

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Twelfth Legislature
8th Day

Monday, February 21, 1955

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Friday, February 18, 1955, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Dewhurst for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon J.A. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural and Mineral Resources) (cont.): — Mr. Speaker, in the first part of my speech I dealt with the Department on Natural Resources except in regard to Forestry. On that occasion I made reference to the speech made by the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) on Thursday last. I was very sorry that he was not in the House on Friday. I was sorry, also, that the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Ripley) was not present when I discussed fur marketing and mining roads in the north. I am very happy to see that they are both in the House today.

The hon. member for Meadow Lake, in his speech Thursday, charged that our conservation officer compelled fishermen to watch the fish after dressing them. As I pointed out Friday, this is completely untrue. He also charged that we prosecuted without warning a Mr. Bedard for transporting fish without having the boxes marked with a lake of origin. As a matter of fact, Mr. Bedard should need no warning. He knows the law very well. However, he was warned, and the charge made by the hon. member was completely without foundation. What the hon. member did not tell us was probably more important. He did not tell us that Mr. Bedard threatened our conservation officer after this incident, and said that he would "get him." He did not point out to us in regard to the petition, purported to be signed by fishermen asking for the removal all the conservation officer, that the signatures were obviously not signatures of fishermen, but of people who are quite accustomed every day to using the pen and pencil.

He did not tell us, when he was talking about the fish being spoiled, that Mr. Clarke was fishing on an isolated lake without having any facilities for keeping the fish, and that, when the fish did spoil, he wanted that Department off Natural Resources to pay for them. In one case at least one hundred boxes of fish stayed on Dominion Dock on Dore Lake for three days in the month of June. That is not too good for fish.

Now, the hon. member referred to a paper given by Mr. Valentine, our anthropologist. Valentine worked for us in the summer of 1952. At that time he was finishing up getting his Master's degree. He was not employed by us when he delivered this paper. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, after he delivered the paper we hired him again, and he is now on permanent staff, which I think is an indication that we want to have fair and constructive criticism. Certainly, the paper is critical as it should be, and is that we wanted it to be.

I would like to quote from that paper. First of all, it was presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association

February 21, 1955

in London, June 4, 1953. The material was collected during the summer of 1952. The quotation I want to make is this:

“In northern Saskatchewan where they number 3,550 approximately, they (that is, the Métis people) experienced no changes in this way of life until 1944 when the C.C.F. party came into power.”

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it sounds like stagnation before 1944. The hon. member quoted this line:

“Prior to 1944 the Métis were dependent on wild life for sustenance.”

But he did not quote this one:

“Further, the yearly work cycle and the credit system were so interwoven that he was always in debt to the Trader, and it had become the accepted mode of living.”

Let us go on to the next page. Some hon. members may like to have a race of people living in a debt economy; I don't. On the next page we find this:

“By 1944 (and this was not quoted by the hon. member) it was no longer possible for the Métis to live in this fashion. The depletion of wild life, coupled with the disappearance of the demand for long-haired furs such as fox, and an increase in population through immigration from the south, had combined to produce an economic situation which made outside help mandatory. In some regions the Métis had become almost totally dependent upon Family Allowances and provincial relief monies.”

And another short quotation. This is one that the hon. member used:

“Before 1944, for one reason or another, the general populace of Saskatchewan was not particularly concerned with the conditions under which the Métis of the north dwelt, or with the development of northern natural resources.”

What he did not quote was this:

“Hence there were no definite policies on the part of the government.”

I believe he quoted this one. He said:

“These programmes, though well meant, have been met with resistance from the outset since the Métis have seen them as threats to their entire customary mode of living.”

And I think that is correct. I think it is also correct that my hon. friend opposite is helping to build up and increase that resistance, even though we recognize that these people now face a situation where they have no choice but to change their mode of living. And one of the reasons, of course, for population pressure in the north is because of the health services that have been instigated by this Government. Infant mortality has dropped very materially

because of pre-natal and post-natal space care, hospitals, doctors and nurses. Another quotation — and this he did not read:

“In fairness to the present government, however, it should be clearly understood that these programmes were meant to assist the natives rather than to hinder them in any way. If they have not done so, it has been owing to the erroneous, but common assumption on the part of administrators that an economic logic which has been derived from a Euro-Canadian society can be imposed upon a people who have a totally different social background.”

I would be the first to admit that mistakes have been made. As I said on Friday, we are like the teacher who wrote on Johnny’s report card: “Johnny’s arithmetic is a disgrace to both of us, but I try and he doesn’t.” Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will take any more time with that.

The forests of Saskatchewan are one of our major resources. One of the bright spots in regard to forests is that they are renewable. If we take care of them, as long as the sun shines and rainfalls we can continue to harvest valuable crops from them. In the heart of the commercial forest belt, approximately 30,000 square miles, for which we have the inventory completed, we find that we have nearly 8 billion cubic feet of wood in all trees four inches in diameter and over. That is a tremendous amount of wood. Obviously we cannot harvest it all at once. Only a comparatively small fraction of that will be available at any time. For some, unfortunately, there is not a market at the present time. Some is scattered timber and on that account is not good commercial. Much of it is young and growing timber which is going to put on a good increment every year for many years to come. Of this total inventory nearly half are soft woods. Soft woods consist of pine, white and black spruce, balsam fir and tamarack. The balance is hardwood. It is an interesting thing that, according to our inventory we have over one million board feet of elm, of saw timber size, in the eastern part of the province, in the river valleys — the Saskatchewan River valley and the Red Deer River valley and others.

Our forests, on account of their location in relation to the highly populated centres and large consuming centres, are at a disadvantage, and that is one of the problems which we have to face now — the question of freight rates and getting the products to market. Otherwise, our forests, to the forest industry and to foresters, are very satisfactory. In fact, they say that nowhere in Canada is there a better setup for fire prevention and fire control than we have here. Our terrain is good. It is comparatively easy to build access roads to get the timber out. We now have a committee between Agriculture and Resources to deal with the question of boundaries of provincial forests and to make recommendations to this Legislature. I think that this means that our forest boundaries are stabilized to a very considerable extent and that, too, is essential.

The forest industry likes our approach to the idea of management, of conservation, of planning for a perpetual yield from our forests. We have opportunity in Saskatchewan for four pulp or paper mills, and other well-balanced forest industries. One pulp company, as the House knows, had an option. They still have that option, and are still paying rent on the ground. Whether or not they will take it up remains to be seen; but if they do not take it up, one of the big factors will be the freight rates on the products going to the markets on this continent. Progress is definitely being made in

February 21, 1955

this line, and I should give credit to the Industrial Development Office, which is under the direction of the Premier, for the good work they have done in making known our resources. I should give credit also to my own staff in my own Department of Natural Resources.

With regard to these forests I want to say this. Whether or not we are getting full utilization now, we can be sure that, as the years pass, they are going to become more and more desirable and more valuable. We have few resources that have greater potential value than our forests, and let us not sell them short. Let us protect them and take care of them, because that is going to pay off, not so much for this generation, but for generations to come. I believe it is in Proverbs, Mr. Speaker, where it is said that a good man leave with an inheritance for his children's children. In regard to forestry, to our forests, let us try to be good men.

I would like now to go onto the Department of Mineral Resources and its responsibilities. This is not only the Golden Jubilee year for the province of Saskatchewan, but it is also the Silver Jubilee for the transfer of resources to the province of Saskatchewan. Twenty-five years ago Saskatchewan got its public domain and though 1905 may be an important date, 1930 also is as very important date.

The first coal was mined in Saskatchewan in 1880; there is no record of the amount. Then in 1887 some 400 tons of coal were produced in Saskatchewan. By 1905, this had increased to 107,000 tons. But in 1905, of course, we had no oil wells, no mines in the north and no production of salt or sodium sulphate. No one had even thought of potash. Let us come along, then, to the next date, 1930. We had still no oil wells in the province of Saskatchewan, though by that time we had 33 dry holes drilled in the province. In 1930, we had one mine at Flin Flon. Incidentally, that mine was discovered about 1916 and did not go into operation until 1927 and then it was on a pilot plant basis really, of 50 tons of ore per day. By 1938 was stepped up to 3,000 tons of ore per day.

The year 1930 is outstanding because then the strip-mining of coal was really established in a successful way in Saskatchewan. In that year one-half million tons of coal were produced. Sodium sulphate had already got a start, and we produced, that year, 31,000 tons. There was no salt produced and no potash.

Since 1930, when the resources were transferred to the province, we have had four years of Conservative government, 10 years of Liberal government and a little over 10 years of C.C.F. government. My hon. friends sometimes like to make comparisons. I think probably this would be a very good time to make some comparisons to show the progress that has been made in Saskatchewan. I suggest that we allow the Conservative government the four years just to get their feet set on the ground, and take a look at these two 10-year periods.

In 1933-35, we had a salt mine operating in Saskatchewan at Simpson. It produced 774 tons. But in 1944, we had no salt production. In 1954, nearly 37,000 tons were produced. In 1944, the sodium sulphate production was about 75,000 tons; last year, 165,000 tons. Coal production, in 1944, was 1,600,000 tons; last year, 2,100,000 tons. In 1944 we had one hard rock mine — the same one that I referred to before — at Flin Flon. Now in 1955, we have four mines producing and one selling stock-piled ore. By the end of this year or next year, we will have six or seven more mines and production in Saskatchewan. There are excellent prospects for at least five more mines in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any other jurisdiction, any other areas, where a more rapid development of mines, development of mineral resources, has taken place than in northern Saskatchewan during the last few years. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said he was not satisfied with the revenue from minerals. Might I take this opportunity to remind him that, when his party was in power in Saskatchewan and they had one mine, they did not make much of their opportunity. They collected in royalty an average of three-quarters of one per cent of the value of the ore. We are collecting approximately five per cent of the value of the ore. The fact of the matter is that, during that 10-year Liberal term of office, the Liberal government missed four or five million dollars of revenue from minerals in the province of Saskatchewan, and yet, in those depression years to which my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) refers, I remember how they used to complain about no money. They did not try very much, Mr. Speaker.

