

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature**  
**15<sup>th</sup> Day**

Monday, February 29, 1956

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

**PRIVILEGE**

**Mr. Wm. S. Thair (Lumsden):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, on a matter of privilege, I would like to draw attention to a typographical error in the 'Leader-Post' of yesterday, evening edition, which made a statement I made read directly opposite to what I actually said in the Throne Speech debate.

The 'Leader-Post' has very graciously offered to correct this error.

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 28, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Brown (Last Mountain) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate, last evening, but I have been informed by the Whip that it is not the intention of the Opposition to put forward any further speakers on this debate; and, as it is not my desire to fire on a disorganized army, I am going to defer to the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank).

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say to those people who might have made a particular effort to be in the Chamber today, or to be in the galleries, or, when CKRM comes on the air, to be at their radios, then I must apologize to them for bringing to them such a disappointment when they came to listen to the hon. Minister of Social Welfare. Now they have no choice but either to shut the radio off, or go home from the gallery; or listen to me.

During this debate, Mr. Speaker, there have been some funny statements come from the Opposition. Many of the members opposite have said that "the Socialism of this Government keeps capital out of the province."

**Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — Yes, it does. . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**February 29, 1956**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) said that “we have had prosperity for the 10 or 12 years just passed because we have had no Socialism.” Now I think the hon. members had better get together, and decide which one they mean. The hon. Leader of the Opposition made his famous statement about the South Saskatchewan River dam in Toronto, saying that “we would never get it until the C.C.F. Government was thrown out of office.”

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — That won't be long.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now we had some suspicion at that time about the sincerity of the Liberal party in regard to industrial development in Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of record that the Liberals are opposed to industrial development; they have gone on the record in this House.

The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) said that “we should give more to old-age pensioners.” I would like to see old-age pensioners get more; but I wonder does the hon. member for Arm River know that there is not one provincial Liberal government in Canada that gives one 5-cent piece of supplementary allowance to old-age pensioners of any kind, nor do they supply health services. Does he know that where they have a Liberal government in Manitoba that the Liberal members in the Legislature in Manitoba have voted a dozen times against giving any supplementary allowance to their old-age pensioners? They conveniently forget to tell these things.

The hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly), speaking the other day, I think said that in his opinion we had very few roads which were fit to carry a load, and then later in his speech he made a very ardent plea for the truckers to allow them to carry increased weights on their trucks.

**Mr. Kohaly:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I think he had better think this thing over, because if he was right the first time, then we would have serious thoughts about what his intention was when he urged increased weights.

The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) said that “Ross Thatcher had made a great sacrifice because he could have been elected as a C.C.F. member as long as there was a C.C.F. party”; and the hon. member gave us to understand at that time that Ross Thatcher had a pretty permanent berth as member of Parliament for Moose Jaw.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He sure had a big majority.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And it's a funny thing, but some of the other people over there have been inferring they were going to wipe out the C.C.F.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I didn't say he had a long term to come.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I wonder what they really mean. I know what they

hope, but what they really believe is probably a different thing.

Mr. Speaker, for centuries in British Parliament rules have been developed to protect the rights of individual members of those Parliaments and of minority groups. To anyone who makes a study of these rules they are not only interesting but they are certainly a proper subject for admiration. Any member of this House, or any other British Parliament, can bring before it any matter which they wish to have discussed, provided, of course, that they have one person to second the motion. In the development of those rules there has also developed certain official positions within the House and related to the House, and one of those is that of the House Leader. Obviously the House Leader is the Leader of the majority group in the House. In our case the Premier is the Leader of the House, or in some larger Parliaments another person is named by the larger group to act as House Leader. The Leader of the House has certain responsibilities, but he is subject to the rules of the House; the same rules that apply to the rest of us apply to the Leader of the House.

The Leader of the Opposition, too, has certain responsibilities by virtue of his selection by his group for that position; but again the same rules apply to him. All members of this House are equal in their rights, and each member represents a constituency, and he represents all the electors in his constituency, and that applies whether he had a majority of six votes, or 57 or nearly 2,000, as was the Premier's majority in the last election.

**Mr. Lopton:** — He won't have that next election.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The handwriting is on the wall.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Each constituency is entitled to equal rights for its member. The House selects one of its members to accept certain heavy responsibilities and to surrender certain of his rights and privileges as a member — that member is Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker has the difficult task of presiding at all meetings of the House; he has no opportunity to speak for himself, or for his constituents. The rules of the House are very specific in regulating the behaviour of the members towards the Speaker. Neither is the Speaker allowed by the rules to argue with the members, nor are they members allowed by the rules to make personal remarks about the Speaker. Though we may differ with Mr. Speaker's decisions, we must not criticize his behaviour, except on a Motion for that purpose.

I was disappointed and disgusted to think that any member of this House would do as the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) did the other day, when he seriously infringed this rule by discussing the Speaker's personal actions. That is in the same class as striking a man when he is bound and gagged. If we are going to have good decorum in this House, then the first requisite is that we do have respect for Mr. Speaker.

Members of the Opposition have spent considerable time grumbling about the treatment they receive in this House. Among other things they have cried about the radio time allotted to them, even though their average time is 33 1/3 per cent greater than the average time for members on this side.

**February 29, 1956**

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's nonsense.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, let us work this out. Leaving aside the hon. member for Souris-Estevan for the moment, we have 10 members in the official Opposition, and on the Government side, we leave you out, Mr. Speaker, we leave out the late hon. member for Shellbrook, and we have 40 members, a total of 50 members; and suppose that the total radio time for these two groups is 2,000. In five weeks it will be 1,875 minutes, so probably it will be 2,000 minutes for the whole session. Then if there is 2,000 minutes, each member of this House is entitled to 40 minutes radio time during the Session, but that is not the way it is divided. Each member in the Opposition is entitled to 50 minutes (that is the way it has been allocated), and each Government member only 37 ½ minutes.

Now the fact that members in the Opposition have, on the average, more time than the members on the Government side is not due to any right. It is due simply and solely to the generosity of the members sitting on this side of the House.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That isn't the way they do it in Ottawa.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member for Saltcoats says "that isn't the way they do it in Ottawa." Nobody in Ottawa in the House of Commons has any radio time at all. They are so far behind they haven't even got radio broadcasts in the House yet, so what is he talking about.

