

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature
23rd Day

Tuesday, March 27, 1962.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. Speaker: — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I have a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor to the Members of the Legislative Assembly:

“I have received with great pleasure the Address which you have voted in reply to my Speech at the Opening of the present Session of the Legislature, and wish to express to you my sincere thanks for it.

Frank L. Bastedo,
Lieutenant Governor.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to draw to your attention and members of this House a group of high school students, grade 10 students from the school at Cupar. They are in the city today to see this House in action, accompanied by their principal Mr. Early Chambers. I am sure all members of this House agree with me when I wish them a good trip home, and we hope while they are here their education will be furthered by our good behaviour in this House.

ANNOUNCEMENT TO PRESS: ORDER IN COUNCIL

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I thought I might just read a statement which I have just given to the press, and which is of interest to the members of the legislature.

“Pursuant to a motion adopted by the Legislative Assembly on March 16, 1962, an Order in Council

March 27, 1962

was passed today establishing a committee to review all matters pertaining to allowances and salaries paid to members and officials of the Legislative Assembly, and to members of the executive council. Mr. Justice E.M. Culliton has agreed to serve as chairman. The other four members of the committee are: Mr. R.L. Bamford of Moose Jaw, Accountant; Mr. Donald W. Pearce of Regina, railroad engineer until a month ago; Mrs. Marion Sherman of Prince Albert, alderman on the Prince Albert city council; and Mr. Roy Atkinson of Springwater, farmer and vice-president of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union.”

The government tried to get a group which was representative in order to assess and recommend on this matter. Mr. Justice Culliton, of course, is a former member of the House and of the cabinet. Mr. Bamford is a well known accountant; and Mr. Pearce was formerly a railroad engineer; Mrs. Sherman, in addition to being alderman, is also chairman of the Health Region Board at Prince Albert, chairman of the Regional Library Board; Mr. Atkinson is a farmer and vice-president of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, as well as being a member of the board of Federated Co-operatives.

MOTION: RURAL TELEPHONE SYSTEMS

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — moved:

That this Assembly respectfully requests the Government of Saskatchewan to give immediate consideration to:

- (a) substantially increasing grants to every rural telephone company in the province regardless of size, for the purpose of maintenance and new construction; and
- (b) constructing rural telephone circuits in those areas not presently being served.

Mr. Speaker: — This motion which appears on the order paper under the name of the hon. member for Turtleford has been a motion that I have spent some considerable time in perusing, so I have a statement I would like to read to the House at this time.

In view of the fact that a bill respecting rural telephone systems is presently standing on the order paper, and also of the fact that grants to rural telephone companies have been referred to committee of supply in the estimates, I have had some difficulty in determining whether or not this motion is in order.

In my opinion, however, part (a) is in order because the motion is couched in the usual terms of a money motion, and because it is only by a substantive motion such as this that a formal request to increase an expenditure can be made. The House is aware that in committee of supply the only motion allowed is one to reduce an expenditure. (Beauchesne, 4th Edition, Citation 242 (2)).

On the other hand, part (b) of the motion is in my opinion anticipated by Bill No. 25 — An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems — introduced on March 14, Beauchesne, 4th Edition, Citation 131, points out that “in applying the anticipation rule, preference is given to the discussion which leads to the most effective result.” Thus a bill blocks discussion of a motion.

As I understand the rules, there are two courses of action open to me: the motion could be ruled out of order under the anticipation rule, for Beauchesne, 4th Edition, Citation 199 (4) points out that an irregularity in a portion of a motion renders the whole motion irregular. On the other hand, I have the right, as Speaker, before proposing the motion, to make “such corrections as are necessary or advisable in order that it should conform with the usages of the House.” (Beauchesne, 4th Edition, citation 199 (1)). I would be prepared to take this latter course but as it is a subject of some complexity; I would first be glad to hear the opinions of hon. members.

I would also like to refer to members, Beauchesne 4th Edition, Citation 200 (3). Now in order that the members of the House and the ones mostly concerned can have a copy of what I have read here to you, I have a copy to give to the Minister of Telephones, the leader of the government, and the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Turtleford.

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of reading your point of order. I listened carefully to what you had to say and I only want to make one observation, and that is, in my opinion, there is little if any relationship between clause (b) of my motion and the content of Bill No. 25, — An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems. In this sense, having read the act carefully I can see no clause which in any way provides additional incentive for the widespread formation and organization of new rural telephone companies, thus brining about greater telephone service to the rural people of the province. This of course is the main motive behind clause (b) of my motion and I can see no area where the motion that I have put overlaps with any clause or any part of any clause in the rural telephone act.

March 27, 1962

I want to repeat that in clause (a) of my motion (increasing grants to all rural telephone companies, I am particularly aiming at some 75 to 80 companies who did not receive any grants last year because . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask you to speak to the discussion of the order, not to the motion.

Mr. Foley: — I felt these were the companies in particular which needed assistance, but with regard to clause (b) here again I state that the provision of incentive for new companies and new constructions seems to me to be outside the scope of the bill.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, a comment on the point of order. If I understand your suggestion of procedure, it would be to declare the (a) section of the resolution to be in order, and to question the appropriateness of allowing (b) to stand. It seems to me this is the wise and proper sort of consideration to take in regard to this resolution, for it is difficult to discuss it without getting into a debate on the bill itself. It may be as the hon. member from Turtleford has suggested, that Bill No. 25 does not make what he considers to be appropriate extensions of the work in order to make rural telephone circuits more readily available. At the same time there are some remedies, some things which are different from the present procedure proposed in the bill, but I would suggest that the member for Turtleford would have ample opportunity in the debate on the bill itself to advance any further remedies and rules in the House, Mr. Speaker, is in part to prevent repetition of discussion and to prevent discussion about the same thing going on under two different orders of business. It seems to me your suggestion of ruling is very appropriate and does that.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, if clause (b) were deleted from the resolution I am wondering if it would meet with your approval the resolution could then be dealt with, if clause (b) were deleted. I am asking a question now, Mr. Speaker, as I want to reserve my right to speak.

Mr. Speaker: — I think I tried to make it clear in my statement that I feel clause (b) is out of order, but clause (a) can be discussed, because in committee a member can move a reduction but not an increase, and therefore I would declare clause (a) to be in order but not clause (b).

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I agree with your ruling with regard to clause (a) that it is in order, for the very reason that you have explained, that in estimates no one can move that a vote be increased, but you can move it be decreased. Here of course it is asking for an increase, and I am wondering if I have the consensus of the House to move an amendment to the resolution deleting clause (b).

Mr. Speaker: — I think for the benefit of the members, the Speaker has this authority. He can order that clause (b) be deleted, and that is what I said in my statement I was prepared to do.

Mr. McDonald: — Could I suggest to you Sir, that clause (b) be deleted. I think in all fairness — I haven't gone through the new telephone act to the extent that the hon. member from Turtleford has, but in view of the fact that this bill in its entirety is before the House, or will be before the House at a future date, I believe that clause (b) could be dealt with when this bill is in committee, and up for second reading, and I for one would be prepared to see clause (b) deleted here and to carry on with the resolution just to the end of clause (a).

Mr. Speaker: — Any further discussion by any of the members? I have been thinking that if there was a lengthy discussion on this that I would ask the permission of the House to reserve my decision until I could peruse the transcript, but as the discussion on this has not been too lengthy, and I think the discussion has more or less centred around the statement which I read to the House, that I will rule that clause (b) shall be deleted, and the discussion shall be confined to clause (a) on the motion of the hon. member for Turtleford. That is my ruling, if the clerk will take note accordingly.

The motion is open for discussion.

Mr. Foley: — moved:

“That this Assembly respectfully requests the Government of Saskatchewan to give immediate consideration to substantially increasing grants to every rural telephone company in the province regardless of size, for the purpose of maintenance and new construction.”

He said:

Mr. Speaker, the welfare of rural telephone companies has been a perennial topic both in the legislature and out; and thus my

March 27, 1962

motion has to do with assistance to encourage the expansion of present rural telephone companies in the province and also the formation of new rural telephone companies, to bring about greater telephone service to the farm people of this province. It is difficult to arrive at a completely accurate estimate of the number of farm families in the province who are yet without the services of rural telephones. If we refer to the 1961 report of the Department of Telephones, we find there are 51,268 rural subscribers listed. When we consult the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as to the number of farm families in the province, it is something in the neighborhood of 90,000. However, from a study of some returns we have had in the past few years it is my understanding quite a number, possibly as many as 10,000 of those that are living with others or in some way not able to qualify as a separate farm entity, so I have estimated and I want to emphasize to the legislature that this is merely an estimate, there are between thirty and forty thousand farmers in the province who are not as yet being served by rural telephones.

Mr. Speaker, I have brought this matter up on previous occasions and I have urged the government to do all in their power to attempt to bring about more widespread assistance for rural telephones. Going back to the summer of 1969, I would like to quote from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of July 15th, when the Hon. C.C. Williams, Minister of Telephones, stated in his opening address to the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Telephones that:

“Every farm in Saskatchewan was expected to have telephone communication shortly.”

Now I think the following day he took issue with the press to some degree on that statement, and he went on to say that:

“Although the ultimate aim of the telephone service is to provide every farm home with a telephone, this is obviously a long term project and expensive and cannot be done overnight.”

In the past two years I submit, Mr. Speaker, that little progress has been made in getting more rural telephone subscribers in Saskatchewan. If we look again at the 1961 report of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones we note that there has been little change in the number of rural subscribers in the province since 1956. In 1956 we had 50,600 rural telephone subscribers in Saskatchewan; in 1961 we find 51,268, or a difference of about 600. I realize of course again that this does not take into account the movement of rural people to urban centres, and movement from urban centres to rural areas,

nevertheless it is some indication, and one of the few yardsticks that we have to gauge the growth of rural telephones in the province.

When we consider that there are almost one quarter of a million telephone users in the province, then our rural subscribers at the moment are only about one fifth or about 20 per cent. In other words only one out of every five telephones in the province is available to our farm people.

Mr. Speaker, I realize of course the problems that are connected with gaining substantial expansion in our rural telephone communication. I feel that the minister and this government are suffering to some degree from an urban complex with regard to telephones, and that rural companies are not receiving their fair share of the resources of this province. When we look at total revenues from Saskatchewan Government Telephones, as listed in the annual report for the year ending December 31, 1961, of \$22½ million, and total operating expenses of \$16 million, this leaves a net operating revenue of some \$6 million, and a net income of \$3,253,555. When we consider that one-fifth of the telephones are rural telephones we might be justified in saying that some percentage close to that of the revenues could rightfully be turned back to assist in the expansion of the rurals.

I again discussed this matter in crown corporations committee and it was agreed that no set figure was possible to determine the amount of revenue from the rural telephones.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour and Telephones): — May I ask the hon. member a question? Would he like the correct figure now? We went to a good deal of trouble to get it.

Mr. Foley: — I don't mind a question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — It will be well over \$1 million of the long distance revenues to the rural companies. It is estimated it will be a good deal less after . . . about \$700,000.

Mr. Foley: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I used that figure in this particular debate. I mentioned from the report net operating revenue of some \$6.3 million. I think I stated it was difficult to determine what amount of that revenue might rightfully be designated as having come from the rurals. However, Mr. Speaker, the intent of this motion is to urge that the government give consideration to substantially increasing grants to the rural telephone companies for purposes of maintenance and for new construction.

March 27, 1962

When we consider that the total gross debt, of Saskatchewan Government Telephones as reported in the financial statement of December 31, 1961, is \$83 million, and when we consider further that the gross debt of the telephone corporation as well as the gross debt of the province, is borne equally by every man, woman and child in the province, certainly then if a debt of this extent is to be justified then this government must take every step in its power to see that services to the people are equalized as well.

When we consider the construction of rural power lines, and the construction and the distribution of natural gas, we find that in each case, the government of the province was required to spend millions of dollars in order to bring these expansions about. The rural people of the province have not as yet received natural gas, with this service being supplied largely to the urban centres in the province. If it is not economically feasible as yet to bring about wide distribution of natural gas to rural areas, certainly if I had my choice, Mr. Speaker, between the services of a rural telephone and the services of natural gas, it would seem to me that telephone service would be more important. I am discussing the expansion of rural telephone service from the point of view of it being a necessity, and certainly not a luxury. I am speaking on behalf of rural people who live anywhere from five to twenty-five miles from the nearest telephone, where the telephone could be the means of saving lives, where the telephone could prevent complete isolation during storms and other periods during the year. I feel if the province has been prepared to extend its gross provincial debt for power and for natural gas, certainly it seems to me it would cost a great deal less to bring about expansion in rural telephone service.

I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, that the rural telephone companies in the province have, over the years, given tremendous service, and have done an excellent job. I feel that additional and substantial increases in grants will enable them to extend rural lines within the areas that they presently serve and will enable them to bring about amalgamations where economy is a factor. Thus the companies presently organized would be able to give more and wider service to the people of the province. However, I am greatly concerned with many areas of the province, who have not as yet found it financially possible to organize rural companies. In many areas of the province groups of farm people gather together to investigate the cost of building rural circuits and find these rural circuits are going to cost \$400 or \$450 a circuit mile, throw up their hands, and say we can't possibly afford to do it. Suggestions have been made by some officials of the government that it is because of the lack

of initiative on the part of rural people in some areas of this province that this has not been done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say here that our rural people want telephone service if a way can be shown for them to organize into companies and to have this service. I believe that the soundest and most practical way of bringing about rural telephone expansion is through the formation of new companies, self autonomous companies, who with the assistance and the encouragement of the government will build lines in areas not presently being serviced.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is getting too close to the clause which was struck out.

Mr. Foley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would hope then, that other members on both sides of the House will find it possible to support the motion on the order paper. I realize, of course, that great demands are being made upon our systems of communication today; that we cannot confine ourselves only to the problem of rural telephones. With micro-wave facilities expanding, I quite agree with some of the officials of the corporation that we cannot allow ourselves to fall behind other provinces, and that it is necessary in the interests of civil defence and nation defence to keep our communications up to date.

I am happy to see many of our urban centres switching from manual telephones to dial telephones and to see such centres as Uranium City and La Ronge receiving telephone communications. I realize of course as our telephone facilities expand that buildings are needed to House the utilities. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the government and the minister must preserve a proper balance of service, and that they must not overlook the welfare of the rural people and become too urbanized in their outlook. The minister may feel that he can justify the expenditure of \$2½ million for a new telephone headquarters building. However when I think of the amount of encouragement and incentive that could be brought about with such an expenditure, resulting in a wide expansion of rural telephone lines, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the minister has not overstepped the bounds of proper balance of expenditures in this field.

In conclusion I would like to urge, in view of the fact that in the constituency of Turtleford in particular seven communities presently served by Saskatchewan Government Telephones in which there are no rural connections; that on the voters list of the Turtleford constituency there are some

March 27, 1962

six thousand names and that we presently have a little less than four hundred rural telephones; that in view of the fact that this situation prevails throughout a good deal of northern Saskatchewan, and I am sure a good many other constituencies are affected similarly; that in view of the fact that the people of the province are being asked to share equally a gross debt of some \$83 million at the present time for the telephone corporation; that this Assembly respectfully requests the government of Saskatchewan to give immediate consideration to substantially increasing grants to every rural telephone company in the province regardless of size, for the purpose of maintenance and construction.

Hon. C.C. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, before the member takes his seat, I wonder if he would answer a question. I would like to ask him if he knows that in the history of the telephone company they have never had a request from any community that we can recall to build lines, and I would also like to ask him who he would expect to pay for the building of the lines he has referred to?

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, of course since you have ruled the (b) part of the motion out of order, it is difficult to answer the question exactly. But with the indulgence of the Speaker, I would just like to say that it is not up to me to determine the mechanics whereby the government may find it possible to expand rural lines. This might better have been worded to state that the government provide additional incentive to encourage the widespread formation of new telephone companies in order that this could be brought about.

Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly on this motion since the problem that was mentioned by the member from Turtleford exists along the southern area to quite a great extent. I know the local people have made several surveys and investigated the possibility of extending telephones into that area and they are finding the costs are prohibitive. Now unfortunately the situation is that they have nice homes; a lot of people have expended a lot of money in building nice ranch homes in that southern area; they have provided themselves with power and a lot of them have sewer and water facilities in the home. Now the only thing missing is the telephone service. It is a sparsely populated area and perhaps the minister would have some idea what the cost would be if a person had to pay for the construction for some four miles of lines, poles and wires to his home, which is the distance some would have to go to get the telephone service.

Like the member for Turtleford, I don't know what ought to be done, but it is impossible to organize the local companies because there aren't sufficient people in that area. One of the prime objectives I believe that ought to be taken into consideration is that these are some of the most productive people in the province and we are anxious to see them remain on their farms. Now if they are raising a family, which most of the younger people are doing, it is almost an impossibility when you are so far removed from doctors, schools, hospitals to live comfortably on a ranch that is say 20 miles from a telephone. I would ask that consideration be given to sharing the costs or at least subsidizing the costs to the farmers who are most anxious to receive telephone service in that area.

Hon. C.C. Williams: — Could I answer the member?

Mr. Speaker: — You will be taking part in the debate if you speak at this time.

Hon. C.C. Williams: — No, I do not wish to speak at this time. I want to answer his question that is all.

Mr. Speaker: — Make a notation of it because we cannot have answers this way in a debate.

Mr. Eldon A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members share the concern of the member for Turtleford for the problem of communications in the province of Saskatchewan. I have some areas that are somewhat similar to his and I know there are problems in communications. I think that his resolution is proper in the respect that he is requesting certain action from the government in order that they may provide some assistance in order to improve the situation pertaining to telephones. However, I think that it is also proper to commend the government when they have done proper things and have taken action in a certain direction.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to some points that the member for Turtleford made. He uses the figure of 51,268 rural telephone company subscribers. I see however in the next paragraph of the report that it says in addition there are 66 rural and 3 independent companies with approximately 6,538 subscribers. The figure that the member for Turtleford used apparently was the rural subscribers which were connected to government telephone offices.

March 27, 1962

There is a considerable difference there, and this comes to a total of some 57,806 subscribers, if my addition is reasonably accurate.