During the Liberal term of office there was one more mine, and that was the Box Mine at Goldfields. It started in the late 'thirties and closed down a year or so later. I feel sure that, had we had a C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan at that time, the Liberals would have been blaming the C.C.F. government for getting that mine closed down. It was not the fault of the Liberals; it was not a good enough mine; but I can just picture them trying to put the blame on us for that.

Let us look at the claim-staking record in the province of Saskatchewan. Let me remind my hon. friends that these minerals were not placed in northern Saskatchewan in 1944. Let me remind them, too, that, ever since the first world war, there have been aeroplanes flying into northern Saskatchewan and canoes, of course, for centuries going through that country. The highest record of claim staking in any year The average number of claims state per year when the Liberals were in office was 376; our average is almost 10 times as much, 3,571.

Mr. Cameron: — Yet they found a mine.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Incidentally, the Manitoba record for claim staking was 6,700. Let us look at the mineral claims in force. In 1944, there were 402 mineral claims in force; on the same date in 1954, 23,935. The figures tell the story.

Saskatchewan is now a major producer of uranium. The population of Uranium City in February, 1953, was about 250; now it is 930. The population in the Beaverlodge area is about 2,900 at the present time, very close to 3,000. I am going to give some information, or you may call it a guess, as to the production of uranium. I want to tell the House that this guess I am going to make is deduced from information which has already been published. You know that information in regard to production of uranium is classified; it is confidential. And so, if we are going to make any estimate, we have to pick up what is published and put it together, and make the best guess we can. Mr. W.J. Bennett, president of Atomic Energy of Canada, predicts \$100 million production of uranium in Canada by 1957. By taking other figures from Mr. Bennett's own report, we can predict that Saskatchewan will produce in 1957 nearly 40 per cent of that amount, or close to \$40 million of uranium will be produced in Saskatchewan in 1957. Again, by taking certain figures and deducing from them I can assume that the production of uranium in Saskatchewan was valued at about \$8 1/2 million in 1954. I do not know how many pounds that means, because the price is not constant.

February 21, 1955

I would like to point out to the House that this is approximately the same amount as the value of crude oil produced in Saskatchewan in 1954. Few of us thought that uranium production would do anything like that at this time. It must be remembered, of course, that the comparison is not absolutely accurate because in the case of uranium it is the value of a partly processed product, whereas in the case of oil it is a raw product, the crude.

I heard Dr. Spinks all of the University of Saskatchewan on the C.B.C. a month or two ago, giving a talk entitled "Atoms for Peace." He said this:

"One thing that would help a great deal in the early realization of the peaceful use of atoms and atomic energy would be an acceptance by me and you and the man in the street that there is nothing magical in the release of atomic energy, that it is really quite everyday and matter of course, like getting in a car and stepping on the gas."

He went on to point out that "uranium is the 20th century symbol of good or evil, and I would say let our slogan be 'Atoms for peace'."

In regard to potash I believe it was first discovered in a well in Saskatchewan in 1943. In 1944, a seam of potash 90 feet thick was discovered in a well in southern Saskatchewan; but it was 7,400 feet below the surface, too deep to be commercial. Then in 1946, we had the discovery at Unity. Now we have six companies with 1 1/2 million acres of land prospecting for potash; one company sinking a shaft down nearly 1,200 feet, the other preparing to sink a shaft. Saskatchewan has one of the most extensive potash fields in the world. There is no doubt about it that a large and stable industry is developing here.

May I say at this time that oil was not placed in Saskatchewan in 1944 either. It was here for a long time. To listen to some of my hon. friends you would think that it just wasn't here until 1944. But, Mr. Speaker, we have the proof that it was here, because in 1940, when we had a Liberal government here, there were produced 331 barrels with a value of \$256. Commercial oil production really started in 1945 in the last nine months of that year with the very small production of 60 barrels per day. By 1949, this had become 2,100 barrels a day. Four years later, in 1953, we were producing at the rate of 7,600 barrels a day; and last year, our production was at the rate of approximately 14,800 barrels a day.

I am going to stick my neck out and do a little predicting. We estimate that in 1955, this year of Jubilee, we will produce about 12½ million barrels of oil, or 35,000 barrels a day. That is not all guesswork by any means. By 1957 I predict we will produce 25-million barrels of oil, or 70,000 barrels a day. And by 1960 — the hon. member for Arm River will certainly be able to laugh at this one — I estimate that we will be able to produce in that year 50 million barrels of oil, or 140,000 barrels a day. Mr. Speaker, I may be here in 1960 to quote these figures again.

Mr. Cameron: — Very questionable.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Natural gas . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You've got lots of it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is not the kind that arose on either side of the House just now. In 1953, the production of gas was 1,600,000,000 cubic feet; last year, 4,900,000,000 cubic feet. That is going to increase too, depending on markets, depending on volumes proved up and discovered.

Let us take a look at the question of wells capable of producing oil. I am sorry that I have to pay so little time to the 10 years that the Liberals were in office, but really there is so little to say about it, because in this case, in the matter of wells capable of production, it was one well for one month. In 1953, at the end of the year, we had 792 oil wells capable of production, 89 gas, a total of 881 oil or gas.

Premier Douglas: — In 1953?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, in 1953. On December 31, 1954, we had 1,211 wells capable of producing oil or gas. What I want to point out is that there was an increase in the year of 330 wells — not so far from one new producer at day; and I think the odds are excellent at that in this year we will act, or on the average, a new producer per day.

Let us look at the drilling record. In the 10-year period the Liberals were here the record was 25 wells in 1943, but 12 of them were less than 250 feet deep, and only five of them could be classed as deep wells, that is, 2,000 feet or more. Now let us look at the next 10-year period. We had 830 wells in 1954, and of those 434 were development wells and 396 were wildcat wells. Mr. Speaker, I prophesy a thousand wells for the Jubilee year.

In pipeline, the story is the same. In 1944, we had approximately none; now we have a thousand miles of pipeline in the province of Saskatchewan, besides the gathering systems in the fields. Of that thousand miles, 280 miles is double. The principal lines are Interprovincial Oil Pipeline. I know we got that because we are between the Alberta fields and the market, but it is an asset to Saskatchewan and it is being used to carry Saskatchewan oil and it is a part of the development of Saskatchewan. The Saskatoon-Brock-Colville gas line (the Saskatoon Pipeline Company) a pipeline from Smiley Oil Fields to the Interprovincial Pipeline, and then from the interprovincial pipeline to Saskatoon. The Southern Saskatchewan pipeline from Fosterton to Regina: at the present time that pipeline is full of oil and oil is being used from Fosterton fields in Regina and in Moose Jaw today at the rate of about 5,000 barrels a day. Now, this is part of a system to take that oil to a market at St. Paul, Minnesota. If both come to Regina, then down the Interprovincial Line, then another line from Clearbrook, Minnesota, over to St. Paul. Those lines are built; the refinery is being built, and it is interesting to note that the storage necessary in connection with this pipeline at Swift Current, at Regina, at Clearbrook, at St. Paul plus the two pieces of pipeline, Fosterton to Regina, and Clearbrook to St. Paul, will hold 1,300,000 barrels of oil just to fill them up, without getting any oil through at the other end. We also have the short pipeline down at Wapella, of course.

This business is going to go ahead, too, because talk is already going about the construction of a pipeline from the Midale-Frobisher-Alida-Nottingham area to the Interprovincial Pipeline and from the Eastend-Dollard area to Swift Current. Undoubtedly we will have the Trans-Canada gas line, and gas lines to server other communities in the province of Saskatchewan.

February 21, 1955

Let us take a look at the total value of minerals produced in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The average for the 10 years the Liberals were in office was \$11 1/2 million; the average for our 10 years is \$40 million. But this probably is not fair; we should pick a better objective than the record of the Liberal party in gas.

Mr. Danielson: — What's the difference?

Mr. Cameron: — Taxes are going up.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, I want to point out that Saskatchewan, as you know, Mr. Speaker is a wheat province.

Mr. Danielson: — All grist to the mill for you.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The average cash income in Saskatchewan in the 10 years 1944 to 1953 inclusive, from wheat was \$326 million. The average cash income from the sale of livestock for the same period was \$130 million. The average from the sale of dairy products was \$21 million. Mr. Speaker, in 1954, the value of all minerals produced in Saskatchewan was almost one-fifty of the value of the average value of wheat sold during that 10-year period. Minerals are becoming a much more important and larger slice of our provincial economy. The estimated value of minerals produced in 1954 is \$63 million. By 1957 the value of minerals produced in Saskatchewan will be over one-third of its 10-year average income from wheat. It will be equal to the average income from livestock; or it will be six times the value of the average value of dairy products over those 10 years. I will go one step further to 1960, because I am going to come back and talk to you about the oil figures at that time anyway, and the value of minerals produced in Saskatchewan will be over one-half of the average cash income from wheat in the 10 years 1944 to 1953 inclusive. Saskatchewan is fast building a new economy, even though my hon. friends opposite shut their eyes and refuse to look at it.

Mr. McDonald: — Cannot see it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, one look at revenue and expenditures concerning resources, and this includes all resources handled by The Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Mineral Resources. The comparison would be much, much better if I took mineral resources alone.