**Mr. Loptson:** — 'Provincial Affairs'.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, within these groups, if the members of one particular group want to allocate more time, for example, to the Premier, or to any other Cabinet Minister, then I am afraid. . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You prevented me from discussing a Resolution that was passed in this House yesterday; now you are permitting him to discuss a Resolution that was passed also. It was already voted on and passed.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the point of order? I would point out to you, Sir, that I have not referred to any resolution passed in this House. I am referring to a matter that has been discussed on several occasions in this debate.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, but they have passed through the House.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I have the right to proceed.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Proceed.

February 29, 1956

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Thank you.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You are giving him a privilege that I didn't have.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, if each group wants to give more time to particular members of that group, that is their business — maybe before I get done, they will have to give me extra time over the 37 ½ minutes I am entitled to. Now the hon. member for Arm River spoke in this debate and he wasn't on radio time. I know that the people throughout Saskatchewan like to hear him on the radio. I was disappointed that he didn't go on the radio, but I want to remind him. . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You bet they do.

**Mr. Loptson:** — He'll be on. . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But I want to remind him that it was his choice that he didn't speak on the radio in the Throne Speech debate.

**Mr. Loptson:** — He'll speak on the next one.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He was entitled to have. . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely untrue, and he knows it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Whips made the arrangements.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the members in the Opposition were offered the opportunity to have this debate go on until the end of the week.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's wasting time. Get on with the work of the House.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I would agree that, according to the speeches I have heard coming from the other side of the House, a lot of it was a waste of time.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It is certainly a waste today.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: he is talking about something that has been going on in this House; but not until yesterday was I aware that this offer was made, and I made my speech last Friday afternoon. He can't be telling you the truth.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! There is no way in which this debate can be concluded except by the will of the members. That applies to both sides of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That isn't my point. . .

**February 29, 1956**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Until every one in the House has exhausted his privilege of speaking once, there is nothing to prevent anyone from getting up.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not the point. The hon. member has accused me of having had the opportunity to speak on the radio, and every man knows that they were going to extend this debate. That was only made known to myself yesterday afternoon.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not accusing the hon. member of anything yet.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, you are.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Oh, no, I am stating a simple fact, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, you are.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . .that the hon. member who has been in this Legislature for 22 years, should know enough about the rules of the House to know what he was entitled to, and that he could have had, had he insisted on it, time on the radio in this House. It was his choice that he did otherwise. I don't want to hear reports from his constituency that he didn't get time on the radio, that he was refused an opportunity to speak on the radio, and I won't be surprised if we do hear it.

Members of the Opposition have on different occasions, not only in the Legislature but in their radio speeches have charged the Government with being arrogant. It is quite evident to me, Mr. Speaker, that this charge was made only for one purpose, and that purpose is to get public sympathy for the Opposition.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Every little bit helps.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Liberal party, even though it was defeated in Saskatchewan nearly 12 years ago, has not yet ceased to act as if they were the chosen party in Saskatchewan. What they mistake for arrogance is the legitimate responsibility and authority of a democratic government.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You have taken to yourself!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is where they made the mistake. And I do not speak from hearsay, Mr. Speaker. I sat on those opposition benches for six years, and I can tell you a story of how an opposition was treated by a Liberal government, and I would be ashamed if we treated the Opposition anything like it was dealt with at that time.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell us about it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I will tell you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell us.

**February 29, 1956**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — First, the government of that day refused to grant to the Opposition and to the people of Saskatchewan the right to have an election. Is that arrogant? — the greatest of arrogance. What was their excuse for it? They said, “we don’t want to have an election just when there is an invasion of France.” When did we have an election? In 1944, when there was an invasion of France on. Mr. Speaker, they didn’t want to have an election (period). Because they knew they were going to get licked. It was not a question of war or anything else. They refused to get licked. It was not a question of war or anything else. They refused to the people of this province the right to speak through their ballots.

On one occasion in this House, and my hon. friend over there will remember it, while one of the Opposition members was speaking, debating a Motion which was properly before this House, the Liberal government arranged to have His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor brought in and prorogue the House in the middle of that debate. Arrogance!

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** — It’s happening today.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Arrogance: that’s all they knew. Free speech? They did not know what it meant. They did not understand they still do not understand, the Liberal party of this modern age, what real free speech meant. And the greatest proof that we have free speech today, is the fact that the member for Maple Creek, a few days ago, could get up in this House and tell that fantastic story. And that there is free speech in the ‘press’ is illustrated by this headline, over the name of Robert Moon, “Mr. Cameron Gets Back Into Form.” What a form! Ninety per cent of the people of the province of Saskatchewan are ashamed of that kind of stuff.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Ashamed of you.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the fundamental trouble is that the Liberal party really doesn’t believe in democracy and, furthermore, they have no faith in democracy. We believe that our democracy is so strong that it needs no protection from either fanatics of the left or fanatics of the right, except that they be allowed to speak and expose themselves, and to give people an opportunity to answer. That is real democracy.

All this talk of arrogance on the part of the Government and abuse of the Opposition is designed to convince the electors of Saskatchewan — and here I want to paraphrase a line from George Bernard Shaw; it is designed to convince the electors of Saskatchewan that no Liberal was ever beaten-fairly. That is what they want the people of this province to believe; and I would suggest to members of the Opposition that they give up their whining and crying and self-pity, and that they apply themselves to their job with some intelligence, and sincerity and energy. . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Who is crying?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Who is crying now?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . .and they will get a lot more respect from the electorate of Saskatchewan.

The members opposite have been deliberately trying to make a case, first, because of lack of help from the Provincial Government, the burden of the rural taxpayer is intolerable. This has been thoroughly answered; but I would like to add one or two examples. I would say, Mr. Speaker, having looked into the record, if I were a supporter of the Liberal party, sitting in this House, a Liberal member in this House, I would certainly be ashamed to mention this subject. Six rural municipalities in the northeast part of Saskatchewan, one of them organized in 1943, and what help did they get? Here it is from the record: In 1938, all of these rural municipalities, the five of them then organized, got a grant. In one case the grant was only \$100 – very low; but they all got a grant, and a total of nearly \$2,500. That was a lot of money for five municipalities, wasn't it, Mr. Speaker:

**Mr. McCarthy:** — More than some of them are getting now.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That was in an election year when they all got a grant. In 1939, not one of them got a grant! They did not need any roads in 1939, for the simple reason that the Liberals didn't need any votes! Now, either these grants given by the Liberal party were for the pure and simple reason to get votes in that area, or else they discontinued the grants because a C.C.F. member was elected there. They can take whichever answer they choose.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You are doing the same thing.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Sometimes they have said, "Let us think of the hard times in the 'thirties when there wasn't any money." Mr. Speaker, 1937 was the toughest year in the history of the province; yet in the spring of 1938, they could scrape up grants for every municipality, and in 1939 none, in 1940 none, in 1941, one out of the five got a grant. In 1942 (it could have been election time was coming close then) three out of the five received grants; and in 1943, when we had six municipalities in the group, five out of the six received grants.