The motion — I admit it has a bit of merit — recommends that substantial grants be provided to all telephone companies in order that this problem may be substantially improved. Mr. Speaker, I question the value of grants alone as a method of solving this problem. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to this motion seconded by Mr. Meakes:

“That all the words after the word “Assembly” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

“commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the assistance now being provided to the rural telephone companies in this province, and recommends that further assistance be provided as deemed advisable.”

This amendment not only takes cognizance of a fact that should now be well recognized, but also incorporates some of the better aspects of the original resolution and that is that it recommends that further assistance be provided as deemed advisable.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, has that amendment been ruled in order?

Mr. Speaker: — I haven't taken the amendment under advisement. He has presented it to the Chair while he is speaking to it and he could proceed to debate it and then move the amendment he has presented for the consideration of the House.

Mrs. Batten: — He is speaking on the motion and not on the amendment at this time then.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes. You can continue on the main motion, but I think that the working of your amendment — the way it is worded and sent to the Chair is not in order. Your amendment proposes that all the words after the word ‘Assembly’ in the third line of the resolution be struck out, but the word ‘Assembly’ in the third line of the resolution be struck out, but the word ‘Assembly’ does not appear in the third line.

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Speaker, this is merely a typographical error and certainly I think members should recognize that if the word ‘first’ is substituted for the word ‘third’ and this is certainly my intention.

Mr. Speaker: — In order that we don’t delay the House, while this isn’t officially before the House I think I shall return the amendment and let the member correct it for himself.

Mr. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, would it be permissible to speak on a point of order before you make a decision on this.

Mr. Speaker: — I will give you an opportunity before I rule on the admissibility of it. You may continue on the motion.

Mr. Johnson: — Is the motion in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Do you wish to speak to the amendment?

Mr. Johnson: — I would prefer to speak to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — You are reserving your right to speak to the amendment when I put the amendment and clarify the advisability of the order of it as some members wish to speak to the order of the amendment.

Mr. Batten: — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that this is merely making it a negative — in fact negating the very motion in putting forth this amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to bring the urgency of this to the attention of the government. Now the amender would have the whole thing struck off and you might just as well put in another motion, or he could effect exactly the same thing by merely voting and speaking against this motion. He is saying that first of all the government has given sufficient aid to telephone companies, which certainly is exactly contrary to what the motion said, and secondly he doesn’t say that it is necessary to have new construction or to increase grants. He is saying whoever the government deems it necessary thereby putting it in the hands of the government instead of bringing to the attention of the government that this is necessary today.

March 27, 1962

Therefore I will respectfully submit that this is not a proper amendment because it seeks to negate the essence of the motion which purpose could be achieved exactly in the same manner by the member voting against the motion if he wishes to do so.

Mr. Speaker: — Is there any further discussion on the point raised by the hon. member for Humboldt?

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. There is something being missed in the discussion by the hon. member for Humboldt. The resolution as it was moved by the hon. member for Turtleford asks that there be substantial increases in grants to every rural telephone company in the province regardless of size for the purpose of maintenance and new construction. All that the amendment does, Mr. Speaker, is to recognize the fact that assistance has been provided and recommends that further assistance be provided as deemed advisable. That is, it narrows to some extent the instruction which would have been given in the resolution as originally moved which says that it has to be given to all telephone companies. The original resolution suggests that this should be given to all telephone companies whereas the amendment says something now is being done and suggests further assistance as deemed advisable which would not necessarily include all of the companies. It seems that the amendment does what an amendment is supposed to do. In other words, it qualifies the meaning of the resolution.

Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, the amendment adds nothing new to what the government can already do. If they deem it advisable today to give these grants then they do so. It is not adding to your powers that you have now or deleting from them. All you are doing is saying — just use a little more discretion. You already have everything that is in the amendment. This is asking for something additional to the powers the government already has.

Mr. Speaker: — Is there any further discussion on this point of order?

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, as I understand the motion as moved by the hon. member for Turtleford, instead of him commending the government for something he has said that grants should be substantially increased. Now, the grants must already be there or you couldn't substantially increase them.

Surely to goodness this House is not going to place itself in a position where the mover of this motion, if it is amended as suggested by the amendment that we have before us, must vote against his own motion. This has happened before in this House and I suggest to you that it is a ridiculous procedure for it simply means that the opposition has no official way of criticising any action of the government, because the government, through their superior numbers in this House, are able to change a motion from condemnation to commendation. If the feelings of the government are such that members in the opposition must stand up and thank them on every occasion for everything they have done in the past, then I suggest to you that is a pretty picture for this legislature to find itself in.

The motion is pure and simple; it requests the government to give consideration to doing certain things. If my hon. friends haven't the courage to ask for this support then vote against it, but do not place this House in the position where you are moving an amendment to a resolution that completely destroys the resolution. I suggest to you that it has happened in the past and it ought never to have happened in this House. I think it is time that we place ourselves in a position where the opposition could play the same role in this House as they have played in legislatures and Houses of parliament down through our history; where they can go on record condemning the government and forcing the government members to stand in their places and vote for or against a suggestion that has been put forward in the House.

Members opposite are continuously saying that the opposition has no constructive criticism. We are criticising the government in this resolution. Let the government have courage to stand in their place and either vote with this to help rural people in the province of Saskatchewan to receive better services or vote against it. Don't amend this out of its entire existence which no authority, whether it is Beauchesne or anyone else has ever written into the rules of this legislature or the rules of any governing body.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, without paying attention to Beauchesne I suppose we should pay some attention to the McDonald rules.

Mr. MacDonald: — Common sense.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I just can't see what the hon. member for Moosomin sees in this amendment.

March 27, 1962

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — We know that, you don't need to tell us.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — The amendment has already been read to the House and I think everyone know what is in it. It asks immediate consideration for certain things in regard to telephones. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into an argument with the Minister of Bridges and Telephones over there, but the motion does ask for certain things to be done in regard to telephone companies.

Mr. McCarthy: — What are you talking about the amendment or the motion.?

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — That is what the motion asks for. Now, even though the hon. members opposite may not want to do so, there may still some members in the House who want to recognize some of the good things that have been done. If they want to recognize some of the good work that has been done by the government they should be free to put it into a motion. They are putting it into this motion because apparently the hon. members in the opposition wanted to completely ignore the help that was given. This member wants to put in commendation for the government. Now the motion did not carry condemnation. It just said let's have some more.

Mr. McCarthy: — Pretty weak Brock.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — The amendment also, besides expressing appreciation of what has been done, asks that further assistance be given as deemed advisable. Now the hon. members laugh at that but it may also be that there are members in this House that are willing to leave it to the government as to when this further assistance is advisable, taking all things into consideration.

Members in the opposition can vote against the amendment when in fact they are voting for the motion. If the amendment carries, then they have registered themselves in favour of the motion. If the amendment carries then they have the choice of either voting for or against the amendment.

Mr. McCarthy: — And that is the purpose of the amendment.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — This amendment is as much in order as I think I have ever seen any in this House.

Mr. McCarthy: — The minister has just pointed out exactly what we object to, and what I have been objecting to for years in this House. It doesn't change the motion and he admitted it didn't change the motion, but he wants to get us in a position where we are voting against something in our original motion. That is exactly what he is doing.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — You don't have to either.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, you want to get us in that position.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — No, you don't have to.

Mr. McCarthy: — You can add to or take from a motion but you can't negative it and that is what you are doing. Now he said that the amendment asks for further assistance. The motion asks for that already. He said that he wants to get it in so we are commending the government. He wants us voting so we commend the government. Now what is a direct negative of what this motion asks for. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that it has been happening since I have been in this House, and I have objected to it. I am not an expert on Beauchesne but I do have some knowledge of the fundamental rules of debate. Down through the years these rules have been set up by our predecessors through experience and they are just paying no attention to them. They are polluting the established customs of good parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Foley: — On the point of order. Listening to the Minister of Mineral Resources, I have never heard such ridiculous reasoning in all my life. I can recall him standing up here a few days ago and making a comment to a member of this side, but certainly when we speak we don't speak with our tongue in our cheek in the manner in which he did. He didn't believe a word of what he said. If the government members are that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — On a point of privilege. The hon. member has no right to say that I did not believe a word of what I said.

Mr. Foley: — It is obvious.

March 27, 1962

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — He is out of order and he should withdraw it and withdraw it without any qualification. He has no right to say that because it isn't true.

Mr. Foley: — Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe I should rephrase the statement.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the member is well aware of the rules that he cannot impute motives to anyone and say that the minister did not believe his own words and that must be withdrawn. I think the member is well aware of those rules.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister did believe part of what he said.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, that isn't good enough. He has to withdraw without any qualifications the remark to the effect that I did not believe what I said.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the statement but I still reserve the right in my own mind to question the remarks of the minister thoroughly. As far as I am concerned . . .

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — That barely comes within the rules. I don't think it does, Mr. Speaker, but under the circumstances let it go.

Mr. Foley: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this technique that the government has employed to twist and squirm away from having to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We are not debating what the government or the opposition are doing. We want to debate the legality amendment of this so I can take the remarks into consideration. We must debate the order of the amendment and not what anyone may think of anyone else's tendencies.

Mr. Foley: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I had thought that the government deserved any commendation for anything with respect to rural telephones I would not have been moving a motion. Because I felt that the government has been lacking in their policy in this respect I moved a motion asking for substantial increases in grants to rural telephone companies. Now I can see no justification . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The member is not speaking to the point of order. He is debating the motion. I want him to speak to the point of order.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amendment. We are discussing . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No. We are not discussing the amendment. We are discussing the point of order.

Mr. Foley: — . . . I feel therefore that on the one hand to ask us to vote us in favour of commending the government and on the other hand to vote for increased rates is certainly negating the motion and I feel that you should so rule, Sir.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I am afraid my knowledge of parliamentary procedures is not as large as it might be. I do not have a copy of Beauchesne before me, but my understanding of such a situation is that you cannot have a negative of a motion proposed as an amendment. If the same result could be achieved by voting “no” to the original motion as could be achieved by proposing an amendment, that amendment would be out of order. I do not think in this case that voting “no” to the original motion does give you the same position as you have in voting in favour of this amendment.

Secondly, I believe there is a section in Beauchesne, — I can’t quote it for you — but it is something to the effect that an amendment that proposes a different proposition to that contained in the original motion is not an expanded negative and may be moved. This does cover the situation in this case. It is my feeling that irrespective of whether or not these motions are advisable, I think that the Speaker’s duty in this case is quite clear and the amendment would be in order.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu’Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the amendments that have been allowed to stand in this House over the period of the last three or four years, I suggest that by following the precedent that you are doing here again today as Speakers have done in the past in corresponding cases to this motion here it will only lead to confusion and chaos. I can recall other questions where a motion has been made by the hon. member for Turtleford and was amended by the government side and turned around to commend them.

March 27, 1962

I can recall on different occasions when we got into difficulty with such amendments in this House that we had members of the government side coming over to the opposition side and asking that we withdraw our amendment in order to clear the whole matter up. I suggest that if you are going to follow this procedure any longer in this House, you are going to get the opposition into the position where they can no longer afford to give constructive criticism to the government side. Day after day after day in this House, and day after day out in the country the Premier of this government has got up and criticized the opposition for not giving constructive criticism. Here it is in plain and simple terms offering suggestions to the government showing how they could improve the status of the rural telephone companies in this province. Here we find this government up to their same old tricks of taking constructive criticism, warping it and twisting it and turning it around to try and commend themselves for something that for all practical purposes they are not doing in the eyes of the rural people of Saskatchewan. They are not serving the interests of the rural telephone companies to the extent they should be.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is surely making a speech rather than discussing the rules of the House as they apply to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — The point is well taken. The member is too far from the point of order. He must not debate the subject matter. We are just discussing the point of order which was raised by the member for Humboldt.

Mr. McFarlane: — I was just going to suggest this, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, who is continually interrupting . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I wish the hon. member would take his seat when the Speaker rises, we would have better decorum here. When the Premier rose he properly rose on the point of order. I concurred that his point of order was well taken — that you were straying too far away from the point of order which was raised by the hon. member from Humboldt, and we must return to the point of order which is before the Chair.

Mr. McFarlane: — I suggest their actions this afternoon simply bear out that they would rather be ruined by self praise than saved by constructive criticism.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I thought when consideration was given to the amendment that we were going to go through this motion in a manner of consideration and gentleness that we hadn't experienced in the House before. I want to read to you again what the motion asks and in order to get the request before the government, what the amendment would ask us to do.

The motion is quite an innocent motion asking merely that consideration be given. It says we are respectfully requesting that the government of Saskatchewan give immediate consideration to substantially increasing the grants to every rural telephone company. We are asking them to give consideration to increasing the grants. Harmless enough — a request that they respectfully give consideration to. The government isn't satisfied with that. They say you must pay homage first. So they say we must not say respectfully request, but we first . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — This is on a point of order. Would you sit down for a moment please.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member inferred, by saying that the government had to have this praise, that members on this side of the House were servile members of the government and that too is unparliamentary.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, if I may proceed. The substance of the amendment is that we commend the government first. We can't respectfully request, we must commend them. Commend the government for the assistance now being provided and recommend to the government that further assistance be provided as they deem it advisable. The substance of the amendment is to commend them for things exactly as they are and if the government should deem at any time advisable that it will increase the assistance, which changes the motion in my humble thinking, to the exact opposite of what we are asking for.

We are pointing out a position that we think exists and asking in the original motion that the grants of assistance be increased — at least consideration be given to it. The amendment says we must praise the government and then say when they deem it advisable they may give such consideration to the matter. I think it completely negates what the motion sets out to do. I can't see any other interpretation of it,

March 27, 1962

other than in their great omnipotence they feel that we shouldn't request anything. You should commend and praise some little thing when asking them to give consideration to some matter. That is exactly the intent and purpose of it. I say in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that if that is Beauchesne's ruling then I think it is time someone did something to find a new Beauchesne or a new interpretation of Beauchesne.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the rules of procedure is to make it possible for the House to express the consensus of its opinion as easily as possible — with as little difficulty as possible. Now, we have two propositions here before us, both dealing with the same general subject matter. One is the motion which calls for “a substantial increase of grants.” The other is the proposition that “further assistance be provided as deemed advisable.” It is obvious that it is impossible to accept both of those propositions. So the question arises, how can the House express its opinion on those two propositions.

Well, if the amendment is out of order, then the House must express its opinion affirmatively or negatively as to the proposition — “substantially increasing grants.” If the House decides the matter affirmatively then it is obviously inconsistent for us to pass a later resolution saying that “further assistance be provided as deemed advisable” because the House has already indicated its consensus of opinion that grants should be substantially increased. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if the House decides against this motion, it would still be out of order to introduce a motion suggestion that the question of further assistance be provided as deemed advisable. For, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible in this House, under the rules in Beauchesne, to introduce a subsequent motion dealing with this general subject inconsistently with the motion already passed. That is true, Mr. Speaker, whether the first decision was in the affirmative or in the negative.

I will read the appropriate citations from Beauchesne — the 4th Edition. First, citation 194 on page 164. “A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as the question which has already been decided, because a proposition being once submitted and carried in the affirmative or the negative cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House.” If the House decided against this motion moved by the member for Turtleford, it would be deciding that grants should not be substantially increased for rural telephone companies. It would therefore not be open for the House to pass a resolution

that further assistance be provided as deemed advisable because the proposition for further assistance would have been voted against by the decision of the House.

I refer also, Mr. Speaker, to citation 200, page 167 which I suggest settles this question. "That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House. Unless such a rule were inexistence, the time of the House might be used in the discussion or motions of the same nature, and contradictory decisions would be sometimes arrived at in the course of the same sessions."

Now it is perfectly plain, Mr. Speaker, that if the contention of my hon. friends opposite was conceded, the only thing that would be open to us would be to first of all deal with the motion and pass it. If we passed it and then the motion made by the member for Kindersley was proposed, obviously a great many members of the House may want to support that and you would have two inconsistent results. If the motion of the member for Turtleford was defeated, then it would be argued that the motion of the member for Kindersley was advocating something which had already been decided in the negative namely, that substantially increased grants should be made. That had been decided in the negative, therefore it would not be open for the House to consider whether the government should examine this question with a view to further assistance being provided.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is perfectly plain, if my hon. friends want to vote for the motion and are opposed to the amendment, all they need to do is vote against the amendment. That is all, and if they don't like the motion as amended they may vote against it. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make it clear that I can't vote for or against this motion without forever giving up my right to vote on the question put forward by the member for Kindersley. I am not prepared to give up my right to vote on that question when it comes before this House. So, Mr. Speaker, it would be recorded in the Journals, if my hon. friends wish it, that they were opposed to the amendment which means that they were in favour of the motion without the amendment. That is exactly, Mr. Speaker, what they want — for their view to be recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of this House and it will be done by their voting against the amendment and for their motion. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that your rule is perfectly clear and the amendment is in order.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to consult with the Clerk for a moment before I rule.

March 27, 1962

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to read for the benefit of the House from Beauchesne citation 201.

“The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the House an alternative proposition, either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. It may be effected by moving to omit all of the words of the question after the first word ‘that’ and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment but includes the motive of the amendment and the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the House as alternative propositions. A motion may be amended (a) by leaving out certain words, (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words or, (c) by inserting or adding other words.”

I would say that this amendment which has been presented by the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnson) to delete all the words after the third word is the same effect as deleting all the words after the word ‘that’ and does offer some alternate proposition, therefore, it is my opinion that this amendment is in order, but both are before the House for discussion — both the motion and the amendment. My ruling is that the amendment is in order.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I appeal your ruling of the amendment being in order.

Mr. Speaker: — The ruling of the Chair has been appealed.

The question being put by, Mr. Speaker:

“Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?”