10 years ago, in the fiscal year 1943-44, the revenue from all resources was \$1,682,000; in the last completed fiscal year the revenue was \$11,267,000. The expenditure of resources by the Government in 1943-44 was \$512,000, just over half a million dollars. Last year, 1953-54 we spent \$3,219,000. But let us come to the final figure — the balance of net. In 1943-44 it was \$1,170,000; and 1953-54, the balance was \$8,048,000, nearly seven times as much.

It is also interesting to note that in the three years ending March 31, 1953, Saskatchewan's mineral revenue was ahead of Nova Scotia's — what kind of government have they got there? It was ahead of Manitoba's and was ahead of British Columbia's. And this year will probably be ahead of four provinces. So don't let us forget that Saskatchewan is rapidly building a diversified economy on in a good and sound base.

I think it is fitting at this time, as this is our Golden Jubilee year, to pay tribute to the people of the first 50 years in the province of Saskatchewan, the pioneers who opened up the country, the pioneers who went into all parts of the province, into the forests, and into the rock country to mine, the people ventured and risked to develop this new country. They deserve tribute and this story of their achievements, of the people of the first half-century of Saskatchewan, is an epic story.

Some of us, at the end of this half-century, can look back and say we were born here in Saskatchewan. To some of us this has been our land for a long time. Some of us are comparative newcomers. But, Mr. Speaker, each one of the nearly million people here in Saskatchewan can say that we are proud to be a part of the province of Saskatchewan and its achievements. I do not believe that there are any of us who can look into the future, into the next 50 years of development in the province of Saskatchewan, and see what is going to happen in that half-century. But if each of us who is here plays out his part in the second half-century as well as the pioneers who have done with their courage, their ability, their resourcefulness, their determination and with their brotherly love, we need not fear about the future of our beloved province.

Mr. Speaker I will support the Motion.

Mr. James Ripley (Athabaska): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. It is very gratifying to me to see members from the other side of the House take an interest in the north country the way they have, and there seems to be more shown every year.

I would also like to congratulate our Minister of Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) on his very effort, and to hear of, and see, many of these wonderful developments that are taking place; but in the past 10 years of general prosperity all over Canada, it would be rather amazing if Saskatchewan had not gone ahead with the other provinces, and for these developments that we have at the present time I think we can be thankful for them — not because of this Government, but in spite of it. It had to take place sooner or later. It will carry on that way in the future, I hope.

We have had several occasions to mention the north, and there has been little discussion about what areas the north are and so forth. So I would like to define this term of the 'north country' that I am going to speak of, and taking it from the 55th parallel latitude north to the end of the province at the 60th parallel. That is five parallels a latitude of the 11 that are in the province. It is thus pretty close to half of the entire province.

There has been much discussion lately, too, of the development of uranium, and many people have become greatly interested in the possibilities of northern Saskatchewan. I would like to see the people here in the south become even more interested, if possible, because it is going to be to their advantage in the future. When the increase in resources does take place, and there is more development, it will ease the tax burden considerably. We have a tremendous future in the north and resources and, in time, I hope they will see more development. At the present time practically none of them are being developed to any extent. Even the Beaver Lodge development and Flin Flon are only just scratches on the surface of the future minds that can be brought into

production, and the amount of mineral resources that we have.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: —Look to the next 50 years, as I was telling you.

Mr. Ripley: — Some of these developments have a very real value, and to make a comparison of the possible values, I would like to point out that the Hudson Bay mine at Flin Flon has been in operation for over 20 years and the area being mined is still, roughly, the area of two mineral claims. When you imagine that, after 20 years of mining operations, you are still in the area of two mineral claims, and yet we have, in the Throne Speech of, last year, 18,000 mineral claims; this year, 7,290, and this is a second record year; but the Hudson Bay mine at Flin Flon contributes, roughly, \$1 1/4 million in royalties, per year, to this province and they only have half of that mine in the province, or one mineral claim. We have now 25,000 mineral claims recorded, and it is the second record year. I say it is the second record year of zero production on any mineral claims except those in Flin Flon.

Now, to move up to Beaver lodge, to the uranium area. It is a very long trip from one end of the producing area to the other. It is about 300 miles north from Flin Flon to Beaver lodge, and the entire width of the province separates it from the east to west. As I mentioned last year, these two points, though so widely separated, are on the pre-Cambrian shield, the greatest mineral-bearing a formation on the American continent. At Beaver lodge, of course, is all our great resorts is of radio-active minerals, which we hope to have in production before very long.

The presence of these minerals is not a new discovery either. They were here many, many years ago, and the occurrence of pitchblende was reported in government geological reports as far back as 1928, along with other mineral-bearing formations in that area. The Black Bay fault and the St. Louis fault, the breaks in the earth's structure which brings these minerals to the surface, were plotted and mapped in the early 'thirties; but there was not much interest in radioactivity. Gold was the main feature at that time, and still aided a great deal in the development of that country and is a big asset there at the present time. If it had not been for that gold operation in the early 'thirties, the production of uranium now would have been delayed for some years, because it was the gold operation, operated by the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, which made it possible for us to have the power we have there now. They built the power plant and the power line to Goldfields, and that power was converted over to the Eldorado and Nesbitt Labine properties when they were starting to do their work there.

The gold discovery also started in the boat transportation system that they use from Waterways and up across the lake; they have very reasonable freight rates, and they have a good transportation system. You will realize that both these mines, though far apart, are the only two industrial plants in Saskatchewan that are using hydro-electric power, and they have means of transportation, reasonable transportation, the volume of power.

The reason I point that out, Mr. Speaker, is that we have, in northern Saskatchewan, tremendous hydro-electric resources and, as the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) was saying, we have power lines now (I believe he said) that would span the province 17 times or go around the earth at the equator. Well, we would not have to go a great distance such as that to develop hydro-electric power on a good solid basis in Saskatchewan. It would take a long-term view of things to have it done probably — maybe 20 or 25 years of planning to write off the cost of a development like that; but it would bring cheap power to all the province. When you can get power at a power rate of one

cent per kilowatt and light rate of three cents per kilowatt, it is going to be a big asset to industry here. That is one of the difficulties that is holding up the future of industry in Saskatchewan, such as this pulp mill we have been hearing about, that has not produced anything yet; but their big problem is power and transportation. They have to have cheap power. They have to have a large volume of power, and they have to have transportation.

In the 10 years this Government has been in office, I believe they have had every opportunity in the world to look forward to having extended railway transportation farther north, and to have gone into the possibilities of power development in the north, so that any industry that did come in what have the benefit of cheap power and transportation, because these properties in the north have been there for a long time, and they have been known, and they will need the assistance of this Government to go ahead with transportation and power. There is the base metal property at Lac la Ronge. There is a low grade ore body there, and the problem will be power and transportation to develop this industry. And any mining development in the centre of the province is going to face the same difficulties; it is going to need power and transportation. They cannot go any farther ahead at the present time until that situation is cleared up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on the fishing industry in the Churchill River. For the past couple of years we have been producing sturgeon there. The season, this past year, was opened with a quota of 6,000 lbs. That is not enough fish to keep six men busy, and yet it is supposed to be a measure to provide summer revenue to all the residents on the river. I believe there were 14 licences issued to catch 6,000 lbs. of sturgeon, and then they were also restricted to fishing in that portion of the river within their trapping blocks. Why fishing should be restricted to trapping regulations I do not know, but they were. Before the season was nearly over the quota of 6,000 lbs. was taken and an increase was requested; and within about a week of the end of the season and additional 2,000 lbs. was added. Why this tight-fisted policy is necessary I do not know, because the Churchill River quota in Manitoba was opened at the beginning of the season at 25,000 lbs.

In setting such a low quota here in Saskatchewan it destroys the incentive of those men who are fishing; when they have such a low quote it does not encourage them to fish very strenuously when they know they are going to be up to the quota in a short time anyway. For conservation or any of those measures, it is not necessary to set that quota so low either; the net takes care of that to a certain extent. Then on top of that, even if the quota in Saskatchewan was set at 30,000 lbs., it is always at the direction of the Minister to close the season at any time he sees fit, if he sees the fish stock is being depleted. So I do not see why these quotas could not be set at as reasonably high a level to begin the season, and why we should protect sturgeon to such a great extent and then have them go down the river into Manitoba where they take 25,000 lbs. I don't think they took the whole quota, but that quota was available for them.

I would like to say these few words on the fur marketing service. The people in the north are very pleased over the vote in the last annual trapper's convention at Prince Albert. They have been opposed, up in that northern area, to compulsory marketing ever since it was introduced, and those delegates from the north voted every year against the compulsory marketing of their products. When Mr. Brockelbank addressed the meeting as to the resolution against compulsory marketing, he pointed out several circumstances which would impede the change to open market of furs. These difficulties are understandable, and the northern trappers accept them; but when he also added that the delays could

be overcome by next fall, they fully expect that to be done and they expect that any legislation which is necessary to achieve free marketing will be introduced at this Session of the House.

One of Mr. Brockelbank's remarks which interested me at that meeting was that, in reference to compulsory markets, sixteen delegates of the 44 had voted for compulsory markets, and that their wishes would have to be considered so that they could have compulsory markets in their area if they wished. Now I consider that a very democratic attitude, but I wondered why he did not have that attitude in the past when the delegates from the north were in the minority. Why did he not say then that those delegates can have open markets?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member is quoting what I said at the trapper's convention. I do not remember ever having said, as the member reports me, that this group who voted against the resolution would have to have special consideration. What I was doing was referring the question to the Fur Advisory Committee, and one of the things I asked them to consider was whether or not it was possible to give the trappers the choice of deciding in their block how they would market their furs.

Mr. Cameron: — That is exactly what he said.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, no.