Since 1944, this group of R.M.'s has received a total in grants of nearly 3 ¼ million and, in addition to that, there was a programme of bridge construction. These R.M.'s, last year, when they had the flood disaster to which the Liberal government at Ottawa wouldn't contribute a 5-cent piece, got special flood damage grants totalling \$60,000. The Leader of the Opposition said, "It didn't amount to a hill of beans." There are a lot of people in this province who think differently.

And then, on top of that, there was the removal of the Public Revenue Tax. . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Oh, I would be ashamed to mention that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I am not surprised that the hon. member for Cannington is ashamed to mention the Public Revenue Tax. I would, if I were you, be ashamed to mention it. To these six rural municipalities the Public Revenue Tax meant about \$30,000 per year.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You must be getting scared. . . election.



**February 29, 1956**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I made a radio speech a little while ago, and then I got a letter from a chap who appeared to be a Liberal supporter, out in the country, and he said, “I disagree with you 100 per cent.” He said: “The Liberals never took a cent out of us, but you take this three cents on a dollar.” I am sorry, but I had to write back to him and point out that this three cents on the dollar was started by the Liberal government in 1937. . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You promised to take it off.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Just a minute. None of his Liberal friends had told him that, of course, and it was then on second-hand goods and on food as well.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, no!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And that was removed, and then the extra cent was put on for the hospitalization plan. He didn’t know that the Liberal government was taking out of his municipality in Public Revenue Tax over \$5,000 every year. He didn’t know that either, so I had to tell him those things.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You took it for eight years.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the other day the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) talked about what may be an imaginary rural municipality. He wouldn’t tell us the name of it; he wouldn’t tell us the number of it.

**Mr. Horsman:** — It’s very real.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He says “It’s real.” Mr. Speaker, when things are real, and the case is good, you don’t keep it hidden. There was only one reason why he kept it hidden, and that was that he knew that if we could look into the real story with regard to that municipality his story would be no good.

Now I will take a real municipality – not an imaginary one, not a ghost municipality. . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Take one in Cannington, will you?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I will take the rural municipality of Round Valley No. 410 at Unity. Maybe my hon. friend lives in it. At December 31, 1943, it has these liabilities: Sundry liabilities, \$24,800; Seed Grain liabilities, \$21,900; Bank Overdraft, \$49,500, making a total in those three liabilities of over \$96,000. They had arrears of taxes of over \$100,000 at that time.

Now let us compare the situation with December 31, 1954, and in the same class of liabilities it had one item – Sundry, \$94.59, compared with \$96,000 11 years before.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Did you pay that off for them?

**February 29, 1956**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And the assets: Cash and Bank Balance, \$29,400; Investments, \$12,200; total assets, \$41,700. This municipality was \$137,000 better off in its cash position after it had enjoyed C.C.F. government for 10 or 11 years.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the reason my hon. friends have to talk so much about the municipalities not getting a fair deal is just simply because it isn't true, and when something isn't true, the only way to get people to believe it is to keep saying it over and over.

Then, in addition, and I do not want to take any time about this, but there is a grid road programme.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Go ahead!

**Mr. Danielson:** — You're doing fine.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — This is the greatest programme for improvement of rural roads that has ever been undertaken in this province. . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell us. . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . .and is proving to be. . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Tell us where they are going.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . .accepted 100 per cent, and my hon. friends will, I am sure, be pleased to see that the progress is made — or will they?

**Mr. Lopton:** — That will be the day.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On the question of education, the Hudson Bay School Unit could never have existed on Liberal government grants- it just couldn't have lived at all. Local school taxes were as high as 45 mills for a one-room school. The school buildings and furniture were in a disgraceful condition in 1944, and the former Minister of Education, when a group of teachers asked him what should be done about these log schools where the chinking was falling out, told them: "with my own hands I would chink them up with mud." That was the Liberal reply. Well, this Hudson Bay School Unit, in its term, has built just about as many classrooms as it had when it started, between new classrooms and replacements, and it has bought more desks than the school unit had when they started, because the old desks, what were they? Pieces of spruce lumber, cut up and nailed together for a wibbly-wobbly kind of desk.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's what you did. . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . .and they had to 'throw them out the window' soon after the Liberal party was thrown out the window.

Somebody in this debate intimated that the Liberal party has no policy. I do not think that is all the truth about the Liberal party.

**February 29, 1956**

I think it is possibly true also that the Liberal policy has no party. Their policy seems, as far as I can see, to be to promise anything, realizing that they are never going to have any responsibility. Now these reckless promises are an insult to the people of Saskatchewan and to their intelligence.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Look who is talking!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's what you did in 1944.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What did you promise us?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Liberal policy is also to protect and support the Federal Liberal policies, no matter how damaging they may be to the province of Saskatchewan. We find the Liberals who, a little while ago, were all for cash advances on farm-stored grain now getting over to the other side along with Mr. Gardiner.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . .and the Royal Commission.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We find them also getting on the other side in regard to the South Saskatchewan dam, and making apologies for the construction of that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Page Cass-Beggs!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I am not surprised at this, because the Liberal leader is a bit irresponsible.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That is a matter of opinion.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I will produce some evidence, Mr. Speaker, to show that he is a little irresponsible. In this debate he quoted from the Throne Speech of 1953 – pardon me. . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Be sure you get the right one now.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He quoted from the 1955 Throne Speech.

**Mr. Lopton:** — He is getting balled up.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And these are the words he quoted: “highest record of mineral claims staked was experienced when 7,290 claims, etc. were recorded.” He was trying to show that in the Throne Speech we were every year saying “highest on record”; but the funny part, Mr. Speaker, is that he started to quote at the fifth word in this paragraph, and when you read it from the start, this is the way it is:

“Last year the second highest record of mineral claims stakes was experienced.”