It was agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 29

Messieurs

| | | |
|---------------|------------|-----------|
| Lloyd | Willis | Perkins |
| Meakes | Brown | Thiessen |
| Williams | Thurston | Snyder |
| Blakeney | Wood | Stevens |
| Brockelbank | Nicholson | Dahlman |
| Walker | Stone | Michayluk |
| Nollet | Whelan | Semchuk |
| Cooper (Mrs.) | Thibault | Peterson |
| Strum (Mrs.) | Berezowsky | Brotten |
| Davies | Johnson | |

NAYS — 18

Messieurs

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Klein | Cameron | Boldt |
| Batten (Mrs.) | McFarlane | Horsman |
| McCarthy | Gardiner | Coderre |
| Barrie | Staveley | MacDougall |
| McDonald | Foley | Snedker |
| Danielson | Guy | Gallagher |

Mr. E.A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, to continue the debate I would like to make some reference to the Department of Telephones. I would like to relate them to the situation regarding telephones in my own community. From the annual report of 1960, Mr. Speaker, I find that there are 954 rural telephone companies in the province. There are, as I indicated previously some nearly 58 thousand subscribers. This means, Mr. Speaker, that there are an average of around 58 subscribers per telephone company. Of course I am aware that each of these telephone companies, that their directors and so on earnestly endeavour to improve the quality of their service, however, I think all should be aware that in small companies there are definite limitations. There are certain inconveniences in switching, dialling long distance to phone a neighbour that may be very close and I would like to make some comparison, Mr. Speaker, with the telephone company in my own community.

March 27, 1962

I say this not in any way of boastfulness because this accomplishment is in no way an accomplishment of myself. I have not been on the board. I have been a subscriber and a ratepayer but I think it worthwhile to draw to the attention of the House that in the Kindersley rural telephone company, the annual report lists 437 rural subscribers and 90 others in hamlets and villages.

I would like to indicate what this means in terms of the community. It means that our community is broadened. It means that neighbours can phone their quite distant neighbours with a great deal of facility at any time of day or night. To give members an idea of what does happen . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — I can't hear the member.

Mr. Johnson: — I am sorry. Our Kindersley rural telephone circuit extends from west of Flaxcombe and we can now phone to south of Glidden. This is a line distance of well over 50 miles and this is something that makes our community much more homogeneous and in fact to use a word that is very popular in this session, it certainly improves the togetherness of this community.

May I say that this telephone company that now exists resulted from the activities, the enterprise and the imagination of the people in the community and may I add that this present company comprises some approximately 19 initial companies. You can compare this telephone company having over 520 nearly 530 subscribers, nearly 10 times as large as the average rural telephone company.

I want to indicate that there is not only the advantage of being able to communicate with a distant neighbour. This telephone company has been able to employ a full time construction crew and a full time maintenance crew. They have been able to use machinery for digging holes. They have been able to employ a very competent person, a very efficient lineman to keep the lines in working order with very few interruptions. The point I wish to make in this respect is that this accomplishment has been very greatly assisted by the policies and actions of the Department of Telephones. I draw this to the attention of the House because I believe that other areas could be made aware of what has happened here and some of the actions that could be undertaken in order to vastly improve telephone communications.

I would also like to add, in favour of the resolution, that this is one which is much broader than the original motion and certainly it has another advantage that I think the opposition should take cognizance of. They are frequently condemned or their actions are deplored because they are entirely critical and may I say to them that this gives them an opportunity to change their ways and through this resolution give commendation for some useful and beneficial activities of the provincial government. Also I say that it has this advantage that it not only restricts the activities of the provincial government to the matter of payment of grants, but it enlarges it to other fields which I think should be desirable. I don't think that a government should be, by resolution, restricted to one course of action. This amendment is much broader and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that members support it.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak both on the main motion and on the amendment that has been moved by the other side of the House, I would like to say that in the first place, I don't think anyone who has any knowledge of the rural telephone system in the province could in fairness to the rural people of the province support the amendment to this motion that has been moved by the member for Turtleford. In fact anyone from the rural areas who knows the history of this program, knows the program that was presented by members on this side of the House through suggestions to the minister. At the time that this program was put into effect they knew the effect that those suggestions would have had. They would have provided advantages to the rural people of our province and to our rural telephone system. I do want to agree on one point with my friend from Kindersley. The telephone company that I happen to be secretary of is one of those that has been able to receive a maintenance grant under the policy of this government. I can assure him and I can assure the minister and the government that of course that particular grant we are receiving is appreciated. But I can say this — that there are very few of the rural telephone companies getting this grant today. When this plan was put into effect, I suggested to the minister on that occasion that the simplest way, both in administration cost savings and the simplest way to get the dollars into the hands of the rural telephone companies in the province was to cancel the connecting fees which would have made the straight payment back to rural telephone companies of some \$375 thousand, without hardly a cent of administration costs and waste of the taxpayers' dollars. Had the minister accepted that recommendation at the time, I think my friend

March 27, 1962

from Kindersley could have moved a motion today commending the government of this province for its program with regard to assistance to rural telephone companies.

What is the position that we find ourselves in at the present time? We find that a very small minority of rural telephone companies in this province and the rural people can benefit from maintenance grants. I have heard the minister on various occasions during this present session state that only those companies whose systems are being brought up to a favourable position as far as the Saskatchewan government is concerned can have this grant. I am going to assure him that if in the last two years all of these companies had had the full assistance that would have been available, had they accepted the suggested policy of two years ago, the rural telephones in this province would be in a better state today than they were two years ago. Not just companies such as the one that I happen to be secretary of, or the company that my friend from Kindersley happens to be a subscriber of, but every rural telephone company in this province would have been in a better position than it finds itself at the present time.

As well, we find that the pole grant has been the most successful as far as passing back money to the rural telephone companies of the province. There is no doubt about that. All we have to do is look at the figures. One hundred and ninety thousand dollars has been paid through the pole grant, or it is estimated it will be paid I think in the next year and roughly \$40 thousand in maintenance grants. So there is very little doubt that the pole grant has been the more successful of the two.

Even there, when we look at the third figure, and I don't know what this figure relates to — \$140 thousand for other assistance — I don't know what that particular figure relates to. It wasn't my intention that when we passed the grants two years ago that \$140 thousand of the \$450 thousand that was passed in that program was to go to so-called "other assistance" that had been given for years and probably would have been given for years to the rural telephone system in this province. The government has seen fit today to call that other assistance to include in their program of grants to rural telephone companies in this province. Whereas it was originally intended to pay through these two programs of pole grants and maintenance grants \$450 thousand to the rural telephone systems in this province. A lot of that \$450 thousand, I am not sure how much it is estimated at the moment, but I am quite certain that a large percentage of the \$140 thousand called 'other assistance' is in the form of administrative costs because

of the varied type of assistance program we have in the province at the present time instead of the type of system that was suggested by members on this side of the House two years ago which would have paid back directly to the telephone companies much more money than they have received in the last two years.

I know where some of it has gone. Some of it has gone to send men all over this province to count the telephone poles, to make sure that the government of this province isn't being cheated of \$1.00 by the rural telephone companies of this province. Every pole must be counted and an official from the government of this province goes out and he not only spends his time but he takes along the lineman of the particular company and it takes two men anywhere from one or two days in every company concerned to go around and make sure that every one of those telephone poles that is going to be paid for has been put into the ground by the telephone company.

Surely we should have enough faith in the people who operate our local government that we don't have to go about counting the poles to make certain that every dollar that is spent through this grant is spent in a proper manner. I think we should have more faith in our local government bodies that when they have purchased poles that they are not going to let them sit in the ground and get a grant from the government for doing nothing with them, but if they are going to have the pole grant in the form they have now, once the rural telephone company finds it necessary to purchase poles to improve their system they should receive one-third of the grant at the time they make the purchase because that is when they need the money. That is when they require the assistance — when they have to purchase 300 poles at a time. They need a large amount of capital, but today they can't get the grant until those 300 poles have been put into the ground and it has been proven to the satisfaction of the Saskatchewan Department of Telephones that that has taken place.

So there is thousands of dollars being used today in administrative purposes that is entirely unnecessary and if we cannot have enough faith in those who are administering the affairs of our rural telephone systems to see to it that these poles are used in a proper manner, then I say that perhaps, as someone suggested, if the government isn't prepared to have faith in the people who are looking after the rural telephone system in this province they should say so directly and probably take other measures to enforce the proper operation of the telephone system in this province.

March 27, 1962

I believe, as the member for Kindersley said, that the directors of most of our rural telephone companies are dedicated men who look after the interests of the people whom they represent in the best possible way they can in their own areas and I think we should be placing faith in these individuals by seeing to it that if assistance is given it is given in the quickest possible manner; it is given at a time when the money can be used at the best time — for instance when capital purchases are needed; thirdly that it is given in a way that administrative costs are not going to eat up thousands of dollars of the money that is supposed to be going to our rural telephone companies.

So I say that I cannot commend — yes, some of the companies can commend the government for the maintenance grants that have been given — slightly over 40 of our telephone companies in this province since this plan has gone into effect can thank the government for that particular assistance. We could give them some thanks and I think I have and I think most other people have for the fact that they have put into effect the pole grant, but as I said previously they could have passed back more money with less administrative costs just through cancelling their connecting fees to rural telephone companies which would have placed back the same amount of money into the pockets of every rural subscriber in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time.

So I say with regard to the motion of my friend from Kindersley, I cannot commend the government for the program that is in effect today because in the first instance it is a program which does not provide assistance to all the rural telephone companies and subscribers in the province of Saskatchewan. Secondly, it provides for the waste of several thousands of dollars in administration which is entirely unnecessary and third, it does not place faith in those who are in charge of the administration of the rural telephone system in this province today. I cannot commend a program which does not place faith and trust in those people who are in charge of the local affairs of our communities whether it is telephones or whether hospitals, whether it is schools or whether it is our municipalities. I could not support a program which would commend the government for not having trust in the people that look after the administration of our local affairs in our rural areas. And so I say I could not, in fairness, vote for the amendment, but of course the original motion which we

are also speaking on I can commend, particularly because it would mean increased grants and particularly because of the reference to every rural telephone company in the province and of course as I stated previously, I would go along even further, if the government had been prepared to accept the suggestions as to recommendations to improve the telephone program two years ago, when the Minister originated the program of grants to rural telephone companies, and so for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment and I will support the main motion.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, occasionally a member of this House does bring in some criticism in regard to the rural telephone system. Now if the directors of the 944 companies are included, I am sure they are going to resent these criticisms and I might say in addition, most of the companies in the province have a board of directors, they have a good plant, they have good lines, they give a good service at a moderate cost, where the service is bad it is usually because of poor crops, marginal land or something of that kind. It should be remembered too, that these companies are autonomous. Connecting fees paid by the rural companies, and that has been mentioned today, run at around \$6 a year. When I speak again in this House, Mr. Speaker, I will have the exact amounts, it runs from around \$5-\$6 to \$11. This entitles the rural subscribers to the same privileges as the subscribers in the urban centres — towns, villages, cities and so forth. For example calls can be made to and from any farm telephone in this province to any place in Canada, or in the United States as far as that is concerned. Charges on long distance calls to and from rural companies are not all velvet, Mr. Speaker, and the provincial government does not receive anything like what the member for Turtleford indicated could or might be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to reply to the matters brought up by the members on the opposition side of the House in detail later on during the session and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned on motion of the Hon. Mr. Williams.

MOTION RE UNEMPLOYMENT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Stone.

March 27, 1962

Mr. Eldon A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, in case there should be some members from the Leader-Post present, the fact that I am standing twice today I hope they won't construe as having any significance towards any ambitions that I may or may not have especially towards the Minister of Telephones and Labour. Before I continue I want to emphasize that point. I have of course considerable admiration for our cabinet ministers but I must say that I cast no envious glances in their direction.

To continue with this debate, Mr. Speaker, the mover from his position of knowledge and understanding presented a very important resolution that I indicated in my own opinion was one of the most important that could be introduced in Canada. I also indicated, that I was sure that my farming constituents would wish me to support this motion and I also indicated my own belief that taking cognizance of the questions and irregularities in the economy that it was desirable to proceed in the direction that this motion indicates of planning programs, in order to minimize the economic vagaries that beset us. These are troublesome particularly in North America and I would like to refer the House to the World Economic Survey of 1960. This is a document put out by the United Nations which I am sure is an organization which all members of this House thoroughly respect. If I may quote directly part of a paragraph:

“That the United States economy has proved to be the most vulnerable to post war cyclical fluctuations of all the major industrial countries. The 1960-61 recession is its fourth in twelve years. Except for Canada whose economy is closely geared to that of United States, no other industrial country has experienced a comparable degree of economic fluctuation. The significance of these recessions appears however to have been widely underestimated. There are many reasons that have been given for discounting the seriousness of the post-war recession. A basic factor seems to be a tendency to assume that recurrent recessions are inherent in a private enterprise economy. Indeed, a large part of the public seems to have come to believe not only that recessions are inevitable but that they are also necessary in order to provide immunity against large scale inflation that would be followed by major depressions.”

I quote that because unemployment is a characteristic of depressions and it is a situation that this motion hopes to recommend some solution towards. The document also indicates that the unemployment in Europe has been at an appreciably smaller rate than in North America. I don't need to quote figures; in fact in this case not all countries have similar accounting procedures, but I am quite convinced that in these years generally, in the post-war period, the European economy, including that of Scandinavia has suffered much less fluctuation than that of North America. My contention is that in general European governments have intervened to a greater degree in solving their economic problems and they have intervened to a greater degree in giving direction to the economy of the country so that this has been possible.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues very frequently refer to Scandinavia as a country which they admire in particular and I of course share this admiration. I would like to add that I have an admiration for a very tiny nation, The Netherlands. I am not implying that this is a socialistic country but I will indicate to the House that the socialist party in The Netherlands has been one of the top two parties since the war. It has formed coalitions in the government group. Their leader is president of one of the Houses. The point that I am making is that the socialists in The Netherlands have played a very prominent part in their administration. I say, of course, I do not think that the economy of The Netherlands is exactly the same as Canada. Of course it is not. However, they have some situations that contrast very strongly with ours. They are a small country that could be dropped in the south-east corner of Saskatchewan between Regina and the Manitoba and American borders. This would bring to our attention that it is a nation that is very small and very densely populated with a population of nearly 900 per square mile which of course contrasts with Canada. The point that I am making is that even in this very densely populated country that they apparently have been able to meet the problem of unemployment. This contrasts with Canada — one of the least densely populated countries in the world and possibly our per capita natural wealth one of the greatest. This is why it seems to me that some action must be taken in order to improve the conditions that we are now in.

Of course, this is in my opinion, a rather basic resolution and in the solution it implies an increased degree of government participation in the economy. I must say that I am sure the members opposite will agree with the undesirability of unemployment. We apparently differ

March 27, 1962

as to the solution. The members opposite are apparently the successors of the laissez-fair doctrine. They apparently have the concept that if you leave an economy alone that it will somehow act as a self-regulating machine. Of course those of us on this side don't believe that a government should only be a referee and most of us on this side feel that the function of a government is to act as a countervailing power on behalf of the people against the instability of a laissez-fair type of economy. They believe, as this resolution indicates, that the active participation of a government is a possible way of meeting the undesirable peaks of unemployment that have been reached in North America in the last few years.

Of course, the resolution proposes that planning and projects be introduced in order to mitigate the unemployment that have been reached in North American in the last few years.

Of course, the resolution proposed that planning and projects be introduced in order to mitigate the unemployment situation and if I may refer again to the country of The Netherlands this is a country that has participated strongly in tremendous public works programs. Most members here are familiar with the fantastically large drainage projects of The Netherlands and may I also say that The Netherlands also is in a position whereby they give very appreciable direction to major industries and at the same time of course they encourage the small firms and business men. This is something that I don't disagree with and I don't think members on this side are in disagreement with it either. To emphasize my point again, I favour the desirability of government involvement on behalf of the people.

Mr. Speaker, to substantiate my case further I would like to refer to a magazine I don't always agree with but I find many good things in it, I refer members to 'Time' of March 3, 1961. The article that I would like to quote from deals with an economist that is very highly regarded by the present president of the United States. As it says here:

“Economist Heller is an impressive man of a type that especially impresses John Kennedy.”

That is right. It doesn't impress the opposition, but I think all members on this side at least have a very strong respect for President Kennedy. This article makes this comment and I would like to quote another very brief paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and this deals with economic planners which are of course an anathema to members opposite.

It says this:

“The economic planners of the now administration believe that much has been lost because government has not done some basic things but the people unless acting together in government cannot do for themselves. During the campaign Jack Kennedy told the Labour Day audience in Detroit that each working man had been cheated of \$7 thousand in the past eight years because the U.S. growth rate had been allowed to lag. Kennedy’s economists hold the federal government responsible because it did not act with sufficient vigour to get the U.S. out of the 1958 recession. In the long run they would run the risks of mild inflation and if necessary even impose controls intended to keep them mild, it would guarantee continued growth and full employment.”

I would like to quote another paragraph that I cannot summarize, and still keep the proper meaning, it is my own opinion that these paragraphs are not out of context.

“The performance of the U.S. economy after 1946 avoiding both deep recessions and severe inflation reached unprecedented peaks of national efforts, restore depressions of our confidence in the market economy and reconciled conservatives to government intervention to combat unemployment and help out the weak with welfare programs. One result has been a waning of controversy among economists. Today, says Kenneth Arrow, you have to find a real crackpot to get an economist who doesn’t accept the principle of government intervention in the business cycle.”

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted from ‘Time’, quite a conservative magazine, and this is an article that has indicated support of the case that I was making and therefore I encourage members to support this resolution with the view and objective of reducing unemployment.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate and to support the resolution that we have before us at this time, I want first of all to express the opinion that I believe is held by a great number of people at this time and has already been mentioned by the member for

March 27, 1962

Kerrobot-Kindersley, that unemployment has become Canada's number one problem, the seriousness of which cannot be underestimated. I believe that everyone welcomes whatever measures have been taken to this date to alleviate the distress resulting from unemployment. The promotion of winter works programs, intensive retraining and vocational training programs are all welcome.

I suggest that this intensive retraining and all these programs which have been initiated to this date have not fulfilled the need. The fact remains that increased productivity by automation and applied technology has given this country the capacity to maintain a steadily increasing output of consumer goods, while the number of people that have been employed in these various industries has either remained static, declined, or in some instances, has shown a slight increase.