Mr. Ripley: — Well, in any case, those are the parts that I remember, and I will carry on from where I left off. I know that in the past there has been very little attention paid to the fact that there was a minority who voted against compulsory marketing of furs. As long as the vote upheld the compulsory marketing board everything was fine and dandy; but that has been changed since it was voted out this year, and there is considerable consternation amongst the good people.

I would like to explain, if I can, the reason why they need and want free marketing in the north. I know it has been attempted before in this House, and I will only carry it on a little further and try to straighten it out again. First of all, all those northern people (that is, north of the 55th parallel) have no other means than trapping or fishing. There is no other industry in except in small locations near Island Falls or near Flin Flon; but they have not any other means of making a living in general. They cannot even cut fuel and delivered as some of the people further south can, where they can cut wood and deliver it to villages and towns and make a little money that way; but these people have no other source of income. And when they bring in their fur and have to turn their rats and beavers over to the field officer for a fraction of its value and then wait as long as two months — I have known it to be as long as two months before they get the balance of their money, and it puts quite a strain on them. I know last winter, at Christmas time, due to the weather conditions and so on, there wasn't much fur produced. It was late coming prime for one thing, and the mild weather was responsible for the late transportation season, too, and they didn't have much fur coming in until a week or two before Christmas. And when they had to turn that fur over to the field officer and just take a percentage of its value, they are certainly not going to get any further money out of it until well on in January. I know they were very hard put to buy Christmas things for their children, and the food they need it and the necessities of life, besides trying to make a festive season for their children. It was very difficult. They have had a pretty rough time of it, this year, on account of the high water levels in various parts of the country.

When they go out on their trap lines they generally need anywhere from \$25 to \$50 to \$100 worth of supplies, depending on how long they are going to stay out, and it is pretty difficult to finance a thing like that when their money is tied up in Regina or Prince Albert for a considerable period of time. That is why it is more important to them to take their fur and get their money for it as soon as possible, than it is to have it sent out. The price may be a little better, but it is not an advantage to them when they haven't got the use of the money. As you can realize, if you are ever out on a trip like that and happen to have it extended by some force of nature or other, where you plan on being held for a couple of weeks and something happens that is going to extend your stay out in the bush for maybe four or six weeks before you can get out again, a bag of flour is worth a great deal more than that same bag full of \$10 bills to a man up there.

I would like to read here a portion of a letter from a chap who was at the convention in Prince Albert. The resolution was:

“It shall not be compulsory to sell beaver and muskrat pelts through the Saskatchewan Fur Service; this is necessary in order to get competitive grading . . .

And the letter says:

“We trappers of A40 added the last sentence — ‘competitive grading’. This is something we are not getting. The Saskatchewan compulsory marketing service has a monopoly on muskrat and beaver and an overwhelming majority of the trappers know that we are being chiselled on grades.

“Competitive marketing doesn't benefit us anything as long as we are getting beat on grades. The fur trade is ‘big business’ and I feel we are chiselled out of approximately 12 to 18 per cent of the value of our muskrat and beaver on over 900,000 rats and 34,000 beaver, which would come to a tidy sum of money.

“Therefore, I personally submitted a second resolution which was next to be introduced.”

That was the one, I believe, where they asked for 75 per cent of the value of their fur to be turned over to them at the time it was turned in. In another part he says:

“I didn't go to this convention to kill the marketing service. I went there to have the compulsory clause removed so that when we send any additional shipments of fur there, we would be doing so of our own free will. That is my idea of democracy which is everybody's business, and I make it mine.”

Some of those things could have been remedied long ago if the administration of the Fur Marketing had paid a little attention to the trappers right from the beginning, and then they would not have voted out that compulsory marketing. They would not have had too much objection to it if they had been given, say, roughly, 75 per cent of the value of their fur on advances, and I think they would have got along very well with it. But they have been subjected to that compulsory feature right along, and I sincerely hope that they won't have to put up with it too much longer.

February 21, 1955

In this matter of these two record years of mineral claims, I would like to go back to that again and point out that, in the years previous to that, this Government had the practice of letting out mineral concessions, and these were, I believe, about 25 square miles in area (some of them smaller, and some larger), and these concessions were turned over to companies — I believe I saw an old prospectus here a few days ago, and they claimed they had 144 square miles. That is a tremendous amount of ground to be holding and, in most cases, they held that ground withdrawn from staking for three years. Most of those concession deals expired in 1952 and, consequently, people were able to get back into the country again and stake whatever ground they wanted. That is one of the reasons for the increase in the number of claims in the last two years. It would have occurred probably much sooner except for the withdrawing from staking of those concessions in the north. I know there was quite a rush on in the summer of 1952, when the concessions expired.

I would like to say a word about the amount of money that is being taken out of the north in royalties and other resources, such as the royalties from the Flin Flon mine amounting to \$1,245,000, and I have some other figures here that I got from the Minister. The royalty from the fish was \$24,605 and the royalty from fur \$151,955. Now there is a lot more than that coming out and I am trying to define it as from that area; I won't say all this money comes from that area in the north, but a great deal of it does. There is also the prospectors' licences, recording fees on claims and so on, that bring in additional revenue to this province. I do not see why the people in the north could not just have the same use of gasoline as is given to the farmer. Some of them have the privilege, that is the privilege of commercial fishermen, of the gasoline tax rebate, but very seldom do any of them apply for that, because most of them cannot read or write and it is a bit of a chore for them to keep an account of the gasoline they buy. So I do not see why purple gas could not be supplied to everyone in that area of the north which could be defined as a line north of the 55th parallel (or something along that line), so that these people can have the advantage of that 11-cents tax being taken off their gasoline. They are paying a pretty high price for gas as it is, without adding the tax to it as well.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker I have something more here. At the beginning of the Session we were paying tribute to some of the members who had passed away since the last Legislature, and I would like to say a few words about a man who is done a great deal for the north — Mr. Don Hood. He was one of the men who was very vigorous in attacking the Government, and he also had a lot to say in support of the northern people. He did a lot of hard, bitter fighting for the people in the north, and I would like to take this opportunity of saying that we have certainly lost a very great ally and Don Hood.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present an amendment to the motion of Mr. Dewhurst, seconded by Mr. H.C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake):

“That the following words be added to the Address:

“but regrets that Your Honour's advisers have not proposed the abolition of the compulsory features of the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service.”

In proposing this amendment, Mr. Speaker, I assume you will understand that I will not support the motion.

Mr. Speaker: — I am afraid I cannot accept this amendment as it is not in order. The seconder, Mr. Dunfield, has already spoken in this debate.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the seconder of the amendment should read Mr. MacNutt, the member for Nipawin.

The debate continuing on the proposed amendment of Mr. Ripley:

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, today is the day for the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Ripley) and myself apparently. I don't know how he can work out another amendment to toss the ball back again, but I do want to say a few words on this amendment.

First of all, I am pleased to see this amendment because it clears up something in my mind. I have always maintained that my hon. friends were opposed to orderly marketing for producers, whether it is wheat farmers or whether it is trappers, and here they offer an amendment which says 'they regret that we haven't abolished the compulsory features of the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service'. Well, in the first place, there are no compulsory features in the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh! Oh!

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — That is correct. Everybody isn't as ignorant as my hon. friend.

Mr. McCarthy: — I think the Minister should withdraw that; I do not think that is very . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think that the hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Certainly I will withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, but there are wiser people than my hon. friend.

Mr. McDonald: — You can include the Minister in that statement as well.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — That is correct, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. McDonald: — It sure is.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — It isn't the Fur Marketing Service that has the compulsory features. The compulsory feature is contained in an agreement between the Department of Natural Resources and the Indian Affairs Branch of the Dominion Government, and we will be approaching the Federal Government to discuss this matter, and I know that Department of Indian Affairs will regret, just as much as I do, that the trappers have decided to do away with this system of marketing which everyone recognizes has brought them a great deal more money, and on that first payment, even on a 50 per cent pieces, it has brought them, at that time, very close to what they would get from the dealer. I know, because I have had letters from the Minister at Ottawa stating that they wanted to see the marketing left the way it was. This matter is under consideration; it is going to receive fair consideration and we will be discussing it with the Federal Government; but certainly I am not able to say now what is going to be done about it. In the meantime, I certainly have no regrets that we haven't proposed to abolish this marketing of fur, which certainly brought to the trapper a great deal more money. I will have to vote against the amendment.

February 21, 1955

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a question? I was wondering if the Minister in Ottawa has written you, suggesting you should not disturb this agreement. If so, would you care to table that letter?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: —I did say that I have had letters from the Minister at Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know about tabling a letter from the Federal Government. I don't think I can do that without a petition or an address, but there is no question about it that they were quite happy (that is, the Indian Affairs branch) with the situation, and certainly did not want it interfered with, and so was I. It is funny, isn't it? — we are in the same boat.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister who has just taken his seat if he did have a letter from the Minister in Ottawa suggesting to him that they should carry on this compulsory marketing fur service in Saskatchewan. Does such a letter from the Minister exist?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes.

Mr. McDonald: — What is the date of it?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — I am sorry, I have thousands of letters in my files; I cannot quote you the date off-hand.

Mr. McCarthy: — You don't want to.

Mr. McDonald: — Was it this year?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — No, I don't think it was in 1955, but I am not sure.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — I would like to ask the Minister a question. Are you in favour of the compulsory marketing of furs?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the House is not in committee. We are speaking to a motion.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, I am still making my speech. What did he ask?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, are you?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — In favour of what?

Mr. Danielson: — The compulsory marketing of furs?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes.

Premier Douglas: — Are you in favour of the compulsory marketing of wheat?

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on the debate, I would just like to say that the trappers, in convention this fall, did vote, asking this Government to relieve them of the Act that compels them to sell their furs through the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service. The people affected by this legislation have asked that that Acts should be repealed, and they should be given the right to sell their furs . . .