Not the highest, but the second highest.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Just one word. . .

**February 29, 1956**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — People who misquote the official records to try to create an impression cannot be classes as very responsible kind of people.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They are all over there, including yourself.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, the other case that the Liberal party is trying to make at this time is to show that in Saskatchewan we are not getting development of resources and industrial development. So let us have a look at that picture for a little while now. First in regard to the hardrock mining in the North. In 1944, we had one mine producing; three or four mines had produced for a short time before that, and were closed. One of them was a very large mine, the Box Mine of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company at Goldfields. . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Telephones):** — Who scared them out?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You did.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And some unkind people might say the Liberal government scared them out. Of course, that wasn't the fact of the case; but if they stopped operation now, my friends over there would be saying the C.C.F. Government scared them out. Actually they ran out of business. With a fixed price for gold, the ore body not as good as they figured it was, and increasing costs, they just didn't have a mine any more; so they shut down even though it had \$5 or \$10 million capital in it.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Should have put a price control on it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Seven mines produced in 1955, Mr. Speaker; not one, but seven, and three of them are major mines: that is, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, the Gunnar Mine, and the Eldorado Mine. We have 10 active exploration shafts working underground, and another mill is now authorized and will be built shortly, to handle a minimum of 500 tons of ore per day, and more are going to follow.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Like the pulp mill.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, we also should notice the number of claims staked in different years, because the first job in getting a mine is to stake claims; find some shows and stake claims. The greatest number of claims that was ever staked in one year in the province of Saskatchewan when we had a Liberal government was 1,180. That is not very many.

**Mr. Lopton:** — A lot for those days.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member for Saltcoats says it was a lot for those days. Well, I guess it was rather amazing. I know that the Liberal party has been trying to convince the people of Saskatchewan that the oil was just put here in Saskatchewan since 1944; but I never realized before that they were also trying to convince the people of Saskatchewan that the great pre-Cambrian shield was put there just since 1944.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Your forests just came since 1944.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In four years, Mr. Speaker, from 1952 to 1955, there were more claims staked in those years than in all the previous history of the province of Saskatchewan. The greatest number of claims in good standing at the year end, while we had a Liberal government, was only 2,460 claims. For some years now we have had over 20,000 claims in good standing.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Not too many.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — One of the favourite activities of the Liberals is to point out that, since 1944, we produced for some years fewer pounds of copper and fewer pound in zinc. Well, in 1943-44 under wartime pressure of production, we were at a peak. The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company at Flin Flon was urged to load their mill to the limit, and to load it with the highest grade of ore they could get out of the mine; and so I imagine they were doing two things. They were first highgrading the mine for the sake of getting more metals, and they were overloading the equipment. They did produce at a very high rate, but the logical thing to do when that wartime pressure got off was to go back to a normal rate of production, which is exactly what they did. Since that time they have built a new zinc plant for recovery of zinc which previously was wasted, and though we are still about 10-million pounds a year under the record for copper production, in zinc we are 10-million pounds a year over the record during the Liberal government.

The value of all quartz minerals in 1943-44 was just over \$20 million. This year, the value of all quartz minerals will be about \$55 million. There was little spent in exploration and development in those years. This year, or rather in 1955, about \$20 million was spent in that work.

The member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) in his radio speech made on February 8, said, “and yet we have little development except in uranium, and we can thank the Federal Government of Canada for that, as they discovered the uranium and pioneered its development at Eldorado.” Do you want to know the truth? The Federal Government of Canada expropriated the Eldorado property, and the value was not arbitrated either, or agreed to by the company; but the former Prime Minister, the late Rt. Hon. W. L. MacKenzie King, called them in and they suggested to him that they should have engineers and arbitrate the value. He said, “you will take what I decide to give you” – and they did.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Good prices. That is your story.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Were you there?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They were not satisfied, but that was expropriation. Now the pitchblende in Uranium City area was discovered and reported in 1936, and this information was used by Eldorado, which was not a Crown Corporation. My hon. friend says “we can thank the Federal government.” The Federal government shut everybody else out of the business of prospecting for our developing uranium from September, 1943

**February 29, 1956**

to January, 1948. For almost five years they wouldn't let people prospect or develop uranium. They shut them out on the very flimsy excuse. . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Would you done that?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . .of national security; and it is generally recognized that it was a very flimsy excuse, because to go out prospecting for uranium and finding it wasn't going to give any secrets away to the Germans at all. I hope my hon. friends realize that this was a kind of Socialism – not good Socialism, but nevertheless it was what my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) would undoubtedly call 'Socialism'.

The member for Wilkie then said, in his radio speech, "I believe that the next half-century should belong to Saskatchewan, and I firmly believe that it will, providing that the people of this province elect a government at the next provincial election in which investors will have confidence." Mr. Speaker, I agree; the C.C.F. Government will be elected and it is proven now that the investors have confidence in this Government. Certainly this people are not going to elect as Premier of this province a man who goes to Toronto and makes statements that are designed to keep capital out of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're nuts!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You know, the only good thing about it is that nobody pays much attention to the statements of the Leader of the Opposition either in Toronto or anyplace else. Otherwise every prospector who prospects in Saskatchewan would have been injured by that statement he made in Toronto.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to oil and gas. This won't take long, it won't hurt much. The greatest number of oil wells ever drilled in "a Liberal year" (if I may use that term) was in 1943, when they had 25 wells drilled, but only five of them were over 2,000-feet deep. In 1955, we had over 1,000 wells drilled. . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . .10 years. . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Over 1,000 wells drilled.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Why don't you tell us what you had in 1945?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We had a lot more than there were in 1943; and, in 1955, there were 25 new discoveries, just the same number as the wells the Liberals got drilled, that were all dry holes in 1943.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — All dry holes?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All dry holes. There were no discoveries that year at all.

