

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature
28th Day

Monday, April 3, 1962.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

GIFT TO MEMBERS

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to call the attention of the members to the little sample of aspenite which they will find on their desk, made at Hudson Bay, one of those better parts of the province of Saskatchewan. On it are words that tell us how it is used, it is intended to have it procurable in all the building supply yards throughout the province and much of Canada. I hope members when they go to Hudson Bay will visit this plant. It is working two shifts a day, uses about a hundred cords of poplar every two shifts. One of the good things about it, is that it uses about the poorest class of wood out of the forest to make this material — wood that people ordinarily would cut for fuel, not good enough for logs or saw logs or anything like that at all. It is a very interesting process which they use there.

INTRODUCTION TO STUDENTS

Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House, 46 pupils, grade 6, sitting in the back of the speaker's gallery. They came to the city to see the sights and they will be conducted around. It is my pleasure to welcome them on behalf of yourself and the members of the House, and I hope their short stay in the city and in this building will be profitable and instructive and that their trip home this evening will be very pleasant and enjoyable.

April 3, 1962

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Ed. Whelan (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to introduce to you and to members of the legislature a group of eleven students who are in the west gallery. They are the auxiliary class from Coronation Park School accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. J. Booth. Their visit here is part of a social study course. We hope their stay with us will be enjoyable and educational.

MOTION RE: PORT OF CHURCHILL

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Moved:

That this Assembly respectfully requests the Government of Canada immediately to take the necessary steps to

- a) lengthen the shipping season at the Port of Churchill;
- b) institute joint freight-rate negotiations between the railways; and
- c) constitute the Port of Churchill a free port of entry for all goods entering Canada from wheresoever or whatsoever country of origin.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on the motion in connection with the Hudson Bay route and the Port of Churchill; and in connection with this resolution which affects the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan and also the two other western provinces, in the use of the Port of Churchill. I don't think I need to take the time of this House by going into any great detail regarding the value of the Port of Churchill to farmers on the western plains.

I understand the distance between Churchill and Liverpool is shorter by one thousand miles, then between Fort William and Liverpool, and it is obvious that any benefits that may accrue through shipping wheat from the Port of Churchill accrues to all the farmers of western Canada who market wheat through the Wheat Board.

What is of interest to farmers whose grain actually goes out of the Port of Churchill is also of interest to all farmers irrespective of whether their grain is actually exported through Port of Churchill or whether it isn't, by reason of the fact that the increased advantages, the increased price per bushel which is received for wheat exported through the Port of Churchill accrues to the benefit of all western farmers.

It is only necessary to study the ocean freight rate on wheat because the big majority of grain exported through the Port of Churchill is wheat. I don't think therefore that we need to discuss any of the rates on coarse grains.

In the crop year 1958-59 the ocean freight rate from the Port of Churchill to Liverpool was 41.2 cents per bushel, as opposed to the cost of shipping wheat from the lakehead to Liverpool via Montreal, the same year, 1958-59, of 52.3 cents.

In the crop year 1958-59 therefore there was saving of 11.2 cents per bushel on grain shipped through the Port of Churchill as opposed to grain shipped through Fort William or Port Arthur. In the crop year 1959-60 the ocean freight rate from Churchill to Liverpool was 41 cents per bushel of wheat, as opposed to 53.2 cents per bushel for wheat shipped from Fort William, Port Arthur via Montreal, a difference of 12.3 cents per bushel in favour of the Port of Churchill. In the year 1960-61 the ocean rate from Churchill was 41.5 cents a bushel as opposed to the rate from the lakehead to Liverpool via Montreal of 54.1 per bushel, which in the crop year 1961 left a differential in favour of the Port of Churchill of 12.5 cents per bushel. The average saving over that three year period of grain shipped out of the Port of Churchill as opposed to grain shipped from Fort William and Port Arthur via Montreal was 11.9 cents per bushel.

The statement might be made that with the St. Lawrence Seaway now completed, there would be some reduction in freight rates that is in the grain shipping rate from the lakehead ports. Well the saving on wheat via the St. Lawrence Seaway amounted to two cents per bushel. However, upon completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, as you can see by the foregoing figures, the ocean rates from Montreal to Liverpool rose by approximately two cents per bushel, and those are rates over which we in Canada have absolutely no control, they rose by approximately two cents a bushel, and therefore ate up the savings which we had made by use of the St. Lawrence

April 3, 1962

Seaway. It might be stated that direct ocean-going vessels loading at Fort William and Port Arthur might also make a saving, but last year, in spite of the fact of the saving of two cents a bushel, on ocean-going shipments loading at Fort William and Port Arthur, only 16 million bushels went on a through ticket, direct from Fort William and Port Arthur to Liverpool.

The export of wheat through the Port of Churchill for the crop year 1958-59 amounted to 18,409,322 bushels. In the crop year 1959-60 total exports of wheat through the Port of Churchill were 21,700,045 bushels. In the crop year 1960-61 exports through the Port of Churchill were 20,094,890 bushels. The average amount exported through the Port of Churchill for that three year period amounted to 20,068,086 bushels per year, that was the average for the three-year period. I was referring strictly to the crop year when I was referring to that period.

When we look at the calendar year we find there is a slight difference. In 1959 the export of wheat through the Port of Churchill in the calendar year was 21,787,125 bushels, in 1960 exports were 19,582,490 bushels, and in 1961 — 19,352,544 bushels of wheat were exported through the Port of Churchill in that calendar year. The average amount of exports of wheat through the Port of Churchill in the calendar years were in excess of the amount exported through the Port of Churchill in the crop years because the total amount exported in the calendar year was more, the average amount for the three-year calendar year period was 20,240,720 bushels. Now if we take the average savings of 11.9 cents a bushel, and throw off four points to go and come on, we arrive at 11.5 per bushel average savings, we have an approximate annual saving basis 11.5 cents per bushel saving in freight rates and basis the average annual export for the calendar years, an average annual saving over the past three-year period to the farmers of western Canada of \$2,327,682.

It is safe to say we save in excess of \$2¼ million on every 20 million bushels of grain per year that passes through the Port of Churchill. The savings which accrue to the benefit of the western farmers can be increased in direct relationship to the increase in grain handling at that port.

This brings me to the life of the port in terms of days, that is the number of days in a year in which

the port is open. In 1959 the Port of Churchill was open from July 28th to October 15th. The total number of days open was 79 days. In 1960 the port was open from July 27th to October 11th, for a total of 76 days, and in 1961 the port was open from July 24th to October 11th, for a total of 79 days. It will be noticed that in 1960 the port was open 76 days, but also the exports in that crop year were 21,700,000 bushels of wheat. The length of the shipping season to a great extent governs the use of the port and the amount of exports that go out through the port in the form of wheat. That is why we are asking the federal government to do everything possible to increase the length of the shipping season at the Port of Churchill in order that we might be able to export more wheat at a saving of 11.9 cents per bushel and in order that this saving might be passed on to the western farmers. Lengthening the shipping season would, of course, have that effect.

Now we come to another question, and that is the question of transportation to the Port of Churchill. All wheat as you know travels to the Port of Churchill over CNR lines. No grain moves over the CPR lines to Churchill. Grain repeatedly in years of surplus was moved off CNR lines very close to my area and relieved some of the congestion in elevators, and assisted some of the farmers to market their grain. But those who lived on CPR lines did not receive the benefits that accrued to those who were living on CNR lines. That takes in the years of grain surplus, now we are probably entering into a period where we may not have the surpluses which we have previously had. In order to keep the Port of Churchill working at full capacity, I think it is of great importance that something be done in order to make arrangements between the two railroads so that wheat may also travel from CPR points to the Port of Churchill. I draw your attention to the position of the visible stocks of grain stored in western Canada, today in comparison with a year ago. I hope we are not entering a period of scarcity but there is always the possibility that we might get another dry year. If we do get another dry year there could very easily be such a thing that there would not be enough grain available on CNR points to keep the Port of Churchill going at its maximum capacity, and it would therefore, be necessary, if the Port of Churchill was to continue to operate at maximum capacity, to reach down on to CPR lines and bring grain from CPR points to the Port of Churchill. That is if the visible supply of grain continues to drop.

April 3, 1962

Just a year ago, March 21st, we had a visible supply in western Canada of 414,400,000 bushels of wheat. On March 21st this year we had a visible supply of 344,300,000 bushels of wheat, a drop of 70,100,000 bushels in visible supply on March 21st last year we had 24,400,000 bushels of oats in the system in western Canada. At the same date this year, March 21st, we had 20,700,000 bushels, or a decrease of 3,700,000 bushels of oats in visible supply.

On March 21st last year we had 58,800,000 bushels of barley in visible supply in western Canada, at the same date this year we had 40,200,000 bushels of barley in visible supply, or a decrease of 18,600,000 bushels.

At this time last year we had 4,300,000 bushels of rye in visible supply and at the same date this year we had 2,500,000 bushels, or a decrease of 1,800,000 bushels in the visible supply of rye. At March 21, 1961, we had 8,600,000 bushels of flax seed in visible supply, at the same date this year, March 21st, we have 4,300,000, for a decrease of 4,300,000 bushels of flax seed.

The over-all totals showed 510,500,000 bushels of all grain in visible supply in the elevators and in the system in western Canada, last year at March 21st — this year at the same date 412,000,000 bushels of grain in visible supply, for a total over-all decrease in the visible supply of grain as opposed to the same date last year of 98,500,000 bushels. Now I think it is reasonable to suppose that if we face another dry year, another crop failure, which we hope we won't, but if we do, it could very easily be that there would not be sufficient wheat on C.N.R. lines with a suitable freight rate differential to keep the Port of Churchill operating at full capacity.

The only way we will ever get grain to travel from C.P.R. lines to the Port of Churchill is by setting up a negotiating committee, and by negotiating freight rates between the two railways. Of course in this resolution we ask that that be done, we ask that the federal government institute joint freight rate negotiations between railroads, in order to bring about the very thing which I have just mentioned and in order that the Port of Churchill might always have a supply of grain at all times regardless of what line it had to be shipped over, and also that in years of surplus those who lived on C.P.R. lines might similarly benefit from the Port of Churchill to the same extent as those who live on CNR lines.