Premier Douglas: — What Act should be repealed?

Mr. McDonald: — That the compulsory features should be removed and allow those people to sell their furs where they see fit. I believe that, when any producer votes for a freedom of market, he should be given that freedom. I believe that if we were compelled to sell any of our products, as farmers, under an Act and the farmers voted to be given the option of selling on the free market, then we should have that option. The trappers have done that, and all that we in the Opposition now are asking is that the people who are concerned, the trappers in the north, be given the right to sell their products where they see fit. They have voted in that regard and I believe they should be given that opportunity. That is the reason we have asked the Government to take out the compulsory features with regard to muskrat and beaver.

I realize that there are certain areas in the north that have been set up as conservation areas, I understand for several years. The Federal Government has wished that the furs taken from these particular areas should be marked through a Board, where they can keep track of the number of pelts taken out of that area. I can agree with that because any government, in attempting to carry on a conservation programme in a block, must know the number of animals are slaughtered each year, and, of course, if they are not marketed through a Board then it is very, very difficult for the Government to know whether the original source is being depleted or what is going on. I could agree with the compulsory marketing of the furs from those conservation areas; but as a whole, when the trapper has voted to market his pelts on a free market, I do believe that he should be given that opportunity.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, there is just one other thought comes to me. I was talking to a gentleman who is a very great co-operator and he said to me: “It would be a bad thing whoever got any of these lines where the completes sale of a product was under one Board, no matter what it is.” He said he thought the ideal situation would be to have 85 per cent under a Board and 15 per cent free, because there is always somebody, in a deal like that, who thinks they are not getting a good deal. If they have the alternative you can say to them, “All right, if you don’t like this, try your open market”, and they will very often come back, because it has a very stabilizing influence, and I just wanted to put that before the House. This particular gentleman is a very great co-operator, and he told me that — that he would like to see some alternative so they could blow off that steam when they did not like it.

The question being put on the amendment of Mr. Ripley, it was negatived on division, by voice vote.

The debate is now on the main motion of Mr. Dewhurst:

Mr. John Wellbelove (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I always derive a lot of benefit from hearing people who are qualified to speak on conditions in the north. I know very little about the north, and I think my life, possibly, is the poorer for that; but I have always been given to understand that the Métis people and the trappers of the north were people who are being pretty much exploited by the white man, and that is the reason they are a little bit difficult and suspicious to handle under the government agency at the present time. But I wonder just what the reason is for the change of stand of the Liberal party. Just before I left home

February 21, 1955

I looked through some of my old files there, and I dug up an extract which was handed around to us at the time there was so much furor about the setting up of this fur market. This is what I refer to:

“Department of Natural Resources, Regina, October 31, 1935.

“I have the honour to submit here with the annual report of the Department of Natural Resources for the year ending April 30, 1935.”

It is from W. J. Patterson, Minister of Natural Resources; I think everyone in the House will recognize that gentleman. The quotation is from page 35, paragraph 6, and it reads as follows:

“The fur trade is far from being satisfactory. It requires a complete re-organization from the trapper to the dealer. The present method of trapping is fast depleting the province of its fur, and present unethical methods of a percentage of the fur dealers warrants the conclusion that the Government control of all raw fur is essential if the province is to reap the benefit of its fur resources for any length of time.”

That, Mr. Speaker, is why I find it very difficult to reconcile that with the stand of our friends across the aisle, who are supposed to be so anxious to protect the trapper of the north.

In referring to our new Leader off the Opposition I was hopeful, on Tuesday last, when I listened to him making his declaration of intent with regard to the way in which he was going to lead the Opposition — I think we are all interested in a young man taking a responsible and prominent position in public life; but we have been privileged for a week to watch that leadership fairly closely. Possibly it isn't fair yet to form our judgment; but if the preview that we have had for the week is any indication of what we are going to have, then I would suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that, while it may coincide with the wishes of the few members that he has supporting him, it definitely does not meet the wishes of the people way out in the country who give support to the Liberal party . . .

Mr. McDonald: — How would you know?

Mr. Wellbelove: — For the past ten years we have had nothing but mere bickering and criticism, and nothing constructive at all. We were in hopes that we would get some constructive criticism, and at least good leadership. I believe criticism is right and necessary and valuable in the House. I believe the Opposition has a very definite function to perform. During the past few years I have listened to the Leader of the Conservative party in this province saying that the Conservative party is the only alternative to the C.C.F. to form a government in this province. Now he may be right, but that is a long, long way off. I don't know that I would want to see it taking place, but I remember when the president Leader of the Opposition took his seat in the House how the leader of the Conservative party used to hover around the rail to the left of Mr. Speaker with all the tender solicitude of a hen that has hatched out one chick. I think he must have experienced something of the anxiety of the average barnyard hen when she wanders a little too close to the horse pond in the yard and the offspring takes to the water and she realizes she has raised one of an entirely different breed. I don't know whether I sympathized

with him or not, but he spent an awful lot of time there during the first two years.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? I would like to ask the hon. member who the leader of the Conservative party was when I came into the Legislature.

Mr. Wellbelove: — The leader of the Conservative party in the province of Saskatchewan was, I think, Mr. Hamilton, was it not?

An Hon. Member: — Ramsay.

Mr. Wellbelove: — Yes, Ramsay . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You'd better wake up.

Mr. Wellbelove: — Yes, it was Ramsay who used to hover around there.

Mr. McDonald: — Did you ever see him in there?

Mr. Wellbelove: — The broadcasts of the hon. Leader are comparatively harmless, I think. He indulges in that luxury afforded all members of the Opposition — that is, spending vast sums of money for which he is not responsible to anybody. Realizing that his life has been comparatively brief, as far as parliamentary experience is concerned, and making allowances for the zeal of a new convert and the desire of a leader to out-promise the preceding leaders of the past 10 years, I think we can surely have no objection to indulging him in his dreaming.

I know that he is going to increase government grants all around, reduce taxes and refund moneys already paid. Now to keep faith with the people of this province, in keeping his promises, it will require one of two things; there will either have to be a considerable increase in revenue or a heavy curtailment of services already accorded the people of the province. I think the Opposition, during this debate, should inform us just which they intend to do, or what they intend to do, with regard to the curtailment of those services.

In the ten years that I have been in this House the only concrete suggestion that I have heard come from the Opposition was that they would reduce the civil service and throw the Crown Corporations out the window . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You threw them out!

Mr. Wellbelove: — I can't recall anything else. As individual members, I consider that we have a collective responsibility to the people of the province, as well as a responsibility to our constituencies. So, when I heard and read the hon. Leader of the Opposition's speech, he said "the provincial Government is at present receiving about \$19 1/2 million a year from gasoline tax and motor licences; in addition to this \$27 million a year as a subsidy from the Dominion Government, and we feel that a much greater part of these expanded provincial revenues should be passed along to the municipalities."

Taking that \$19 1/2 million to which he refers — I suppose we properly could call that a road-users tax, that is motor licences and gasoline tax; last year we voted, in this Legislature, in capital and revenue, \$18,600,000. Then there are three small branches dealing with highways to which we voted

February 21, 1955

money — the administration of the Highway Traffic Board, \$226,000 odd; the Vehicles Act, \$281,000; the Gasoline Tax Act, administering that, \$104,000, making a combined total of those three of \$653,670. If you add that to the amount we voted for highways you get \$19,253,000, which was voted by this House for highways alone — that is an amount equivalent to, apart from any supplementaries which may come in, the total that the hon. member mentioned is accruing from the gasoline tax and the licences.

Then the \$27,000,000 under the tax agreement from the Federal Government. I gathered from the Estimates of 1944-45 that the Dominion subsidy of that year was about \$8,000,000; so, in round figures, we get, under the tax agreement, an increase of about \$19,000,000, not taking into account the surrender of the tax fields in lieu of that agreement. In 1944-45, the amount voted to Public Health was \$2,152,000, and at that time the mental hospitals were administered by the Department of Public Works, and the vote was \$1,052,000, making a total of \$3,205,000. Now in 1954-55, this Legislature voted, for Public Health, \$20,180,000, an increase of nearly \$17,000,000 over the amount voted by the Liberals during the last term of office. After measuring up to what this Government concedes to be the most urgent need in the field of public health, we have about \$2,000,000 left from what the hon. member refers to as “those greatly expanded provincial tax revenues.”

Then in the Leader of the Opposition’s broadcast on hospitalization and health insurance, he says:

“Experience with general health insurance and some other countries and with hospital insurance and Saskatchewan has shown us that the total cost of these services under a prepaid or general insurance plan is very much greater than under the system where each person pays for these services as he receives them.”

I just wondered what was intended by that, but I suppose time will tell.

Under a Liberal administration in this province the hospital grants (those of you who served a hospital boards will realize) was 50 cents per patient per day, and build your own hospitals. So, if this Government reverted back to the Liberal government’s measurement of the requirements of the people of this province in the matter of public health, there could be a considerable saving. I will admit that, if you go back to 50 cents per patient per day and build your own hospitals, there would be a considerable saving there. I noticed, the other morning, Hon. Paul Martin was reported in the ‘Leader-Post’ of February 14th, and he said he was confident that the future would prove the wisdom of the Federal Government’s steady, responsible, dynamic approach to the problem of health care for all Canadians. Well, I think we can all subscribe to that ‘steady’ business, but where he got that ‘dynamic’ stuff, I haven’t yet been able to find out.

In connection with the education and hospitalization tax, I think our friends across the aisle say that that should be taken off. Well, that would be a reduction in public revenue, in government revenue, of about \$16,000,000 to \$17,000,000 . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Be sure of your facts.