**Mr. McDonald:** — How many dry holes today?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In 1955, the number of new wells capable of producing oil or gas was 675. The greatest Liberal oil production in any one year was 331 barrels; that figures out on a per-day production just at nine-tenths of a barrel per day. Since October, 1955, we have been producing at the rate of just around, sometimes over, 40,000 barrels per day. Saskatchewan is now close to producing its total requirements of oil on balance; some oil is cold, some is imported. We wondered a few years ago when we would reach that point — we are not far away from it now. In 1945, there were only five wells in the province capable of producing oil, and 31 gas. Many of them were poor wells, most of them are now finished. Now we have over 1,850 wells, getting on towards 2,000 wells capable of producing oil or gas. Gas production in 1944, that is the useful kind of natural gas, was 30-million cubic feet; in 1955, over 10-billion cubic feet.

New discoveries (and by now discoveries I mean bringing in a new field, not just a new well in a field, but a new discovery) from 1947 to date number 134. Companies in 1955 spent on exploration, development, pipelines and refineries over \$80 million.

The member for Wilkie in a radio speech, again, on February 8 said: “The search for oil in Saskatchewan is at best a half-hearted effort.” I would like him to go around and tell the companies which have been spending \$5 million, \$10 million and \$15 million in the search for oil, that they are only doing a half-hearted job.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They know it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They probably know that the hon. member said it, and I think probably they will be remembering it, too. The companies that have been operating in Saskatchewan have done a magnificent job. It is a difficult area in which to work. There are very deep glacial drifts; there is the rugged winter weather, and the, to cap it all, this silly Liberal criticism which doesn't help it at all.

We have also had increases in the production of coal, of sodium-sulphate, of clay and salt. We have a potash development that was never dreamed of, and will have a substantial potash industry in Saskatchewan in the very near future. Over 3-million acres are under exploration. The newest of all, of course, is the agreement to explore and develop and try to find ways and means to produce and use the deposits of magnesium which we have.

Let us come now to the question of forestry for a few minutes. In 1943, there were only 13- million acres of forest in the protected area. Now we have over 90-million acres protected. The far North isolated areas do receive a lesser degree of protection, but the protected area has been extended to cover all of the forests. In 1943, little use was made of planes for patrol and suppression of fires; now we have four small planes on the job all summer for patrol for detection of fires, and one Horseman plane for use by the ‘smoke-jumpers’. The smoke-jumpers are the first in Canada, and still, I believe, the only smoke-jumpers in Canada.

**February 29, 1956**

According to the Department of Natural Resources Annual Report for 1943-44, the total spent in forest protection improvements that year, in dams, fire-guards, roads and trails, telephones, towers, buildings, etc., was less than \$18,000. Mr. Speaker, forests are a renewable resource. Forests are like a farm. They have got to be managed. They have got to be cared for. They have got to be protected. You have to spend some money on them if they are going to be any good to you. The policy of the Liberal government was not to spend anything on them, and, of course, they didn't get very much out of them. For the same kind of work – dams, fire-guards, roads, trails, telephones, towers, buildings, etc., - last year our expenditure was over \$1/2 million the forested area. This included construction and reconstruction of nearly 400 miles of roads and fire-guards, and maintenance of nearly 2,000 miles of roads and fire-guards. There was no forest inventory in 1943. Now we have it all completed south of Latitude 55; about 27-million acres.

In 1943-44 there was a large cut of white spruce saw-timber of 169-million board feet. In 1954-55, the total cut of saw-timber was 95-million board feet. A larger percentage of that is poplar than in the past, and the white spruce is actually getting down close to a sustained yield basis. Pulpwood and boxwood in 1943-44 was a large amount – 84,000 cords, and again it was wartime production. Now we produce to the full market demand which varies from a small amount up to 100,000 cords a year. Only a couple of thousand poles were produced in 1943-44. Last year, we produced 120,000. No plywood bolts were produced in 1943-44; last year, we produced 5,600 cords.

We have often heard about all the sawmills that have moved out of the province of Saskatchewan. Well, in 1943, we had 528 sawmills, and now we have 642. That is the way they have been going!

A number of the members opposite have referred to the article headed, "LUMBER TOWN WALKING LAST MILE TO OBLIVION"; which was in the 'Leader Post' of February 6, 1956. I have here a clipping from the Prince Albert 'Daily Herald' of January 26, 1956, headed, "McDonald To Query Saskatchewan Forest Policy." One paragraph reads – and this is something he wanted to know:

“Why The Pas Lumber Company, the last of the large private lumbering industries has moved out of Saskatchewan to British Columbia?”

Well, I shall try to tell him why they moved. Then, I have here a 'Leader Post' editorial of February 16, 1956, and I would suggest to the hon. Minister in charge of the Power Corporation that if the 'Leader Post' needs engineers to tell them how to write their editorials about gas, they sure need foresters to tell them how to write about forestry, because they had this statement in the editorial:

“There is every reason for believing that the Timber Board was responsible for The Pas Lumber Company pulling out of Saskatchewan for British Columbia.”

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You don't need an engineer to tell that.



**February 29, 1956**

**Mr. Danielson:** — Correct.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the article published in the ‘Leader Post’, headed “Lumber Town Walking Last Mile To Oblivion.” I know this country well, I have been there quite often, but one paragraph of that article reads as follows:

“Within a month the big sawmill of The Pas Lumber Company, backbone of the community for the past 26 years, will be idle.”

Mr. Speaker, the big sawmill at the date of this writing had been shut down for months. This article was published February 6, 1956, and the mill was shut down away last fall. The article goes on:

“The firm announced recently that it was moving its mill to Prince George, B.C., because no more private timber is available here.”

**Mr. Danielson:** — That’s right.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Continuing from this article:

“Negotiating with the Saskatchewan Government for timber rights in large remaining stands broke down last spring, and the company looked elsewhere for lumber.”

**Mr. Danielson:** — There you are!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. Negotiations did not break down, and they actually did get some additional timber. And, again, the article says:

“The 1,800 mile moving job which, when completed, will cost the company an estimated \$750,000 in wages and shipping charges. . .”

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell them how much more timber they got.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I happen to have in my hand a copy of a letter from the Executive Vice-President of The Pas Lumber Company, and in regard to this moving question, he says:

“I was amused at the newspaper report that the cost of dismantling and shipping the equipment to Prince George was estimated at \$750,000. If our actual cost goes to three per cent of that figure, we are going to be howling mad.”

And the whole of the article is just as far out. And then they say. . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Liberal falsehoods!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Just trying to cover up.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The article in the ‘Leader Post’ says:

“They approached the British Columbia Provincial Department of Forests. From the extensive discussions came forth an agreement. One thing is sure, The Pas Lumber Company did acquire a large tract of timber land 70 miles from Prince George.”