I am not going to bore the House with a great number of examples, but I would like to point in particular to the manufacture of farm machinery as one particular instance where applied technology and automation has taken something of the heavy toll. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures for the year 1945-57, a matter of 12 years, the productivity for workers during that period of time rose by 108% while the total number of persons involved in the manufacture of farm machinery actually declined by 31%.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that everyone agrees that retraining is a particularly valuable job protection device, especially for older workers. I suggest once again that this is not a solution to our job problems which have been created by the application of technology to the manufacturing process. There are just not enough jobs in relation to those people who have been displaced from industry by automation, in addition to those who are graduating from our universities and high schools every year. Often what is left when new devices and new techniques are applied to industry is a mere handful of maintenance workers and in a great many instances the business of maintenance has been further simplified and the defective portion of the apparatus is merely removed on the spot and replaced with a new portion similar to the one which is defective, and by this process time is saved in production and the number of people involved in the maintenance part of the operation is decreased even more.

I believe everyone will agree also that automation has by no means run its course. Thousands of people in the years that lie directly ahead are going to find themselves

out of work with no place to go, and I suggest that these people are in a position where they are justified in asking, "What are we entitled to under the circumstances? Were machines made for man, or was man made for machines?" Any technological change that is made today is made for one purpose and for one purpose only, for the purpose of increasing productivity in terms of lower labour costs and fewer jobs. I believe that the automotive industry probably is an example of an industry which has lent itself to automation more so than any other industry which we might mention at this particular time. To further complicate the issue also lies the fact that approximately half that automotive industry is unused, that is to say that they are working a good deal of the time at half capacity or less and I suggest that this causes a further decrease in the effective demand of the consumer for the products of that particular industry.

Walker Reuther was being shown through a large automotive plant a number of years ago and at that time management drew his attention to the fact that a new automatic device had been installed and also drew his attention to the fact that it would not go on strike, to which Mr. Reuther replied, "that it would not buy automobiles either".

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure that all members of this House recognize the new innovations this technology and automation are a sign of the times and I am sure that all progressive people respect this thought and realize that it is folly to resist the march of progress. I am sure also that most people feel that these modern changes which by necessity result in lower production costs and less man hours to produce any given quantity of goods, should also result in lighter work, shorter hours and more leisure time for the people of our nation in the final analysis.

However, to this date I suggest that the net result of this practice of machines replacing human labour has had more undesirable aspects than the virtues that it has produced and I believe that the time has come when we are going to have to ask ourselves where we are heading. I think it is obvious that the cost of following the present trend is going to be heavy in terms of blighted lives for many workers and their families.

The overall cost of unemployment is difficult to calculate. The millions of dollars in lost production, the many millions of dollars that have been paid out in unemployment insurance and other welfare benefits could

March 27, 1962

be measured with a certain degree of accuracy, but I suggest that the cost of following this present trend in terms of blighted lives for many workers and their families will be difficult to measure and the long term effect of prolonged idleness is very difficult to gauge. The general trend is unemployment leaves very little cause for complacency. We have already reaped the benefits of the unusual conditions which existed at the end of World War II and extended into the mid '50s.

We are now going to have to face the realities of the 1960's. War-devastated countries of Europe have been re-built and the special advantages which we enjoyed in those areas no longer exist. These countries which were previously our customers have become our competitors. This fact, Mr. Speaker, has led to the claim in certain quarters that Canadian labour is pricing itself out of the world market. I suggest that this does not take into consideration Canadian productivity, nor does it take into account the fact that Sweden, a country which enjoys no special advantages in terms of natural resources, geography or climate has managed to maintain the highest average hourly wage scale in the whole of Europe and at the same time has managed to keep the unemployment figure at less than 1% of her total non-agricultural labour force.

Now further to this same question, Mr. Speaker, I want to place on the records a table of the average hourly wage rates which apply in Europe. This is from the Labour Gazette, an official organ of the Federal Department of Labour for July 1961. This is in terms of American dollars and includes benefits therein. It shows The Netherlands with an average hourly wage scale of 63¢ hour, Italy slightly higher at 65¢, Belgium 77¢, Switzerland 81¢, the United Kingdom 82¢, West Germany 91¢ and Sweden on the top of the heap with \$1.19 as their average hourly wage rate.

I think further evidence to the effect that Canada's labour cost in production have not had a detrimental effect on her position as a trading nation, can also be seen in a news release which appeared in the Regina Leader-Post of January 31, 1962. It said, and I quote:

“Labour Minister Starr said Monday that business men who claim that labour costs are pricing Canadians out of the world market have not proved their point. He said in an interview that statistics now show that wages only make up 15% of total product costs as compared to 15.9% a matter of ten years ago.”

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this evidence indicates to us that there are other factors which are involved other than low wages when we are talking in terms of the desirability of full employment.

I suggest also that Sweden, to a greater extent than other countries which I have just mentioned, does have a planned economy and I believe it must be regarded as the key to the success of the Swedish Social Democrats in their country.

Mr. Thorburn Carlson, who is the Swedish Labour Attache to the Embassy in Ottawa addressed a meeting some time ago, a Labour Institute at Dalhousie University, and at that time he said, I would like to quote him — there are only a few short lines. He said:

“We don’t tolerate unemployment in Sweden. A full employment policy is the bedrock of our national economic system. Swedish workers are 95% organized, negotiations are economy wide, governing every company and every worker in the country. Profits of all companies are published periodically. Swedish workers’ wages are the highest average in Europe, 40% higher for example than in West Germany. No one worries about health or old age, all are looked after by government social security measures. Pensions are two-thirds of the salary during the fifteen most productive years.”

Now another editorial appeared in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix a short while later, November 24th, 1961, entitled ‘Sweden Near Full Employment’ and it elaborates on the same question that I have already mentioned. It quotes Mr. Carlson when he spoke to the National Union of Public Service Employees in Montreal some time ago. He pointed out at that time that the government of Sweden uses two key measures for the purpose of combating unemployment in their country. The first measure is increasing the mobility of the labour market in that country, and the second is the matter of maintaining the level of investment.

Now respecting the first of these two measures which Mr. Carlson suggested were the reason for the success of his party, of his country, in combating the problem of unemployment, he said that in his country the labourers were transferred from one section of the country to the other.

March 27, 1962

They would be transferred from sections of the country with unemployed workers in them to expanding sectors and he mentioned that to this end general travel allowances were given and grants were awarded to those who moved for this purpose. He said that an allowance of \$27 a month was given to the wife and \$9 a month for every child under sixteen years of age. In addition to this the rent was paid in the home town. If the worker stayed on the job for at least three months, the entire sum was written off.

Mr. Carlson explained that during recession which Sweden suffered in 1958, between four and five thousand workers were transferred in this manner from one part of the country to the other and he said also that when the mobility of the labour market failed to cope with the severity of unemployment that the government then stimulated the level of investment particularly in building and in construction industries.

In the second phase of this operation Mr. Carlson explained and I quote him, Mr. Speaker:

“The stimulus to investment has not however been confined to housing and public works. An attempt has been made to maintain the level of investment in industry during a recession by making use of so-called investment funds. Under special legislation business firms are permitted to set aside a portion of their profits in special investment funds. These funds are used for investment in building and machines during a period when investment is desirable for employment purposes. Companies do not have to pay taxes on this money, provided that investments are undertaken at a time when it is considered most appropriate from the point of view of the economy of that country. The primary value of the investment fund is that it provides a stimulus at the appropriate time.”

Now Sweden's National Labour Board was created in 1940. It is a tripartite body. Its executives include representatives from industry, from the trade unions, and from the employees. It has three specific functions. First, to operate a nation-wide labour placement service, and second, to counteract an increase in unemployment creating measures. It also encourages the operation of private industry and local national governments to this end.

Its third specific function is to continuously survey and study the state of the labour market and keep all interested parties informed as to the changes. Now Mr. Carlson concluded by saying that Sweden's success is due to a maximum of co-operation between these three groups, the employer, the employee and the governmental bodies. He suggested that Sweden always has a plan in readiness, both in the public and in the private sector of their economy. These plans can be begun quickly and they can be terminated just as quickly whenever a specific problem has been overcome. This editorial which appeared in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix suggested that similar plan could be initiated in Canada with the consultation and the co-operation of these three groups, the employer, employee and governmental groups and it concluded by saying this and I quote:

“Considering the huge stakes involved, near full employment and industrial prosperity, is co-operation by government, industry and labour too much to ask?”

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this particular country over a period of the past 11 years we have had four distinct recessions, I shan't refer to them as depressions, that has become a forbidden word. After each of these recessions, our economic level has settled down at a lower level than it was on previous to the recession and in each instance we have been left with a larger pocket of unemployment. After the 1949-50 recession, the level of unemployment fell back to approximately 2.4%, after the 1953-54 recession it fell back to approximately 3.4% and after the 1957-58 recession it dropped back to approximately 6% and, after the latest recession of 1960-61 the level of unemployment fell back to approximately 7% of our non-agricultural labour force. There is now, Mr. Speaker, a prospect for many unemployed workers never having a permanent job again unless some concise action is taken at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a little over 20 years ago a large number of young men left the soup kitchen and the bread lines of this country in order to defend a country which prior to that time was unable to supply them with a peace time job. They were told at that time that if they never had a square deal before they were certainly going to get one when the war was over. I suggest that many of the people within our unemployment ranks today are veterans of World War II. I also feel that they in conjunction with the other unemployed workers in this country have a right to expect that the government of Canada and the people of Canada will deliver the goods.

March 27, 1962

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, and I am convinced that all members in this House will agree that no provincial administration will be able to rest easy while unemployment is assuming the proportions that it has of late. The winter works programs and the low-rental housing developments and reduced hours of work and various other programs have a very helpful effect in easing the problems of unemployment. They all play a useful part and I believe that we must also recognize the fact that these are merely stop-gap measures and they cannot be considered as the final solution to the problem of unemployment. Something much more comprehensive is going to have to be entered upon in order to solve this particular problem, somewhat along the lines I suggest as is being used in the country of Sweden about which I have had some words to say this afternoon.

Now I think to face this problem squarely there is another disconcerting feature, Mr. Speaker, that we have to recognize at this time and that is the fact that according to the present trend we may expect that the migration of the rural population to urban centres will undoubtedly continue unless a particular effort is made on the national level to give the farmer a fair share of the national income. Saskatchewan's agricultural labour force has declined from 148 thousand in 1951 to 112 thousand at the present time or a decrease of approximately 24%. The Gordon Commission Economic Report on "Canada's Economic Prospects" indicates that the farming population now makes up only about 14% of our total population and they forecast further that by 1980, the farming population will only comprise about 8% of our total figure. I think this points out quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, that today's farmers will undoubtedly be tomorrow's trade unionists, a great number of them are going to fall within the ranks of the unemployed.

Some members may have noticed an editorial which appeared in the Regina Leader-Post on February 27th, by Walter Lippman. It is entitled 'Realistic Farm Policy Needed'. In this editorial it deals with conditions on the American farm, but I believe that by and large the figures apply to a very relative scale in respect to the difficulties encountered in Canadian agriculture at this time.

Mr. Lippman says, and I am only going to quote two paragraphs of the editorial that I feel are pertinent to this question:

"The bad news is that there are more farmers trying to make a living on the land than our modern scientific agriculture requires. Underneath the crop surpluses there is a surplus of farmers.

The essence of the problem is how to take care of the farmers who because they are not needed cannot make a decent living. In his farm message of January 31st, President Kennedy ventured on to this new and politically dangerous ground. He pointed out that out of 3½ million farmers in the United States, 1½ million produce 67% of total production. They could easily produce the other 13%, which is presently produced by 2 million farmers. There are nearly twice as many farmers engaged in agriculture as are necessary for efficient production, and in the years to come as more and more scientific methods are applied to agriculture, the number of farmers will decline even more.”

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, will the member permit a question?

Mr. Snyder: — You can ask a question after I am finished. As I suggested earlier, Mr. Speaker, these figures which I have mentioned here undoubtedly apply to a relative degree in the Canadian farm scene and I believe that this thought combined with the estimate that it is going to be necessary to provide a million new jobs before 1965-66, in order to maintain the present level of investment, indicates to us, I am sure, of the need for action on the national level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan’s unemployment problem is neither isolated nor is it unique as a large number of members opposite try to indicate on various occasions. Canada has at the present time about 600 thousand people unemployed. The latest official figures which I have at my disposal are for November of 1961 and it shows a figure of unemployed of approximately 454,329 or 7.7% of Canada’s non-agricultural labour force. These figures show that Saskatchewan, Quebec and Alberta are approximately at par with the Canadian average. The Atlantic region, Manitoba and British Columbia show figures which are considerably higher than the national average. The Atlantic region showed a figure as of November 1961 of 8.8% of her total non-agricultural labour force. Manitoba with 8.9% and British Columbia with the largest number of unemployed of these different regions which I have mentioned, of 10.5% of their non-agricultural labour force.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some members opposite would have us believe that in order to solve this problem of unemployment it would only be necessary to displace the

March 27, 1962

present administration and return it to the Liberals and immediately this province would become a mecca for industry and our problems would vanish as far as unemployment is concerned. I suggest that a great number of people are going to have difficulty in accepting this theory, in part or in whole, with or without salt. Especially in view of the conditions which are apparent in other parts of the country where a Liberal administration is in office, and I want to offer in evidence and place on the records of the House information which can be found in the "Northern Light" which is described as "The Maritimes Greatest Weekly Newspaper". From Bathurst, New Brunswick, Thursday, March 15, 1962. I want to show the members of the House a list of names under heading, — "Notices Of Issue Of Warrants To The Sheriff", page after page, column after column, Mr. Speaker. There are a total of some 2920 of these people who have been dispossessed of their property, — their property is up for sale because of default in payment of taxes, and this lo and behold is in the county of Gloucester, one county in the prosperous Liberal province of New Brunswick.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these figures, in addition to the other unemployment figures which I have quoted from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics indicate to us that this is a common problem in the 10 provinces of the Dominion of Canada. It is a problem which is apparent no matter what province of this Dominion of Canada you consider. As I have suggested earlier on other occasions that it is unlikely that you will find a healthy limb growing from a diseased body, by the same token it is unlikely that you will find any provincial administration that will escape for very long unsound policies in the federal field. To this date in our history, Mr. Speaker, under both the old Liberal and Conservative administration we have found that neither of them has been able to cope with this problem of unemployment. We have ridden the humps and the hollows, we have experienced the booms and the busts and their wars and depressions and I would suggest that the time has come for all interested groups, farmers, labourers, all other people who have such a vital interest in this question of full employment to join hands in a common purpose and to reach an ultimate goal and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the New Democratic Party is a conveyance towards this ultimate goal. I will support the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, now that the speaker has resumed his seat I would like to ask him if he endorses the sentiments of Mr. Lippman in regard to getting rid of the farmers off the farms?

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Chairman, I would answer by asking him if he agrees with

Mr. Walter Gordon in his report on the prospects of the future?

Mr. McCarthy: — That's no answer at all.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McCarthy: — Afraid to answer it eh?

Mrs. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Chairman, in rising to take part in this debate I shall answer the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy). I personally am very unhappy about this; I would much rather see people able to stay on their farms and I would much rather see the people in New Brunswick able to hang on to their property. I think none of us are happy Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, or Saskatchewan or any other province where people lose a life time of savings. Let's not look happy about this no matter which side of the House we are on, but let's face up to it. This is what happens.

The member who has just spoken has given you figures which I shall not repeat, but I want to add to this just a few thoughts, which I think are important at this time, and when we read the resolution we are faced with the statement which I am sure none of us would disagree with, that we are gravely concerned, that the growing threat of high and permanent unemployment is a threat to our economy and it is a challenge to our ingenuity. I am sure that we will all agree that we should join with the national government in making an effective attack on this problem which is so prevalent and which is such a threat to all of us.

In trying to find some argument to support his resolution, naturally we try to find things that are new and that no one else has said before. This morning when I was in the library I noticed the New York Times had some very interesting figures, and they have a new economist whom I had never read before and his name is Mr. Hanson. His article was entitled, "We must grow or sink" and he was deploring the fact that the American economy, with the biggest machines and the greatest store of technical know-how, and the greatest resources in the world is suffering from the very same thing that New Brunswick is suffering from — a lack of growth in the economy — people unable to pay their way and earn their own living and he says that it is really a very serious thing.

March 27, 1962

I am going to give you a few quotes that apply equally to the United States and to ourselves.

“In the days when the depressions were far more serious than in recent years, many economists and business men believed that depressions were not only inevitable but useful. They believed that depression squeezed out inefficient firms, just as the inefficient farmers are being squeezed out that they squashed out unhealthy speculations; that they ironed out distortions in the cost-price structure and they brought the law of supply and demand into equilibrium. They agreed that every boom ended in bust and that its function was to reduce the speculative fever. The economy (now these are his words, not mine) needed a cold shower and a rub-down to put it into shape for the next recovery movement.”

Of course we all have lived through this sort of adjustment and the figures that the hon. member has just given you prove that these depressions occur more frequently and that we wipe them out with the greatest difficulty. In fact, we never really wipe them out, and in spite of the best we have been able to do, the unemployment figures are growing and hardening and becoming permanent, and this of course is very serious thing. This rough and ready adjustment is something that we have all been the victims of, whether we like to admit it or not. It has always been hard on a small operator, it meant that if he was a corner grocery man or a small store keeper in the country he could only manage by keeping his store open to all hours and working his wife and kids for board and room. It was hard on the working man who depended on a job for a living. He was often laid off and he found that by the time another boom got under way that only young men were being hired, and there were plenty of them looking for jobs. Perhaps he had let his life insurance lapse. Perhaps he had lost his home and perhaps his furniture had to be repossessed.

Even worse things happened in the Maritimes than happened in New Brunswick. This happened in Nova Scotia and we read about it in Canadian magazines, like MacLeans magazine. I ran into a man from there not long ago and he gave me an even worse angle than appeared in MacLeans magazine. He came from Glace Bay, where the great underwater coal operator in Cape Breton decided a few years ago

to close down. Now this great coal firm spreads like a great city out under the Atlantic. I have explored it on a visit to the Maritimes and I was fascinated how layer after layer goes down and you go down a grid system like the blocks in the city streets. This operated for years with a federal government subsidy. Now this ancient and honourable company was quite tricky. You see they had a very smart business sense so they didn't say anything about closing down, they just went on operating but they brought in a new policy and they decided that these old Houses which several generations had rented and which were obsolete and substandard and were now depreciated could now be sold to their employees, and their employees were encouraged to sink their life savings in these old Houses with the prospect of the mine closing, of which they were unaware, and so now the company has their life work and their life savings too and the miners had nothing but their old Houses in a worthless, blighted area.

