may find trade from the northwestern states up through here to the Hudson Bay Railway. It certainly is possible. It should be mentioned at the same time that there is a dividing line in Alberta, and I think it runs roughly halfway through the province north and south, where the grain from there can go to the Pacific Coast and around through the Panama Canal at just the same rate as it can go east from there. The same applies to Manitoba; there is only half or two-thirds of Manitoba actively

March 3, 1947

interested in the Hudsons Bay Railway and I am afraid as far as Winnipeg is concerned, they are not particularly interested. The city of Winnipeg is benefitted by traffic that goes either through there east bound or west bound, and it doesn't make an awful lot of difference to them. In fact, they are, I think, afraid that it might hurt them in some way.

Now the advantages of the route — the Member for Watrous gave us figures and showed there would be a saving of 4 cents per bushel. That is not quite as much as Mr. Gardiner anticipated when he spoke in October, 1926 — if that was the year. The report of the Board of Grain Commissioners for the year 1938 showed a net profit in transportation of wheat to Europe through the Port of Churchill, as compared with Montreal route as six cents per bushel. Actual experience apparently has brought that figure down to 4 cents, but that is quite an amount when one considers the enormous amount of grain we ship from this country.

Now a great deal of credit is due, Mr. Speaker, has been due to the many people of the Prairie Provinces — the officers and members of the Hudsons Bay Route Association, formerly known as the On-to-the-Bay Association, have been actively engaged for many years in keeping up the interest in this route. The Young Men's Division of the Board of Trade, Saskatoon, has done a great deal of work and should be given the credit that it is due. We can expect no help from the East. We are going to have to do whatever we can ourselves. It needs to be primed; it needs to be kept primed.

In that connection the Department of Co-operatives, under the Hon. Mr. McIntosh, has recently opened an office in London, as we know, with Mr. Graham Spry in charge. We expect great things, of course; we expect the manufacturers' goods to flow more freely from the British Isles and other European countries through Churchill and down onto the Prairies; and in return of course, we send the raw materials, most of which are grain. Tonnage in both directions is the transportation man's dream. If we can tonnage, of course, to Churchill, that is what we will have; and as far as the amount of tonnage coming back, it is going to simplify things a great deal as far as the railway situation is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the mover and seconder of this motion for bringing it in and would repeat that we must keep alive this situation at all times. I take pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. A.T. Procter (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, from those memories when you sat in that seat there and before your elevation to the high office of Speaker, you must have noticed, Sir, a very peculiar thing in connection with this debate on this Resolution. You will remember, Sir, that in those days when you sat here and I sat over there, that on a resolution in connection with the Hudson Bay there was one Hon. Member of the House who always took a most active part, and a most vigorous part, in support of the resolution. In denunciation of the Government then in power on that side, that, of course, was the Hon. Member for Saltcoats, the Minister of Natural Resources. I have wondered, Sir, how he could retain his seat on this occasion without getting up at least to say something on this Resolution. Oh, I am not as young as I was, Mr. Speaker, every moment I am getting older; but

nevertheless there is something which, even if my hon. friend should favor us with his torrent of eloquence on the Resolution, cannot be changed unless my hon. friend is going to move an amendment. In those days, as you will recollect, Sir, it was not the Federal Government who was to assume the chief responsibility for pressing on with the Hudson Bay route, it was the Provincial Government of the Province of Saskatchewan. Well, Sir, that is the thing that has struck me in connection with this Resolution. Why is it, again, that we have this Resolution which we have so often talked about in this House and which we have so many times been told was one of the chief businesses of the Provincial Government? There can be no question, Mr. Speaker, but that we are going to support this Resolution.

May I read to you our own Liberal platform in connection with it?

Whereas we are of the opinion that the use of the Hudson Bay Route would greatly reduce transportation distance, time and cost of western products being exported to Europe, therefore be it resolved that the federal, provincial and municipal authorities do their utmost to bring the route into popular use, thereby saving millions of dollars for western Canada.