Let us look at what the Executive Vice-President says:

“Also, the large timber concession we have at Prince George consists of a timber sale bought at auction, totally 20-million feet. Our application for a Forest Management License is still tabled, pending the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry.”

Now I could read some more from this article, but I really do not think it is necessary.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh! Go ahead.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who wrote the article?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I do not like to say the name. Now, Mr. Speaker, in this letter, which is dated February 9, the Executive Vice-President of The Pas Lumber Company says – I do not mind leaving a copy of the letter on the table:

“The report is datelined ‘Reserve’, although I am sure the reporter did not talk with Bill Madill, for there are so many inaccuracies in the article that Bill could not have been interviewed. The basic fallacy in the article is that both the employees and the company have known for years that with the completion of the cutting of the berth timber, a continuation of the kind of operation we have been conducting would be impossible.

“You told me your years in politics had accustomed you to this kind of reporting; nevertheless it is frustrating that the reporter completely failed to catch the real drama of the situation: that if we had not installed the central sawmill in 1946, at the urging of the Government, considerably less lumber would have come from the company’s berths, and we would have been through sooner.

“That none of us anticipated the possibility of continuing Reserve when our operations could not economically run, certainly not at the Board’s proposed operation of six to eight million feet, which means 50 per cent of our previous payroll spread over a wider radius.

“That if the sustained yield policy and fire-protection policy adopted 10 years ago had been put into effect

50 or 60 years ago, a healthy industry and a more modern community would exist today at Reserve.”

I could read a great deal more, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to take up your time, on this occasion.

There is a little more to say in regard to The Pas Lumber Company though. The Pas Lumber Company is as fine a company as ever existed. Efficient, honourable, they complied with the regulation. They had the best of labour relations; they paid good wages, and they had good living accommodations for their men. Nevertheless, there are other facts – they were operating on a cut-out and get-out basis. In 10 years from April, 1944, to March, 1954, they produced 338-million board feet of lumber. Practically all of it was white spruce. The revenue from that lumber to the province was less than \$4.00 per thousand board feet. The total revenue in 10 years was approximately \$1,300,000, from 338-million board feet of lumber. And, before 1944, the highest rate of dues was \$1.50 per thousand, and the lowest \$1.00 per thousand.

The Pas Lumber Company had the very choice lumber in Saskatchewan, the best location, best quality timber, lowest freight rates. They exported practically all their lumber. The Reserve operation was all in Saskatchewan; for the Carrot River operation, the logging was in Saskatchewan and the milling at The Pas, Manitoba. So, insofar as benefits to Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people are concerned it was actually about the poorest kind of utilization of timber; and I do not want anybody to take this as a criticism of the company or its officials. We got for our best timber very low dues and a little over half the employment. The original deal for this timber was made by the Federal Government about 1926. It was the same as many other timber deals made by the Federal Government. And in 1930, when the Federal Government handed over those resources to Saskatchewan, they might have said to Saskatchewan, in regard to the timber, these words:

“Here, Saskatchewan, are your forest resources. We have sold nearly all of the best say timber stands to large private operators, most of whom have cut out what they consider to be of value, and got out of Saskatchewan lock, stock and barrel.

“Some of the choicest stands still remain in the Reserve and Carrot River areas, but these we have just sold to The Pas Lumber Company. The remaining forest resources are handed over to you on the condition that you honour the deal we have made with The Pas Lumber Company and others.”

**Mr. Cameron:** — What are you quoting from?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — These are words I have written.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Oh!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** —They might have said:

“You may collect the timber dues we have bargained for; but the leases we have issued must be honoured by the Government of Saskatchewan until the timber is cut and the leases expire.”

Mr. Speaker, if there is any place in our whole picture where Liberals should be ashamed of their record, it is in connection with what they have done to the forests of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You wrote that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, let us take a look at the Saskatchewan Timber Board operations. During the past 10 years, the Timber Board has operated all across the province in scattered stands for timber. Many of these stands were left by the private companies as being unprofitable. They could make money out of them, so they didn't bother with them. The Saskatchewan Timber Board in those years has produced nearly 400-million board feet of lumber, 360,000 cords of pulp-wood, one million railroad ties, and over a half million power and telephone poles – enough poles, Mr. Speaker, to build seven lines from Halifax to Vancouver, and all of them used in the province of Saskatchewan. And the total dues from the Timber Board accruing to the province on white spruce lumber, together with the profits of the Timber Board will be at least \$10 per thousand: not \$4, but \$10 per thousand. Many millions of board feet were sold to Saskatchewan consumers for community projects, schools, churches, halls, curling rinks, at reduced prices – another benefit to the province. The very fact that the Saskatchewan Timber Board lumber was available in the piling yards at Sturgis, Prince Albert, Nipawin and so on, certainly held prices down for the consumers in Saskatchewan.

Harvesting this scattered timber in Saskatchewan is a lot different business from going into a big solid block. It means a much higher ratio of labour; it gave more employment. The roads built by the Saskatchewan Timber Board are a permanent improvement. In the case of The Pas, many of the roads lead, in the Carrot River operation, the wrong way. The Saskatchewan Timber Board has paid over \$3 million in dues, and over \$3 million in profits, and I pointed out to you, a few moments ago, that the total for 10 years of The Pas Lumber Company was \$1,300,000 compared to \$6,000,000 returned from the Timber Board. The Timber Board has employed Union labour at good wages. Contracts for the logging are let at higher prices than we could get by competitive bidding on them. Yet if we lost a lot of contractors, we wouldn't have the least bit of trouble in getting people to fill that gap. There have been more people wanting to contract and work for the Timber Board than we can accommodate.

On occasion the Timber Board has undertaken an expansion programme, stock-piled a lot of products, so as to give work and wages when they were badly needed. If we compare the operations of the Timber Board with the operations of The Pas Lumber Company, and take into account the difference in the value of the standing timber where each operated, then I would say it would be a very conservative statement that the Timber Board

**February 29, 1956**

operation was worth in employment and in cash returns in the province four or five times as much as The Pas Lumber Company operations. The Pas Lumber Company was one of the best. I am sorry to see them leave Saskatchewan; but certainly we could not afford to keep them operating on that basis. I talked to them on many occasions, but we could not persuade them to undertake the type of operation which would have made it possible for them to stay, to get into other lines than just high-grading the forest and taking only the white spruce lumber. So there, Mr. Speaker, is the story of The Pas Lumber Company.