That brings me to the final clause in the resolution. In an endeavour to bring about increased use of the Port of Churchill. All this large amount of grain goes out in ships, the large majority of which come in ballast, that is they come in empty. Box cars going to the Port of Churchill, unload their grain, and come back empty. As everybody knows the most profitable transportation is that with a two-way haul, with transportation be it boats or box cars whatever it happens to be travelling loaded both ways. The possibility of increased exports from the Port of Churchill in regard to wheat, is there, there is also the possibility of other exports, ores, metals, potash, all those things might be exported from the Port of Churchill, and possibly will be, but those are exports, and in order to encourage our exports I think we should do everything possible to encourage the imports, on the basis of assisting in transportation, and also on the basis of accepting goods from other people who buy the things which we have to sell. I therefore propose in the motion that the Port of Churchill be constituted a free port, and that goods enter that port free of duty. Here in western Canada we have always desired and required free trade, we produce goods to be sold on the markets of the world. We have had to buy many of our goods and means of production in a protected market. I think it is a most reasonable thing to expect that a port with a life of approximately 76 days, should be constituted a free port, not only to assist in making transportation more profitable for the ships coming into the port, and box cars going to the port, in order that they may go loaded both ways, but also to assist the farmers of western Canada to purchase their goods and their means of production for less money than they are paying at the present time.

We think this resolution would encourage export, we think it would encourage increased use of the Port of Churchill, we envisage the possibility and we have the hope that in the future the Port of Churchill will develop into one of the greatest importing centres in Canada and I believe that to be possible. It would be both a saving to the people of western Canada on imports entering and, it would be a saving on our exports of grain, potash and what have you that are moving out to the markets of the world.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is necessary that I say anything more in regard to this matter. I think everybody in this House has been conversant for years with the Port of Churchill, and with the problems that pertain thereto, and with the savings and benefits that can be made by using that port in the interests of

April 3, 1962

our western farmer. I move this resolution, and hope it will receive the unanimous support of the legislature of the province of Saskatchewan, to which the production of wheat and the income derived therefrom means so much.

I move this resolution, seconded by my colleague the member for Souris-Estevan, Mr. Ian H. MacDougall.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by Mr. Snedker, seconded by Mr. MacDougall. Do you take the motion as read?

Members: — Agreed.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is necessary to have a long debate on this particular resolution. I am sure all members of the House are in agreement with the resolution itself. Everyone is very much aware that it is not necessary any more to prove the practicability of utilizing to the full the Port of Churchill. As a matter of fact the pressing question now is to obtain full utilization of the export, and looking to the future, hopefully expecting that the facilities at the Port of Churchill will be expanded to handle not only agricultural commodities but non-agricultural commodities as well.

I attended the annual meeting of the Hudson Bay Route Association in Lloydminster very recently, when I pointed out to the meeting that we ought now to not just think in terms of agricultural commodities, but that we ought to think in terms of many other commodities for which this port could be used, particularly with reference to the future resource development of the great northern areas of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and the other resource development in the southern part of the province, of the mines at Esterhazy and Saskatoon, which could readily find their way to the world markets over the Hudson Bay route, and the Port of Churchill. If there are good and substantial savings made in the shipment of grain from this port, it is equally true that very substantial savings can be made in shipping other commodities through this port, and bringing commodities into Canada from this port as well.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would therefore like to strengthen the motion submitted by the hon. member a bit, by adding another section to it.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Nollet, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Kuziak:

That the following words be added to the motion: —

“(d) provide additional facilities to handle non-agricultural commodities.”

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved in amendment by the Hon. Mr. Nollet, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Kuziak, that Mr. Snedker’s motion be amended.

Is the House ready for the question?

Amendment agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member from Saltcoats . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You are out of order . . .

Is the House ready for the question on the motion as amended.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MOTION: GRASSHOPPER CONTROL

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

Mr. John Thiessen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, the other day when I adjourned the debate I felt that a few more things should be said in regard to grasshopper poisoning, because the resolution would lead one to believe that we had no program to do this job.

I want for a minute or two to go back to what we used to do for grasshopper poisoning and where we have got to today. In the old days when we really had to poison grasshoppers, there wasn’t just the government involved, we involved the farmers and the municipalities too. The governments in those days produced the sawdust, the poisoning, millseed and this type of thing and shipped

April 3, 1962

it to the stations within the municipalities, or to one shipping point in a municipality. This is where the municipality then took over with a program of grasshopper poisoning. It was their job to see that the millfeed, the poison and the sawdust was unloaded, and this was all during the winter months. The municipality could order whatever sawdust and other things they required or which they thought they might require for poisoning grasshoppers during the summer. At the height of the program that one winter we shipped in a pile of sawdust that looked like a strawstack, the RM council had to sit down during the winter and designate some 25 or 30 stations to which you hauled this sawdust to after it was mixed. We had to get trucks to do this. You had to hire the people to operate your mixing stations, you had to have people to haul water to this because the mixture of poison was the sawdust and millseed and as much water as it could absorb in about four or five minutes of mixing. Then the farmers job was the biggest job of all. At that time he would go to his bait station and could pick up possibly two or possibly three bags of sawdust, which he would take home in the evening and then in the morning, just before sun up he would try and get out to his field so he would be there when the sun came up, he didn't want to spread it too early because the dry land would absorb the moisture that was in your sawdust, you couldn't do it too late because then the sun would dry it out, and your grasshoppers wouldn't take the bait, because the only thing we could hope for at that time was that the grasshopper would hop on one of these little bits of sawdust and absorb enough poison to destroy them, so that in the morning you would get out here and you would plaster your hands with axle grease or whatever you had so the poison wouldn't get into your fingernails, and you would spread this mixture like you used to spread seed in the old days.

This was quite a program, Mr. Speaker, but it didn't only involve the government, it involved the municipality and it involved the farmer. They had a lot of work to do in this, and today the motion here would say that the government at this time isn't doing anything or not very much, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the municipalities and the farmers were involved in this as much as they were in those days, that we have a comprehensive program for poisoning the grasshopper at this time.

At this time too we have a little different poison, we have two kinds of bait, the deildrin is poison we can use, but does leave a residue, and this is found in your poultry, in your butter, in your eggs, and

it is not too good to use in hay crops or in cereal crop which you are going to use for hay. This poison is costing the farmer in the neighbourhood of \$4.00 and some cents a gallon, laid down in Moose Jaw. If this poison was purchased by the farmers at a retail price he would pay nearly twice this amount, but we feel that by getting in a large quantity of this, by storing it for them, that we are assisting the farmers by many thousands of dollars. Then we have a chemical, sevin, which we can use on hay crops, and which we can use any other place where you can't use deildrin. This chemical sevin is costing 81¼ cents a pound, and to make it economical to use for the farmers in hay crops, the government is subsidizing this and selling it for 37½ cents a pound. This brings the cost down to very nearly 25 cents an acre. Deildrin costs about 16 cents, and we feel we have subsidized this too. We have at the moment on hand 176,000 gallons of deildrin which is worth \$772,400. We have on hand in Moose Jaw at the moment 300,000 pounds of chemical sevin, and this is worth \$244,500 bringing the total sum somewhat over a million dollars of stock on hand at the moment. Then we have an option with the chemical companies of another 100,000 gallons of deildrin.

Now we feel that by supplying this, by putting it in store so that the farmers when the time comes can get this material, and the municipality can order this when necessary, we are giving a service that is second to none in any province.

Then looking at the resolution too, the idea the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) had of spraying by plane, Mr. Speaker, has become very nearly prohibitive unless you wanted to do it on small areas. When you look at the cost of spraying, your plane would cost you approximately \$1.00 an acre without the poison, and it would cost about \$24,000 to do a township, and for the average municipality it would cost you somewhat in the neighbourhood of \$210,000 for spraying. This would still be not too bad if we could get the hopper convinced that he must hatch at one time, and be there when we spread this poison, but you can have a hatch of hoppers coming out this week, then you will have two or three or four days of moist weather and you can have another hatch, whereby your first spraying is not too good. This would make spraying by plane too costly, and it would also be detrimental to wild life and other things.

Mr. Speaker, I want to amend this motion as follows:

That the words "instituting a" in the second line be deleted and the words "publicizing the" be substituted therefore, and the words "province-wide" in the second line be deleted.

April 3, 1962

I think if the hon. member had looked at the province at all, he would have left the word "province-wide" out of this, because half of this province hasn't got a grasshopper in it.

Amendment (Mr. Thiessen) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is on the motion as amended now.

Mr. Robert Perkins (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, the mover of the motion has practically covered everything I want to say. I had in mind before the motion was moved to oppose the motion as it was simply because of the two things that the mover mentioned. It was in the first place there was an inference there that the government has not already instituted a comprehensive plan for the eradication and fighting of grasshopper outbreak. That in itself was enough to oppose the motion, and I am glad to see it has been amended.

The motion leaves out the fact that the tremendous amount of work the Department of Agriculture did last summer in combating this outbreak, said nothing about the continuous surveys that are made by the fieldmen of the Department of Agriculture, to keep abreast of the outbreaks in the districts that were most affected, and so on. In most cases after a municipality phoned in that the outbreak was becoming serious chemicals were on the way within hours to that municipality.

I want to also mention the air lift that was carried on when the supply of chemical ran out in the southern part of the province. No person, even the men from the university or the federal or provincial fieldmen were able to accurately forecast the extent of the outbreak, and for that reason and others that involved the suppliers of chemical it ran out while the outbreak of grasshoppers was still very serious.

I would like to ask what private concern or what farmer or group of farmers could afford to pay \$80,000 to get this chemical into the province in a hurry, which was done by the Department of Agriculture through this air lift from eastern Canada.

I also wanted to mention the fact of this province-wide sweep, mentioned in the resolution. I can imagine what kind of criticism the government would

have got if they had sprayed the total province, when you consider that the centre of the province is one hundred miles or so north of the city of Prince Albert, and that even that far north the grasshoppers are very seldom a menace.

One incident that happened last fall that is not too well known, was that where there was a wholesale dying off of grasshoppers in this province, and most farmers thought the problem was over. Quite early in the fall in some districts dead grasshoppers were inches deep, and even some of the fieldmen considered that the grasshopper menace was past, but with the alertness of both the fieldmen from the federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture, with daily inspections of the egg infestation just before freeze-up, they saw that the danger was still here for this spring which is just about upon us. Even with the egg infestation that was apparent at that time, and is still in some cases apparent, large quantities of chemical as the member from Shellbrook has intimated, are on hand and ready to go to war this spring when the grasshoppers show up.