Mr. Fines: — Are you reading . . .

Mr. Procter: — No, I am reading from the provincial platform and I say that we accept therein our share. There is a certain measure of responsibility and if my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer, because I am always willing to let the light into the dark places, will listen again, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to read it to him again: “Be it resolved that the federal, provincial” — I might ask the Provincial Treasurer to note that work “provincial” “and municipal authorities do their utmost to bring the route into popular use.”

Now, you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that in this Resolution that we are debating here in this House, all responsibility, as is usually the case, is lifted from the shoulders of the Provincial Government and deposited on the shoulders of the Federal Government once more. But, Sir, casting your memory back to those days to which I have referred, before you attained this honorable and august position that you now hold, do you remember the eloquence with which the Members of the Opposition, particularly my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, used to insist that while perhaps the Federal Government had a certain measure of responsibility, the main responsibility — and I can see him pounding his desk, Sir — was on this Provincial Government. Well, I submit that there is a threefold responsibility in connection with this route and it is a responsibility that must be accepted and exercised by all parties if this route is to be the success that we, in the West, have hoped for for so many years.

I do not know how many Members of this House have been privileged to visit Port Churchill and travel over the Hudsons Bay Railway. I may say that I, myself, in preparation for the conference that has been alluded to by the Hon. Member for Wilkie, made that trip so that I would have some firsthand knowledge of the actual situation. I would like to urge on every Member of this Legislature that they should make that trip. They will find

March 3, 1947

it a delightful and an instructive and informative trip. And, Sir, by so doing, they will gain a much greater grasp of many of the problems that confront the use of the Port and they will be better able to meet many of the criticisms.

Now at the risk of being tedious, I am going back a few short years to see what we were doing in connection with this Hudsons Bay Railway route and you, Sir, will remember that I informed this House when that matter was under my jurisdiction as Minister of Highways and Transportation, I informed this House of the steps that have been taken. It was decided that there should be a conference of the three western provinces and arrangements have proceeded to inaugurate that conference when unfortunately the Great War broke out. Now, let me say this, and we didn't go to the Federal Government to do these things, as a Provincial Government we had a gentleman whose duty it was to do everything that he could to assist and I think he was the man who first interested the Mr. Dalglish, who we have heard now in the Port of Hudson Bay. We had him give attention to freight rates, to insurance and to all these matters. We went so far as a Provincial Government not as a Dominion Federal Government. We didn't shelve all our responsibilities as to guarantee ships coming into Hudson Bay a certain amount of rates on their cargo. We gave them every assistance. We took up the question of the insurance which you have heard mentioned here this afternoon and which constituted one of the greatest buys to the use of the Hudson Bay railroad.

Now, there is on record in the debatement, a resolution by the underraters that they would recommend that when 20 ships in a single season came into Hudson Bay that the freight rate would be reduced. I am speaking purely from memory now, but I think it was 40 per cent, that the insurance rate would be reduced. I think it was 40 per cent provided that those ships were properly equipped with the devices for navigating the Strait. All these things had been done before. The question of the shipment of grain out through the Hudson Bay have been taken up with their own Wheat Pool long before we have the Dominion Wheat Board and, incidentally, there is on the records of the Bay Association and in the records of my Department, the reasons assigned for the Wheat Pool, for the small use made of the Hudson Bay Port at that time, which I do not intend to go into now. There was shortness of season, danger of navigation, those were only some of the things, Mr. Speaker, but they did agree to make trial shipments through that Port.

Now, I come down to the time when I, personally, had some responsibility in connection with this. I have informed you, Sir, as to the arrangements that were made for this conference, the date, provisional date had been set when the War began and rendered it impossible. Now, we in Canada, we were of the opinion as a Provincial Government, again let me say, we didn't unload all this onto the Federal Government, we took the stand that there might be an avenue for the use of the Port of Hudson Bay during the War period, and we investigated that. At that time the whole shipping of the allies, there is no reason why I shouldn't say it now, Sir, was under the control of a Joint Allied Shipping Commission and we pointed out the many uses that could be made of Churchill. The Commissioner refused to allow us the use of Churchill for two reasons.