Now the same people that had justified this type of operation defend ruthless naked power in industry. They are the enemy of the planned welfare state, and they don't really believe in marketing boards, or co-operatives and they really would like nothing better than to get rid of the Wheat Board and bring back the free competitive open market of the Grain Exchange. They hate labour unions and they curse the Teachers' Federation, they in short still believe the world is flat economically.

Mr. Gallagher: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't think she is talking . . .

Mrs. Strum: — I didn't name you, just sit down. Now to return to this publication, The New York Times, this economist, speaking of the American economy, says this:

“It is no doubt true that 47 million people, around the year workers who are continually employed in the United States, need not worry too much about our recessions, but what about the 7% of the unemployed which persisted for 11 consecutive months and then finally fell only to 6.1% and to 5.6% in February. Large segments of our economy do indeed enjoy a high stability, but there are great recessions sensitive industries and workers in those industries who face periodic unemployment. Five million unemployed together with their dependents represent a population of over

March 27, 1962

12 million people and are more than the entire population of the six New England States, such was our employment at its worst in both 58 and in the 1960-61 recession.”

It is only three years apart; it is getting closer and closer and deeper and deeper. And he continues:

“A free society should do better than that. Recessions in the United States can cause a loss of export earnings to many underdeveloped countries, far exceeding any foreign aid that we have given them. Recessions impede our rate of growth. Recessions create, by under-use, over-capacity cuts back on the rate of investment in plant and equipment.”

And he continues:

“Western European countries have suffered less from recessions than we have in the entire post-war period, and their rates of growth have doubled ours. Conditions in Europe are, however, a good deal different. Massed markets are just emerging and Europe is experiencing a technological revolution.”

He goes on to talk about the western European countries and comes to West Germany, which we have mentioned here a great many times, and I want to give you a quote from John Gunther, who has written ‘Inside Asia’, ‘Inside Europe’ and a second ‘Inside Europe’ which came out just last year, 1961. He says this about western European recover:

“Almost all European countries except the haunts of the backward, like Spain and Portugal, subscribe nowadays to the major premise of the welfare state, within the confines of the free enterprise system. This, obviously, is because no government stands much chance of getting elected unless they do.”

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the next federal election you won’t be able to tell the parties apart by their programs. They will all sound like our party, but their performance won’t look like it.

Mr. Guy: — Which party is that?

Mrs. Strum: — Gunther goes on,

“Any modern state must assume responsibility for its citizens to one degree or another, in health services, in medical care, in old age pensions, and unemployment benefits and other forms of social insurance.”

Of course this is not new, and as the hon. member pointed out, the Scandinavian countries have been welfare states for a generation or longer and Gunther says,

“The reforms of the Front Populaire in France began in 1936, Germany has had social security since Bismarck. The movement for fully extended social services has been greatly accelerated since the war and the concept that all citizens must share in the proceeds of the national economy is almost universally accepted, (and here is the figure that I think is important), West Germany spends not less than 30% of its budget on social welfare, including housing.”

Now this shows what modern realistic thinking admits as a necessity for the economic health of the nation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that to give everybody jobs, a decent wage so that they may buy their home and keep the sheriff from the door you must have growth, expansion and high national productivity. These are the goals of the socialist countries, Norway and Sweden, and the goals of the capitalist United States of America and of Canada as well. I submit that free enterprise capitalist United States is not likely to attain the high level of production per capita and the low rate of employment of socialist Sweden or Norway, because their government is not free to embark on the policies that bring about either stability or full employment. To return again to my friend of the New York times, “we must grow or sink”, Hanson says in conclusion:

“It is not likely that congress will give the President of the United States the power to do these things which would rehabilitate the American economy and put the unemployed to work, and he says that the all-important question is, “Can we head off the next recession, and shunt the current recovery movement on to a fairly steady growth current?”

March 27, 1962

Mr. Speaker, I agree with him when he suggests that growth depends basically upon two things, upon private investment and public investment and when he says that outlays on capital equipment of all sorts are needed to enlarge the output of material goods, I agree with him. And when he says that private enterprise here adequately and respectively fills the bill for consumer goods, I agree with that. And when he says that in meeting the urban living, mass transport, health, education, training, science, research and development, government of necessity must come in and play the primary role, Mr. Speaker, I agree with that.

This is what our government in this province has tried to do this year with the budget. We have tried to attack unemployment by strengthening the economy, by retraining people whose jobs have altered. We are told now that we will have to be prepared to change our jobs three times in a normal cycle, the jobs fold up, new industries come into being, and new skills are required. When our government here has tried to do this, they are in the best position of the most forward-looking countries in the world today. They have budgeted to build access roads, to build power lines, to build telephones . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think the member is getting more on the budget debate.

Mrs. Strum: — Yes, but it is related to employment, Mr. Speaker, these are where the jobs arise, in the power lines and the development of all these resources, and in the 1960 report of the Power Corporation, I want to point out that in developing power we are making available a resource which is very important and volume which is very necessary. I want to point out that in the Interprovincial Steel Mill alone, the consumption of this plant is equal to the city of Moose Jaw, according to the 1960 annual report. If we are to have industry, if we are to have plants, if we are to have jobs, we must develop these resources of water, and power and roads and these things in themselves give jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to make a few observations about other jobs which will come into being as a result of research. We have had to defend research in this House and the attacks by people, I think, who really like research too. When you think of all these nylon products that we use, of all the plastic products that we use, of all the jobs that have arisen in the electronics industry, of all

the little radios that we carry around in our hands, some of them come from Japan, it is true, but we have gone very, very far in many fields in creating many jobs, and our universities and our technological institutes will supply workers and will supply research which will give a great many more jobs.

I want to, just in passing, answer criticism of labour and a criticism of government that was levied in this House a few days ago. A few years ago I had the privilege of visiting New Zealand . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, I don't think the hon. member can refer to statements made in previous debates.

Mrs. Strum: — Well, all right then. Let's put it his way, (this is what I learned from my hon. friends in the chamber), a great many people in an economy which is producing government-owned utilities will be employed by those utilities and a great many people will be employed in the civil service. A few years ago I had the opportunity of visiting one of the most highly industrialized and perhaps the country with the highest percentage of workers employed by the government of any country in the world, I refer to New Zealand. In the early days, in the development of that country, private railway companies went broke trying to tunnel through the mountains. They have the longest tunnels in the world. They have a chain of mountains that run the entire length of New Zealand, and is called the southern Alps, and as company after company went into bankruptcy trying to build railways, the government was forced to take over the railways. They tool over all transport, as a matter of fact, and when you travel in New Zealand, you get off a government bus, you get on a government ferry, you get on a government boat, you get on a government train, these things are all government-owned and they are all integrated and it was necessary because of the pattern of development in this country.

Now the number of people who worked for the government got to be so great that the problem arose of how you would permit these people to maintain citizenship and practice democracy and still work for the government and in that country I was surprised to learn that they have an arrangement there to permit civil servants to get leave of absence to run as candidate.

Mr. Speaker: — I am afraid the hon. member is too far from the resolution, I wish you would deal with that certain resolution.

March 27, 1962

Mrs. Strum: — This is part of the employment picture. Are you going to fire everybody that works for the government if they take part in the ordinary processes of democracy, Mr. Speaker? This is relevant to employment and this is a problem that had to be faced and this is a problem that you and I have to face, because there are people that would rob everyone of all their democratic privileges just because they work for the government and I wish to suggest to those who doubt this that they clarify this themselves, that there is a growing segment of our population that will, perforce, do the jobs that we want done publicly and it is most unfair that we should treat them as social lepers and disfranchise them just because they happen to vote for the government. This is related to the employment picture and it is something that we are going to have to face.

In closing I merely wish to say that I am proud that I am part of an administration that is not afraid to embark on projects that will give employment, that will strengthen the economy and that will develop our country.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the resolution.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I was sitting down and enjoying the debate and I hadn't intended to take any part in it at all, but the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) altered me because he passed the remark that the Liberals believe that the only solution for unemployment was to elect a Liberal government. I didn't know whether we actually believed that or not. I thought we had many other matters that we were giving consideration to, and he said neither the Liberals or the conservatives were able to cope with the problem and there is only one solution after all, that is to elect the NDP.

Now, I didn't know how wide-spread his support for that thinking was. I happen to have with me the Medicine Hat News of Saturday, March 24th. Medicine Hat being our main shopping centre, we actually subscribe to the Medicine Hat News and it just so happens that on the front page they have Pulse Association as taking a survey of the political picture in Canada asking people how they will vote in the next election. In view of the severe unemployment and of the problems facing Canada, I was quite interested in the thinking of a good many people apart from Liberals. It goes on to say here that "Pulse survey made in the wake of Hazen Argue's resignation as CCF-NDP House Leader found the party rapidly losing support of many people in the west . . ."

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — On a point of order . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . in keeping people to the subject matter in discussion.

Mr. Danielson: — Why didn't you say something before.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He is speaking on a subject that has no relationship to the motion.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, in this debate, I am answering statements made by both speakers that took part in the debate and the thinking of the people, I think, has some bearing on unemployment and seeing what other people are thinking. That's what I want to read, what other people's thoughts are on unemployment.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the point that the minister has just raised was somewhat well taken, but I see that the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) is answering certain statements which were raised and when you get a resolution like this which each time you try to get it back to order, if it can be related as something that effects labouring people, it is a very wide resolution, I am afraid . . .

Mr. Danielson: — That's what they were doing all yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: — . . . and I will ask the hon. members to please . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I will be very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be exactly to the point, just answering those two statements raised, that the solution to the unemployment was to elect an NDP government. Now that statement was made. I thought I would investigate and see what some of the thinking was. According to this Pulse report, they asked the people how they voted in 1958, and they told them. They asked them how they were going to vote this time in view of the unemployment situation and which particular party they thought had the better chance in solving the unemployment. CCF voters in 1958 indicated they were mostly going Liberal and this abandoning of the NDP party hammered out as the people's party would bring together old CCFers and

March 27, 1962

new Progressives. Of ex-CCFer voters 42% say they will go Liberal at the next election.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Only 29% planned to transfer their loyalty to the NDP, only 29% of the CCF plan to transfer their loyalty to the NDP.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Where were the Liberals?

Mr. Cameron: — Of them 17% were undecided and 2% of the ex-CCFers said they were going to vote Conservative. In the west as a whole, how are the people thinking in the wake of this unemployment?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — 21% of the people of the west . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The member rose on a point of order, I must listen to a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member says, that he is replying to something said earlier in the debate. Does this give him the right to wander all over the place? There is a motion before this House and it is no answer to a point of order to state that he is answering a statement made earlier. You could wander all over the place in answering statements made by someone else, but it wouldn't be in order . . .

Mr. Klein: — The lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) indicated the election of a certain type of government would do a lot to alleviate unemployment. This is related to the type of government that we would like to see elected and therefore it would take care of our problems.

Mr. Speaker: — I realized that the point of order in my opinion is well taken, it is true that the member adopted certain statements, but the Attorney General has raised a good point that we cannot have debate on statements and I think that the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) does not want

to pursue this and I think he has made his point and I hope he will come back closer to the debate.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I have just one remark to make in closing, I would have been closed if the Attorney General hadn't seen fit to get off his seat, my point is this: I think people in public life should always try at least to keep their ears tuned to what other people are doing and what other people are thinking and the group across the way, Mr. Speaker, is not the only group that is giving consideration to unemployment. That is not the only party that is giving consideration to unemployment and the people of Canada are not only the ones that are facing unemployment. And I think it is most interesting to enlighten the debate if we could bring into this House the thinking of other people, that was what I was attempting to do. Forty-five per cent of the CCFers said the Liberals have the solution and of those who voted Conservative thirty-one per cent say they think the Liberals have the best solution to unemployment in Canada today and in the west twenty-five per cent. Nine per cent of the people in the west think the New Democratic Party has the solution. Those are the points that I wanted to bring out on the thinking of the people in the west, not the CCF or the Liberals here but the people in western Canada in regard to who can best solve the unemployment situation.

Mr. Speaker: — It being 5:30 p.m. I do now leave the Chair until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, Canada has often known temporary depressions and lows as we all know, but the situation that exists in Canada today, the unemployment, the farm costs, price of wheat, and the general instability of the country I think can only be compared to the dirty thirties, and I have thought there would be no division on the voting as far as this motion was concerned, but after listening to some hon. members opposite I am not too sure that they will vote with us for this resolution and I thought maybe I should stand up and say some of the things that should be said.

As I said there are certain references and statements made in this House and I have of course been accustomed to hearing different kinds of statements some years ago to those we hear now. As a matter of fact until 1956. Just before the conservative government got elected to Ottawa, and I repeat we have been listening to a different

March 27, 1962

kind of tune since that time, actually I hate to have to get up every year in this House and remind the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) for example, who said some years ago how well off the farmers were and how well off our economy was, I am not . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — That is quite true — quite true.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am not going to remind him, I hope, again. But even as late as 1956 the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) — report March 15, 1956, page 11 — the hon. member for Moosomin was speaking in this House and in the budget debate said this:

“And I wish that some of the people sitting opposite would compare their personal expenditures for 1934 and 1944 with their personal expenditures of today. Each and every one of us, Mr. Speaker, are much better off today than we were during those days.”

Opposition Member: — That is quite correct.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now that has been the kind of tune but of course it is different today, and that is because their companions have also indicated they are just as much concerned with the present disastrous situation as exists in Canada as are other parties, but as I pointed out that wasn't their record before and if they have changed then of course I can't see it, there could be a metamorphosis as far as they are concerned, but I can't see it in their speeches or in their behaviour.

Opposition Member: — Pretty weak, Bill, pretty weak.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now referring to there present crisis I think it can be truly said that had not the free enterprise parties, the Conservatives and Liberals, pampered the private enterprise industries and corporations, and done their duty towards the people of Canada we would not be going through the kind of disastrous situation we are living under today, and this is one of the other reasons why I got up to expose some of the activities of the friends of the Liberals and Conservatives in this country. For example we have the Canadian Chamber of Commerce trying to tell the people of Canada that the government is too much involved in the economic needs of the people of this country. We have for example another one of their friends, (and I received

this the other day). The Huron and Erie Trust Company, and they refer to the taxes that the government are collecting and decrying these taxes being used for social purposes, such as alleviating unemployment and providing pensions among other things. This is what they say on page 4, of the Huron and Erie Trust Company report, and I think the hon. members would be well advised to read their whole article which is the President's report of the 98th annual general meeting, and may I quote, Mr. Speaker, it says:

“Taxes may well be contributing to this situation.”

It refers to the situation where Canada didn't make anymore than two per cent on the gross national product and they had anticipated about four or five per cent. It goes on to say:

“Taxes in any country can be justified only if they are a means of spurring economic development for the country as a whole, and not if they simply serve as a means of distributing wealth without regard to individual efforts and individual productivity.”

Now that is quite a serious statement to make today to the governments of Canada, whether they be federal or provincial or municipal government, that the only kind of taxes that is proper to collect are those taxes that are going to build up industry, and as far as they are concerned these people think we have no right as a government to collect taxes to provide social services and to provide money to correct unemployment situations and things of that nature.

Not only that but I was listening to the radio the other day, and there was somebody on the radio, I don't know if it was a John Bircher or who, telling the people of the United States, that they should not agree to accept federal aid for education from the government. Now these kinds of people have created the situation that exists today in Canada. These are the friends of the governments that have been in Ottawa for some generations now, and through their power and through their efforts have told the governments of Canada what to do.

We talk about — yes they are advisers — you know just as well as I do that these governments take the advice

March 27, 1962

of the people that belong to these kind of organizations, to the trusts, to the banks, and to others, and they have told the people of Canada all along that there is too much money in the country, that the government shouldn't be doing the kind of jobs that should be done, the government shouldn't take in hand the kind of situation that has been developing over the years, and the governments both Liberal and Conservative governments have been listening to these people and are responsible for the situation that exists in Canada today.

Mr. Speaker: — I hope the hon. member will keep his remarks to the motion.

Mr. Klein: — I was just going to ask what resolution he was speaking about?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out that the unemployment situation today is the result of policies of the federal government in the main. I am not saying the provinces are not partly to blame too.

Opposition Members: — As well as municipal government.

Mr. Speaker: — I hope you won't stray too far from the motion.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall try to keep to the motion. Now what has been done, of course the big boys know that the people don't like to live under depressed conditions or to have considerable unemployment, and the only thing that the government in Ottawa, the Conservative government, the Liberals didn't even do that much, was to supply the opportunity for some winter works, and those people who are, (say the municipal councillors), who are associated with municipalities know this is only a token kind of a solution to the problem of unemployment that exists in Canada today.

Now if the government of Canada had the courage to go ahead and do what the United States did in 1929, or 1932, and had gone ahead and put on large works program the year round to take those people who are unemployed and put them to work, we of course wouldn't have this situation, and I think that is the reason for this resolution.

It urges the dominion government to do what is necessary to be done. Hon. members know as well as I do that the federal government not only has the responsibility,

it has the prerogative and it has the ability to obtain the necessary funds, the necessary monies to put into action the kind of programs that are going to take care of all the people today who are either on unemployment insurance or on social aid.

Now getting a little closer to home, Mr. Speaker, and to show you what is happening, I, of course must talk about the area in which I live, and which I know something about, and I can only say this to the House at this time, that we have had in the north what you would call a population explosion. Now a lot of this is due to the fact that this government has been very concerned about the needs of the people of the north, and has assisted them in many ways to obtain better incomes, though incomes are still too low, and notwithstanding what we have done the fact remains, that conditions are still bad. As a matter of fact they are getting worse this past year because of the general economic conditions. Let me point out this, that in northern Saskatchewan, the increase of birth over death is twice as heavy as it is in the rest of the province. We now have about 18,000 people according to the statistics I could gather, and with this kind of increase and young people growing up and no place to go, we are certainly going to have a problem, and I would just like to give a few figures here what is happening to the people there.

In 1957-58 we had to hand out assistance in the form of pensions and social aid, and so forth, to the extent of \$88,240. Since that time that assistance has had to be doubled, and last year the amount was \$173,286 and the main reasons for this doubling of the assistance which the government has to give those people is the fact there is no place for them to make greater incomes. There is no employment there. They can't come out of the settlement and get jobs here, and the opportunities of the north are pretty well saturated.