I think the Department of Agriculture and the fieldmen from that branch especially, and all the officials of the Department of Agriculture, should be commended on the work they are doing, not only on grasshopper control but on other insects as well.

I would like to support the amendment.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this. I think the people over there are pretty touchy when they start talking about grasshoppers north of Prince Albert. They don't have them. Grasshoppers are nothing new in this province. We have always had them. The Palliser expedition said they laid their saddles and saddle blankets down and the grasshoppers ate them, ate their clothing, some people think this is fiction, but I don't. I have seen some very heavy grasshopper infestations and they will eat anything, that has a sign of moisture in it. I believe we had a bad outbreak in the nineties although I can't find any record of it, but I remember when I first came to this country, I heard people talking about the outbreak in the nineties. We had another outbreak along about 1918 and I remember that very well. We mixed grasshopper poison; that was the first grasshopper poison I ever saw mixed.

April 3, 1962

We mixed it with sawdust, with bran, molasses, lemons and so on, and I suspect it was arsenic, I don't know, but some sort of poison and we spread that around. Then we came to the thirties and we went through in my area a real devastating time with grasshoppers. It was really something that I hope I will never see again. There are two things a farmer is hopeless with, one when his soil starts to blow away, and the other is when a bunch of grasshoppers fly in and take his crop. He is absolutely helpless.

Well the outbreaks we had this year didn't follow the usual pattern of grasshoppers, and I know, and when these gentlemen were talking about what wonderful work they were doing, I am not too sure. I am not criticizing the work they are doing, but I have an article here by Professor Roy Edwards of the Department of Biology of the University of Saskatchewan. It is quite a lengthy article and I am not going to read it all to you, but I want to read the last paragraph of it. He says:

“The problem and which course of action he should take (talking about a farmer) in any particular year in any particular field is crucial to his success or failure. Unfortunately there is no one who can give the farmer very reliable advice, because it is a matter that has received very little scientific study, we suggest research will tell the value or otherwise of this.”

Now it is my opinion there was a lot of crop cut this year that wouldn't need to have been cut, and better left standing, if we had had a little more information on our grasshoppers. After all there are a great many species of grasshoppers — actually there are I guess if given the proper name, the locusts, but there are a great many species and they all act in a different way and have different habits. The grasshopper we have this year was the roadside grasshopper, and they are an entirely different thing from the migratory or stubble grasshopper. These grasshoppers just lay their eggs on the roadside, and their habits are different. Once the grasshopper concludes they will eat the crop just when it comes up, they are very devastating, because they eat it at the time when it is just leaving the ground, and that kills it, but they are not nearly as devastating as the other kind, and the method of combating them is different, because the roadside grasshopper, you can't do much with cultivation, you have to poison them. He wants

something in the grass stage, something coming up but he is not nearly as destructive as the stubble or migratory grasshopper that comes in large herds and just drops in on your crop and eats.

Now we had plenty of grasshoppers in our area, plenty of them, and I was surprised there was any crop at all. I didn't find out until afterwards what the species of the grasshopper was. These roadside grasshoppers, it is true they will move short distances, move from one field to the other, but they don't fly, and in our experience in the thirties, the grasshoppers they were migratory grasshopper, most of them. When they hatched in the southern part of the province and in the northern part of the states, and the grasshopper only lays his eggs where the ground is dry, if you look at your map you will see areas cut out where there are no eggs, they had a good rain there, they lay them where the ground is dry, and what happens in the thirties is that they ate all the crop where they were hatched, then they came over and blackened the sun and dropped down, and anything they landed on they ate right there. I think if we had the information we had now, that the greater part of our infestation was of the roadside hopper, that we would have had a much better chance of fighting them, a much better chance of knowing what we were doing. When you have the stubble grasshopper you can kill a considerable number of acres by certain cultivation, but that doesn't apply to the roadside grasshopper, because he is usually in sod or around sloughs or somewhere where you can't get at him, but you can poison him, and I think the poison we have now, I haven't had any personal experience using it, but I think it is a great improvement over the old poison we had.

I can remember going out in the morning and spreading this stuff around on the hot ground, and if you stopped to light your pipe why the stuff you had thrown out would dry, because you were supposed to put it out between 70 and 80 degrees as I remember. It has no attraction to the grasshopper immediately the moisture is out of it. The chemicals they have now are much more effective because they will stay there, but it has one disadvantage of course, that if you spray a field and you get to the position it isn't worth cutting for grain, you can't cut it for fodder, and that happened in our district this year in a great many case, but the grasshopper is, as one of the members stated, I don't know which one it was, doesn't hatch every day, so that you

April 3, 1962

can't go out and spray grasshoppers and you are through, because they hatch in different stages according to where they were laid. If the eggs are laid on a bald knoll with no grass well of course they will hatch first, if they are laid in a place with some grass coverage, keep the ground cooler, why they hatch later on, and then they will probably hatch for awhile, and you get some cool weather and they cease to hatch. They only hatch when the temperature is at a certain degree.

So the handling of grasshopper is a very complicated and a very serious business, but after all, when all is said and done, it is my opinion that the best we can hope for is some measure of control because the ultimate enemy of the grasshopper is moisture, and just as soon as we get moisture our grasshopper problem will disappear, and that is the way it will disappear this time. One criticism, if it is a criticism, probably a suggestion, is this: that grasshoppers travel from the southeast to northwest, that is their natural flight, and as I said they lay where it is very dry, and it doesn't take them too long to clean up that if it doesn't rain, and then despite the fact they may have poisoned them in that area, they have only got a fraction of them, and they move up and light on other areas where they weren't hatched, and that is the bugbear we have been up against, is the flying in of these hoppers. Now it didn't happen this year because they weren't the right kind of hoppers, but nobody knew that until they were all over. I wonder how many members have actually seen grasshoppers that were hatching.

It is quite an interesting thing — they lay in a capsule about the size of a bean, about 24 eggs or something like that, they lay there until the heat gets to around 70 or 80 degrees, and I have seen them come up; they just come up one at a time. They are cased in a little case that looks like plastic, about the size of rice, they lay there in the sun just for a half a minute, they give a kick and off goes this casing and you have a grasshopper. Another one comes up, kicks this little casing off after laying there in the sun and you have another grasshopper.

It is very interesting thing if you are not afraid of the grasshoppers. If they would all hatch in one day it would be a lot more simple, but it isn't.

I think this resolution was quite in order and

to the point, when it said that we should have a comprehensive program and I think we should, there is the point where the grasshopper does not hatch on your farm and flies in, by the time a fellow poisons a couple of times and has no crop, he has not the wherewithal to poison them again. I was down there one time this summer and one fellow said, heck if we want out and poisoned them now, all we would be doing would be protecting your crop. We can't afford to do it. That is one thing serious consideration should be given to. According to Dr. Paul Riggert, 90 per cent of the infestation this year is the roadside grasshopper, and while he is a serious threat, it is not nearly as serious as the migratory or stubble grasshopper, and I was wondering what the other 10 per cent were. Some points of this information has not been put out, it should be gotten out now by someone who understand the grasshopper and their habits, and point out the difference between the roadside grasshopper and the migratory grasshopper, and the difference in their habits and the methods you have to use to fight them, so I think this resolution is quite in order when it is said we needed more information and a provide-wide program, and I am sure nobody in this province would ever think, provide-wide included the precambrian shield, I think that was a red herring.

I think that is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, in the years I have sat as a member of this legislature I have seen the government side of the House twist and warp and change and alter resolutions from this side of the House in many ways, and I fully expected this time, Mr. Speaker, that they would run true to form, and amend this motion by commending themselves for what they have been doing, but lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, they have come out with an altogether new technique this afternoon. Here we find ourselves now where the government is not going to commend itself on any program it has ever had. Apparently it must be ashamed of itself for or not satisfied with the program it had in the past, and when a member of this side of the House gets up and puts a motion on the order paper that he believes for all practical purposes is a motion giving constructive ideas and constructive criticism.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The amendment has been carried, so we cannot debate on the amendment. It has been carried with no attempt made by anyone to speak at that time.

April 3, 1962

Mr. McFarlane: — Well we find ourselves now, Mr. Speaker, when we are just going to give the government, or are asked to support a motion that this Assembly respectfully requests the government to give immediate consideration. . .

Mr. Danielson: — May I ask a question? When you carried the amendment, does that not become part of the motion?

Mr. Speaker: — It is part of the motion.

Mr. Danielson: — It is the motion. We cannot debate on the advisability of an amendment when it has been accepted. It is the motion as amended that is before the House. It is part of the motion. He is discussing the motion as amended.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, I understand I have at this time the privilege to speak on the amendment and the original motion.

Mr. Speaker: — Not the amendment and the motion, but the motion as amended.

Mr. Danielson: —That is right — it couldn't be better.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That is what I ruled in the first place.

Mr. McFarlane: — As I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, when constructive criticism was given it hasn't been adopted and the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) when he introduced this original motion into the House wanted the government to assume its proper responsibility in providing for the protection of the welfare of farmers in this province, for the protection of cattle in this province, a system whereby the grasshoppers could be controlled in the year ahead. Now we find all the government are going to do now by this amended motion is set up a propaganda machine in order to publicize the grasshopper situation throughout the province. Well I

suggest, Mr. Speaker, no government in Canada can do that better than this government here, because they have the best propaganda machine as they have demonstrated over the years.

This isn't going to solve the very serious position the farmers are going to face in the spring, in the prospect of what could be the most serious grasshopper situation for many years. What the government should have been doing as the hon. member for Rosthern suggested, they should have had some plan set up whereby they could assume their share of responsibility by seeing to it that the land they have control of, namely the community pastures and the provincial lands, that an adequate grasshopper control program has been instituted over those lands, what is the sense of a local municipality or a farmer going ahead and keeping his farm land sprayed and keeping the grasshoppers poisoned if there are acres and acres of provincial lands breeding grasshoppers when at any moment they can fly over on to the farm lands. This is the type of thing the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) had in mind when he placed this resolution on the order paper.

Mention has been made of the way the grasshoppers were controlled in the thirties. Sure, we had a long, tedious and expensive way of doing it then but I suggest that even the methods employed last year and even the poisons employed last year, probably in all good faith by your government, today are outmoded. The livestock and cattle men of this province, can't for all practical purposes, go back and use deildrin because of the harmful effects it has had on the cattle and byproducts like meat, milk and butter. For all practical purposes, this year, we have to develop and use a new type of poison, especially those who are engaged in the livestock industry. As we all know we are going to have to adopt the poison called sevin and it is going to be more expensive. So we can't rest our laurels on what has happened in the past. We have to accept what is practical at this time.