First reason was that the ships coming out of the Port of Churchill would have to proceed down the Coast of Labrador to

the point at which they assembled for convoy purposes. During the whole of that period they would be subject to submarine menace and without submarine protection. The second reason was that by reason of the length and trip to come down to that point of assembly for convoy purposes took up a great portion of the mileage that was saved and thereby to a great extent nullified the shortage of the saving in distance that would normally be obtained by the use of the . . . Again, let me say this to you, Sir, that we were not satisfied with the first decision in respect to the use of the Port of Churchill. That matter was carried up to Mr. Churchill himself, the Right Hon. Winston Churchill himself, and he himself dealt with the matter and satisfied himself that the Port could not, under War conditions, be used except to the extent that it afterwards was used when the American troops came in there.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, by the way, was shown the letter in that regard and you may remember there was a dispute as to the use of that letter. I refused to make it public on the floor of this House at the time because it contained information as was marked as “secret and confidential” for the War purposes.

An Hon. Member: — Was that the time . . .

Mr. Procter: — Yes, I am not sure whether that was the time that the hon. gentleman voted against his own motion or not. However, that was the history of it.

Now, the same considerations operated as far as the Government was concerned all through that period until this Government took office. I hope, we have listened to one Minister of the Government, I hope some Member of the Government will get up and tell this House what is now being done. I suggest to the Government that if there isn't at the present time any necessity for a guarantee of the rates for ships coming into Churchill that the Government should not hesitate to assist in that matter. I am glad to hear the Hon. Minister refer to the efforts of Mr. James Spry, I commend his efforts if they are directed to having a traffic into Churchill.

The question was investigated at one time that shipping pit props for the coal mines out of Hudson Bay by our Government when we were in office. We had not, by any manner of means, expended all the efforts that could be developed among the various lines, but there is a great deal that can be done by this Provincial Government without showing the whole onus and burden onto the Federal Government. Much can be done by the Provincial Government to assist in the development of that Port. Much more can be done by a campaign of education, instead of a political campaign such as we have through the Saskatchewan News, Mr. Speaker, that a certain portion of this propaganda that the Government's spreading across this country be developed to creating a consciousness in the importers of western Canada, to bring to them the point ably stressed by the Minister of Labour when he said that the grain of transportation was an inway freight and an outway freight. It is all very well for us to go to the Federal Government and say, you ship 16,000,000 bushels of wheat out of here, and so on. But if we, ourselves, can go to the importers and exporters and say, if you will bring in so many tons of freight through Hudson Bay, ships will be available to take out some parts of this 16,000,000 bushels of wheat. We

March 3, 1947

are going to have a great deal more sympathy from those at Ottawa than we will for simply saying, here this starving baby is yours, you feed it. There is another thing that should be done, there should be some report. I am astonished, Sir, that this Resolution should be introduced in this House without the complete and full report as to what has been done in connection with this conference of the three western provinces. The conference, the idea of the conference when it was initiated by our Government on that side of the House, was not that it should just be a temporary thing that should expire. The conference naturally could not meet in view of what had taken place in connection with the Port and the War situation. But the idea was that the three western provinces should unite — that there should be a continuing and a working conference to see what could be done along all lines, as three provinces and not as one. What has happened to that conference? Is it still in existence? Is it still operating? Is it still functioning? We haven't been told that, although this Resolution comes on the floor of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are all things that we can do, without asking anybody else to do. We have responsibilities — let us take these responsibilities, then go, having fulfilled our own responsibilities — we are in a position to bring much more weight, to show our sincerity.