I would like to point out that out of this \$173,000 that was spent last year, \$45,000 went to able bodied men and the rest went, of course, to dependents and others. This is the kind of situation we have today, twice as bad today as it was in 1958, and it will probably be twice as bad five years from now. We can't continue to keep handing out social aid. I think it is time the government, and it is not funny at all, either federal or provincial or municipal, took the matter in hand and did something about this situation.

You may ask me as to what some of the remedies are, Mr. Speaker, but first I would like to point out

March 27, 1962

something about the farm people in my area. I don't know exactly, say north of Prince Albert or in my constituency what percentage of young people have left the farms and gone to the cities and tried to find jobs, but I would say at least a third, and there again you have young people who have moved into the cities, older people who have moved into the cities, and none of them can get jobs, so the city of Prince Albert and other cities have a tremendous load of unemployed, who are on social aid and whose problems must be solved.

Now I think it is recognized by all hon. members that it is the right of people to work, it is the right of people to be able to make an income, and we in Canada have been denying our people that basic right, and the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) has pointed out as have other hon. members that this is not the same situation in all other countries. Where you have social democratic countries the unemployment problem has been taken in hand, they have no unemployment problems above normal; and if it can be done in Sweden, if it can be done in Israel, Mr. Speaker, it certainly can be done in Canada which is much, much richer in natural resources and opportunities than are some of these other countries.

I should have mentioned while I was talking about the cost to us in the north, I should have mentioned that with the population growing, we have to provide more hospitalization and we have to provide medical care for these unemployed. This again is costing us a tremendous amount of money because most of these people can't pay. But if jobs were provided for them, if work were provided, no doubt they would pay.

If hon. members are interested the figures I have for 1960 here show that we only collected forty-one per cent of the hospitalization from these people, and the only reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that these people can't get jobs. There are no opportunities. If it is of interest, we have enough work for around 3,000 fishermen, and we have trappers, most of the fishermen are trapping also. Now when you take that many out of a population of say 18,000 you can see there is a great proportion of adults who cannot find an opportunity to make a living.

And so it is very, very necessary for us to do something about this situation, and the question I must ask myself is what can be done? There is no use just telling the government that the situation is bad, I should be able to tell some of the things that I think should be done.

I think many things can be done in that part of Saskatchewan as in other parts of Saskatchewan. For one thing if you look back into what happened during the depression in the United States in 1932, which I mentioned at the beginning, most of their unemployed were put to work in public works. Nobody can tell me that we can't do the same and provide work in this province, and in the municipalities, in our resources and on farms. Yes, even on farms, Mr. Speaker, if the government of Canada had the will and co-operated with the provinces, there is no reason why a lot of these young people and older people in the cities, could not get jobs on the farms, and I could illustrate what happened to me, and I think it is worth trying to understand.

I farm my land myself, but I need help. I obtained a man from the city of Prince Albert, and he stayed with me three days. I paid him \$10 a day, and he wouldn't stay, for the simple reason he said it was better for him to be unemployed, and if he stayed longer he wouldn't be able to get enough aid to support his family. Now why can't the government, to help the industry of farming, help to pay wages for the working man and we will put up the rest, enough money so that a person will have his \$300 or \$400 a month to feed his family, to pay his rent and to pay all the expenses of living. Why can't it be done?

If hon. members think we can't do that, I would like to suggest to them that the government of Canada today is paying ship-builders 50 per cent of the cost of building ships. The government today is paying to mining companies, to gold mining companies, subsidies so they won't lose any money. They are paying tremendous amounts of money to uranium companies, as a matter of fact I stated on a previous occasion, where one company made \$14 million clear profit. The government of Canada can do all those things and yet the government of Canada can't co-operate with the provinces to see that the people who live in our good country of Canada have jobs?

What about the north? Well, Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of things you can do in the north, and the most important one, I think, is housing. Surely if a little country like Denmark can, through good legislation, provide assistance for people to build homes with a deposit of only three per cent down and a rate of repayment and interest less than two per cent, surely Canada should be able to do the same thing. If they want to save this country something like this is urgent.

Mr. Danielson: — That is not for rural Saskatchewan.

March 27, 1962

Mr. Berezowsky: — This government does not control the Bank of Canada, neither does the government in the province control money, and the hon. member knows quite well money is controlled by the federal government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . and if the federal government wanted to save this country from any kind of slum conditions all they have to do is see that the people get the same kind of decent consideration they get in Denmark or any other social democratic country.

Mr. Danielson: — That Socialist . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — That is all the hon. member knows is socialist. He doesn't know what the word socialist means. He doesn't know what social justice means. What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is social justice. We have some 150 thousand people in Canada of Indian origin who have not decent homes.

Five hundred thousand or maybe a million people like myself and yourself Sir that could have better homes, and we haven't got them. For the simple reason that our incomes as I pointed out are much too low. We cannot provide the kind of decent homes we should have. The hon. members don't like facing facts, but I am facing facts. I live in a community in Canada, a lovely community where some of the best people live in a single home there, that have not all the amenities they should have. Many people there haven't got decent homes, and they can't afford it because of the situation in this country.

Mr. Cameron: — Unemployment — unemployment would cause that.

Mr. Berezowsky: — But getting back to the suggestions I have to offer. In the north as I said we could be building houses for the most underprivileged people we have in this country. Another thing we probably could do with the co-operation of the federal government (and I am sure the province would co-operate) — we could have a canoe building plant. We buy canoes, most of the sportsmen buy them, and the local people must have them, and why do we have them shipped in from the states and eastern Canada, from Peterborough,

when we can have them built here? There are a thousand and one things and I am not going into detail right now, as to all that can be done in this province, but the province can't do these things alone, Mr. Speaker. Every time we bring in a budget the hon. members say it is too big, that we had better cut it down. If we did this, if we removed taxes as was done by previous governments, then it would be necessary to cut out all the services and we would have a police state, denying social services to the people. Those are the arguments that face us.

Opposition Member: — A little off the track.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I was not prepared to make a long speech. I just wanted to point out some facts and some of the behaviours I have noticed on the other side and the attitudes of hon. members and I think I have said enough to indicate that I feel this is a very serious problem, and also that I am going to support this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate and one which I think is of the most importance to the people of Saskatchewan I would like to answer a few of the statements that have been made from across the floor.

The member from Cumberland mentioned it is very important for us and he put terrific emphasis on "us" to do something, and then he goes on to say "Nobody can tell me we cannot provide work for our unemployed in Saskatchewan." For the moment, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to leave these two statements which the hon. gentleman has made.

This afternoon we heard approximately five speakers on the government side of the House, and they have looked over the horizon; we have gone to Sweden; we went to Denmark; we have been everywhere, but we have not been to Saskatchewan as yet.

However, seeing that we can go into all aspects of the discussion on unemployment and probably if we would really go into the problems very thoroughly we would be here for the next week or two discussing the questions and the problems of unemployment as it applies to Saskatchewan and trying to solve these problems.

I propose to give some recommendations this evening which I hope the various ministers of the crown will listen to and give serious consideration to and apply to

March 27, 1962

the policies of the government. I am sure these will go a long way to alleviate some of the problems of unemployment that we have. There was some mention a moment ago of the undesirability of machines of automation coming into the country, that is, that it is creating unemployment. It has been said in the past, Mr. Speaker, time and again, that it is our capital and our machines have made it possible for us in this country to have the second highest standard of living in the world. It is only with our capital and our machines that we can do it.

Many statistics have been brought in here this afternoon in regard to Sweden, Denmark, and what have you, and I don't believe they are relevant insofar as the problems we are discussing here. What are we going to do or what has been done, other than lipservice?

As far as members who have got up and spoken on the government side, I believe they would have rendered a much better service to the unemployed in Saskatchewan if for the two weeks before the opening of this legislature, when they were sitting in caucus trying to convince the government that they should do something, had they tried to convince the government we might have had more to help for the problems of unemployment.

Now they are coming here, individual members trying to air their problems generally, and still as yet we have not had one cabinet minister get up and tell us what they would do to help alleviate this problem of unemployment.

The lady member of Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) says, let us face up to the problems of unemployment. Now I say, let us face up to it. This is one time I did agree with the lady; she was right; let us be prepared to face up to it and see what we can do. But she mentioned as she was going on about glorifying some of the good points of socialism or whatever you may call it. She said, you know I went somewhere and got off a government plane, then I got on a government train, and then I got on a government bus, then, that reminds me of a little story. She got a drink or this person got a drink from a government liquor store . . .

Mrs. Strum: — Mr. Speaker, I demand an apology I am an abstainer, now you just take that back. Mr. Speaker, I will not have the member saying . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the lady member misunderstood the speaker.

He was referring to what was said early this afternoon, that it reminds him of a story.

Mrs. Strum: — Well, he had better be careful. He can speak for himself.

Mr. Coderre: — I got off a government plane, I got on a government train, I got on a government bus, I got a drink from a government liquor store, and I got sick on government liquor. I had to see a government doctor, I got into a government hospital, I died. I was buried by a government hearse and I was buried in government ground. I suppose the man in question had led possibly a bad life, and then probably went to a government hell. Maybe he lived in a socialist hell before.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Real wit. Better go to Sweden and find out.

Mr. Coderre: — One of the members across the floor was mentioning that 30 percent of the West German budget was for social welfare. I believe that is understandable, but you must understand that in a western democratic world, Germany, under a free enterprise system where they are developing very well, has full employment, and daily from the eastern socialist government of East Germany, people are coming across, and naturally the people of West Germany under a free enterprise system are assisting these unfortunates who are unemployed. It is understandable that they can have this 30 per cent on social welfare.

However, getting to the more serious part of the resolution, the resolution as I read it fails to cover all the phases or many of the important phases that would help promote an increase in employment in Saskatchewan.

Now I say that when we take a resolution of this sort, it is not enough to ask the federal government but we should ask ourselves, what are we going to do about it as well. It is a question of asking all the time and not trying to help themselves. I have mentioned in the past that before we can expect any help from anyone I think we should try and help ourselves, and then our neighbour is more than ready to help us if we help ourselves. Due to this centralization that this government has been so adept and so quick to adopt, our work force, our young farmers how are leaving the farms, become an additional, increased labour force on our available work force in the province.

March 27, 1962

Apart from the fact that many of these young farmers and working people that we have in this province are leaving the province, we are still faced with over 27,000 unemployed. What have we done in this regard? I wish sometimes the Minister of Education was here today to listen. What has he done to try and train this green working force that is getting on to the market — the work market of today. Are we helping them? Are we training them to be better men and to provide more for the economy?

I find the lady from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) shaking her head in the affirmative. Apparently she is not quite conversant with what is actually happening.

I know, Mr. Speaker, of two young farm boys who have been forced off their farms. They applied for assistance to go to winter school that we have in the city of Moose Jaw, the Technical School, they have not the academic standing and are not in a position to carry on with further education, but they can take technical training. Because these boys were not on the unemployed list they were not able to enter that school and take training. What is going to happen to these people, Mr. Speaker?

The government is so prone to this centralization, it seems everything they have done has created an additional burden on our farm people. These young farmers are leaving the farm — they are coming to the cities seeking employment. This is creating a greater problem than we actually have. I fail to see in the resolution some recommendation to the government of Canada. I fail to see in the resolution what we should do for job placement. I think I am quite fair in being critical about the unemployment office, sometimes. I don't believe they are doing everything they can to place a person without any training. If you have had some training, have been a holder of an unemployment insurance book, then they will give you job placement, but I know, Mr. Speaker, of many young farmers who have entered the employment office and asked for a job. What are they trained for? These boys are prepared to do any kind of work as long as it is work. There are no opportunities anywhere to find them jobs. They have to trudge the streets to try and find work. What is the government doing about that?

Don't you think that some effort should be made to encourage, to ask the government of Canada to do more in that respect, that we could probably provide employment for some three, four, five thousand fellows who haven't got any type of training. These boys want jobs, any kind of jobs, it doesn't matter what it is, they are prepared to work, because a young farmer has no fear of any type of

work, providing it is available to him.

There is no mention in this resolution, no mention of having a good honest look at our labour relations, our conciliation services, our standards. Let us have a good look at them and see if by any chance or other they are the instruments of curtailing some of our employment or holding back some industries that would come into this province and provide employment. It is all right to have good relations but a good honest look at our labour code which would not deprive either the management or the employee of any benefits or rights would go a long way to establishing or creating of better industrial climate.

It has been mentioned time and again that a good industrial climate will give jobs to the people. That is your job; it is the government's job to go ahead and have a good honest look at it, without infringing upon the rights of the benefits of any individual. There has been no mention made in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, or anywhere, that we should try and promote the buying powers of the farmers. Is there any denying that an increase in the buying power of the farmers one way or another, would not promote employment. When the farmer has the dollar, the farmer purchases, and when he purchases somebody has to provide these services. There has been no mention, Mr. Speaker, in this resolution anywhere of asking the provincial government to make any attempt that the provincial government create the proper atmosphere that would be conducive to industrial growth. This would definitely increase production and employment in this province, put more wealth, and more wealth means more employment.

No mention is made to look at our oil and seismic regulations. This would promote search, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — . . . are searching.

Mr. Coderre: — Good, I just love to hear you say something constructive for the oil industry — where we could get more oil in this province — we need that.

As I say if anyone would take the time this afternoon to deal with every one of these subjects that I have brought up so far, we could be here for a week and deal with them each individually, fully. We could promote employment in this province, and take a good percentage of our 25,000 unemployed and put them to work.

March 27, 1962

There is no mention either in this resolution about the government doing anything in regard to our loss of mineral production in this province. There has been constant curtailment. Oh they show us dollars and cents figures. This would provide jobs which the people of this province would have, and it would be providing more money for these people.

But production restrictions have curtailed our employment. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to promote employment you must promote maximum industrial and agricultural development in the use of the free enterprises under which individual companies and co-operatives risk their capital and use their skill and their initiative to produce with a high degree of efficiency.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if one paragraph alone, this phrase alone, is worth more to good industrial growth and to promote employment for this province, as anything that this government has ever brought forth yet.

We cannot enjoy prosperity like we have had in the past, with increasing government controls and interference with our very lives. This constant yearly infringement, controls in every way of life, is bound to curtail industrial development. It is bound to create greater unemployment.

I would like to put it this way; if the government would keep its cotton-picking fingers off the affairs of men, all men will solve their problems in their own way to the benefit of all.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — Creeping socialism has done more to discourage employment than any other factor. Of course, if you go to 100 per cent socialism where you can have your slave labour camps, then you would have full employment.

People in this province, Mr. Speaker, want to buy; people in this province want to work; people in this province want to produce. Give and provide the proper atmosphere and it will be done. By improper approach by both the federal and provincial governments, for example, people in Canada today fear to invest for fear of confiscation, the fear of losses and otherwise. Governments should establish proper safeguards for investors, and be sure they are properly established. These investments could be poured back into the industry, small industries of this province, everywhere, and we would have more employment.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if you start thinking of the question of investment, you will realize there is more money in savings by the people in Canada than there is actually investment from outside Canada in Canada, the people of Canada have more in savings, that could all be ploughed back into our industries toward developing our country. What a wonderful boom we would have. The people must be assured of a reasonable amount of protection without being fleeced.

If we had more Canadian investment capital we would have more industry and more employment.

Mention has been made time and again, about the capitalist monopoly. After all, in many cases these big businesses invest the money of many of the small people. In mutual funds, and otherwise, insurance, yours and mine, my children's — this is the money of these big monopolies, these big capitalists, that this government so very often criticize.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Just words.

Mr. Coderre: — These companies reinvest this money into larger corporations, but they have a duty to do, they have a duty to perform, because they are looking at the small investments which all these people, with insurance policies have made, and they have to safeguard the investment. They are on board of directors, and they have to be sure that these monies are properly invested. That is why these directors give and have wide ownership. In other words, many of the corporations that are so often criticized from across the floor have wide ownership in the fact that it's money from everybody in insurance and mutual funds, but they have a tight control on it and I think rightly so. They have to protect these investors, the small investors; they can't take a chance.

In recent years as many of us are probably aware the role played by owners of capital, its very productive enterprises have been widely separated between the role of management and those who are involved with the actual money the put in. It is the duty of management to see that the aims of the directors of these supposedly large companies, especially those who have a very important part in a national economy, that it doesn't come in conflict with the interests of the people of Canada as a whole, with the common good, because we are directly involved in this. It is our money. This immense concentration of funds from these investment funds amounts to literally billions of

March 27, 1962

dollars, and trustees have reason to be fairly careful, consequently they have had to seek the services of large investment firms, large companies, so that they could be guided properly. Is this the type of group often times that they criticize? Anyone who has a small insurance, a thousand dollars, he is a shareholder of a company. He has a right to vote. We pass our vote by proxy. It is our money. It works to increase the productivity of our country and we must have some of this money, and by increasing the productivity it can increase the employment in Canada and in Saskatchewan, but how can we do it. Why is employment not here? When you hear speech after speech in this House, for the last 16 years, Mr. Speaker, in the hustings and everywhere, then these monied interests which is the money of the small people grouped together which makes the tremendous funds, how do you expect to get these monied interests in this province and develop our industry?

The modern trend, Mr. Speaker, is to aim at proficiency in our trade and profession. Have we reached the goal? Has the government through its training program increased the proficiency of this work force? Let us have a fairly good look at it, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is precisely where the government of Saskatchewan has failed to provide its increasing work force, this new work force, with the wherewithal to increase its proficiency, and therefore increase in production and increase in employment.

I would like to add at this point, Mr. Speaker, that only too often the supposed fighters for social justice assume that because they are fighting for a just cause, their choice of means is justified. I say that the end does not justify the means in many cases.

For example automation with its side effect on employment is a problem. As it mounts it will increase the demand for probably shorter hours, shorter work week, at the same take-home pay. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that probably no one would object to this principle, provided we could afford it. The unemployed, the 27,000 people who are unemployed in Saskatchewan are not concerned with the words, 50, 40, 30 or 25 hours a week. All they want is a job so they can buy the bread and butter they want to provide for their families. That is all they want. What we need is more industry, producing a greater variety of produce to help alleviate many of the shortages that are elsewhere on this planet.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Like in New Brunswick.