Now, there was something said about Nesbit plywood. There was an article published in the Prince Albert 'Herald' of January 25, and this is what it said – and this is supposed to be a quotation from the manager of the Nesbit Plywood Company:

“We are unable to work out a long-term policy with the Provincial Government. If necessity calls, we may even consider moving out to Manitoba.”

He is quoted as saying:

“There has been a continuous cold-war, and we feel there is a distinct lack of understanding and sympathetic hearing by the Government of our requirements.”

Some of those quotations were read in this House, I believe, Mr. Speaker, but members of the Opposition were very careful not to read from a letter which was published in the Prince Albert 'Herald' by the manager of Nesbit Plywood, on Friday, February 3, because here the manager says:

“Our relationship with the Government and the Department from the start have been amicable and normal. This fact was stressed several times in my phone conversation with your reporter. My direct quote on this point fully confirmed by people in my office at the time of the conversation was ‘we have no grounds for complaint against the Government on this point, because we have never applied for a reserve’. I further stated that I was not to be quoted unless the final draft was cleared with me first. This was not done.”

**Mr. Erb (Milestone):** — Liberal propaganda!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the manager of the plywood plant told me in his letter:

“I was, if anything, more surprised and disappointed than you at the political bias and twist the 'Herald' reporter built up out of extracts from a 'phone conversation with me.”

And, again, he said:

**February 29, 1956**

“My first reply should have appeared in the Saturday paper of January 28. However, the editor maintained that I was too direct and personal in what I said about their reporter.”

Free speech, Mr. Speaker! Free speech! And so he did not get it published until February 3.

It might be interesting to not just at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, now that we are talking about forests; I have in my hand the issue of the New Zealand ‘Herald’ for Friday, December 16, 1955, and it reads:

“Today, for the first time the ‘Herald’ is printed entirely on newsprint made in New Zealand. With it a 30-year-old dream comes to life – the dream of a great newsprint industry, based on the softwood resources of the 260,000 acre forest planted on the Kaingaroa plains in the 1920’s and the early 1930’s.

“The operating company, The Tasman Pulp and Paper Company Limited, a public company in which the Crown is a shareholder. . .”

Is it a Socialist government over there in New Zealand?

“. . .was formally registered on July 2, 1952. . .”

And then over the opposite page, we find:

“The shareholders: the Crown owns 2,000,000 shares of £1 each and the balance of the 6,000,000 shares are owned by other parties.”

I thought that just might be of interest to the members of the House to know how they are developing a brand new pulp industry in New Zealand. I am going to present this copy of the first issue of this paper that was printed in New Zealand on paper made in New Zealand to you, Mr. Speaker, for the Legislative library.

Going on from forestry to fisheries – our commercial catch, in the last year, was a very good one. It is interesting to note that the actual volume was smaller than it was ten years ago, but the value was higher; and it was higher largely because of the facilities which we have put into the north for the processing and handling of fish. One industry that has become very important is the tourist industry, and angling is a part of it. In 1943-44, 7,000 angling licenses; now, over 70,000 licenses.

In Game, we see the same increase. The license revenue in game was \$3,000 ten years ago; now it is \$318,000. In the fur and trapping business, progress has also been made until last year we touched a high of almost 2-million muskrat pelts taken. That was 17 times as many as in 1943-44.

Sometimes the members of the Opposition talk about all the Government employees. Well, I would like to make a comparison. In 1943-44, in the Department of Natural Resources, there were 148 permanent positions; in 1954-55, in the two departments of Mineral Resources and Natural Resources (and we must take them both if we are going to make a fair comparison), there were 460 permanent positions. That is a lot more employees; but the total revenue, in 1943-44, was \$1,600,000, and in 1954-55, the total revenue was over \$9,000,000. The total expenditure, in 1943-44, was just over \$1/2 million. It was the policy of the liberal government to spend very little on development, or taking care of resources. We spent, ten years later, almost \$3 ½ million; but what counts is your net revenue after you deduct the expenditure from the revenue. The net revenue, in 1943-44, was just over a million dollars, and in 1954-55, it was over \$5 ½ million.

In 1943-44, the Lands Branch and the Water Rights Branch, which are now in the Department of Agriculture, were in the Department of Natural Resources. They had a staff of 26 and a revenue of \$500,000; in fact that was pretty near one-third of the total revenue of the Department of Natural Resources at that time. When we translate this into the total of revenue for each employee, we find that each fired man the Liberals had was only making, for the government, \$5,495; whereas each one of our hired men, in the past year, has made almost \$20,000 in revenue. So I do not think we should be criticized for having a few more civil servants. As long as they are turning in good money like that, it is good business. It cost money to look after resources, but it pays.

I am sorry that the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) is not in his seat, because I want to comment on some of the things he had to say the other day. First of all, he said the Government has failed to speak out and advise people on the nature and value of their mineral holdings. Well, he is wise now as to the values in or beside the oil fields; but, Mr. Speaker, six or seven years ago he was just as ignorant as everybody else, and knew no more about it than anybody else. He wouldn't dare gamble on what it was worth at that time. If he really is so wise, if he had known six or seven years ago, he could have made a fortune. But that isn't true. The best of people didn't know; the people who were in the business. One oil company gave up a permit in south eastern Saskatchewan of 250,000 acres a few days before the oil strike was made across the line, in North Dakota. So, when the hon. member for Souris-Estevan says that the Government should have told the people of Saskatchewan six or seven years ago how much their mineral rights were worth, he is just talking a bunch of nonsense. Nobody knew; nobody could know.

He also put himself on record as opposed to the net royalty lease. He said no major companies were taking these net royalty leases. Well, Tidewater has these leases – and, you know, Tidewater has a subscribed capital of \$163 million. I don't know whether that is a major company or not, but it is quite a chunk of company. There is Sohio, which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Standard Oil of Ohio, and that is not what you would call a minor company, hardly. And then we have Whitehall Canadian Oil – that is a British company; they are associated with Trinidad Central Oilfields and they are affiliated with Whitehall Securities Corporation of London, England, and they have world-wide activities. I do not know whether they are major or not, but they are a good company. The Frontier

**February 29, 1956**

Refining Company of Cheyenne, Wyoming; they produce, they refine, they market; their net worth on April 30, 1955, was nearly \$6 million. All of them are good companies, with excellent bank references.

