

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
37th Day

Monday, March 31, 1952

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

On the Orders of the Day

STATEMENT ON FOSTERTON OIL FIELD

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I presume all members of the Legislature have heard the news of the discovery of a third producing oil well at Fosterton yesterday.

Socony Western Prairie drilled this well. On test oil came to the surface in 40 minutes. The formation in this well, the same as in the second producer, is somewhat lower, but is showing also that it will be a very good producer. It is now quite evident that a small field has proven up in that area. It will probably become a larger one — we hope so at least, but now I think we can safely say that it is some place from 1500 to 1800 acres, and has been proven as an oil field, with quite a few million barrels of oil reserve.

At the present time two drilling rigs are working the area. It is also interesting to note that this latest discovery was spudded in just one week before it struck oil.

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Might I ask the member how far this well was from the first one?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — This one is a mile east, pretty well east. The one that was announced last Friday is about a mile and a quarter northeast; and this one may be a little southeast; so that we have three wells in a triangular pattern, with about a mile and a quarter between two of them, and the other two are about a mile apart.

RE AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to inform the House that I have received a wire from the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner, two days ago, inviting me down to a conference at Ottawa, at which time the Dominion-Provincial Ministers of Agriculture will be called together to discuss the removal of provincial embargoes, and I am encouraged to believe that an adequate price will be set on livestock uniformly, throughout the Dominion, during the period of the emergency, as long as our livestock is not permitted to go across the border to the United States.

March 31, 1952

If we are successful in having an adequate price set for livestock, it will mean more, perhaps, to the country and to Saskatchewan, than two or three oil wells, Mr. Speaker.

TRANSPORT ACT

Moved by Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin), seconded by Mr. John G. Banks (Pelly):

“That this Assembly respectfully urge the Federal Government to give consideration to introducing an amendment to the Transport Act, adding thereto “highway transport carriers” as a class of person entitled to appear, and be heard on the consideration of any application to the Board of Transport Commissioners for approval of agreed charges under Section 35 of the Transport Act.”

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, firstly I want to thank the Premier and the Government for moving this motion up to today’s paper so that we can deal with it before the first of the month, but in moving this Motion, I might say that I believe I will be a serious contender, along with the Attorney-General, as to who makes the shortest speech of this Session.

As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, there are very few figures available as to the amount of business, or the number of people employed by the trucking industry, either in Canada, or in the province of Saskatchewan. We all know that it is a fairly new industry, and I understand that the people concerned are endeavouring to have statistics filed as to the number of people employed and the amount of business done, but to date these figures are not available.

We have at this time some 20,000 “for hire” trucks in this province. I have no idea how many this would be in the Dominion of Canada, but I know with 20,000 in this province, there must be a considerable number of people who make their livelihood from the trucking industry in Saskatchewan alone. They almost must enjoy considerable patronage in the freight business when they have aggravated some of the people who are also in the freight business to the extent that they have. Therefore, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of fair play, that our truckers in Saskatchewan, and the truckers in the Dominion of Canada, should have the right to be heard before the Board of Transport Commissioners. Anyone who has built their business up to the position that they hold today, I believe, as I said before, in the interests of fair play, they should have that right.

I might say in passing that I understand, in the United States today, that 20 per cent of all freight carried is carried by trucks. I do not think we have attained quite that position in Canada today, but I believe that it is growing year by year, and it is employing more people every year.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I want to move the above motion, seconded by Mr. Banks.

Mr. John G. Banks (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this motion, I would like to refer to the numbers of small truckers in every little town of Saskatchewan, and that seems to be their main means of livelihood, and I have heard, unofficially, that there are more people making their living out of trucking than there is out of the railroads.

I am particularly interested, also, in the fact that, in Kamsack, and the constituency where I live, we have not got the best rail connections. We are shunted off into one corner, there, and our big purchasing centre is Winnipeg. Now we have to depend on the trucks and it seems to me a remarkable thing, and I believe it will be quickly corrected, that these people could not be heard before the Board of Transport Commissioners, who were likely to make an order against them; and it is to correct that that this resolution is being adopted.

I believe it has the full support of all classes of trade in Saskatchewan. They have a pretty fair idea of just what the truckers do in the commercial life of Saskatchewan, and I am very glad to second this motion.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise in support of the Motion that is now before the Assembly.