We have heard that Simpsons, Eatons and Hudson's Bay and all these people are willing to bring in shipments. Let us go to them and say, 'now you say you are willing to bring in shipments, let us put this thing on a business basis. Put down a proposition on what you are prepared to bring in and we will have this man Spry of ours over there contact the people in the Old Country to see what we can get from there to meet your requirements;' and so create a traffic in and a traffic out of the Port.

Mr. Speaker, it has been established, I think, to the satisfaction of all those who are interested in shipping and in traffic lanes that, while there are certain difficulties in the use of the Port of Hudson Bay — of Churchill I should say, that actually today, with the improvements — with radar and all the other devices for the protection of ships — that there is nothing there that would seriously impede the use of the Port. But what has not yet been established is that, while we in the West, are continually prepared to talk about it and to ask the Dominion Government to do something about it, yes, and the Harbor Commissioners to do something about it, that we are not prepared to back our own opinion by doing something about it ourselves. And the time has come when we should be prepared to do something about it ourselves and then we would get a much better and a much more favorable hearing from these other groups.

Now it was not my intention to speak as long as I have spoken, but when I see the continual flood of these resolutions coming down, ignoring our responsibilities, asking the Dominion Government to do that and to do the other thing, knowing all the time that for many of these things we, ourselves, have a responsibility that we have not fulfilled, but that we should fulfil. That we cannot go honestly and fairly before them asking them to fulfil, without having done our part first. It seems to me that it is not the action that the people of the Province of Saskatchewan expect this Legislature to take. I shall support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Williams: — . . . in fact it should come into the Port of Churchill, I presume from European countries and then we would return with, I think. Now, when I spoke I mentioned the fact that for one ton of traffic that came in there were 1400 tons went out. Now is it your intention to reverse the preponderance of traffic and only ship raw materials out on what boats would bring manufactured goods in?

Mr. Procter: — No, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Williams: — I would just like to say that the traffic must be light in one direction. We think it should be light coming this way just because it might be light going the other way.

Mr. Procter: — Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that we have always found is that boats that have come in, many of them in ballast — I have forgotten whose these ships were — in the first ships that came in I think one brought a cargo of coal. Now I don't want to question my hon. friend's figures, but as a matter of fact, I think there must be certain omissions in them, because I can't think that a cargo — a shipload of coal — only conveyed the few thousand tons that I understood my hon. friend to give. There was a shipment of coal that came in — Dalglish brought in, I think, three ships, if I remember rightly, that were loaded in different years. One, I remember distinctly, that we — while I was in charge of this matter — guaranteed some part of the freight costs of bringing that shipment in; and there has never been any difficulty insofar as getting cargoes to go out were concerned. We have had wheat there, as a matter of fact this wheat that is in storage up at Churchill has been stored for many years at Churchill, because there was no means of getting it out. The difficulty has been to get in shipments, not out shipments.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Co-operation): — Mr. Speaker, the Leader-Post has carried fairly complete reports of the activities of both the Policy Committee and the Technical Committee set up by the three western government in connection with the question now under discussion. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that we will take up a little collection on this side of the House and send the Hon. Member for Moosomin the Co-operative Commonwealth paper. The Member for Moosomin suggested that the House should be told what the province is doing in connection with this question, and with that I have no quarrel.

Briefly, might I review the activities taken by this Government and later on by the Government of Manitoba and Alberta. In January, a year ago, at a meeting held in Saskatoon, the Province of Alberta, the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan were represented. It was decided at this meeting that each of the governments represented should take back to their respective governments a recommendation. The recommendation was that an interprovincial Policy Committee be set up. In the month of February that interprovincial Policy Committee was formed.

Mr. Patterson: — February, 1947?

March 3, 1947

Mr. McIntosh: — Yes, that has been reported.

Mr. Patterson: — No, but in February 1947?