I was amazed to hear one of the members opposite say that spraying by plane was almost prohibitive but I am going to suggest to the hon. member and to the government that we are finding ourselves in this province in a position where in the future we are going to have to spray by plane. How else can we spray all these community pastures? How else can all the road allowances be sprayed if we are not going to use planes? The different areas of

April 3, 1962

the province differ, of course, because of sloughs and natural vegetation covering these areas. In some areas it isn't practical to spray by tractor. If we are going to control the grasshoppers we are going to have to use planes. The areas at the moment that would appear to cause us the greatest concern are of course the areas in the southern part of the province, because the history of grasshoppers has always been that they move up from the northern states into the southern part of Saskatchewan and then gradually work further north. If we are going to protect our own cattle industry and our own crops in the southern part of the province then for all practical purposes all these areas have to be sprayed. If we have to spray these areas by plane, then we are going to have to put ourselves in a position where we have the finances and the planes and the men available to do this type of work.

What this government should be considering is what the financial position of the farmer will be next summer because as the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) has pointed out, in some cases the farmer may have to spray two, three or four times to save his crop. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, knowing the financial position of many of those farmers in the southern part of the province, it is going to be hard for them to afford to spray their pasture lands or their crop once, let alone two, three or four times. I think the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) had every justification, when he stated that we needed a comprehensive grasshopper control program and I am certain he is not going to be satisfied and the farmers are not going to be satisfied with a program that gives only publicity.

Now, we should learn by our mistakes. This government apparently has felt that it was in the best interests of the people and in the best interests of the Department of Agriculture to store vast amounts of grasshopper poison in warehouses. I am going to suggest to you a situation which could arise and how this could be very costly in the end. Because of the fact the natural trade and retailing pattern of this province in the past has always been that poison and field sprays, etc. have always been handled by municipalities or in most cases by local merchants who are supplying these services to the farmers. What you have to watch out for when the government takes over the rendering a service of this kind is that if the smaller merchants see that the government is going to control all these stocks then they

aren't going to be able to afford to lay in a stock to supply their own farmers. So, when a severe shortage develops, such as we saw in the province last year, and an intensified outbreak of grasshoppers, plus a severe outbreak of cutworms — we found ourselves in a position where there weren't enough stocks of poison on hand. Then to overcome the emergency the government had to have it flown in from outside the province. Because the local business men couldn't meet this type of competition, he didn't have too great a supply on hand in his local area. Then, and this is something you can't put off, when the grasshoppers are devouring a farmers pasture or eating up his crop he has to have that poison immediately. Then, the circumstances he found himself in were because of what I have already stated that the poison wasn't available in his local district; it wasn't available in the municipality and of course the provincial government had no longer any supply in their warehouses and it had to be flown in.

To the farmer who was fortunate enough to get some from his local merchant, because of the excess carrying charge and because the local merchant carry and stock these poisons in volume, naturally the price had to be higher. This is something that can cause a great deal of concern and confusion in the future, so I would ask the government to give this serious consideration.

Sometimes it helps when larger organizations take over and assume responsibility but at the same time if they can't gauge the supplies that are going to be necessary, correctly; if they haven't conducted a comprehensive study as to what supplies are going to be needed; then because they are the sole distributors, for all practical purposes, the farmers when an emergency arises could be in a position where they can't get these supplies. I suggest that is another reason why the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) urges that a comprehensive program be instituted by the government.

I would suggest that the farmers and the cattle men of this province are going to receive little comfort from a government, that when pressed members on this side of the House, could only see fit to enact a program which for all practical purposes is only propaganda in what could be one of the most severe years of infestation in the history of this province. I suggest that those members who say that it shouldn't have been on a province-wide basis are only hiding behind the facts, because if they are trying to say that it only pertains to the southern part of the province, I can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, what

April 3, 1962

is going to happen to the northern farmers if a comprehensive program isn't instituted in the southern part of the province; if the government don't accept their share of responsibility in seeing that the grasshoppers are poisoned, if no program is going to be instituted then there will be grasshoppers flying by the millions from the southern part of the province into the northern part of the province and you will have them all the way up to Lac La Ronge. They will be wishing then that they hadn't tried to hide behind some insecure facts.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the motion had to be amended. I would have thought that all members of this House would have supported the original motion. Now that it, for all practical purposes, isn't worth a hoot to the farmer, in order to bring his attention to some aspects of the program, I will of course have to support the motion as amended, so I can at least get some pamphlets and read about what the government hasn't done.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, just a few words in this connection. One of the objections to the resolution is of course the fact that the so-called comprehensive campaign is under way for some time. These are things one must prepare for well in advance. The comprehensiveness of a program, of course, will be determined by the extent of the outbreak. I would rather speak in terms of effective control campaign rather than a comprehensive control campaign. In this connection, in order to achieve effective campaigns, as hon. members know, and to satisfy the objections raised by the hon. member who has just taken his seat in the matter of cost and the financial position of the farmer, and having sufficient supplies on hand — it is exactly for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial Department of Agriculture in 1950 began a policy of bulk purchase of grasshopper chemical. During the campaign of 1949 which was the last campaign in which we used sawdust, chemicals came on the market. Chemicals were then costing the farmer \$3 per acre. The department subsidized half the cost of the chemicals at that time to the extension of \$1.50 per acre. In fact there were over a half million dollars spent in subsidy to bring the price down to \$1.50 per acre and this is prohibitive and we then decided to bulk purchase in an endeavour to do two things; to bring the price of chemicals down to the lowest possible level and to have ample supplies on hand when an infestation took place.

The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) has said, and said well, that no one can tell the extent of an outbreak on the basis of the forecasts that are made available to us by the entomological services of the federal government. The extent of the outbreak in the spring will depend upon the kind of weather we have. This has been pointed out by the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy). If you have continuous dry, warm weather we can expect that the entire forecast area will represent an extensive hatching area. But if the weather sets in cold and becomes wet then of course you will not have the infestation. We have experienced this repeatedly.

We felt that someone had to assume the risk of laying in large supplies of chemicals at the lowest possible price. Mr. Speaker, we have never been out of chemicals with the exception of about a two-day period in the last campaign. This was a most unexpected circumstance, as I have told the House on so many occasions. We still had 60 thousand gallons of deildrin in storage at Moose Jaw when the orders from the municipalities were running in the order of three to four thousand gallons a day. Then the very extreme warm weather came, as hon. members all remember, three successive exceedingly hot dry days, and this is when the explosion of hatching took place. The last orders, on a Saturday, amounted to around four or five thousand gallons, I don't just recall. On the following Monday, the demand rose to 30 thousand gallons a day and on the following Tuesday 25 thousand gallons a day. There was 55 thousand gallons ordered in two days. Now it is most difficult to meet that kind of situation. As a matter of fact we had orders into the company to supply additional quantities some two weeks previously and they were processing and coming through by rail, but they couldn't come fast enough to provide the farmers with as much poison as was needed at the critical stage. It was at this period that we brought in the airlift to Regina and trucked chemicals to Moose Jaw. Some 30 thousand gallons of deildrin began coming and we were able to continue the campaign.

As compared to this situation in the two years previous we wound up with over half the chemicals still on hand. In each of those years 1959 and 1960 there was a very large outbreak forecast. In addition in 1960 we had an extensive cutworm outbreak. Still in each of those years we had half of the chemicals remaining on hand. We had a very substantial quantity for 1961. In fact, you can't say that the department hasn't fulfilled its second objective of having large quantities on hand.

April 3, 1962

We are not in competition with merchants. We felt that this was a field where we must take some responsibility in the interest of reducing prices, having stocks on hand and if necessary subsidizing prices, which we have done in the case of, as hon. members know, of phosdrin and sevin, which are chemicals being used for pastures.

In the case of grasshopper chemicals, we were able as a result of this policy, to bring the cost of the farmer down from \$3 an acre to 15¢ an acre which I consider is fulfilling the obligations the government has in these matters. Now, in respect to an effective campaign, this will depend on how well the campaign is organized and how effective we are in getting proper control in the early stages. The principal factor in this is determined by how well each farmer has surveyed the potential hatching areas and if the areas are sprayed very early in the hatching stage. We have to check these infestations before they get in the air. Once hoppers get in the air and begin flying, that is when people start talking about spraying by planes. The situation is out of control by this time. This is a situation that must be prevented during the early stages but is only possible if you can get 100 per cent co-operation from farmers, in actively searching out the hatching ground and spraying these areas.

We were told at the meeting held in the Museum of Natural History recently by people in authority, the dominion entomologists, that an area as big as the centre of the Assembly could hatch enough grasshoppers to destroy 100 thousand acres of grain. This gives you an idea — once the hatching takes place these grasshoppers get on the move, particularly if they get in the air and fly, then they are all over the place and instead of having to spray a small area you have to spray large areas, making it more costly to the farmers concerned. It is on the basis of early control that a successful campaign depends — how well the thing is organized and done. This of course takes organization.

In regard to information. Information and research is always most valuable but we have a great deal of information available to us now. The hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) says — on the habits of the grasshoppers and this sort of thing. The striking thing that comes out is this — that the grasshoppers that do the crop damage are not hatched over large areas of natural prairie land, with the exception of the roadsides. Then there is the stubble hopper which as the

hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) said is the most dangerous of all. This hopper will lay its eggs in stubble fields and where this has happened and an entire quarter section is infested — the farmer has been advised over the years, even when we used the poison bait, or I would say particularly when we used the poison bait method, to summerfallow stubble that is infested with hoppers and leave green strips. When the hoppers hatch on the barren ground they will move to this green patch for food and then the farmer sprays the green patch and again the cost of spraying can be reduced tremendously. As a matter of good farm practice, since grasshoppers come with drought it is not good farm practice to sow stubble to crop, particularly if there is infestation of grasshopper eggs in that stubble. It is a better practice to summerfallow it immediately, leaving green strips. Now all this information is available — all the habits of the grasshoppers and all the rest of it.