I think it was in the year of 1885 that the first ribbons of steel reached the Pacific Coast, and at that time, and for a good many years following, we were of the opinion that we had the last word in transportation, but as time marched on, and as road conditions improved, such as they have in the province of Saskatchewan, we found an increasing tonnage of traffic moving off the rails on to the roads, and as the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) mentioned, there is an increased quantity, an increased weight of freight, moving from rails to the highways. And when the Board of Transport Commissioners was set up to give, and were given jurisdiction over rail freight rates, they exercised that jurisdiction, and later on exercised jurisdiction over water carriers and, quite recently — as a matter of fact in 1951 — air transportation was also included as coming under the jurisdiction of the Board of Transport Commissioners.

Back in October of 1946, in co-operation with six other provinces of the Dominion of Canada, we joined hands with a view of placing before the people of Canada our objections to the 31 per cent increase in freight rates asked for by the railways and heard before the Board of Transport Commissioners. There is quite a lengthy history attached to the many revenue cases, and particularly to the hearing of the Royal Commission on transportation. The provinces concerned — the Maritimes, Alberta, Manitoba,

March 31, 1952

British Columbia, and Saskatchewan — asked the Federal Government to set up a Royal Commission to make a thorough study and enquiry into all phases of transportation. The technical committee representing the Government of Saskatchewan placed the case, on behalf of the Government, before the Royal Commission, and in the preparation of the brief, Mr. Speaker, the Committee gave a great deal of thought to the position of highway transportation in relationship to the movement of freight; and in arguing before the Board of Transport Commissioners, the brief that was prepared by the technical committee, and approved of by the Government of Saskatchewan, had this to say insofar as highway transportation was concerned, and its relationship to the Board of Transport Commissioners:

“The Government of Saskatchewan, in September of 1949, asked the Royal Commission to give consideration to amendments to the Railway Act, whereby air and highway carriers would be considered as part of the responsibility of the Federal Board of Transport Commissioners.”

And on page 88 of the Saskatchewan submission, the Province had this to say:

“There seems little doubt that the control of the Board should be extended to the matter of inter-provincial trucking, both as to rates and the condition of service.

“The further opinion is expressed that the uniformity of control over all commercial trucking would be desirable, either through co-operation among the provinces, or by a vesting of jurisdiction in the Dominion to the end that control might be delegated to the Board.

“The Government of Saskatchewan is prepared at this time to surrender jurisdiction over freight rates in the case of all commercial trucking to the Board of Transport Commissioners, but it would wish to reserve such a measure of control as to protect the Provincial highways and also protect the revenue position of the Province.”

And Mr. MacPherson, counsel for the Province of Saskatchewan, in arguing Saskatchewan’s case before the Board of Transport Commissioners, drafted amendments to the Railway Act, which made provisions for the inclusion of highway transportation vehicles, to become part of the responsibility of the Board of Transport Commissioners.

When the Royal Commission made its report, it had this to say in connection with trucking, to be found on Page 279:

“All forms of trucking have increased considerably since 1937. The time has come when Parliament might well consider this question of control. There seems to be no valid reason why

those who carry on a business over which Parliament has jurisdiction (assuming this to be the case) in competition with others who are regulated in respect to the rates and operations, should not be asked to submit to a similar form of control.

“This, of course, does not mean that any one form of transportation should be regulated only for the benefit of the other.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns of the Government of the Province was in respect to the personnel of the Board of Transport Commissioners, and again in the brief, we asked that the Board of Transport Commissioners be so strengthened with Commissioners and with technical personnel so that they might, in turn, give proper consideration to highway transportation.

When the Acts came before Parliament, and were considered an amendment bringing air transportation under the control of the Board of Transport Commissioners was made, and our suggestions and recommendations relative to highway transportation were not included in the amendments to the Railway Act.

I think it was established on the Mackenzie Coachlines case, versus the Province of New Brunswick that a province does not have control over inter-provincial or international trucking. Therefore, it is assumed that the Federal Parliament of Canada has the control over inter-provincial and international trucking. Consequently, there appeared to be no legal reason why the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Transportation and the recommendations of the Government of Saskatchewan could not be carried out by an amendment to the Railway Act. So today, as the resolution suggests, Mr. Speaker, the trucking industry, particularly the trucking industry of Saskatchewan, along with the trucking industry from the head of the Great Lakes to the Pacific Coast, where highways are available, are faced with the question of whether or not the trucking industry can meet the competition of agreed charges. And the trucking industry, a very important and vital part of our whole transportation system, is now asking through this, and by this resolution to be heard by the Board of Transport Commissioners before a final decision is made in the disposition of the request by railways for an agreed charge.