Mr. Wellbelove: — When it comes to dealing with assistance to education this is what the Leader of the Opposition proposes:

“The only sound and permanent solution of this problem is for the provincial government to accept responsibility for the major part of the cost of education.”

And if we take up the report that was tabled here, the other day, we find the annual report says that there was \$23,000,000, the proceeds of taxes for the fiscal year, for education. Well now, the major part of that would be about \$12,000,000. Last year, this Government voted over \$10,000,000 in grants to education, so when our friends get on the air and say that they are going to assume the responsibility for the major portion, we are assuming responsibility, at the present time, for over \$10,000,000 in educational grants, and when you compare that with the \$3,200,000 in government grants to education which was voted in the last year of Liberal tenure in this House, you can make your own comparisons.

In connection with power, I just want to touch briefly on that. I often wonder who the Liberals are trying to fool when they talk about this power to farmers. I have found, in my constituency, that it is very, very difficult to satisfy sufficient farmers year by year. I do not know where I have had more requests than from farmers asking if they can be included, this year, in the plan for extending power to their farms. I don't think there is any dissatisfaction on the part of the farmers. They prefer to pay it in a lump sum rather than pay capital investment by annual instalments, with an interest rate. When you read in the Liberal handbook of 1929, pages 73 to 75, and see the marvellous things they promised there in their Saskatchewan power policy; and when you realize that the Liberals, in their last four years of office, provided 23 farmers with power, I will agree, Mr. Speaker, that their collections would be nominal from the farmers. I will agree with that.

By 1944, the Liberal government had accumulated, as we all know who were in that House at that time, a heavy deficit. This Government, after coming into office, before 1947 made three reductions in power rates and turned that 1944 deficit into a surplus. So it is small wonder that are Liberal friends, when they make comparisons with regard to what can be done in rural electrification, never refer back to the pre-1944 period.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) has dealt pretty fully with the oil business, and I do not intend to deal much further with that, any more than to say that the operating companies, during this past year, have produced past the 5-million barrel mark in oil. Now I passed a note across to the Minister, because I remembered that, in 1915, there was some activity in Saskatchewan and exploration work in connection with oil, so that would put it back about 40 years. There was activity, also, on the Alberta side of the border. As you know, during the term of office of the late Liberal government, Turner Valley came into production; but the Liberals hung up the record here that, I think, is a record that is going to hold for some time. But until 1944, there were 224 oil wells drilled in this province, and they had 400 barrels of oil in 30 years. I think that is a record that is going to stand for quite a while — 400 barrels of oil brought to the surface in 30 years, from 224 wells. When our Liberal friends talk about what this Government is doing in connection with oil development, if you figure their record out over 30 years it amounts to a little over a barrel a month, for 30 years — quite a stream of production. In comparison, part of that time, Turner Valley was shipping it out by the trainload; and here we got a barrel a month, under Liberal administration! And now they say, “Return us to office and we will get speculative capital into this province.”

February 21, 1955

I remember, when this Government first came into office, the despicable methods resorted to by the capitalistic press and, I am sorry to say, by some of the Opposition members in this House, whereby, with their cries of confiscation and expropriation, they did their best to try to keep development capital out of this province. I want to exclude Judge Culliton from that. He sat on that side, but he always took pride in his province. He was proud of his province and I never once heard him make any one statement that was derogatory to the province in which he lived. I wish I could say that of all the members who sat across there.

Mr. Danielson: — What about Joe Phelps?

Mr. Wellbelove: — They tried their best to keep development and risk capital out of this province, and their press echoed it right across the Dominion. In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, there has been \$200 million in risk and development capital come into this province since this Government came into office, and from \$22 million to \$25 million has been expended in the construction of additional oil refineries for the processing of oil in this province.

Up in our Kerrobert-Kindersley constituency we have quite a lot of activity. As you know, in the Coleville-Smiley field there are 300 producing wells. On the west side in Smiley field, it is a good high-quality crude. There has been 12 miles of gathering pipeline laid into the Smiley field, and an 8-inch pipe which runs from the Smiley field and will connect with the Interprovincial pipeline at Ermine, which is just a little bit east of Kerrobert. Now that type has an initial capacity of 3,200 barrels a day, but after the booster stations which will be installed, its rated capacity is 15,000 barrels a day. That is on the Smiley side of the field where production and exploration work is still going on.

On the east side, or on the Coleville side of the field, there is a heavier crude. While production in gallonage could be greater, the restricted market holds the production down to a great extent. There are unlimited resources of oil there of that heavy crude. A new refinery has been built in Coleville village there, and it has meant quite a boost to the general district surrounding Coleville. In addition they have step-out wells at Buffalo Coulee, Dewar Lake, Hoosier, and then the Eureka pool has just been tapped. I understand that the Eureka pool is going to be connected up with this pipeline. So there are great possibilities, as the Minister has said, in oil development in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Government is to be commended in the early steps it took, as soon as that found there were going to be adverse conditions in the rural districts. I noticed several Liberal speakers and the Liberal press rub their hands together in glee and they said, "We will see what this C.C.F. Government can do now, under adverse conditions", never thinking about how those adverse conditions would affect the farmer, but how it might give them an opportunity politically. Well, I want to say that the Government measured up to its responsibility in the work-and-wages programme that it instituted, and in the collecting of coarse grains. The amount which may be necessary may be a little bit of a difficult problem owing to the frost damage — oats, as we know, or more susceptible to frost than wheat and some of the heavier grains; but plans are going ahead to endeavour to locate sufficient quantities of oats and barley to meet the requirements.

I was proud of my own municipality in which I homesteaded, R.M. of Snipe Lake, No. 259. As soon as the Minister had circularized municipalities asking what the seed needs would be, the Council there instructed their secretary to correspond with the Minister of Agriculture, and let him know that they had an up-to-date seed cleaning plant in that municipality, that there was a considerable stock of wheat available in the general locality, and that they would put on additional help so that they could run a double shift, if required, to clean up carload lots of wheat to ship to the points where it was needed.

In the seed-drill test that was taken, last year, in that municipality — some of you may have seen the editorial in the ‘Western Producer’ where that municipality ranked highest in connection with the test of 40 samples taken at random from different farmers in that municipality, and the seed was tested at the University with regard to its germination, and for the presence of other grains and weed seed. Thirty-eight of those samples ranked top-notch. There were two samples, one of which was cleaned at a public elevator, and I don’t know where the other one was cleaned, but they dropped down. But I want to assure the Minister that there is lots of seed wheat available their present time, if he is able to use it.

In concluding, I would like to refer to the South Saskatchewan dam. I understand it has been referred to the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent, the Prime Minister, to decide whether it is in the public interest or not to expend public moneys for the construction of that dam. I want to suggest that our Prime Minister is a pretty busy man. He has that tax field yet to fix up with Mr. Duplessis and then they are spending all those millions of dollars on the St. Lawrence Seaway; and I think, by what they say, he has to see that there isn’t a dollar spent which would benefit the province of Ontario with regard to the generation of electricity. That will require some watching. Now, if we take those two things into consideration, his time is going to be pretty much taken up, and I think it would be most unfortunate if posterity should think that the pioneers of this province had not foresight enough to see the benefits that would accrue from the using of the waters of the South Saskatchewan River for irrigation purposes and the generation of electricity. I want to suggest to our Jubilee Committee that they consider erecting a stone cairn at the point when the last definite survey was supposed to be made, because I think it is going to be of historic interest. I think it has a right to rank with the old cart trails and the early trading posts and historic interest; and for fear it should be lost and that posterity should think that we hadn’t foresight enough to see in those things, casting a reflection on we pioneers, I think it should be marked. There could be some interesting things done with it. I was thinking possibly that the native stone could form a cairn there at very little cost, because there is quite a lot of the surplus rock and stone available in the general locality, but now if you wanted to put on a stone slab facing on one side some of the statements that have been made and things that have been said that they have said that they never said all the way down through (I think for generations they have been trying to decipher the meaning of all those scratchings on the pyramids in Egypt); well, I think we could give posterity as good a puzzler as those old Egyptians ever did, if we took the extracts from these speeches and inscribed them on the stone face slab on one side of that cairn.

Some Govt. Members — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — Your own speeches included.

Mr. Wellbelove: — When I think that we were definitely assured, a long time

February 21, 1955

ago, that there was \$110 million definitely earmarked by people, supposed to be in authority, for the building of that dam, and then all that has transpired since, I am reminded of the verse, Mr. Speaker, that appeared in John O'London's weekly, in the January issue of 1953, on the passing of the old year:

“Here lies 1952,
Promised much it did not do,
If 1953 lies more
Good Lord, speed 1954.”

Mr. R. Brown (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, there are probably two very good reasons why I should not get into this debate at this time. The first is because I have a rather bad throat, and the second one (and probably the more important) is that I probably won't add very much to it. And before my friends across the way say 'hear, hear', I would like to suggest that that would probably put us on exactly the same level.

As I have already congratulated the mover and a seconder of the Motion, I will dispense with that at this time. I would, however, like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his recent elevation to that very important post. I would like to say to him that I watched with great interest the manoeuvring and the three-ring circus performance leading up to, and following, his election as Liberal leader in Saskatchewan. I watched, too, with a great deal of interest the test of strength between the old 'Jimmy' Gardiner machine and the so-called younger group, which apparently were determined to prove that the Liberal party in Saskatchewan had a 'new look'.