Yes, I know, the professor went on to talk about research and information, but when an infestation of grasshoppers hits farmers you can't say to him, well we ought to do a little more research on this thing. You can't let nature take its course and the learned scientist, that the hon. member for Cannington referred to, inferred that maybe we ought to let them take their course because it is most difficult to control them in any manner, even with the chemical spray. But, Mr. Speaker, we have proved that where there is an effective campaign inaugurated and well organized we can stop the infestation from spreading, (if it is well done at the early stages). Now these are the stepping stones of success, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the grasshopper campaign is concerned. In view of this it is very difficult to make out a case of lack of responsibility on the part of the government. Certainly we can make mistakes and we do, but I think in the field of grasshopper control we have rendered a very valuable service to the farmers of the province. We have had conferences and we will have additional meetings in various municipalities called by the agricultural representatives to get a proper control organization established. In addition a good deal will depend as to whether or not a municipality will pass the grasshopper control bylaw so that some enforcement will take place in the interest of protecting the farmer who is doing his level best to control damage as against the farmer who is not doing his job, so that this land that is infested can be sprayed by the municipality and the cost assessed against his land. This is what is involved in the municipal grasshopper control bylaw.

April 3, 1962

A good deal depends on the organization of an effective campaign.

We have in store and on order \$1,300,000 worth of chemicals. We will have ample chemicals on hand, I hope. And as I told the conference at the Museum of Natural History, I would hope that we wouldn't have to use any of that poison. I would hope and pray that we get rains and that this infestation disappears. I would much rather carry over this inventory as we did from 1950 to around 1957-58 when we carried over a heavy inventory of supplies. The other factor that I want hon. members to keep in mind is deildrin is a dangerous poison. It must be handled with exceeding care. The food and drug people, and rightly so, are observing the use and the results of deildrin very carefully. We are putting a good deal of emphasis on the careful use of deildrin because should it be outlawed we would be sitting with a million dollars worth of deildrin on hand. Deildrin has been the most effective chemical available, but it must be confined entirely to stubble. Then we have purchased sevin for pasture spraying and we will be subsidizing sevin very heavily to enable farmers to use it for pasture spraying. These are the criteria, Mr. Speaker, for what can be termed a comprehensive campaign but I would much rather say an effective grasshopper control campaign.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister a question before he sits down? Has the provincial government any provision for the land that they control? I mean the pasture lands, and have you made any representation to the dominion government about theirs? Those lands are very light and they are grasshopper breeding grounds.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am very glad the hon. member mentioned that. I overlooked it. Insofar as crown land is concerned, the lands branch assumes responsibility for all vacant crown lands and our community pastures. My understanding is that P.F.R.A will also pay for any control measures that the municipality undertakes in a P.F.R.A. pasture if they haven't the equipment to do the work themselves. The same with us. If the municipality goes into a pasture and does the spraying or anyone else does it, we pay for it. Pastures are not the big problem. It is effective control campaign measures right at the farmer level and during the early stages of hatching before the critters get under way. Once they fly they are gone.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to warn the House that the mover is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak they must do so now.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly in connection with the motion and the amendment. It was interesting to note that the Minister of Agriculture admits that the government across the way can make mistakes, and I think one mistake he made was in changing our motion to insert the word ‘publicity’. However, I think we would sooner see the government increase their expenditures to publicize a comprehensive program for grasshopper control than for some of the other objectives that they have had and I refer to nearly half a million dollars spent last year, by the power corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are two things that should be considered in a comprehensive program. One is that there be a considerable amount of liaison between the Departments of Agriculture of our neighbouring provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, coming from a constituency along the border of Alberta I feel that whatever is done in Saskatchewan should be done in consultation with other Ministers of Agriculture in that respect. I do feel too that there should be a stepped up program of research concerning grasshopper control. We know that deildrin has certain limitations. I think the minister dwelt on one — it must be confined to stubble and so on. Certainly it may be that other chemicals may be found in the next year or two that may be even more effective in other areas.

We are fortunate I think in the northern part of the province that the grasshopper problem is certainly not as serious as it is in the south and anything that could be done to restrict the infestation will certainly work in favour of those areas. I think with those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to pledge my support for a greatly extended and comprehensive program for the control of grasshoppers in the province.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to warn the House that the mover is about to close the debate.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to note the remarks made by the member from Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen)

April 3, 1962

and following his remarks I could only come to one conclusion, that we should not hold him responsible for what he did say because he is not a farmer. The member for Nipawin (Mr. Perkins) I will also excuse for the remarks he made because I think he is very seldom in a grasshopper area. I appreciate some of the statements that were made by the hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) and also some of the remarks that were made by the minister. He said a few minutes ago that there is a great deal of information available to the farmers. This might be true, but I would like to read from a report in the Leader-Post, March 17, 1962, where one of the leading professors, Professor Edwards of the Department of Biology, University of Saskatchewan had this to say:

“It has never been conclusively demonstrated that the use of insecticides does actually increase the farmers' income.”

He questions whether the insecticides are useful to the farmer, but at the same time he says; that despite the drawbacks he sees in insecticides he is not prepared to recommend their abandonment, so there is a reasonable excuse that we need further assistance in education not only at the farmer's level but also at the university level. He also goes on to say, elaborating on his general opinions, Professor Edwards says that:

“Farmers do not necessarily get full value from the money he spends on insecticides used for the control of grasshoppers. In view of that the effectiveness of an insecticide is measured by its ability to clear grasshoppers from a sprayed area, no account is taken of those that are driven to unsprayed areas and no measure is taken of the increase in crop yield.”

This is information that we should have, and I believe the request was reasonable when we asked for financial assistance, not only to the farmer but also to our university, in the way of chemicals. Now the co-operation of the farmers, the municipalities and the states I believe is absolutely necessary and this was demonstrated at the municipal convention that the co-operation does not exist. The educational program is far short I believe, as I stated on previous occasions due to the fact that the areas are not invaded every year, and information should be made available to the farmers as to the best methods and the most economical methods, and

financial help I believe is most important.

I would like to see some of the members from the south of the province on this resolution.

I had the privilege of travelling through the south yesterday to Gull Lake, and I feel sorry for the farmers, the way the snow has disappeared and the drought that will exist. What I would like to mention here too is that we agree with the minister with the amount of money that has been spent on deildrin in storage, I think he said \$1.3 million. I would suggest to him this should be increased to at least three times that amount. If a grasshopper outbreak occurs this year, and there is every indication that it will, there is no reason for throwing up hands and beginning to pray. The time for it is now, to see that these things are there, and every indication shows to us that the outbreak will be three times as severe. The hoppers have moved up about fifty to a hundred miles north this year, according to the map, and the infestation, the laying of eggs has been tripled, in many areas, and I certainly see if we are not going to be on the spot we could lose a crop despite the fact that moisture conditions could be quite favourable.

Now with regard to what the government has done, claiming they have reduced the cost to \$4.00 a gallon, from \$8 a gallon, I believe this is a reasonable service that the farmers should expect from the government, and if the government hadn't given us this service I am quite sure that the rural municipalities would have been able to make the same deal, they would have had to co-operate, make the same deal with the chemical plants, and would have received the deildrin at the same cost.

The minister also state they have never been out of deildrin more than two days. This I believe to be true, I wouldn't question the minister's word, but municipalities have been out more than two days. I remember the R.M. of Warman on a Sunday, and I remember this very clearly, one of our Sunday school teachers left right after Sunday school class to go to Moose Jaw to pick up some deildrin as our municipality had been out for days. I remember that on many occasions farmers came to my farm and asked whether we had deildrin. I also believe it is reasonable to expect that another depot should be opened in Saskatoon, due to the fact that the grasshoppers have moved further north. I believe the municipality should have the opportunity of being able

April 3, 1962

to pick up deildrin within a reasonable distance. Moose Jaw and Rosetown are just too far away from the farmers and the municipalities in the northern area.

When I read this resolution as amended it just didn't make sense to me, I will read it again.

“That this Assembly respectfully requests the government to give immediate consideration to publicizing a comprehensive program for the control of grasshoppers.”

I am disturbed that this resolution had to be amended. I hope the government will see fit to do more than what the resolution calls for, especially in a financial way. I did not ask, when I spoke on the resolution, for financial assistance to the big farmer, it also might include some of the dairy farmers, where they have a steady income there is no need for assistance. Certainly you are not going to assist a farmer who had a 40 bushel per acre crop, but the farmers, particularly in the south that had a poor crop, and face the prospect of another poor crop, I believe the financial conditions have been debated on numerous occasions in this House during the session, and need not go into it now, but I feel if assistance to the small farmer is not given, our grasshopper control program will not be effective. I hope therefore the government will see fit to give some assistance to the small farmer, and with that I will support the motion.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MOTION: RE RURAL TELEPHONE COMPANIES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foley and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Johnson.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) referred to some statements I made while addressing the Association of Rural Telephones in Saskatoon in July 1959. This is what I was supposed to have said:

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

The member then went on to say that I took issue with the

press the following day and stated:

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

Surely the member for Turtleford does not expect people of Saskatchewan to provide this service free, anymore than they would expect them to provide running water or power free. I will list in a few minutes the things done for rural telephone companies since 1944, and I suggest it has been considerable. Further assistance is gradually being provided and sparsely settled parts of the province will receive extensive study. Just a few weeks ago we created a new position of assistant general manager in charge of research and planning. It will be one of his duties to further study the rural telephone program.

A week ago Sunday, Mr. Speaker, the member for Turtleford appeared on television, C.K.C.K.-T.V. during the 6:30 news. Perhaps some of the hon. members saw him on that occasion. This is what he said in reference to rural telephone companies. First, that grants should be extended to all rural telephone companies wishing to have them, regardless of their circumstances. Second, that widespread building of rural telephone lines in areas not being served should be undertaken. Third, he suggested that the policies of the government have not encouraged building of telephone nor encouraged people to set up their own companies. He cited the case of the Glaslyn area, where rural telephone service would cost between five and six hundred dollars per farm. This he said, the farming people felt was beyond their means, and four he suggested a revision in the policy of the Department of Telephones.

Then on Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, when he spoke in this House he made further charges based on half-truths exaggerations, or without foundation in fact. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is easy enough to make charges of these kinds, and put up a fairly plausible case, especially if one is obviously not very well acquainted with the facts, or in other words, Mr. Speaker, doesn't know what he is talking about.

The member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) has mounted a white charger and apparently is out to see the defenceless rural companies are done right by this government.

April 3, 1962

The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has climbed up behind him — poor horse — they are pretty big fellows both of them.