Mr. Coderre: — Even trade, Mr. Speaker, would be very useful here. There is no mention of that in this resolution. By destroying our small communities they are discouraging many small industries that could be further developed. By the lack of increasing or bringing power and gas to communities where they could develop small industry. By establishing tax incentive programs, that would encourage industry to come in to establish themselves, the increased productivity, the increased earning of its wage force, would more than supplement anything that we could give in that respect.

And it is within the scope and power of the province to provide in that way. There is no mention of this in this resolution. This resolution as it reads, could fill the whole page with some of the have nots or haven't done parts of the government. There are many things they have not done which they should do to help alleviate this problem, and it hasn't been done. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, says, "This Assembly gravely concerned with the growing threat of high and permanent unemployment requests the government of Saskatchewan" then it stops there. This is a private member's resolution. A private member on that side of the House was not satisfied with what the government was doing, because he says he requests the government of Saskatchewan but somehow or other he lacks the steam to finish his resolution. I propose in some way to contribute by adding to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, the following motion, seconded by Mr. Horsman.

Adding after part 2 of the motion:

3) to give consideration to establishing a tax incentive to encourage a greater establishment of industry thereby creating jobs for unemployed.

4) to give consideration to reduction of industrial power rate to attract new industries and thereby create new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I move this, seconded by Mr. Horsman.

Government Members: — No taxes for the big boys.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe the amendment does deal with the situation before us and I would say the amendment is in order and the debate is on the amendment.

March 27, 1962

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, may I beg your leave to adjourn the debate.

Debated adjourned.

MOTION: TOLL SERVICE IN MELVILLE

Assembly resumed adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Gardiner.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour and Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on the adjourned debate of the proposed motion by Mr. Gardiner which reads as follows:

“That this Legislature urges the government to maintain the long distance toll service in the city of Melville in order to provide comparable facilities with other cities in the province.”

Recently the member from Melville asked us to provide information for him. He wanted a list of all the buildings built by telephones since 1944, also the revenues received from long distance exchange rentals and rural connecting fees during 1961 from the twenty points as toll offices, which we plan on keeping open at the end of a ten year period. Also, estimated amounts spent to December 31, 1961, on contract and architectural fees at Indian Head, Moosomin, Yorkton, and Prince Albert. These figures required a tremendous amount of digging to get the information the same day, but your comptroller undertook to do it and at about 7:25 came over to my house with the information. I don't know what his wife said to him when he got home at 7:40 for supper. However, we were glad to supply the data that the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) requested, and he used some of it in his speech on Friday.

Indian Head has old and obsolete equipment and required an extension to the building at a cost of \$30,000. Moosomin, one of the 20 toll centres, also required more room and equipment to service the southeastern part of the province and the cost will be approximately \$100,000. Prince Albert, the building there was bursting at the seams and had to be extended, the cost will about \$250,000. Yorkton building also has to be extended and it will cost approximately \$60,000. There will be no needed extension there to provide any extra room on account of the exchange

being closed at Melville.

When the member spoke on Friday he kept repeating that the city of Melville would have no long distance service. Here are some of the statements I jotted down at the time: The only city without long distance service — long distance service tolls out — loss of service — curtailment of necessary service — retaining service to the people of Melville. Even the Leader-Post picked up something of that kind, and here is a paragraph they printed on March 24th.

“The Melville member said this move would leave Melville the only city in the province without a long distance toll service, and in addition he said revenues derived by S.G.T. in 1961 from the Melville exchange were greater than those in 11 other centres in the province, which will be included in the service.”

Of course the matter of revenue has nothing to do with leaving Melville as a toll centre, and I will show that a little later on.

Now the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) does not apparently realize just what S.G.T. has in mind for long distance service to that city. I intend to prove in the next few minutes that there will be an improvement of service, after we make Yorkton the toll centre for that area.

He referred to a celebration in the city of Melville in 1958, where I had the honour to represent the province, at which I wished the people well in the years to come. This was quite correct, Mr. Speaker, and I really meant it, and I still mean it, because I have a great deal of respect for this railway centre.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that my high regard for the people of Melville should influence me in the decision which amounts to a loss of \$110,000 in capital costs and an expense of \$17 thousand to \$18 thousand a year for the future.

On Friday the member for Melville read a letter I had sent to Mr. Swartz, secretary of the Board of Trade on November 24, 1961. I have a copy here.

Mr. Gardiner: — Vice president . . .

March 27, 1962

Hon. Mr. Williams: — What did I call him?

Mr. Gardiner: — Secretary.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Vice-president is he? He has been promoted then. I have a copy here and I will just go over it and won't interject any of my own remarks between the paragraphs:

“Mr. Harry Swartz, so forth

This will acknowledge receipt of your recent letter in which it is suggested that the closing of the Melville office be postponed until such time as all other changes have been completed. The fact that Canora and Melville are an equal distance from Yorkton really has nothing to do with the situation, as was explained to your group a few weeks ago. By far a greater number of lines from the west and southwest run into Yorkton and it is only logical to include the city of Melville with these. The town of Canora will be a toll centre for the northwestern part of the province. As you know the community dial office program will not be completed for approximately ten years. I had the impression when your committee met with us about six weeks ago that you were in agreement with what we are doing. Following is the main reasons we wish to proceed sometime in the spring of next year.”

Mr. Swartz of course I think did indicate at the end of the meeting that he was not in agreement. I was not there.

“First, there will be an annual saving of approximately \$19 thousand on conversion of Melville to a C.D.O. Second, a deferment would require an estimated \$30 thousand to the building extension which will not be necessary if we proceed with our present plans. Third, switchboard equipment valued at \$28 thousand is required in other areas and a deferment would necessitate additional capital expenditure. That figure was later changed to \$30 thousand. Fourth, Melville is not included in the initial plan for customer distance dialling and an additional cost penalty will be incurred to make this

service available in the future to our subscribers at that point. (The amount is \$50 thousand. I didn't actually give that to Mr. Swartz.) Fifth, during the last few months conversion to C.D.O. has taken place at Biggar, Wilkie, Unity, Battleford and Maple Creek, and the 1962 program which will convert 23 extensions to C.D.O. will be announced in a few days. Any deferment in the plans developed will slow down our mechanization program, which we obviously do not wish to do.

It is expected conversion of the Melville office to C.D.O. will take place during the first part of next August.

I trust that the reasons outlined will be accepted by the Melville and District Chamber of Commerce."

I presume, Mr. Speaker, that this was the same Harry Swartz who was recently elected to the position of financial secretary to the Liberal Association in Melville. There is of course nothing the matter with that. Others are also interested in keeping the Melville exchange open, Mr. John Burton, the CCF federal candidate has been quite active in this regard and has written me on two or three occasions and has spoken to me privately, and been a member of delegations which met with officials of S.G.T. and myself.

Until the present time, Mr. Speaker, nothing has been heard from the Conservative party or the Social Credit.

Opposition Member: — Both dead.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Might I suggest that Mr. Swartz might more profitably spend his time in attracting secondary industry to that city. I will now read the resolution again:

"That this Legislature urges the Government to maintain the long distance toll service in the city of Melville in order to provide comparable facilities with other cities in the province."

I am heartily in agreement with maintaining good long distance service in the city of Melville.

March 27, 1962

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, will you get the gentleman to speak up so we can hear. It is wasted on us.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — I am doing my best, Mr. Speaker. I will back up and take another run at it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Long distance service will be improved after Melville is connected with the Yorkton exchange. At the present time the Melville operator is required to dial an intermediate centre to start a long distance call. After next August a person wishing to place a call will need only to dial 0, and the operator in Yorkton will answer, and if the customer knows the number it will be punched out immediately and the party who is being called will answer in a few seconds. The service therefore is improved and the time saved by eliminating the extra call of the intermediate operator at Melville. Over the years the city of Melville unfortunately has suffered a number of setbacks. In the 1930's it was an important railway centre, but due to economies the railway moved practically all of its headquarters, including the train dispatches to Saskatoon. This meant quite a reduction in the payroll spent with the various places of business in that town. During the last few years more staff reduction has taken place due to the replacement of steam power by diesel power, which can run for weeks without being serviced, compared to the steam locomotives which had to go to the shop for servicing every few miles. A few days ago a train consisting of 258 cars left Saskatoon hauled by five diesel units — only one engineer was necessary. Longer trains are being hauled by these locomotives as compared to fewer cars with steam, the result being fewer engine and train crews are needed. Many of these men had their homes in Melville.

Other classes of employees have also had reduction in their numbers. When I was in Melville a few days ago I was advised that a machinery company has moved its staff to Yorkton. In addition the government has seen fit to move some of its staff to Yorkton, and in August the position of nine employees of the telephone exchange will be done away with. Three or four repairmen will of course remain.

There has always been a certain amount of rivalry between Melville and Yorkton, and it is only natural perhaps,

(we have the save rivalry between here and Saskatoon) and I might add, Mr. Speaker, that personally I would like to have seen Melville get the Mental Hospital in preference to Yorkton. I see my friend from Yorkton smiling.

Mr. Gardiner: — It hasn't been built any place yet.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Just keep cool, it will be — it's in the budget. Also if a technical school is built in that area sometime in the future, I would like to see it built in Melville. I don't think the city of Yorkton should get everything in that area. However, to leave the telephone office as it is now and make it a toll centre would I repeat, involve a capital loss of \$110,000 plus a payroll loss of approximately \$18 thousand each year. We simply cannot go along with this.

Improvements in long distance service are being made continually. Two years ago I attended a telephone conference in Nova Scotia. As a matter of interest or perhaps courtesy, a special arrangement was made whereby the delegates could dial any number they wished on a specially installed instrument. The party calling would have to know the number of course, and it would need to be in a centre where the necessary receiving equipment had been installed. I took advantage of the offer one day and dialled 306, the Saskatchewan prefix followed by the Regina number, and in a few seconds my party here answered. This is an example of the service we will have all across the province, all across Canada, and all across the United States in a few years. There will be no need, Mr. Speaker, for far distance calls to be connected by several exchanges across the country. Equipment now being gradually installed will enable calls to automatically find their own route and delays will be reduced to practically nothing.

Now just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, at our semi-monthly meeting of the board of directors of telephones we had a paper from one of the chief engineers, and I was quite interested in two paragraphs here — it refers to the speed — the approaching speed in telephone service. Here is what it says:

“When machine switching is being considered, the second must be recognized as the considerable interval of time it really is.

March 27, 1962

Many of the internal functions of these D.D.D., that is direct distance dialing, are measured in microseconds — one comparison frequently used to indicate the short period of time represented by a microsecond is the statement — there are more microseconds in a minute than there are minutes in a century. When we say we reduce the time of a switching function from 8 seconds to 4 seconds, the fact that the customer's individual call is completed 4 seconds faster, it is not too significant. However, the fact we have reduced this switching time by 50 per cent where our entire traffic volume is concerned is extremely important.”

The ten year program, Mr. Speaker, started last year by S.G.T. to provide the entire province with automatic dial service will eliminate all offices with the exception of 20. A number of exchanges have already been closed, Biggar, Maple Creek, Unity, Wilkie, Wynyard, Battleford, Rouleau, Birch Hills, Fort Qu'Appelle, Regina Beach and I may have missed one or two others. Arcola, Esterhazy, and Kinistino will be closed in a few months. Dial service will be provided. A great improvement to the cord and plug system calls manually operated.

There have been little or no complaints, Saskatchewan and citizens at these points have accepted the change as modern progress, although nobody likes to see the operators' positions disappear. In fact all persons displaced are given the opportunity of taking work elsewhere in the system if they so desire.

Approximately 350 other telephone exchanges will disappear over the next nine or ten years, and this will result in better service to the subscribers; keeping up with modern and rapidly changing trends, and with large savings to the telephone system. We may save enough money to do what the member from Turtleford suggested this afternoon, that is a possibility. Some citizens in the city of Melville however have opposed such a move.

Mr. Gardiner: — All citizens.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Maybe so, I doubt it very much. I think most of them — in fact I understand it is a dead issue there now. Some citizens as I say have opposed such a move and feel the city should be made one of the toll centres.

Unfortunately Melville is not in the proper location, and to leave it open would be quite expensive, even extravagant, and I enumerated the \$100 thousand, I won't go over that again.

The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) compared revenues at eight points, that is the information we got for him last Thursday, he compared revenues at eight points out of twenty where toll offices will be retained with the revenues received through the Melville office. All were of course less. These figures, however, prove nothing insofar as the location of toll centres is concerned.

I have a proposed zoning arrangement in my hand, which indicates, I don't suppose it can be seen from any distance, but it indicates the towns which are attached to the various centres, North Battleford, Prince Albert, Melfort, Saskatoon, etc. and I will just read out the towns for instance that are attached to Canora: Togo, Kamsack, Arran, Pelly, Norquay, Sturgis, Preeceville, Invermay and Buchanan. The towns connected to Yorkton will be Foam Lake, Sheo, Theodore, Springside, Rhein, Calder, Saltcoats, Brendbury, Churchbridge, Langenburg, and then over towards Melville it includes all towns between Lestock and Atwater on the main line. Then we come to Regina and in that direction we have Punnichy, Cupar, Dysart, Lipton, Fort Qu'Appelle, Balcarres, Abernethy, Neudorf and then towns over the main C.P.R. line. Moosomin extends up to Spy Hill, Tantallon, Wapella, Whitewood, Windthorst, Kipling, Kennedy, (are you listing Mr. McCarthy?) Kipling will be attached to Moosomin in 1963.

That indicates the situation, Mr. Speaker, and the city of Melville is simply, shall we say, lost in the shuffle among these four centres. In other words Melville just happens to be in the wrong geographic location for our program. Our branch has been in touch with city officials in Melville and have proposed two or three methods for the handling of fire calls — one is the installation of a button at the C.N.R. which would start a siren — another is an automatic arrangement which would ring the telephone in every farmer's home — as yet the city has not indicated any preference. Then of course there is the annual saving of between \$17 thousand and \$18 thousand by the reduction of the nine members of the staff now on the payroll at Melville.

March 27, 1962

I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot make an exception of this city. The closing of this exchange means little or nothing to the average citizen of Melville — the merchants of course will do a little less business, but the loss of a \$17 thousand or \$18 thousand payroll spread over a twelve month period cannot be considered a tremendous sum especially in a city.

The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) did make some reference to unemployment, when the nine employees are taken off. Most of these young women are married and will not wish to leave, and they have husbands there who are gainfully employed. The others will be moved to comparable positions elsewhere in the system. I regret this resolution has of necessity resulted in the threshing over of old straw, and I wish to move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Turnbull,

“That, the word “Maintain” in the first line be deleted and the word “improve” be substituted therefore, and the word “facilities” in the third line be deleted and the word “service” be substituted therefore.”

The resolution as amended will now read:

“That this Legislature urges the government to improve the long distance toll service in the city of Melville in order to provide comparable facilities with other cities in the province.”

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before accepting that amendment I would just like to suggest to you that in the original amendment it speaks of the long distance toll service, and of course there will be no toll service in the city of Melville when this action is taken, so these changes are out of place, because it is not improving the long distance toll service in the city of Melville. The action suggested by the minister, I would suggest his amendment is out of order, because of the fact that if the action is taken as contemplated, there will be no long distance toll service in the city of Melville to be improved. It would make no sense whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — The service will be there; the operators will not be there.

Mr. Gardiner: — The toll service will not be located in Melville.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — The service will be there and it will be better service.

Mr. Gardiner: — The long distance toll service will not be located in the city of Melville.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Toll service is what you get when you pick up the telephone and dial it. It will be there — it is not there now, but it will there as a result of this improvement. The toll service will be improved in the city of Melville. My hon. friend thinks service means telephone operators. Service means the service you get over your telephone. Toll service means long distance service. Long distance service will be better if the minister does what he has just outlined here now.

Mr. Gardiner: — That is just in the opinion of the minister.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! . . . There have two changes in this — to change the word “maintain” in the first line to “improve”, and the word “facilitate” to be changed to “service”. It is my opinion that the amendment is in order I so rule.

Mr. Gardiner: — There is one other purpose I suppose that probably is in order because it is moved by a minister, originally my motion was to be worded . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — On a point of order, the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) cannot cast reflections on the Speaker of this House by saying that “I suppose an the amendment is in order because it is moved by a minister”. You must withdraw it.

Mr. Gardiner: — If you would let me finish what I was going to say. I suggested . . .

Government Member: — You have said too much.

March 27, 1962

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That point raised by the hon. minister which I was going to raise myself is well taken and I think the hon. member would like to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Gardiner: — I didn't even finish the statement . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You said . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — I did not, I didn't even get a chance to finish the statement. I just wanted to state that the amendment has to do with the increase of expenditure of funds in this legislature, because it points to the improvement of services. I was originally going to ask for this in my motion and I was told I could not, and that it would be ruled out of order, if I did so, because it would mean the increase expenditure of funds.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member knows that ministers have the right to move motions to expend the public funds only when they read a message to the Assembly from His Honour, saying that His Honour has been advised of this, and nothing like that has been done here, so my hon. friend can't wiggle out of his unparliamentarily attack on the Speaker by that kind of substitute.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am just going to say if that is the case, then this motion is out of order because of the fact that it does mean the expenditure of extra monies, and the Attorney General has just said that can't be moved under certain circumstances.

Mr. Speaker: — The way the hon. member phrased his words was that this motion would be in order because it was moved by a minister. Now I think he would like to withdraw that reference and phrase his words afresh to bring up the point with the meaning he had in mind.

Mr. Gardiner: — No. I didn't finish the statement and I did finish it afterwards. I said it was my feeling that a minister could move a money measure and for that reason it would be in order. It wasn't casting any reflection on you. It was my opinion that a minister could. I find I am wrong in that opinion. The Attorney General says you can't, so therefore this motion is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — I would request the hon. member to withdraw the inference for the records.

Mr. Gardiner: — I didn't make any — he didn't let me finish my statement or it wouldn't have been that way. I am not going to withdraw something I didn't say.

Premier Lloyd: — I understood the hon. member to make the statement that he did not cast any reflection on the Speaker, so to avoid quibbling . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — No reflection on the Speaker at all.