Speaking of the old so-called Gardiner machine, Mr. Speaker, it is something in which I take great interest in speaking about. I ran across something, the other day, which I thought was quite interesting, a recent editorial in an Edmonton paper which reads as follows:

“Political machines have been much commoner in Canada than Canadians would like to admit, but that founded by Walter Scott and C. A. Dunning, and carried out by Mr. Gardiner was one of the strongest and toughest in our history. It ruled Saskatchewan from just short of 40 years, from 1905 to 1944, with one interval of Conservative rule from 1929 to 1934. When it was in its heyday in the late 'thirties, it was awesomely efficient. Like all such organizations it was based essentially on the exchange of jobs and favours, federally as well as provincially. Visitors to Saskatchewan were particularly impressed with the way in which the provincial civil service was mobilized in the service of the party, especially in elections. In election time it was no use trying to do any official business in Regina. Most of the government employees, from deputy ministers down, were out campaigning. The organization's power was by no means limited to Saskatchewan; it had a great deal to say in the affairs of the Alberta Liberal party as well. The decline of the Gardiner machine began with a sweeping C.C.F. victory in 1944 election.”

Mr. McCarthy: — Would the hon. member tell the House what he is reading from? Is it a C.C.F. paper or something?

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — That is an editorial which appeared in the Edmonton Journal, not exactly a C.C.F. paper.

Mr. McCarthy: — I don't know whether it is C.C.F. or not, but it sounds like C.C.F. propaganda.

Mr. Brown: — My friends across the way, and the other Liberals here in Saskatchewan, they think they have convinced the people of this province that they have cut loose from the old federal organization. In my mind that is only wishful thinking. I don't think the people of the province will forget too quickly that immediately the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) was elected to the leadership of the Liberal party, he was practically on the next train heading for Ottawa. I am sure he went down to tell the boys there that they were only 'kidding' here in Saskatchewan; they really had not changed; they were only putting on a false front hoping to fool the gullible once again.

Mr. McDonald: — You sure arrive at some wild conclusions. You had better go with me, next time.

Mr. Brown: — You go ahead, I have got lots more of it. The tightness all of the ties-that-bind in the old Liberal party and the fact that the old machine tactics are still employed, I think, is borne out by the manoeuvring backwards and forwards of Federal government employees and Party officials. Last year, you will recall, I remarked in the House that the provincial secretary of the Liberal party had, just about that time, been appointed to a very juicy position as director of P.F.A.A. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest if there ever was a position where a good party man could really cut a swath, and do the party some good, that was it.

Just to keep things nice and close, another employee of P.F.A.A. immediately took over the position of Liberal provincial secretary. I think that is one of the nicest, cosiest arrangements I ever saw in all my life. It would seem, in view of the personalities involved, there is not much question that all this manoeuvring at that time came about in order to set things up so the director of P.F.R.A. could be handed the Liberal leadership on a platter. But, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that somewhere down the line someone must have decided that they Liberal party needed a 'new look', and they could not very well make that convincing as long as the heavy hand of Mr. Gardiner was so much in evidence. I am afraid there must have been a slight case of double-cross somewhere in the picture: the hon. member for Moosomin was in, and Mr. L.B. Thomson was out. However, before anyone starts feeling sorry for Mr. Thomson, lets me assure them that he did not suffer except in his pride and his prestige. As you all know, he retained his position as director of P.F.R.A.

I would like to mention, too, that if anyone should be foolish enough to think that the old machine still is not effective and powerful in this province, I would like to remind him what happened to the only candidate who came out openly and defied it. As I recall the press report he got exactly 16 votes at that convention.

The latest move in the game is rather interesting too, I think. It rather leads me to believe that the life of the Liberal leader in this province is rather an unhappy and an uneasy one. Apparently in the Liberal party you cannot trust anybody, not even your closest associates, because, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen formerly employed by P.F.A.A. who took over as provincial secretary of the Liberal party just about a year ago, has now been replaced by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr). I am sure that his going will no doubt

February 21, 1955

make the new Leader of the Opposition feel much easier and I am sure, of course, that he is now safely back in the employ of the Federal Department of Agriculture. After all, I have been assured that the Liberal party always takes care of their own, particularly their 'fall guys', and to bear that out I imagine that most of you know that our old friend, or their old friend, Mr. Rawluk, is now employed by a local Federal Government office.

It begins to look to me, Mr. Speaker, that rather than having one Liberal machine here in the province, we now have two, and I'll lay you five to ten that when the next election rolls around they will be chugging along side by side at the same old pace. To my mind, the whole thing is rather a smelly mess.

That reminds me of something that an old Liberal friend of mine gave to me, one time, as his reason for staying with the Liberal party. This is what he said, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is rather interesting: He said that, many years ago when he was rather unhappy at about the Liberal party, he was seriously toying with the thought of leaving the Party, and he decided that the only way to clean out a pig pen was to get in there with a shovel and really shovel it out.

Mr. Loptson: — That's what you are doing now.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to my friend, and a lot of other Liberals, that any farmer in this province can tell you that, when it comes to cleaning out a pig pen, shovel as you might, when you get it all out, the taint and the smell still remains, and you cannot obtain that 'new look', Mr. Speaker, by merely tossing out the old hog and bringing in a long, lean and hungry one, who is anxious to get in the trough again. You cannot obtain that new look, either, by following the old Liberal procedure of throwing together a multitude of impossible promises, everything and anything that might catch a vote and then calling it a platform. I wonder how far you can go, Mr. Speaker. Well, apparently, the Liberals can go plenty far. As one Montréal paper put it, commenting on the recent Liberal convention in Saskatoon, they put it this way:

“Liberals in Saskatchewan are now trying to out-socialize the Socialists.”

In case anyone should doubt that the Liberal platform was tossed together by the Party 'brain trust', let me give you some idea of how it was hammered out — I believe that is what the press termed it when they were reporting on the convention. I am sure they must have used the expression with their tongues in their cheeks, because one reporter reported in his story words to this effect:

“Many more resolutions were passed; many without discussion.”

That is what rather intrigues me, Mr. Speaker. According to the press reports of the convention, the first day, in the afternoon, they heard the usual reports. Greetings were extended by civic officials, and well over an hour was spent deciding on procedure to be followed the next day, dealing with the leadership election. I am rather sure that those formalities would take up most of the afternoon. Yet I recall going home at six in the evening, turning on the radio and listening to the 6 o'clock news, and I heard a report that the Liberal convention had 'hammered out' a 19-point agricultural programme. I wonder who

approved it, Mr. Speaker. I wonder who had time to approve it.

Mr. McDonald: — Two thousand people.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — It seems obvious to me that the convention could have nothing more than time to merely rubberstamp the proposals which were put before it and which were designed merely as vote catchers and not with a view to coming out with a down-to-earth programme which had some possibility of being carried out.

That would not be so bad, Mr. Speaker, — 19 points; that is not too bad in one afternoon, taking into consideration everything else that went on; but what happened on the second day? Well, I read the press reports and I heard a lot of talk, or read a lot of words about all of the lobbying that was going on with respect to the election for leader, and all the formalities and procedures necessarily involved in the election of the leader. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the press reports that the convention, that day, approved a further 78-point Liberal platform. To top it all off, they also reported that the meeting broke up early, as soon as the results of the election for leader were announced. That is the way the Liberal party democratically formulates policies. That is the amount of say in formulating policy that the supporters of the Liberal party have here in Saskatchewan.

What a programme they came up with, Mr. Speaker! Some comment has been made in connection with it by other speakers in the last few days, and I am not going to bore you with all the details. I have got a copy of it if anybody would like it. I would like to say though, that just a quick glance over it reveals, as I said before, that it is loaded with promises designed to catch votes and most of it is utterly impossible of carrying out. A lot of it, of course, is already in effect in the province, but apparently the Opposition do not know that yet. In the main, it promises to reduce (if I am not mistaken) or abolish at least three taxes, and at the same time provide for a considerable amount of additional expenditures. I am no mathematician like the hon. Provincial Treasurer, but a little quick rough arithmetic indicates to me that on two items alone, their promises with regard to power and education would take approximately \$25 to \$30 million more money in revenue to carry out. If you take all of the other promises which they have made and add them in, then, of course, the figure rises much higher.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, listening to the first radio address by the hon. Leader of the Opposition shortly after he was elected to office. He made a statement at the close of his broadcast — incidentally the broadcast was devoted to telling the people what they would do and how they would spend money; and he concluded his broadcast by saying:

“I am sure that you will want to know how we are going to pay for all these things, and I intend to tell you that in a later broadcast.”

I have had copies of most of his broadcasts since, and I am still waiting to hear how it is going to be done.

Mr. McDonald: — Here you are; here it is.

Mr. Brown: — If he can show me how he can do it, like a lot of other people, I might consider voting for the Liberal party.

February 21, 1955

I think the Liberals know, as they did in 1952, that their promises are utterly impossible of carrying out and they just can't keep them. Yet they still insist on trying to 'kid' the people of this province. Well, I have said this before, and I am going to say it again: the people of this province are not nearly as stupid as the Liberal party wish they were. They gave them their answer in 1952, and they will give them the same answer when the next election rolls around.

Something else that I would like to comment on, Mr. Speaker, is some of the tactics which our friends across the way employ and some of the things which they talk about and insinuate; some of the things which prompted me to get up and say a few words in this debate. I am getting awfully sick and tired of listening to the people across the way insinuate that the civil service of this province are nothing more or less than political stooges. For that reason I would like to say a word in their defence. I would like to challenge my friends across our way to produce one public servant here in the province who has ever been told to, or asked to, do work on behalf of the C.C.F. organization.

Opposition Members: — Oh, ho!

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — You can laugh if you like, but I happen to be rather closely associated with the organization in this province . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You are so close you can't see.

Mr. Brown: — . . . but if there are any I would like to know them and possibly we could get together and work out a formula that might be a means of cutting our friends across the House down even smaller than they are.