I intend going over most of the statements made by these members and give the House a true picture of the situation. First let me deal with the television statements. Number one — pole grants are extended to all companies, large and small, regardless of the condition of their grant. This provides them with one-third of the delivered cost of all approved poles purchased by them. Maintenance grants are available to all companies, irrespective of size, providing the plans meet the construction standards as outlined in our manual Construction and Maintenance Information for Rural Telephone Companies.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy: — Better go easy on that.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — I know what you mean Ross. Second the provision of telephone service in rural areas in the province is the responsibility of rural telephone companies. S.G.T. provides all long distance service as well as local service in urban centres. Within the limits of financial resources rural companies are continuing to build telephone lines.

Third where he states that the policies of the government have not encouraged building of telephone lines, nor encouraged people to set up their own companies, this is an inaccurate and irresponsible statement. The Department of Telephones and S.G.T. are continually encouraging and advising on the formation of new companies, and extension of existing companies.

In connection with the statement regarding Glaslyn . . .

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I have listened to the minister very carefully. I don't think he has the right to accuse myself or any member of half-truths, exaggerations, remarks without foundation, don't know what he is talking about, imputing a lack of sincerity, and these other things. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I believe he should withdraw that imputation, and should sustain it throughout the remainder of his remarks, and I would so ask.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, it is quite within the rules for

members to express their opinion in regard to other members that they do not have all the information they are poorly informed for the reason that they don't know what they are talking about, but it is not within the rules to charge lack of sincerity and I don't think the minister did that; or to say he doesn't believe what he says.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, the other day I told the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources that I didn't believe he believed what he was saying. Now if there is any difference between that situation which he requested I withdraw and the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Telephones I fail to see them.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the point is clear, if the minister imputes motives that a member is doing a thing for motive which he knows is not correct or he accuses a member of deliberately lying then he must withdraw the statement, but if he says that any member is lacking in facts and he is prepared to in his opinion to supply additional facts, then that is a debatable point whether he supplies the facts or whether he doesn't. I think the minister was in order on these statements, I don't think he imputed motives.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, when he suggests I don't know what I am talking about if that isn't an imputation of lack of sincerity. When he suggest that I am riding a white charger and he suggests that I have another motive than attempting to gain assistance for my own area in particular and the people of the province, then I believe he should withdraw those insinuations. I would ask you to rule in that direction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I ruled that if he said the member didn't know what he was talking about, that he didn't have all the facts, he must produce the facts to show different, but if he said the member was deliberately falsifying the facts then he would have to withdraw it.

Mr. Foley: — I feel he so implied, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the feelings of the hon. member and his benefit and yours I will repeat the words

April 3, 1962

I said. I said, one who is obviously not very well acquainted with the facts in other words, does not know what he is talking about. Now those words, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest are pretty mild in comparison to some of the statements thrown back and forward across this House in the past few weeks.

I will continue, Mr. Speaker. In connection with the statement regarding Glaslyn our files show that interest was shown by prospective rural subscribers in the area as far back as June, 1956, but despite efforts by members of the department no progress has been made. Now perhaps the hon. member does not know that, we have sent men there time and time again.

Certainly costs of rural telephone constructions are high in the Glaslyn area. Occupied farms are far apart and it is estimated that capital expenditures in the order of \$500 to \$600 a subscriber will be involved in introducing service to that area.

Fourth, the problem of extending rural telephone service to unserved areas of the province is basically an economic one. In the final analysis whether or not telephone services are introduced to a specific area depends on whether the residents in that area recognize the value of telephone service and are prepared to pay the necessary cost. At the present time we do not believe we are justified in expending vast sums of money, of provincial funds, to extend service to unserved areas, when it is noted that some 58 thousand rural subscribers have over the past years expended the necessary money to provide themselves with service. We are, however, continuing to study the problem. It has been said in this House that farmers have never asked for special privileges and they are not asking for them today. Someone said that they other day. I don't remember who it was. The rural telephone situation in this province is not a very fertile field for political capital. The officers and executives of the rural associations are well pleased with our program, and I have letters to that effect from them in the last few days. May I now enumerate the assistance provided by the Department of Telephones to rural companies. They are as follows: I wish my friend from Turtleford (Mr. Foley) would listen to this. The first one went away back to 1911 — will show the years for each one — in 1911 the department arranged contact on Saskatchewan government telephone poles at the modest rate of 10¢ per contract per pole per year. An excellent thing for the department of that day to do. Second, in 1917 the department commenced

the program of elementary courses in the early part of each year for the purpose of training linemen of the smaller rural telephone companies. Thirty-four men received training in these courses in Regina between January 8, 1962, and March 2, 1962.

Then, Mr. Speaker, comes quite a gap. The next program of assistance comes in 1947, thirty years later, when Saskatchewan Government Telephones commenced supplying all required engineering for rural telephone companies at no cost to the company.

The next step was in 1957, when the rural companies with 85 per cent of its taxes paid up, which wishes to raise money by debentures and can show at least 50 per cent of the amount of the debenture can be raised locally, can source the balance by arrangement with the rural telephone company the Local Government Board, and the provincial treasury. Yes, here is another one 1947 which seems to be a little out of place, In 1947 the Saskatchewan Government Telephones adopted the following policy. When a replacement of any substantial number of poles, long distance pole leads is taking place, the new poles to be erected are to be of sufficient length and strength to carry rural telephone lines which at the time are located on the opposite side of the road, to that of the long distance lead being renewed. In this way when the rural lines become run down, instead of rebuilding, all that is necessary is to move the line across the road on to the S.G.T. poles and pay the ten cents per pole per year as I mentioned a few moments ago. A number of rural companies have already taken advantage of this provision and more will do so in the future.

Number six, this was in 1949, and provides new dial telephone sets in exchange for the old ones at no cost, when the rural telephone company service exchange is converted to dial operation. May I also say that prior to 1949 S.G.T. charged each rural company \$5 per telephone to install a dial and make modifications. No new telephones were changed for old ones as is the present practise. As a matter of interest, Melville is the first area where we exchanged new telephones for the old ones at no cost.

Number seven took place in 1960. From our Regina office and through six rural inspectors in the field we supplied advice in the administration of rural telephone companies' affairs and gave assistance in technical matters.

Point number eight, also in 1960, the department

April 3, 1962

will pay one third of the delivered cost of all poles where the construction of the load meets the standards set by the department. These standards are outlined in the manual.

Number nine, also 1960, the department will pay a maintenance grant of \$2.50 per subscriber per year to any company whose system meets the standard of construction and maintenance set by the department, or will agree to do so.

Point number ten, the department provides each rural company with a manual of construction and maintenance information free of charge.

Number eleven, starting this year the department is providing an advance training course for full time linemen of the larger rural telephone companies. The first such course started March 5, 1962, with 28 rural linemen in attendance.

It will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that in comparison with two methods of assistance to the rural companies previous to 1944, there have been nine by way of assistance since 1944.

On Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) made the statement that there are 52,268 rural telephones in the province and that 30 thousand to 40 thousand farms in the province do not have telephone service.

Actually at December 31, 1961, there were 57,806 rural telephones in Saskatchewan approximately 7,000 of these were non-farm subscribers leaving 70,700 of these were non-farm subscribers leaving 70,700 farm homes. On the basis of D.B.S. statistics, 1956 figures, the estimate of 30,000 unserved farm homes is not unrealistic, and I think the member was reasonably accurate there. The cost to provide service to these 30,000 farms is estimated to be in the neighbourhood of \$15 million.

And then there was the statement to the effect that there was hardly any growth in rural telephones since 1956. In reply to that, in the records for the department for the years 1957 to 1961 inclusive, we find that during this period the rural telephone companies have constructed nearly 3,000 miles of new pole lead, bringing service to 5,973 subscribers. Naturally the year end statistics do not reflect these figures, since during the same period there has been a drop in the number of telephones of

approximately 8,300. This reduction is no doubt due to the urbanization trend, many farmers have moved into the towns and cities. It is also due to the fact that the S.G.T. have taken over approximately 1,000 subscribers with the purchase of rural owned telephone plants in certain towns. I am thinking of the town of Duff as an example which we took over a few months ago.

Again the member for Turtleford stated that the government is suffering from an urban complex, rural companies are not receiving their fair share of the resources of the province. Approximately one fifth of S.G.T. revenue should be turned back to assist in rural expansion. This was the statement of the member for Turtleford. My answer to that is that it is impossible to estimate with a fair degree of accuracy the portion of S.G.T. revenue which accrues from rural telephone companies. In fact we estimate that in 1961 this revenue amounted to approximately \$1,356,000. Without a detailed and extended study it is not possible to come up with a reliable estimate of the cost incurred by S.G.T. in earning this amount of revenue. However, assuming that rural revenues contributed to S.G.T. net income during 1961 in the same proportion as other S.G.T. revenues, we could say that \$197,000 was the 1961 net income accrued from rural companies. Let us say \$200,000 in round figures.

Now what does the Department of Telephones spend on the rural companies? Administration \$103,000; pole grants \$171,746; maintenance grants \$56,002; other assistance \$140,000; a total of \$450,648. The \$140,000 shown as other assistance is practically all new telephone sets. I will have something to say about that a little later.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the government spends a little over a quarter of a million dollars more in various programs, that is cleared from the rural companies. We are glad to be in a position to offer and to provide this assistance.

The odd part of it is, Mr. Speaker, that the rural companies appear to be well satisfied, and a well known member of the association wrote me a personal letter just last week ending with this statement:

“Can this association be of any assistance to you in offsetting a lot of misunderstanding and misinformation that one reads in the press?”

April 3, 1962

He further stated that the members of the association were appreciative of the assistance given by the department by way of pole grants and maintenance grants, and also that the association were fully conversant with the problems confronting S.G.T. and the overall picture of telephone communication on this continent.

Another statement the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) made Tuesday, was that the gross debt of the corporation is borne by the taxpayers of the province. That was rather an amazing statement, Mr. Speaker, which is absolutely incorrect. All debt servicing cost to S.G.T. are met from its net operating revenue, not one red cent is paid for out of tax revenues of the province.

I wish to emphasize this point, Mr. Speaker, not one red cent is paid for out of the tax revenues of the province.

Fifth, and this is the last, the member stated that the government had spent vast sums of money on the expansion of power and gas distribution network in the province and relatively little in expanding telephone service. May I reply, that it is true that sizeable amounts of public funds have been invested in the distribution of gas and power to the people of the province and it has been greatly appreciated by all those who have benefited both in the urban and rural centres. However, substantial amounts of capital have been advanced to S.G.T. for improving and expanding telephone service in the province, over \$75,000,000 in the last ten years.