As this affects, as the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) mentioned, a very substantial number of people, and it does affect a very strong industry — or rather, should I say, an industry with a very heavy investment — and a very substantial portion of that investment has been made by veterans of World War 2, using their gratuities to set themselves up in business, and now are faced with the elimination of their business. It is our information that this decision is to be made tomorrow. That being the case, the time factor becomes very important, and I sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Legislature will see fit to give unanimous approval of the resolution introduced by the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), and I can assure the member for Moosomin, based on our experience, based on the request of the Provincial Government, to place the truckers in a position where they may have a referee in the form of the

March 31, 1952

Board of Transport Commissioners, where they can appeal, and I have no hesitation in giving my wholehearted support at this time to this very timely resolution.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, if I had known it was coming up today, I would have procured a little more information for the House regarding this resolution. As a matter of fact, I was a bit surprised when I found that the truckers were asking for this. It is just a year ago last September when their organization at Winnipeg, strenuously fought against any interference by the Federal Government in the trucking industry control. And the year previous to that, at their annual meeting in Saskatoon, their Dominion Secretary opposed this very strenuously. On both those occasions I was in favour, and pointed out to the truckers the need — the very great need — for that organization coming under the jurisdiction of the transport Board, and I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that they have seen fit to change their opinion, and I am prepared to support this motion, this afternoon.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, it does appear to me that the denial of the right to the highway transport carriers to appear before the Board of Transport is a negation of a very important principle of democracy — that is, the right to be heard.

These men are vital, as has been pointed out, to the Transport system of Canada, and of this province. Here on the western plains we have not the competition of water such as they have in Ontario and Quebec, the Maritimes and B.C., and these men comprise hundreds of small, independent operators and as has been pointed out. Many of them are returned men who have chosen this means of rehabilitation; they have put in their rehabilitation grants and whatever money that have been able to save, into their trucks and transportation equipment, and now they are faced with disaster; so that I do make a special appeal with respect to the returned men who, in common with the returned men, generally in this province, have done a marvellous job in rehabilitating themselves, and becoming very vital citizens of this province. The Board of Transport is appointed by the Federal Government, and it seems to me that the least that can be done is to give the right of the Association representing these men, to appear; to whom else can they appear? The answer is, to no other body, no other authority, judicial or otherwise.

I can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would happen in this province if a bona fide organization of workers were denied the right to appear before, say our Labour Relations Board. We would hear about this in no uncertain terms, and yet here is an organization comprised of a great number of returned men who have no recourse, legal or otherwise, in this matter that is set forth in the preamble to this resolution, “whereas there is presently before the Board an application for approval of a certain Agreement”, and those interested vitally in the request for approval have no status to be heard under existing legislation.

I strongly support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I had no intentions of speaking on this, either, but I feel that it is an excellent thing to have this group given permission to make representation to the Board of Transport Commissioners.

Now, at the moment I have a letter in my office — I should have brought it with me, perhaps — and I would have, if I had known this was coming up, complaining that the truckers in that particular part of the province have been cutting rates. We all know that the rates of both the steam carrier and the trucker are set out according to law. Now, this complaint is to the effect that the truckers in the locality referred to — at least some of them — have been cutting rates, and there does not seem to be very much that can be done about it. A matter of that kind, of course, could be argued before the Board of Transport Commissioners, and something definite arrived at. Another complaint I have had is to the effect — and I do not want you to think, Mr. Speaker, I am an advocate for the steam carrier — but I am referring to a long-distance haul, of let us say, furniture; furniture that ordinarily needs to be crated. The steam carrier rate, let us say, is \$7.00 per cwt., but that furniture must be crated, which would cost you approximately another \$5 per cwt. The trucking rate use the \$7.00 that the carrier charges, plus the \$5.00 crating charge you would ordinarily have to pay, to ship by rail, but you do not have to crate when moving by truck; and \$12.00 is the trucking rate. I do not just think that is fair, and I think matters of this kind could be very well handled before the Board.