Mr. McIntosh: — Oh, pardon me, no, in February of 1946. Manitoba is represented by the Hon. Mr. McDiarmid, Alberta represented by the Hon. Mr. Fallow and I have the pleasure of representing the Government of this province on that committee. It was July last before the interprovincial Policy Committee met. They met here in the city of Regina on the 13th day of July, at which time the decision was arrived at to set up an interprovincial Technical Committee. On this Committee the three provinces are represented. This Committee held its first preliminary meeting in Winnipeg and held two full meetings, following that, here in Regina. At the preliminary meeting held in Winnipeg they set out a course of study in connection with this question and when the full Committee met in Regina we had with us a representative from the Department of Trade and Commerce that was sent here under the direction of the Minister of that Department. He attended both the first and second meetings of the Technical Committee. In addition to Col. Fisher, representing the Department of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa, we had a representative here dealing with the value of radar and other aids to navigation. We had also men meet this Committee that had been giving some study and thought to the whole question of shipping through the Port of Churchill.

At that meeting of this Committee, they felt that they had advanced as far as their general knowledge would permit them to do and in their recommendations to the Policy Committee they recommended that they be permitted or instructed to secure other technical assistance which would enable them to complete the study that they had undertaken. The information of this Committee was communicated to the Manitoba and Alberta Government representatives on the Policy Committee. They are now awaiting word from the representatives of the provinces to the East and to the West of us.

In the meantime, our studies, of the studies of the interprovincial Technical Committee, has advanced far enough for them to recommend that if there was a minimum of 12,000,000 bushels or a total of 16,000,000 bushels of wheat, if possible, moved out through the Port of Churchill this year, that as the Hon. Member for Watrous mentioned, would wipe out any deficits in connection with the operation of the railway and in the Port itself, and would bring into that Port a sufficient number of ships to warrant the Technical Committee and others interested into going to the shipping concerns, to the insurance people and to the railway people suggesting adjustments in railway rates, in ocean freight rates and in cargo rates.

While Mr. Spry was in Canada, we asked him to go out to the Port of Churchill and he spent about a week there gathering what information he could. In addition to that, he was in Washington, he spent some time in Ottawa, he spent some time in Winnipeg and his recommendations were that the facilities that we now have at Churchill and recognizing the shipping season as it now exists, from August to October 10th, that he gave it as his opinion after the studies that I have mentioned that he made, that we could move 15,000,000 bushels of wheat during that period, August 5th to October 10th. That is the reason that we arrived at the 15,000,000 bushel figure.

Mr. Spry in proceeding overseas has been instructed by this Government to devote almost exclusively the first six months of his work in the United Kingdom to the securing of cargoes through the Port of Churchill. In a cable received from him yesterday he stated that he had already been in touch with Mr. Dalglish and we were aware of the fact that Mr. Dalglish was coming here to the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Dalglish will arrive in Regina on the 10th of March and I believe two days later arrangements have been made or are under consideration whereby it is hoped that the Members of this legislature may have an opportunity to meet Mr. Dalglish. Communications have gone out to the Boards of Trade and other business interests indicating the stay of this shipping official in the province. Arrangements have now been completed for a luncheon here in Regina one week from Wednesday, where it is expected that approximately 60 business men will be in attendance. Arrangements are under review for Mr. Dalglish to visit the city of Saskatoon in which he will have an opportunity to meet some of the business interests there. I might say that in addition to the Dalglish Shipping Company there are other shipping firms in the United Kingdom and on the continent whom we have been in touch with in connection with cargoes out through this port.

I would like to mention that when in the United Kingdom last spring, I took the question up with the Department of Transport of the British Government to securing enough ships to move the 2,000,000 bushels of wheat that were in store at the Port of Churchill. The Minister of Transport promised a sufficient number of boats to move that 2,000,000 bushels. Later on we were successful in securing an additional three ships which took out an additional 1,000,000 bushels of grain that moved into the Port of Churchill from the 1946 harvest.