I feel quite confident that the net royalty lease is good business for the province of Saskatchewan. I do not say that in every last case we will guess right and be the winner; sometime we are going to issue a net royalty lease when we might have been better off to take the cash instead – and when we do, my hon. friends will surely publish it high, wide and handsome. But if we win 50 times they will never say a word about it. You see, what we do in the net royalty lease – it gets a lot more people into the business. The real major companies, like Imperial and Shell and Mobil and so on, are not fussy about the net royalty lease; they would just as soon we didn't have it, because they know that they have a far better chanced to get control over a larger amount of our oil if we do not have it. They know that the small companies cannot put up \$1/2 million or \$2 million of a cash bonus hid, and risk it – and that is what they are doing, they are risking it. As far as I am concerned, I am interest not in seeing that a few large companies can control everything, but that as many as possible of smaller, good companies get into the oil business; and we have a lot of them now.

I believe, in the long run, it will bring greater revenue, but that time will only prove; but one thing it certainly does (and this my hon. friend from Souris-Estevan should agree with) it does postpone, for the next generation, some of the revenue from these measure, and according to him, that is a good thing. Time will tell. I tell you what I will do, Mr. Speaker. It will take a couple of years to find out very much about this, but about two years from now I will send a message down to Souris-Estevan with Mr. Thorson to tell him how it is coming along.

**Mr. Kohaly:** — Send it over here now.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member suggested a development fund for Saskatchewan, and again, he is a little bit late, because that is already in effect. We have a School Lands Fund and \$3 million of bonus bids and other mineral revenue has now gone into that School Lands Fund. What is it used for? Well, already between \$3 million and \$4 million of that fund has been loaned to school units and school districts, by the method of buying into that fund the debentures issued by those school units and school districts; and there is \$4,800,000 gone into general capital account to help to build permanent improvements in Saskatchewan that your grandchildren and my grandchildren, Mr. Speaker, will live to enjoy here in the province of Saskatchewan. We may even, in permanent improvements, put a really good permanent highway through Estevan.

**Mr. Kohaly:** — It's about time.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Then my friend also did a little grumbling about the compensation for surface rights in oil drilling. Now the regulations suggest, for a well-site of four acres and for a roadway of one acre – that is five acres; and suppose it is assessed at \$15 per acre, the capital damage payment is \$265 for five acres, and in most cases that is a lot more than the value of the land. The annual rent is \$265,



making total payment for the first year, \$530. Now, the poorest land is valued for this purpose, or assessed for this purpose, at \$10 an acre; and if it goes down to the poorest land, then for a well-site and roadway it is \$215, for capital damage, and for annual rental \$215, or a total of \$430 the first year. Now that is not compulsory. That is set out in the regulations, and when there is an arbitration, unless there is some extraordinary circumstance, the arbitration board pretty well follows that formula; but the owner may make any deal he wishes. We have also provided that the companies must use approved lease forms in regard to surface rights.

I know many farmers who are very happy with this revenue, and I think you can see, Mr. Speaker, why they should be. With four wells on a quarter-section they have a steady revenue of \$1,000 a year, and you can still farm, in spite of what the hon. member for Souris-Estevan says, at least 75 per cent of the land that was previously farmed, with only a little inconvenience. Now pipelines and tank batteries are additional. No farmer is compelled to give his land for a pipeline or tank battery. There is no statute under which they can expropriate for that purpose. They can get entry to dig the well, because they must have access to their property; but they do not have to have the pipelines and the tank batteries. So the farmers are in an A-1 position to get a reasonable and fair price for the land, for tank batteries, for pipelines and so on.

We have provided that arbitration can be had with very little cost, and we have also provided that in the new leases there can be a review of the rental every seven years.

The hon. member also had some grumbling to do about the tourist business, because we couldn't tell him how many tourists were coming into Saskatchewan. Well, actually, Mr. Speaker, the trouble is that we haven't the time to count them; but they are many, and certainly the business is growing every year.

**Mr. Kohaly:** — That isn't. . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It certainly is. And I happen to have in my hand here a letter from a man at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, written in January of this year, addressed to Saskatchewan Government Airways, and he was telling about the fly-fishing up at Black Lake, and referring to his son, he said:

“In the next four days he found out what I meant, and his comment was, ‘never did I imagine, in my wildest dreams, there was such fly-fishing anywhere in the world’.

“From Black Lake we went back to Stony Rapids and fished the Rapids for river-run trout. The average of these trout would be under 15 lbs., making wonderful fishing, using casting rod and 18 lb. test line.”

Mr. Speaker, this letter is so good I would like to read a couple more extracts from it. He says:

**February 29, 1956**

“When that time comes that I wish to go hunting or fishing – but where? I know it is some place in the far north. I send to your tourist department and I get maps, letters and such information telling me where I can go. It only costs us letter postage to get these maps, and a fund of information, and usually it doesn’t take me long to get it either.”

Then later, he says:

“In every way I am being made to feel at home. When you can feel like that I am no longer a stranger. I get on one of your planes. The pilots are grand boys; soon I am calling them by their first names and we get along swell. I have a fine trip; the people I meet at my destination are just as friendly and co-operative. I meet trappers, prospectors, government employees, Indians, and all are friendly. Your plane brings me back to where I have left my car; I have had a wonderful trip – a trip I will remember a long, long time.”

And the last quotation I want to read:

“At this writing I am on the shady side of 78 years, and I hope to be able to enjoy many more trips into your great northern country.”

Mr. Speaker, over the last ten years, the holiday resources of the province of Saskatchewan have been well advertised in the United States, and to a considerable extent in other parts of Canada. We have had a great number of reporters who have done a grand job of writing; we have taken them into the north to show it to them, and they have really done a job of advertising. In 1943-44, there was hardly a place where you could put down a sleeping bag at Lac La Ronge. Now there are hotels and motels and cabins and cabins, and I do not know how many hundred or thousand people that they can accommodate, and do accommodate, and they are filled up; and more tourist accommodation is being built every year, and certainly one business, among many others, that is expanding very rapidly is that tourist business.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Motion.

The question being put on the Motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, it was agreed to on recorded division by 36 votes to 11, and the Address order to be engrossed.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o’clock p.m.