I would like to say that these accusations are absolutely false, unjustified and unfair, and I think it is statements such as these people have been making which are driving the civil service of this province to support the C.C.F. I notice that our friends in their platform have another one of those ambiguous statements which they are so fond of, and they say that they will amend the Civil Service Act to release civil service from political intimidation. What do they mean by that? I would like to know.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Brown: — Every civil servant in this province knows, even if my friends across the way don't, that not until this Government came into office did they know what freedom from political intimidation was. I have had civil servants in this province come to me by the dozen and tell me exactly what I am telling you, that they are sick and tired of the insinuations which are being made by the Liberal party; and if the civil service are turning to the C.C.F., then I should be the last one to kick, but you people across the way are the ones who are chasing them into our ranks and nobody else.

You know, speaking of political organizers in the guise of civil servants, Mr. Speaker, I had a rather interesting document come to hand the other day, an extract from a document which sets out the details of the expense account for certain employees of P.F.A.A. for the year 1953. One interesting item, Mr. Speaker, is a record of expenses of \$3,023.86 for one A.A. Brown, of Theodore. The gentleman was, as most of you know, the president of the

Saskatchewan Liberal Association a year or so ago. It is very interesting to note that those expenses were not incurred in any one defined area of the province, but all over the province. It is also interesting to note that these expenses were incurred from early April until early August, and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal election was on August 11, 1953.

Mr. Carr: — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Covering the whole territory.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Carr: — . . . on a point of privilege. I am sure that the hon. member would not wish to mislead this House, but A.A. Brown was not the president of the Liberal Association in 1953.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I did not say '53 — I said a year or so ago. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCarthy: — That's not correct either; you had better check up on your figures.

Mr. Brown: — Mr. Speaker, previous speakers in this debate have very ably dealt with the record of this Government in the various fields of activity. I would like to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the things they have said. I think that most of the speakers have proven very conclusively that the criticism which has been levelled at the Speech from the Throne has mostly been without point or without reason. That does not leave me very much to deal with; but there are one or two things I would like to touch on before I take my seat.

I think the main criticism of the Speech from the Throne comes from the Leader of the Opposition. Oh, it is true the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) did make a speech, but I would hardly class that as a criticism of the Speech from the Throne. In my mind, after listening to that diatribe, I would set it down as rather an effort to re-try a smelly case in which one of his friends was found guilty, and to twist the facts and spread around some of the dirt which the Opposition seems so well supplied with. I happened to notice, too, that the 'Leader-Post' did not waste any time in jumping in and writing an editorial on the charges which the hon. member made. They did not, of course, have the decency to wait until they got the true facts of the case. It was an opportunity to stir up a little stink and, of course, the Leader-Post does not pass up an opportunity to do that sort of thing.

I see my hon. friend from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) is not in his seat. He did make a little speech the other day and entertained us very well for half an hour or so. I would like to say a word about that a little later on.

Getting back to the Leader of the Opposition and his charges, Mr. Speaker, there are only one or two comments I would like to make. I will make my remarks as brief as possible. But I did notice that as usual he followed the practice of jumping from one province to the other in his efforts to try to prove that the record of this Government is so much worse than governments elsewhere. I notice that he referred to power in Manitoba and advocated a similar plan for Saskatchewan. I don't know why these people, when they start to talk about power in Manitoba, do not tell the whole story. I wonder why they

do not bother telling the people that Manitoba's power programme is the result of planning which started many, many years ago. Years ago, when the Liberals were in office in this province, as usual sitting around and twiddling their thumbs and doing nothing, Manitoba was developing their power facilities and began to build a grid system while we in Saskatchewan stagnated under the Liberal administration.

I wonder why they do not tell the people that Manitoba's rural electrification has been extensive primarily because of the high concentration of rural population in the extreme southern part of the province, which, incidentally, is the only area served. That makes it possible to build rural lines much cheaper . . .

Mr. McDonald: — That is not true; neither is the other statement.

Mr. Brown: — . . . than here in Saskatchewan. I wonder why they do not tell the people that the area served in Manitoba is only equal to about one-quarter of that in Saskatchewan. I wonder why they do not tell the people that the Manitoba government owns practically all of the hydro facilities. That is the reason why they are able to produce power at so much less cost than we can here in this province. It is a reason, too, why they can accumulate earnings so much faster than we can in Saskatchewan, and plough them back into their electrification programme.

I wonder why they do not tell them that in Manitoba the areas outside of the densely populated part of the province are not likely to get power for years, if ever, while we, in Saskatchewan, are trying to bring power to the farmers in this province in every nook and cranny of it.

Mr. McDonald: — You have got a lot of bad information there.

Mr. Brown: — Pardon? It must be a change to get some facts.

Mr. McDonald: — It sure would.

Mr. Brown: — I wonder why our friends do not compare the power development of this province to that in Alberta? Why don't they tell us what goes on there? Why don't they tell us that a farmer in Alberta will pay anywhere from \$1,000 to \$1,300 to have power installed on his farm? Why don't they tell us that there the farmers put up the money through their co-ops to build the lines; it is then turned over to private companies, who sell power to the farmers and they reap the profits? Oh, no! It is easier to tell about the wonderful things that the wonderful Liberal government is doing in Manitoba.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCarthy: — And what kind of government have they got in Alberta?

Mr. Brown: — I haven't got the words I can use in the House to describe it, Mr. Speaker.

I was rather interested to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals have got around to changing the plank in their platform with respect to power. I can remember, in 1952, when they were out in the hustings, shouting around telling everybody that they were going to give 'free power' to the farmers of Saskatchewan — yes, sir, 'free power'. And now, if you want to check out their programme

it has been changed to a 'low-cost power programme'. I think they finally discovered that power is not free in Manitoba, that the farmers pay for it in the end, the same as they do here in the province of Saskatchewan. It took them a long time to find it out, but they finally did.

I notice, too, that that Leader of the Opposition is doing a lot of crying about the farmers' taxes being high here in the province. Considerable has been said from this side of the House with regard to taxes so I am not going to have too much to say; but I wonder why he doesn't tell the people why taxes are high. Why doesn't he admit that the taxes that have been increased are not those levied by the Provincial Government, but are the taxes are levied by the local government? Why doesn't he admit that those taxes have been increased by the local governments . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Because of your policies.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — . . . simply because of the inflationary prices, due entirely to the removal of price controls by the Federal Government? Why doesn't he admit, as the 'Leader-Post' did in an editorial not so terribly long ago (I think I have it here) that, while this province is in the best financial position in its history, that improvement has been brought about, in the main, with practically no increase in provincial taxation.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, hold her!

Mr. Brown: — That from the 'Leader-Post' — and the 'Leader-Post' is supposed to be always right . . .

Mr. Danielson: — According to you!

Mr. Brown: — I happen to read it once in a while. I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition really thinks, Mr. Speaker, that those meagre little increases that he was talking about the other day — crying about the increase in your driver's licence, crying about the increase in your car licence, crying about the increase in your insurance, and a few little things like that — I haven't totalled them all up, Mr. Speaker; but I wonder if he really thinks that those differences are the deciding factor as to whether a farmer in this province can keep his head above water, or go under. I wonder how ridiculous you can get! Why don't they admit that that isn't the reason at all; that those little differences would have practically no bearing at all on the soundness of the position of the farmers in this province. Why don't they admit the big factor is simply the gap between the price of what the farmer has to sell and the price of that which he has to buy, a gap that is growing wider and wider and wider, due entirely to Federal Government policies? That is the reason why the farmers in this province, even after three bumper crops, find themselves in a pinch when they lose just one crop.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned the increasing municipal and school debt. I wonder why he doesn't say that the municipal and school that has gone up much higher and much faster in our neighbouring provinces? Saskatchewan municipal and school debt, in 1944, was \$22.6 million; in 1953, it stood at \$37.4 million. In Manitoba, under a Liberal government, the story is considerably worse. The debt, in 1944, was \$33.6 million; but by 1953 it had climbed to \$61.4 million! And if you want to know what happened in Alberta, we really have a story there. In that oil-rich province with all the revenue which has been available from their resources, the debt has risen from \$54 million in 1952, to \$156,720,000 in 1953! I don't think it is any wonder

February 21, 1955

that the people in Alberta are beginning to wonder of what use the development of their oil resources has been to them.

One other point was touched on by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker — market road grants. I am not going to spend too much time on that now; I know, before this Session is over, we will hear plenty about market roads and grants in aid of market roads. I would just like to remind my hon. friend, though, that it might be as well if he had not talked to his colleagues in Manitoba, because I am advised that the Liberal government in Manitoba does not make grants either for roads, bridges or any other public works whatsoever . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Whoever gave you that advice doesn't know anything more about it than you do.

Mr. McCarthy: — You'd better go and check that up.

Mr. Danielson: — He knows less than you do, I bet.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — If the hon. members doubt that statement that is their privilege — I know it doesn't sit too well; but that statement is correct. As a matter of fact, in Manitoba, the C.C.F. party has been trying to get the provincial government to back municipal bonds for a number of years, and they haven't even been able to get them to do that.

I think that is about all I am going to say, Mr. Speaker. I was going to pass a remark or two about what my hon. friend, the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly), had to say. I was rather intrigued with his little box of samples which he brought in the other day. I was rather impressed, too, or rather taken up with one statement that he made, and that was to the effect that he was sorry he didn't have a sample of livestock to show us, and I was going to comment that he didn't need to worry as I felt sure that every time he got up to speak he gave us a 'prime' example that industry.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, the criticism which is being offered with respect to the Throne Speech has been about as ineffective as any that I have heard in years. Nothing has been proposed of concrete value in solving the problems which face the province today. That there are problems I am quite prepared to admit, particularly with regard to municipal financing. I am well aware of the problem in that field. I hope to have something to say in that connection at a later date during this Session. In the meantime, I am sure that the Throne Speech is a blueprint for progress and I shall support the motion.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.