I do not think there is a great deal more to be said, Mr. Speaker. I feel that many situations of this kind would be clarified, and there is a great need for this group to have representatives appear before the Board of Transport Commissioners.

I will support the motion.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this motion, I first understood the motion to mean that it was purely a request to have the truckers heard by the Highway Transport Board, but after listening to some of the speakers — to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) and some of the others, I take it that the motion will mean more than that — that it will mean the Board of Transport Commissioners will be setting the rates for the truckers in Saskatchewan. That is the way I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs has interpreted the motion.

Now, I agree with the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) that the truckers do not wish this. They wish to have the rates controlled by themselves, and the Provincial Government, for reasons that under local conditions they could set the rates as they see they should be, with respect to the highways and transport difficulties that we have here. Now if the rates were set by the Board of Transport Commissioners, I do not think that same consideration would be obtainable to the truckers, because they would be set more on a Dominion-wide basis, and I think that the truckers of Saskatchewan would consequently suffer very much.

March 31, 1952

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I do not see anything about rates in the Resolution.

Mr. Deshaye: — I am not referring to rates any more than some of the other speakers that have spoken, Mr. Speaker.

However, I am not going to speak very long on this. I just want to set out my own position. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the motion.

Premier T.C. Douglas: — I had not intended to take part in this debate, but I believe my hon. friend misunderstood the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh). What we had argued was that interprovincial and international trucking should be under the Board of Transport Commissioners, instead of being in the indefinite position that they are now. We had never contended that rates on trucking inside the province should be affected, but under the present set-up, international and interprovincial trucking occupies a no-man's-land position.

Our suggestion to the Royal Commission was that this trucking industry ought to come under the Board of Transport Commissioners, and I think the second thing we had in mind was that any rates set for water, air or rail naturally affected the trucking industry, because any rates set by these other bodies would be in competition with the rates for the truckers, and the truckers should have the right, at any time, to appear before the Board of Transport Commissioners and place their case, since their livelihood could be affected and even jeopardized by any decision with reference to rates for the other three.

I do not think it was, at any time, suggested that the Board of Transport commissioners would set rates within Saskatchewan; but certainly I think my hon. friend appreciates that trucks running to Winnipeg and trucks running to United States or Alberta ought to come under some type of national control. I think that was the question to which the Minister of Municipal Affairs referred.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Speaker, with regard to what the Premier has said, I appreciate the explanation. The only thing is at the moment I cannot see why it was brought in, when I understand that the rates here to be affected, if they are, is only for a matter of, I think, up to 200 miles, and it is purely a provincial matter, and I understood, originally, that the motion was for a hearing, but apparently it goes further than that from what the speakers have said, and I do not think that the truckers want to come under the Board of Transport Commissioners at all. If there is any danger of that, I think we are leaving them open to a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Does the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) wish to exercise his privilege now?

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, in closing the debate, I want to thank the members on the Government side of the House for supporting this motion, and I also want to say, as some of the members have already stated, that there are many returned men — veterans — engaged

in this trucking business, and many of them have their entire livelihood tied up in it, and I think that that is a strong case in itself, why these people should be given a hearing. I believe that anyone is entitled to be heard at least. With those few words, I will close the debate, Mr. Speaker.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 99 — An Act to amend the Fur Act, 1950.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — The Fur Act at the present time allows permits to farmers to allow them to destroy beaver dams which may be on their land, and where the beavers are doing damage by flooding. A good many permits have been issued in the past, and in a good many cases too, beaver were trapped alive and moved to other parts of the province to provide foundation stock in those parts of the province. Now we no longer have any need for foundation stock in any parts of the province where the habitat is suitable for beaver, and the beaver have become so numerous that they are in some places becoming a bit of a problem. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Fur Conservation programme has met with such great success in most areas of the province that this necessity has arisen; the necessity for this amendment. On account of the great numbers of beaver, and they being very industrious animals, and building dams where they can make big ponds of water, and in many cases flooding hay land or pasture land, and in some cases actually they have been flooding crop lands.