The sixth point he made last Tuesday, that some government officials claim that this is due to lack of initiative on the part of rural people, that telephone service is not provided in rural areas. My answer to that is that the problem of extending rural telephone service to unserved areas is basically an economic one. The proposed revisions to the rural telephone act are aimed at encouraging and facilitating the expansion of service by existing companies and formation of new companies, we will come to that in a few days when the act comes up. However, in the final analysis, whether or not telephone service is introduced to a specific rural area depends on whether the residents in that area recognize the value of telephone service and are prepared to pay the necessary costs. At the present time we do not believe that we are justified in spending vast sums of provincial funds to extend service to unserved

areas when it is noted that some 58 thousand rural subscribers have in the past expended the necessary money to provide themselves with service. We are however continuing to study the problem, especially in sparsely settled areas, so the member cannot claim that he has prodded us into something that we are not already doing.

Seventh point, and this is the last one, he is critical of us spending \$2½ million on a new S.G.T. head office building in Regina saying that this money could better be diverted to rural companies and rural telephone expansion. Might I say, Mr. Speaker, that the head office staff of this corporation are located in four widely separated buildings in Regina and this situation has existed for some time. A new head office which will accommodate all the head office staff will enable the corporation to cope effectively with the complex problems of directing and coordinating its growing operations. The property was purchased some seven years ago and the erection of this building is long overdue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are 43 communities in the province served by S.G.T. which are not connected to rural telephone circuits. There are approximately 65 toll stations, points in which there is only one telephone. These were installed at considerable expense of the Department of Telephones and the income is practically negligible. The farm population is so sparse in these areas that the cost of providing a telephone system to connect these subscribers to the community with a tolls station would be very high. It would be economically impossible to provide a switch board and the necessary staff to switch the limited number of calls that would originate from these points. There would not be enough revenue, Mr. Speaker, to pay the operators cigarette money.

Now let me turn to some of the remarks made by the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), he referred to a suggestion made in 1960 that rural connecting fees should be cancelled rather than introduce the grants program. This he contends would result in getting more money into the hands of the rural company. In reply may I say, that the grants program is designed to provide rural telephone companies with a financial incentive to improve their telephone plant to improve the policy of service to their subscribers. The aim is not only to get more money into the hands of the rural telephone companies.

April 3, 1962

We do believe, Mr. Speaker, that cancelling rural connecting fees would result in an improvement of the rural telephone plant and the service.

While on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I might add that the rural connecting fee which runs from \$6 per year in group one which is under 200 telephones to \$12 per year to group nine which is over 40,000 telephones — in other words connected to either Saskatoon or Regina — corresponds to the monthly charges on residential telephones made in the towns, villages, and cities of between \$2.20 per month or \$26.40 per year to \$3.90 per month or \$46.80 per year. We feel that this charge, Mr. Speaker, from 50¢ to \$1.00 per month for rural subscribers, by providing them with entry into the entire S.G.T. system and in fact entry to any point on the continent is worth that amount of money and is entirely justified. It should also be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that 25¢ per month or \$3.00 per year per subscriber is taken from this connecting fee and paid to the local agent.

The second point that the member for Melville made was that a very small minority of companies get maintenance grants, only forty companies since inception, and that the pole grants program is more successful than the maintenance grants program. This statement is not accurate. During 1960-61 maintenance grants were made to 124 companies, serving 14,400 rural subscribers. The first instalment of the 1961-62 maintenance grant was paid to 174 companies, 19,720 subscribers. It is evident that this program is succeeding in that more and more rural companies are improving their plant maintenance program to qualify for this grant. The hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) stated that the pole grant program was more successful than the maintenance grant program since it resulted in more money being paid to rural telephone companies. In answer to this let me reiterate that the purpose of the grants program is not merely to put more money into the hands of rural telephone companies, but rather to provide financial incentive to the companies to expand and improve the quality of the rural telephone service for the benefit of the members. Judging by this criterion, Mr. Speaker, I say that the grants program is successful, particularly as more and more companies are taking advantage of it.

Point number three made by the member for Melville, is he suspects that most of the amount of labelled "other assistance" is really administration charges. My answer to that is that commencing in 1949, Saskatchewan Government Telephones inaugurated a program of providing

automatic telephone sets free of charge to rural telephone companies connected to the exchange being converted to dial operations. This sub vote is intended to reimburse S.G.T. for the cost of providing dial sets to the rural companies involved in the 1961 dial conversion program. Due to unavoidable delays the major portion of this \$140 thousand voted for 1961-62 will be spent during the early part of 1962. Incidentally this amount covers the cost of approximately 4,600 telephone sets. No portion of it whatever is used for administration, contrary to the intimation of the member for Melville. If you multiply 4,600 sets by \$25 each you will come up pretty close to the \$140 thousand that we referred to as other assistance.

The fourth point made by the member for Melville was that the administration costs of the grants program were too high, that the government does not have faith in the rural telephone people. Following is part of his address made March 27th, and I quote: — “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 is in the form of administrative costs, because of the very 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 is not being cheated of one dollar by the rural telephone companies of this country. Every pole must be counted, and an official from the government of this province goes out and not only spends his time but he takes along the lineman of the particular company and it takes two men one or two days in every company concerned to go around and make sure that everyone of these telephone poles that is going to be paid for has been put into the ground by the telephone company.”

I am very pleased to have an answer for that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the majority of the time of the staff of the Department of Telephones is spent in providing advice and assistance to rural telephone companies, not in administering the grants

April 3, 1962

program. We estimate that only 10% of the time of our field staff — six inspectors — is involved in pole grant inspection work and the cost of this activity in 1961 was approximately \$4,600 or about \$770 a year for each of the six inspectors.

The hon. member stated that the government by its inspection program demonstrates the lack of faith in the rural telephone people. In answer let me say, that the primary purpose of these inspections is not to count the poles as the member suggests but rather to insure that the rehabilitation or new construction does meet approved standards to provide, and I repeat this again, provide advice and assistance to the rural companies. Rural companies cannot provide themselves good service unless approved standards are followed.

It is interesting to recall at this point that a resolution was received from the Lemberg Telephone Company by the association of rural telephone companies at their conference in Saskatoon last July. It reads as follows, may I quote again:

“That we ask the government to change its payment policy under pole grant payments so that payments can be made by the department on the purchase of the poles rather than after they have been installed. The reason for this request being that it is at the time of purchase that the money is required, also that there would be a large administration saving if inspection is not necessary.”

I just referred to the administration saving — very little — no one would second this resolution in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker.

I had spoken to the association shortly before this resolution came up and had been invited to stay if I so wished, I was on the platform at the time and recall that one of the delegates in the audience got up and said that the convention had been pretty sober, pretty dry, up until then and that the resolution would give them something to laugh about. I repeat that this resolution was not seconded.

It is interesting also to note that the Lemberg Rural Company has received \$1,182 pole grant and \$828 in maintenance grants, and will receive another \$200 in maintenance grants in just a few weeks time.

Now point number five, and this is the last one I will deal with that the member from Melville made on Tuesday. He stated that the grants program does not assist all rural telephone companies. In answer to that may I say, that pole grants are available to all rural telephone companies who wish to rehabilitate or expand their plant in accordance with approved standards. Maintenance grants are available to all rural telephone companies regardless of size whose plant is constructed and maintained according to accepted standards. I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that we have these accepted standards is to provide the subscribers, the farmers out on the lines with good service, that is our chief aim. I would again point out that the grants program is designed to provide financial incentive to rural telephone companies to expand and improve new telephone service in rural areas, a task which has traditionally been the responsibility of rural telephone companies and which they have undertaken with a considerable measure of success. More and more companies are availing themselves of the assistance available to the grants program.

Last Tuesday the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) asks what the cost would be for four miles of poles which is the distance some would have to go to get telephone service in this area, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I wasn't able to answer him at that time but I am pleased to do so now. The answer is that a new pole line constructed according to standards to provide service to one subscriber would cost in the order of \$415 per mile, it is possible however that radio telephone equipment could be used in sparsely settled areas. He referred, I think, to the ranching country down in his part of the province. Nevertheless the cost would be considerably more than the average of \$513 per subscriber experience by rural telephone companies during the past few years. I can assure the hon. member that we are actively studying the problem of extending service to unserved areas.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the exaggerated and irresponsible statements made in this House last week by the members for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) and Melville (Mr. Gardiner) have been adequately replied to and that all members will now have a better understanding of the rural telephone system of this province and the interest that has been shown in providing reasonable service — reasonable assistance, I should have said. I repeat, that the association representing these companies are well satisfied as are the boards of directors of all

April 3, 1962

companies I know of. I am not suggesting that we have come to an end in providing assistance where required but will continue to expand our program to a reasonable extent.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, just before I take my seat, that I am not particularly concerned about being commended for what we have done although bouquets are rather pleasant compared to bricbats. I do feel that the Assembly in recommending further assistance be provided the rural companies as deemed advisable is quite proper.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring one or two matters to the attention of the House and to the attention of the minister. I think he knows pretty well what I am going to say, that after listening to his very fine oration and patting himself on the back I still say that he rather over-rated it and my opinion is the theory of the maintenance grant is all right. I am all for it but he only expended \$56 thousand on it and if I remember correctly people that applied for it, only two-thirds of them got it. The reason he said we couldn't get it down there was because the line wasn't in shape to be repaired and I would like to know when we need a maintenance grant, if they had said that it was so good that we didn't need maintaining, I could have understood, but when the department says that it is so poor that they can't give them a grant, I think they had better revise their sights and get a few more regulations in there because after all of it needs maintaining I would think that that is what the maintenance grant is for but to say that it is too poor and couldn't get the maintenance grant, that looks rather ridiculous to me.

The other thing that I wanted to bring to the attention of the House was that in connection with the winter works program, under the present set-up, and I am going about this in connection with rural lines since we have lots of them down there built in 1911. Under the present set-up if the municipality is building a grid road, and they find it necessary to move that line back, they can get a winter works assistance on it, but if the telephone company itself has a line that is fifty years old it doesn't come in that category and I would suggest to the minister that those companies are just as

much entitled to it, they have got to rebuild their lines, they all have to be rebuilt and they should be reorganized, most of them, but I would suggest to the minister that he see to it that before the next year that if a telephone company finds it necessary to rebuild their line, that they be included in the winter works program. They include it now if it is a municipality that applies for it but if a telephone company applies they are excluded. I can't see the reason for it but a lot of this work would be done, rebuilding of telephone lines is a lot of work, a lot of day labouring — if you want to call it that, and this could be done in the early fall and all those lines, it is not a local problem, all those lines were built fifty years ago, should be rebuilt and they serve their purpose and they should be reorganized too and I would suggest to the minister that he give some help in setting up the reorganization of those things. Some advice would be a lot better than some of this trying to revise municipalities because there is a real demand for that very thing.