Now this particular Resolution that is now on the order, suggesting that certain assistance be forthcoming from the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Department of Transport and the National Harvest Board. The purpose of that is this, the Canadian Wheat Board has full control over the direction of all wheat, the Canadian Wheat Board operates under the Department of Trade and Commerce and we are now asking the Canadian Wheat Board and in this Resolution, asking them through the Department of Trade and Commerce to do everything possible to see that 16,000,000 bushels of wheat is available for shipment out of the Port during the 1947 season and until such time . . .

Mr. Procter: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question. If I recollect the storage capacity of Churchill, there is about 3,000,000 bushels or over. In order to have a movement of that kind you will have to have ships there prepared to take it out almost as fast as it goes in. Are you arranging for those ships?

Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, if the terminal of Churchill is 2,500,000 bushels.

Mr. Procter: — But it can take some extra though. There were 2,000,000 when I was there.

Mr. McIntosh: — And just as soon as we get some assurance from the Wheat Board that certain quantities of wheat will be available for

March 3, 1947

shipment out of the Port of Churchill, we will then approach, through the overseas representative, Mr. Spry, the British Ministry of Transport in making arrangements with them to secure the ships to take out this grain. One of our first problems is to be able to say that there is going to be some wheat or so much wheat available. If we get a commitment from the Canada Wheat Board then we are in a position to approach those controlling the transportation in connection with the ships.

I don't think it is necessary to say anything further other than to draw this to the attention of the Hon. Members of this House that the Technical Committee is a continuing committee. The Policy Committee has been set up representing the three governments. We have come to a position now where we must ask the Canada Wheat Board and the Department of Trade and Commerce for further co-operation in giving us assurance that the grain will be available for shipment in 1947 and we do want to make this the trial year of shipments through the Port of Churchill. Our information from the United Kingdom up to the present time would indicate that incoming cargoes will be far heavier in 1947 than in any year since the Port of Churchill has been in use. So we are now asking the co-operation of the Dominion Government in helping us to carry out the findings of the interprovincial Technical Committee set up last July.

Hon. J.L. Phelps (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak after some of the statements were made by Members on the other side of the House. I say it in the beginning, a great deal has been said about the Hudson Bay railroad. I think we are all afraid, the advantages that might accrue particularly to western Canada by its extended use.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't satisfied at that time and I am not satisfied now as some of the excuses that the Hon. Member gave at the time he was sitting on this side of the House was quite the reason why the railroad was not used at that time. My visit up there, Sir, I would like to say to this House has further substantiated that belief. I want to say, and I think the Member has his answer that this Government is doing something about the use of this railroad. The Federal Government has promised action on the use of this railroad and I have just been refreshing my memory here from some of the discussions recently taken place in the House of Commons and during the past two years in which a definite promise has been made by the Federal Government that this railway will be used. Now, Mr. Speaker, for any Member of this House to suggest that it is the province that should take all the initiative and responsibility is certainly begging the question.

My hon. friend talks about the trade through Churchill. The Federal Government is in an ideal position today to supply that trade. The Federal Government today controls the wheats of the Dominion of Canada, to the Canadian Wheat Board and they are the ones that are sitting in the saddle and can say how much wheat is going to be diverted to the Port of Churchill or to any other route. And all my friend's talking will not convince, you can't make people, Mr. Speaker, the least you can say it is daylight when the sun is shining, and all my friend's argument isn't going to convince the people of western Canada any different. I say the Federal Government is in that position today, they

can talk; they have been doing some talking. Now they have made a promise. All the attitude of the Hudson Bay Route Association is this — that they should be given the opportunity to fulfil that promise; to make that statement good that that railroad will be used — and they are in a position to use it.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend in his talk a few moments ago brought out the old, old argument that what has been holding this Port back is the lack of two-way trade. Now, if he keeps on talking that way and making those statements long enough himself, he may get himself to believe it, but he certainly isn't going to get anyone else to believe it. All that anyone has to do is to read the annual report of the National Harbors Board and they will find out, Mr. Speaker — and there are several copies of them in the library. I haven't had time to peruse them this afternoon because I didn't intend to enter this debate; but I have perused them before. If you will check over those National Harbor Reports you will find that every port in the Dominion of Canada operates on the same basis. It is a one-way trade and for anyone to try to make the House believe that that is the reason that is holding the Port of Churchill back, Mr. Speaker, is trying to 'kid the troops.