It is interesting to me, and I think to members of the legislature, that the Fur Conservation programme has been as successful as this, that we got to the point where the beaver actually (in a good many cases) become a nuisance. I would like to point out that one important contributing factor to the success of the Fur Conservation programme has been the controlled marketing of muskrat and beaver pelt. Members will recall that some years ago in the agreement made between the Department of Natural Resources and the Indian Affairs Branch of the Indian Government, to set up a Fur Conservation block in Northern Saskatchewan, this Conservation block was divided into conservation areas, and in each area a trapper's council was organized and later, an annual convention of trappers was also provided for. The trappers in each area exercised very free democratic rights in appointing the members of their council, and also in appointing the delegates to the Convention.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the agreement with the Indian Affairs Branch, pelts of beaver and muskrat were to be handled in accordance with the provincial regulations which are passed under the authority of the Fur Act. These regulations provided that these pelts were to be delivered by the trappers to a representative of the Department of Natural Resources, and they are then delivered to the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service for

March 31, 1952

sale for the account of the trapper. This programme was an entirely new one in Northern Saskatchewan; there was naturally some opposition to it, particularly from traders who had purchased these furs previously.

I have no doubt that many advantages have accrued to the trappers through selling these furs through the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing service. Many reports of sales published in the trade journals of eastern Canada could be produced, indicating that the prices received for the furs on this market were the very best. In addition, the fact that all muskrat and beaver pelts from Saskatchewan went through this one sale, did establish a reputation for Saskatchewan furs, due to the way they were handled, and put up for the buyer. This controlled marketing policy, as I think I previously intimated, has been very valuable in maintaining control of the quotas of pelts to be taken, and has consequently been of great value in the conservation areas, in putting into practise the best in conservation and has brought, as a result, greatly increased harvests of furs to the trappers.

The records (and this, I might mention, is not a matter of opinion) show that the five-year average take of beaver from 1941-45 was 1,409 pelts per year. The six-year average from 1946-51 inclusive has been 8,225 pelts. The average for the last three years has been 12,790 beaver pelts, and the annual take now, this year will, I believe, be over 15,000. In the case of muskrats there is a similar story to be told; for a five-year average, 1941-45 there were just under 163,000 and for the six-year average, 1946-51 the take was 466,000 pelts.

Now, there have been some disadvantages to this method of marketing. Farmers in southern Saskatchewan would undoubtedly object very strongly, if the compulsory marketing of grain was abandoned. The northern trappers have not had the same long experience of co-operative and orderly marketing, and their attitude towards the compulsory feature of this programme is not nearly as unanimously in favour of it, as is the feeling of the farmers in the south, in regard to the marketing of their grain. The trappers get an advance payment on the furs when he delivers them to a representative of the Department of Natural Resources, but there is some unavoidable delay before he gets the final returns, even though the marketing service gets the final check-out within 10 days after each sale.

Any controlled or compulsory marketing programme has a weakness, in that it is difficult to make fair comparisons of the results achieved; when dealers cannot buy these furs it is, of course, very easy for them to offer high prices, and this has, undoubtedly created some discontent. There has always been some complaints on the part of the trappers in regard to this plan, and I believe that is to be expected. There undoubtedly will always be some complaints with any programme, whether it is a controlled programme; whether it is a co-operative programme operated by the trappers themselves.

Now, this programme of controlled marketing is not necessary to the economy of Saskatchewan, nor is it necessary to ensure the success of the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing service. The sales conducted by the Fur Marketing service have established such a reputation that they will attract furs from trappers and dealers, and they will attract buyers from the centres in the eastern part of this continent.

This programme was only put into effect for the benefit of the trappers, to get better prices for their furs, and also providing for a better conservation programme, resulting in greater harvests of fur. Undoubtedly, many hundreds of thousands of dollars extra have gone back into the hands of the trappers, due to this programme of direct selling. Some trappers' meetings have passed resolutions opposing this controlled marketing of furs, but the trappers in their annual conventions, of which there have been three, have always, by a substantial majority, supported the controlled policy of marketing muskrat and beaver pelts. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that at these conventions the trappers are under no restrictions, and do speak their mind freely, and vote as they please.

I would like to see this programme continued, because it is in the best interests of the trappers. Only by having their furs go direct to the market, such as the Fur Marketing service, can the trappers get the best possible prices. Only in this way can they continue to maintain the high reputation which has been established for Saskatchewan beaver and muskrat.

In addition there is the assurance of continued success of the conservation programme. I would like to see this programme continued until the trappers can organize in co-operatives, so that they can take responsibility for, and manage, their own market, but I realize that it is not possible to continue indefinitely in doing good to people if it is against their will, and therefore if, any time that the trappers' convention votes against this orderly controlled marketing, I will certainly consider their recommendation with favour and will, of necessity, take up the matter with the Indian Affairs Branch.