Mr. Speaker: — I will accept that from the member, and you may proceed if you have further remarks to make on this amendment. You have spoken to the motion and you are entitled to speak to the amendment.

Mr. Gardiner: — Is it in order or isn't it?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, I have ruled that the amendment is in order.

Mr. Gardiner: — In other words you contradict the Attorney General on his stand that a suggestion of increased expenditure of money, cannot be made except . . .

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Speaker has declared it is in order. I think we can continue with the debate in the regular way.

Mr. Gardiner: — I am quite certain that the people of Melville will be very pleased to hear some of the things the minister had to say about the city of Melville tonight. I was quite surprised.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would like to draw the member's attention to the fact that he must confine his remarks strictly to the amendment because you will have the opportunity of closing the debate on the motion after the amendment is disposed of so you will have to confine your remarks strictly to the amendment at this time.

March 27, 1962

Mr. Gardiner: — The only thing I have to say on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is that of course the suggestion of the minister that the so-called move is going to be an improvement is only one person's opinion. It is his opinion and no one else's. The people of the city of Melville do not necessarily share his opinion that this will mean improved services. They know full well that they have full rights to have exactly the same services and could have them with the technical improvements that have been suggested by the minister, and no attempt being made by the city of Melville and no request that any technical improvements be held back by an action such as this. The people of the city of Melville state that they expect exactly the same services and they expect to have located in Melville the same services as other cities in the province of Saskatchewan.

They are not asking that you hold up your program to improve the Saskatchewan Government Telephones one iota. They have not asked that at all. All they are asking for is equal treatment with other cities in the province of Saskatchewan which I think quite rightly is deserving to them. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment moved by the minister, the "improve" part is only his opinion and not the opinion of most of the people in Melville and district.

I am quite certain you will remember the day of the meeting there when one person got up and said that very seldom people telephone Halifax or Vancouver, or Hollywood, or some other place where they want to get one minute quicker than they could under the previous system. Most of their calls from centres of that type are calls that are outside of the particular town or the particular city, and under this system they know those calls will be much longer and much more difficult to obtain, than they would be if they had the toll centre, and the operators located in the city of Melville. Anyone here that resides in a rural area knows full well that this is true, that the rural service is going to be much more difficult to obtain under a system whereby Melville does not have its own operators. When the minister claims that this will provide comparable services with other cities in the province, this is not true, and a definite falsehood because they will not have the same services or comparable services with other cities in the province of Saskatchewan, because they will not have operators located in the city of Melville in order to handle the special types of services that can be handled when you have operators in the centre in your particular point.

I would just point out that aspects of the amendment, neither one can be proven. The one with regard to comparable services cannot be true, because they are not being provided with the same comparable services as other cities in the province of Saskatchewan. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this is another attempt by the government as we have seen in the past. We have already seen it once or twice today, to try to make it look as if they are fixing up a question, by changing a few words in the amendment . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You must speak to the amendment not the motion.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . in order to turn it into a position where it might appear that the member who originally moved the motion is supporting something that he does not agree with, and of course I could not agree less than I do with the amendment that has been moved by the minister, and of course I will oppose the amendment and reserve my right to speak again on the motion.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — My hon. friend has made a lot of statements which we have to take on his authority, but he hasn't cited any responsible authority. The hon. member states the service will not be better as a result of this change, and the hon. member is wrong.

Mr. Speaker: — I think in order to get this motion ready for discussion with the exception of the member who has just spoken, he spoke on the motion before the amendment was put, I think it will facilitate matters if we consider that the motion and the amendment at the same time. It is pretty hard to discuss two words without referring to what has been said. I shall so rule.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend professes to be concerned because this resolution calls for something that isn't going to be done. He says this resolution, as amended in advocating better service for the people of Melville, and he says this isn't going to be done. Well this will give my hon. friend an excellent opportunity to criticize the government for having failed to comply with the resolution of this legislature. The real crux of the matter is — and what is making my hon. friend unhappy —

March 27, 1962

is he knows he isn't right about that. My hon. friend knows that the government intends that the amended resolution shall be complied with. Now he says it is an inconvenience to the people of Melville if the operators are in Yorkton. Well my hon. friend does not seem to be able to understand this, but for his information a good many of his constituents in Melville were able to understand it when it was explained to them at the meeting in Melville.

Mr. Gardiner: — You had better ask them again.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Now my hon. friend does not seem to understand this, that when you dial a number in Melville, calling another number in Melville, under this new system you don't have to call Yorkton long distance and ask the Yorkton operator to dial the number for you in Melville. My hon. friend just can't get it through his head that the machinery which does the dialling is physically situated in Yorkton and in Melville. The operators that you call when you call "long distance" will certainly be situated in Yorkton, but you can't detect that on the telephone. As far as the use of the telephone is concerned he doesn't know where the operator is — whether she in Regina, Lumsden, or Milestone, or where she is. She answers the call and it makes no difference to the people of Melville whether the voice of the operator comes from Yorkton, transmitted by wire to the Melville residence or whether she answers in Melville. The only difference it makes, Mr. Speaker . . .

Opposition Member: — . . . Bob you are . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — My hon. friend can't understand this either.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The only difference it makes, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Melville, is that by virtue of the technological improvement, the system is able to eliminate some six or seven operators' positions and consequently when my hon. friend walks down the street in Melville and walks past the telephone office he will no longer be able to exchange a cheery greeting, a "good morning" or a "hello" with a pretty girl who works in the telephone office in Melville.

So far as the service is concerned it means this that when a Melville resident wishes to call an office in Regina and he knows the number, all he has to

do is dial the Regina number and he gets that office in Regina, or if he wishes to call an office in Yorkton, all he has to do is dial that number, or if he wishes to call an office in Winnipeg all he has to do is dial the number in Winnipeg that he wants to call. If he wants to call any other centre that is serviced by this automatic equipment, he will be able to do so by simply dialing the number when this conversion is completed.

Now if Melville doesn't get this improvement then Melville will continue to be a sore spot, an isolated area outside the progressive community. Now my hon. friend and the people of Melville should know this, and I think they do, that back in the 1920's when towns that size were going onto dial equipment and in Melville you still had to crank and say "hello operator, will you give my 37 please", other towns were going on dialing systems, and Melville stayed on this obsolete system. Why? Because an influential citizen whom my hon. friend knows had a niece working in the telephone office and he was afraid she would be out of a job if they converted to the dial system.

Mr. Gardiner: — That is a lie.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — As a result, up until a few years ago, Melville was still operating on the old hand crank system, 25 years after other communities of that size had turned to dial.

Mr. Gardiner: — I would ask the minister to give the name of the individual . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I told my friend about this — I have told my friend before . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — You have never given the name of the person involved.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — My hon. friend knows the name of the person.

Mr. Gardiner: — No, I don't know the name.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Oh yes he does.

Mr. Gardiner: — I have no idea . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker . . .

March 27, 1962

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think if the minister is going to make a statement to that effect, if some person who is an influential person has enough influence on the government at that time to keep the Melville exchange as it was, and I think for the benefit of the people in this House he should give the name of that person.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — If I chose, Mr. Speaker, I would have done so. Now, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That is not a point of order.

Mr. Gardiner: — It certainly is a point of order. You have stated that I know someone and I know nothing whatsoever about this particular matter, and I ask the minister to either withdraw the statement or to name the person involved.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend says there is something he doesn't know I will accept his word for it, I accept his explanation.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I demand that if the member is going to get up and mention that certain people wrote letters to the government of this province, that he state who wrote them. This is no evidence and no proof to anyone.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is having hallucinations.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if any member can get up in this House and make loose statements such as the Attorney General has made, he should be made to substantiate those statements by giving the name of the person he is mentioning, or be a gentleman and withdraw them.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member makes a statement attributed to any member of this House, he must either withdraw it or

substantiate it. I did not hear him say it was a member of this House.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, he stated it was a prominent citizen in the town of Melville who had written a letter . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — No.

Mr. Gardiner: — He certainly did it was the same statement he made in Melville when he was up there too, and he refused to give the name that day.

Mr. Speaker: — I have ruled that if any member names any member of this House and says he has knowledge or he has been instrumental, then he must either withdraw or substantiate his statement. The speaker was definitely not naming a member in this House.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — With respect, I agree with your ruling. Now if there is any member who doesn't believe what I said, all he needs to do is ask the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) if he can explain why it was that Melville went for 25 years without this modern improvement of dial telephones, that was introduced to other communities in this province at that time.

Mr. Gardiner: — That is a lie too because the places you mention didn't have dial service.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Oh yes they did.

Mr. Gardiner: — Oh no. Regina didn't.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, members know what the facts are. They know whether the hon. member from Melville is bluffing or not. I say, Mr. Speaker, this kind of a thing I cannot understand. The hon. member from Melville doesn't even know what the facts are.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — That is what we want to know — to find out what the facts are.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! . . . Are you rising on a point of order or a point of privilege?

March 27, 1962

Mr. Danielson: — Yes I do — on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Well state your point of order.

Mr. Danielson: — I say this, that he should either withdraw that statement or else prove it. That is what you made some of us do on this side. I am going to say this if you are going to treat everybody alike and that is what you must do, my friend who is sitting here beside me Mr. Cameron had to do it. This gentleman should do it too.

Mr. Speaker: — You have made your point. I have already ruled that if any member directly attributes a statement to another member of this House, he would either substantiate or withdraw it, and I warn the Attorney General of that.

Mr. Danielson: — He hasn't done either one. He has neither withdrawn it or substantiated it.

Mr. Speaker: — I have not heard him make a charge against any member of this House.

Mr. Danielson: — I would say this — this applies to all in this House.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — On a point of order, I would like to suggest that it does not become the office of the Attorney General to make a charge of this nature against any citizen in the province, let alone a member in this legislature.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of order. You may enter the debate, but that is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, somebody must have informed some of my hon. friends that there is such a thing as a point of order, now I wish whoever told home that would explain what a point of order is.

Opposition Member: — You are degrading your office.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . One thing or another — name the party or withdraw the statement that he made.

We had to do it . . . you do the same.

Mr. Gardiner: — All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the statement of the Attorney General is a lie from beginning to end. It is his usual performance.

Mr. McFarlane: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General just got up and said that for the benefit of the opposition and members on this side of the House, that he had explained to us what a point of order is. Now I would ask that either you yourself do it for our benefit, or have the Attorney General do it, then we will get this thing . . .

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of order. If you are asking for information we have books on procedure, and it is not the duty of the Speaker to explain the point of order at this time.

Mr. Danielson: — They are no good to this House without being enforced.

Mr. Speaker: — I am trying to enforce them if I could get the co-operation of the House.

Mr. Danielson: — I hope you will. I will be disappointed if you don't.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, it was only comparatively recently that Melville got dial telephones into operation, and Melville was almost a city when it was still operating on the crank system.

Mr. Danielson: — You think you are doing a smart trick now. You wait a day or two.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend opposite . . .

Mr. Danielson: — There is no order in this House. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

March 27, 1962

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends opposite seem to object to seeing Melville get toll service, because that is all we are asking. I do not understand why my hon. friends should be so indignant about it. I must say however, that it wasn't really any mystery to me last Friday when my hon. friend got up and read this resolution. It is sometimes said that some people who get elected to public office are primarily concerned about themselves and special privileges of individuals in their local districts. Other people get elected to public office and are concerned with high principles.

Mr. Danielson: — Some on their reputation.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I deplored last Friday this evidence of a member putting on this rather squalid performance, of using the time of this legislature to try to get a resolution through this House concerned only about one thing, maintaining in his constituency a payroll for seven people . . .

Opposition Member: — No wonder he had to bring Mathews in from Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . to keep an obsolete system of telephone exchange operating. I realize that all of us have to put aside petty and selfish interests and small matters in our own constituency in the interest of important public policies. I don't think there is any member of this House that does not approve of the tremendous technological development that is going on in our telephone industry.

Saskatchewan is marching ahead in scientific progress in pace with the most progressive jurisdictions in North America. Saskatchewan is fast reaching the day when we will have automation to the maximum possible extent in our telephone system. Now if we are to accede to selfish local interests, to keep two or three girls who are friends of the hon. member . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You know whereof you speak there boy.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . on the payroll in Melville then I suggest it is a bad thing for Saskatchewan. I think it is bad for Saskatchewan that any member takes the time of the House to bring in an appeal for a petty little local interest,

against the general public interest. Mr. Speaker, when a highway is being built it is often in the interest of the province at large, to bypass a village or town. If it happens in my constituency, I suppose I could get up here and I could insist that that highway pass through the village or town in the interest of John Doe who has a filling station on the street corner. But I have never done it, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the general interest of all the people ought to be served and that the members ought to accept this principle. We are not here as mere delegates.

Opposition Member: — Yes, that is why you brought someone in from Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We are here to pass upon the great principles, affecting the interests of the whole province.

Mr. Gardiner: — I am glad it is.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say even if the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) doesn't agree, I for one will vote for improvement on long distance toll service, for the residents of Melville, for the people of Melville, whether my hon. friend puts some personal interests ahead of the interests of the whole community of Melville or not.

I am going to vote for improvements in the long distance toll service in Melville, and I am going to ask that Melville receive this modern up to date toll service like other cities do, and not be kept in the dark ages like they were in the past, and my hon. friend suggest that they should be kept in the future.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — I had no intentions of getting up to speak in this debate, but I don't think there is anything more humiliating than to sit and listen to a member of one's own profession get up and make such an unparliamentarily attack on one member.

Now if we have anything to say about a motion, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you are more than lenient, realizing that probably this man didn't know what he was talking about, you let him ramble, and certainly this was not speaking as a man who is elected to uphold great principles,

March 27, 1962

when he spent the time of this House and your time, Mr. Speaker, attacking one man because this man had the courage to get up and speak for the people of his constituency.

I don't know about the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker), maybe he doesn't think he is here as a delegate for his constituency, but, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here as a delegate for my constituents, I think that is why I was elected.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — And to condemn any man or woman, any member of this House, for standing up and speaking for his constituency, certainly is not upholding very high principles. This was an attack on one person because this one person spoke for his constituency. I have never heard (and I have seen the minister put on some pretty poor shows) but nothing quite as petty and small and squalid and sordid, to cite his own words, as this. To quote letters that he would not produce, to quote people that he would not name, to attribute friendship with telephone girls, which might be a beautiful thing — friendship is supposed to be — but certainly the tone and indication that the hon. Attorney General expressed was not a very beautiful or platonic or spiritual type of thing. The hon. Attorney General attributes motives to a member who comes in here to speak in the interests of his constituency as being personal motives, and suggests that the hon. member was elected merely with narrow interests, and for that purpose. This is exactly what the hon. Attorney General said. This is below the dignity of any member of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I resent it, and on behalf of all the members on both sides of the House, I feel this is not a performance which should again be repeated in this House. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is in order for anyone of us to get up and put a motion on the order paper of this House, speaking for the interests of one person if need be, if we feel that one person has not had a fair hearing or a fair deal. Surely this is still a democracy and surely one person is important enough to be spoken for if that person has suffered an injustice. Surely we don't have to speak only for great international principles of socialism in order to be allowed a hearing. Surely the position, the financial well-being, the happiness of even one humble constituent

although he or she be not a voter or a supporter of the socialist party, is good enough reason to speak in this House, and I hope this will continue to be the way members will conduct themselves even without the consent of the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the House ready for the question?

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour and Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate but in view of what has been said . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You can't speak again — you have spoken once and you have used your right to speak.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 28

Messieurs

| | | |
|---------------|------------|----------|
| Lloyd | Thurston | Perkins |
| Meakes | Wood | Thiessen |
| Williams | Erb | Snyder |
| Blakeney | Nicholson | Stevens |
| Brockelbank | Stone | Dahlman |
| Walker | Whelan | Semchuk |
| Nollet | Thibault | Kluzak |
| Cooper (Mrs.) | Berezowsky | Peterson |
| Strum (Mrs.) | Kramer | Brotten |
| Willis | | |

NAYS — 12

Messieurs

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Klein | Danielson | Foley |
| Batten (Mrs.) | McFarlane | Horsman |
| McCarthy | Gardiner | MacDougall |
| Barrie | Staveley | Gallagher |

March 27, 1962

Mr. Speaker: — I declare the amendment carried. The motion as amended is before the House. Is the House ready for the question? It is my duty to warn the House that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate on this particular question, I would like to say in commencing my remarks that I will be voting for the motion as it is amended at the present time, largely because of the fact of course that when it has been limited to the extent it has, that one could not at the same time now fail to vote for the measure as it stands.

However, I do want to point out that in the remarks made by the minister in his address, I was very interested to hear him say and I am quite certain that the people of that particular area will be interested in that he made the comment about the city of Melville that he did, and I am proud to speak on behalf of the people of my constituency, no matter what impression some people might get if a person speaks on behalf of their constituents. I think in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have taken as little opportunity as anyone dealing with the problems of my local people, and I do not take a backseat to anyone in this House. In fact anytime I will stand up and fight for the people that I represent, for their needs, and for the services and facilities which they deserve to have, as well as any other parts of the province.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Then of course he made the statement that Melville was lost in the shuffle and I am quite certain the people of the city of Melville will be very pleased to hear what the government of this province thinks of them. After the manner in which that city has supported the party that sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, for the last number of years in a political way, I am quite certain their friends in Melville will think very little of the references made to their city by a former resident of that city, and one who continues even to claim to this present day, that he has some feeling for the place he used to call home. I am quite certain that when they hear he remarked they were just lost in the shuffle and that is the reason they cannot have the same facilities as other cities, the people of the city of Melville will wonder what type of a government we have

that sit across the way, after receiving political support from the residents of that centre for the last twenty years, that they will wonder just why they have been supporting that particular party that sits to your right.

With those few remarks, I am just going to say that I regret very much the government and Saskatchewan Government Telephones have seen fit to take the action they have and that they are going to take and that they refuse to listen to the appeal of the people of the city of Melville to retain the present facilities and to improve them to give equal facilities to other cities in the province of Saskatchewan. The minister and his government are not prepared to do so and we will have to abide by their decisions and I am quite certain that in the future the city of Melville will show a much different decision when it comes to voting on election day.

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the House is the motion as moved by Mr. Gardiner as amended. Will the House take the motion as read? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion as amended?

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.