I want to say again, it is becoming quite apparent that what we are seeing here is a clash of western interests in opposition to the entrenched financial interests of eastern Canada. They have large investments down there that they are going to protect at all costs. They have people represented in the House of Commons — their supporters there, Mr. Speaker, who speak for them and legislate for them. However, we are now in this position, that they have made a promise and we are going to wait and see and insist that that promise is fulfilled. Insofar as co-operating with them is concerned, this Government is prepared to co-operate with them to the fullest extent, but, Mr. Speaker, that railroad has been bought and paid for by western money. It is now under the control of the Dominion of Canada. We don't hold title to it — the Dominion of Canada holds title to it. It is the only railroad, Mr. Speaker, that has been bought and paid for running in the Dominion of Canada today. It has been bought and paid for by western money.

All that we are asking is that the Dominion Government, who have in the hollow of their hand the control of the commodities that would make that possible, that is, the Canadian Wheat Board, that they would divert a fair percentage of grain through that facility and use it to the maximum. If they do that, Mr. Speaker, it is a foregone conclusion what the result will be.

The Port facilities themselves have not resulted — the operation of those facilities have not resulted in a very large deficit. The main deficit, of course, has been in the operation of the railway itself. But I want to say that if the Federal Government does not fulfil its promise and it may not; it isn't the first promise, Mr. Speaker, they have made — but if they do not fulfil that promise, then I can think I have some knowledge of what the Hudson Bay Route Association is going to have — the position they are going to take. I have followed the work of that Association for a number of years. The House knows I was one of its officers for a certain term and I think that the Province of Saskatchewan owes a good deal to that Association that did a good deal of pioneering at a time when the activities of Port Churchill were at a very low ebb. They have continually kept this problem before the public mind.

March 3, 1947

The sad situation as far as the Hudson Bay Route Association is this — if the Federal Government does not fulfil the promise that they have recently made in utilizing this railroad, then there will be a move to see to it that that road is turned over to a western board of management. In the interim, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested — I think it's proper tactics — that we should give the Federal Government, who now has title to that road and to those facilities which have, I repeat, been bought and paid for by western money, we give them the opportunity to fulfil the promise that they have made. They have all the machinery at their finger tips to do it, Mr. Speaker, and no one will lay a straw in their path of doing it. If they don't, well then it is the time to say what the next move will be. But in the interim — again, I want to hasten to assure this House that this Government, as explained by the Member for Prince Albert, has already not only given lip service to this proposition, but we have made very definite moves to get the wheels moving and we shall continue to do so.

I want to say that the trip I made up to the Port of Churchill certainly has exploded many of the old arguments — just like my hon. friend still brings up the fact about two-way traffic. They said, oh, there are all kinds of things they have said — that this couldn't be done insofar as the railway is concerned. They said you couldn't get a road bed, but we find out we've got the most economically maintained road bed that there is in the Dominion of Canada today. The things that they said couldn't be done are now accomplished. I want to say that, it is not an excuse to say, that you can't make that Port pay with plenty of wheat on a one-way traffic. It would pay better, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying that it won't pay better if you can have two-way traffic, but that's an idle dream so far as the history of the operation of a port is concerned if you will read the annual report of the Harbor Commission.