I can say also that we have had in the main, very fine co-operation from the officials of the Indian Affairs Branch. I thought, on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, when we had reached the point where some of these valuable furs had become a nuisance in certain places, it was an opportune time to review in brief the situation which exists, and some of the things which have been done and to give this information to the members of the House.

I would move that Bill 99 — An Act to amend the Fur Act, 1950 be read a second time.

Mr. L.L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 99 says one thing, that a farmer will have the right to pull out a beaver dam. I think the Minister of Natural Resources is quite a way away from the beaver dam when he gets four pages of written speech made out, boosting up the conservation and marketing service of furs. Now, I suppose I can go just as far.

So far as the conservation is concerned, I have not very much to say about this. I just took a note or two while he was speaking. The conservation is good, but it is by no means the first in this province. It is copied after Manitoba, who has a very much better system. You can conserve

March 31, 1952

anything very easily by just calling a closed season on any brand of fur, and that fur will increase, and you will have all kinds of fur the next time you go to trap it. You can do that with beaver, and you can do it with rats. That is all you have to do to get a lot more fur — anytime you want to boost up the crop.

So far as the compulsory marketing service is concerned, that is absolutely no good, and it does not link in with conservation in any way whatsoever. There is nothing you have to do to link one up with the other, and as far as that is concerned, no wonder the trappers have kicked because in times gone by they have had one-third of their gross returns taken for a rake-off by this marketing service. They have become a little more lenient since we showed them up on a few of their returns, and they do not take quite so much anymore, but they take plenty yet.

The trappers do not like it for another reason. They did have a chance to sell their furs, and often times the buyers of furs did not always make money; sometimes they lose money, and perhaps their judgment is bad, but it is one thing for sure, when a trapper goes there and sells his furs, he can get food and he can get money, and make a complete deal on his furs; he does not need to wait for half the winter to get his money.

Now, as far as these conventions are concerned, if you want an opinion of the trappers, just call a trappers' convention once. Don't have a bunch of "front" men from the Department of Natural Resources, and the Indian Department down at Ottawa go there and dominate that meeting, and make every suggestion, and these fellows sitting there, and they do not know what you are going to do to them if they do not follow in line. But you fellows just get out of that room and let them make their decision once, and you may see something quite a bit different.

I will support this pulling out a beaver dam, but that is all we have to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The mover of the motion is about to exercise his privilege of closing the debate. Anyone wishing to speak must do so now.

(Closing Debate)

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, this debate is kind of a closed corporation — you have to have a membership ticket to get into it; just the member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) and I . . . , the Premier suggests that maybe we should have coon-skin hats!

But the member for Turtleford did make one or two statements which I would like to comment on. One was when he referred to conservation, saying there is nothing to conservation — just call a closed season. Mr. Speaker, that is not conservation in the properly understood meaning of it at all. Conservation means not just no open season in trapping; it means taking off the proper harvest of furs with an idea of getting the maximum average harvest over a term of years, and you cannot do that by just closing the season. It takes management just as much in fur as it does in raising cattle, and it is a little more difficult because the

animals are not so easy to control, and the factors affecting them are not so easy to control. But conservation is a great deal more than just the closed season.

I must also disagree, as many other people, including a great many trappers, that the controlled marketing did not have something to do with conservation. It certainly — there was a situation in northern Saskatchewan where there was a great deal of “bootlegging” of furs, and having a controlled marketing made it a great deal easier to control that bootleg handling of fur and bootleg trapping of fur, beyond quotas. The hon. member said we copied conservation from other places in Canada. I am not going to argue about whether we did or not, but sometimes the techniques of being wise is to have enough sense to copy a good thing from somebody else, and certainly it was this government that did copy it.

Then, when the trappers go to the dealer he can get a complete deal, and not have to wait half the winter. Well, in the first place, they do not have to wait half the winter, and in the second place they always get an advance, so that they can carry on and get food. As I stated in my moving of the motion, there is among the trappers in the north, some discontent on account of having to wait for that final payment, but I think that hon. members will recognize that even that is no harm to the trappers in the long-run, and does help to spread their income out. We do get it out to them as fast as possible, and there is not very much unavoidable delay.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

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