So I say that our position is going to be — again drawing this question to the attention of the Federal Government. And I think it is proper — it is not a matter of passing the buck at all — it is proper that we should adopt these tactics and give them plenty of opportunity to do the things that they have said in the House; that hon. Ministers there have stated to the House, that they intend to do and that is to use the Port of Churchill. They say they have all the facilities there. I think they should be given that chance.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of this Resolution will simply put this Legislature on record as being in favor of giving them the opportunity to fulfil the promise that they have made. I shall support the motion.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — I really didn't intend to take any time discussing any of these things that have been so very well covered by the former mover and seconder and by the Minister who spoke on this — the two Ministers who spoke on this Resolution.

I was rather amused to find that the Minister of Natural Resources is not in agreement, or does not think that the question of the return cargoes for two-way traffic is of any importance whatever so far as the success of the railroad is concerned. I have heard very few men in this province express an opinion of that kind and I am sure that the mover of the Resolution and the seconder, particularly, and also the two Ministers who have

spoken, stressed that point and I think they are on very, very sound ground. I think it is very, very important that part — that particular two-way traffic will play a very important part in the success of this route.

Now, I think everything has been said practically. The Member for Moosomin has enlightened the House about some of the things that have been done by the former Government. The Minister of Labour, I think, gave us very entertaining information and very enlightening information, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the start of that dream of a Hudson Bay railway. He gave me a lot of information that I had never heard of and I think it was worthwhile.

It is getting rather late and everything has been said that could be said on this Resolution and I would like to move an amendment to this Resolution. It is not going to detract anything from the Resolution; it is going to strengthen it; and I am sure everybody in this House will agree with it. It is this:

That the following be added to the motion:

And, further, that in the meantime the Provincial Government should promote, by every means in its power, the co-operation of the Prairie Provincial Governments in developing traffic on this route.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — As pointed out by the Minister of Co-operative Development the steps that the Government has taken during the past year to do this very thing. Now in view of the fact that the Government is doing this, I think the way the amendment is worded is not strictly correct. I would like to, therefore move an amendment to the amendment:

That we add the words “continue to,” in front of the word “promote”. It would then read “should continue to promote, by every means in its power, the co-operation of the Prairie Provincial Governments in developing traffic on this route.”

Sub-amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended as agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. J.L. Phelps (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 49 — **An Act to amend The Fur Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are just a few points I would like to bring to the attention of the House when considering this Bill.

One point I would like to bring to attention is the provision in the amendment which provides for authority for trapping in The Pas in certain areas under certain conditions. I would like to inform the House that under the present regulations the only way this can be done, except by special permit, is to declare an open season and that is not considered good principle at any time. We are trying to adopt conservation measures but owing to some years where there is low water in some areas and

March 3, 1947

severe frost there is a danger of freezing up so it is proposed to make that change in the Act.

The second change I might draw to the attention of the House is provision for simply providing for a penalty on anyone caught with a whole animal in his possession that is taken illegally. At the present time it only says the pelts. The other one is to provide for fur farmers longer time to make returns, giving them more latitude at the first of the year. The other one is to appoint a voluntary honorary game warden as provided for under our new regulations in the Northern Fur conservation blocks. Power to search vehicles with another clause contained in the Act similar to Section 193 of the Vehicles Act at a new principle. Provide for the minimum of a \$5 penalty on muskrats caught out of season and reaffirming the \$50 penalty passed in 1943 by the former government on beaver.

I wish to say that these measures, Mr. Speaker, are taken to protect the fur bearing animals particularly the beaver, conservation measures in the Province of Saskatchewan in the interest of conservation and I hope that it receives the wholehearted support of all Members of this House. If you think there is any new principles there, Mr. Speaker, I would move the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. L.E. McIntosh (Minister of Co-operation): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second reading of Bill No. 43 an Act to amend The Trade Services Act, 1946, I might say that the amendment is for clarification, for clarification only and no principles of policy involved. Therefore, I don't think it is necessary to take up the time of the House just at this moment as the clarification question will arise in Committee. Therefore I beg leave to move the second reading of Bill No. 43.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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