I just wanted to draw to his attention that I can see no reason why if telephone companies are being moved owing to the fact that the grid road is moving it comes under the winter works program but if another line is running that is equally as bad because it doesn't come under the grid system they can't come under winter works, and I think they should be able to.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — We'll take it up with John.

Mr. McCarthy: — With who?

Hon. Mr. Williams: — John.

Mr. McCarthy: — You had better take up the maintenance with yourself.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. R. Perkins (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to be allowed the privilege of saying a word or two about this matter of rural telephone service in this province. I share the concern of those that have spoken on the other side regarding the service as it is at the present and has been for a long time in the province as regards rural telephones. I don't think anyone can deny in taking a look at the total

April 3, 1962

rural telephone picture in this province the fact that there are too many different types of service in the province. Right from the north to the south end of the province. We see all types of rural telephone systems, some that are right up to standard with depleted lines rebuilt, new poles put here and there and then you will run into a local telephone company that has, through inefficient management or on account of the fact that they are unable, financially possibly, to rebuild, we find dilapidated lines. That is not only true in this province, it is equally true in the province of Manitoba that has had a public telephone system, for I think ever since the province started, at least twenty-five years or forty years. It is equally true in Alberta more especially true in the northern part of Alberta where we have private telephone systems operating in the province. I will stick to our own province, Mr. Speaker. I wish to say that I am not in favour of the resolution as worded at the start and well, I can't go along completely that the opposition should be forced to commend the government, I know that is a thing that they shouldn't be obliged to do and I can't say that they should agree with the word commend, I certainly think that we must recognize the efforts that have been made by the Department of Telephones in giving assistance in recent years to local rural telephone companies. I am glad that the amendment has been passed so that it gives me an opportunity to recognize the work that has been done by the department and also to give some of my impressions of the rural telephone system as it is in the province.

I was amazed at the recommendation, I think it was of the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) when he came out several times with the suggestion that the province supply initiative for these rural companies. I thought that the word private initiative was the only thing that the members of the opposition could worship and that the fact that the government would start and supply this stuff to the local people or the individuals or to the company is certainly a new, not only new type of song, but a new sound completely, coming from the opposition benches.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I think the word I used was incentive, I was just checking the script now and I think that is the word I used.

Mr. Perkins: — I stand corrected, to me it means practically the

same thing, there is a very slight difference. That the government should apply incentive, government-supplied incentive to private operation I have always thought was anathema to all the members across the legislature.

It seems to me that if we re to continue to support locally owned and operated companies in the province of Saskatchewan that the government must stand some responsibility to see to it that the money is wisely spent. If a local company who has full authority to operate a company now and are not now operating it efficiently it certainly can't be guaranteed by giving them additional blanket assistance right across the province regardless of whether they need it or deserve it, is going to correct it. One of the reasons that I am opposed to the motion is that it was originally worthless. I think the responsibility of the government when they make grants, is to see that the grant is properly used and that some recognition must be given to the actual need of the companies who are getting assistance. With over 900 rural telephone companies in the province, it seems to me next to impossible to expect uniform operation, uniform service, each private rural company has its own bylaws, it is responsible for operating and carrying out operations and in a good many cases responsible for supplying their own connecting or switching services, efficiently and some are not and the fact that we have 900 companies makes for a great variety of types of telephone service and also as I said before implies some sort of consideration on the part of the government when it comes to making grants.

Personally I can see no hope for adequate rural telephone service in the province until the people of the province demand publicly-owned and operated rural telephone systems. I think only then will we get uniformly efficient service right across our province. I have to admit and the government must admit that this demand must come from the people of the province. I think I can report that I sat in two meetings, either two or three years ago in the city of Saskatoon, one was a political convention and I will leave you to guess which convention it was, likely the only one that I would be admitted to. At this political convention a resolution was passed with a majority, it was not unanimous, that the government of the province set up public telephone systems, that is go into public ownership and control of the telephone system in the province. I slipped down to the convention of Rural Telephone Associations, the same day and in the same hotel in Saskatoon at which a resolution was brought

April 3, 1962

in and was almost unanimously voted down that the government take over the rural telephone system in the province. You see here in the case of the provincial convention you had a group of people who were not necessarily officials of the local rural telephone companies, a good many of them were not provided with telephone service at all. Those living out in unsettled districts in some places where the population was very sparse, those people voted in favour of a public rural telephone system, while the officials of the rural telephone systems in the province were sitting in at the annual meeting of the rural telephones association not all of them but most of them were officials, each of them must have had telephones or they wouldn't have been at that annual meeting, they vote almost unanimously against it.

There would have to be more unanimity of opinion in the province before we can see the day when we can have publicly owned and operated rural telephone system as in the province of Manitoba. I say so far there is not enough unanimous demand for this that I would think that government could go ahead with working toward public telephone systems in the province.

It seems to me that as long as we have the condition that we have, where we have this multiplicity of companies with practically an equal number of types and degrees of efficiency that we will have to, as best we can, go along with the present rurally, privately owned companies.

I think that there has been a decided evidence that the legislation brought in a little over a year ago of assistance to rural telephone companies is having an effect. Six hundred or some phones that were mentioned by the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) increased over the last five or six years, has been practically all the during the past year. It seems to me that points out the fact that this assistance that has been given, a pole grant and an operating grant to rural companies is having some effect. The fact that at the time the legislation was brought in, when this assistance was first made available, there were over 1,100 companies, we are now down to 900 and it seems to me that it points out the fact that companies are finding that where they become eligible to share in this grant. It seems to me that this is working in the right direction. I think that the fact that we had an increase over 600 rural phones during last year shows that more and more rural companies are shaping themselves so that they can

qualify for this grant.

A suggestion was made by the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) it seems to me would not have the required effect either, would not solve this problem. He suggested a government refund of connecting or what is ordinarily called switching fees or at least a part of those fees. I think that it should be pointed out that when the government supplies the local company with switching fees that are anywhere from \$6 to \$12 that they have already, once they have given that service and given it fully they have already earned the \$6 or \$8 per telephone that the rural company is charging. I think it should also be pointed out that not all rural companies are served by the provincial government system. I think the minister stated that there were 43 rural companies who are not connected to the government system at all. There must be somewhere in the neighbourhood of 100 companies who supply their own connecting services and the company doesn't pay the government for those switching fees the government pays the company. So that with such a great diversity of service I think that any attempt to subsidize companies that needed it the least and would leave these other companies that are not now connected with government services at all. It would still leave them out in the cold worse than ever. I don't think that would be a remedy.

I would just like to repeat, that with such widely, varying density of population and such great distance that we have to serve in some instances compared to others that the best we can hope to do is as is recommended in this amendment, to supply assistance somewhat along the same lines as the province is supplying now with increases as soon as possible what looks like is necessary.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I debate on the amendment without removing my privilege of closing the debate on the original motion.

Mr. Speaker: — According to Beuchesne both motions are before us and I would assume that if you were speaking at this time you would have a right to speak to the amendment and also close the debate on your motion at the same time if you wish, because Beuchesne points out that they are

April 3, 1962

alternate motions which gives a choice so as mover of the original motion you would have the right to debate on that if you wished to exercise that privilege.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to move an amendment to the amendment and I have the motion here and I wish to comment briefly on the amendment before moving the additional amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — I am not too sure that that is permissible, I'll have to check, I am not too sure that it is permissible. Its is very difficult here to be too clear on the interpretation, but Citation 201 points out that when all the words after "that" are deleted and other words are substituted in their place of different import in that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment but includes the motion of the amendment and of the motion. Both matters being under the consideration of the House as motions, so when both of them are before the House, according to Beauchesne, to restrict it to one without restricting to the closing of the debate, I cannot see how we can restrict it just to one, when the mover wants to speak to the one and at the same time when both are before the House would automatically be closing the debate on the other one.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, may I say a word on the point of order? It seems to me that the basic philosophy, in the legislature or parliament is that no member shall ever be shut out by a rule of the House from speaking on any question that is introduced to the House.

Every member should always have an opportunity to speak on that question. Now the hon. member obviously has the right to close the debate, that is to speak just before the vote is taken on the final amended form of this resolution, he has that right to speak at that time. But by that time, may I indulge in a little fantasy, this amendment might be voted down and by that time then this member might never have a chance to speak on this amendment. This would be a question introduced to the House on which he would not have a chance to speak. This is the position that we would be in.

If the amendment is not voted down it then in effect becomes a motion, but you cannot surmise what is going to take place in the House — I might be willing to

lay a bet out in the corridor as to what will happen to it but you can't here in the House, surmise what is going to happen to it. I think that the member has got to have a right to speak on this amendment. I don't see how you can get out of it. I have been arguing for . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think it is and I am hoping to get some data from the House because it is not too often that we get motions like this. My thinking is that anyone that spoke before this amendment was introduced is entitled to speak to the amendment then.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — But anyone who spoke since that time would be speaking to both at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — Now there have only been two members who spoke prior to the amendment being introduced, the mover and one other. But what I am trying to clear in my thinking here and I hope the House will give me guidance on it, when the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) rose he intimated that he would like to move an amendment, if I understood him right, to the amendment. Now that is the point which is worrying me. Will he have the right to move an amendment to this, at this time? Both motions are before the House. Or is it right just to oppose this and talk in favour of his own motion? I am not too clear the way the rulings are placed.

Mrs. Batten: — On that point of order wouldn't it be the case that he would have a right to move and to speak to his amendment and of course he would therefore have the right to speak on the prior amendment — the amendment that he is amending — but he would have no further right to speak until the final vote and then he would be able to close the debate by speaking now he would speak on the motion he's bringing in and on the amendment that was moved by members from the other side of the House. Wouldn't that exhaust his right except that final right which he will speak at the end.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that it would.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is a point of order

April 3, 1962

about whether it is in order to move an amendment to the amendment. I was trying to look something up in the rule book on it and the only thing that I can see and really has no relation to this is rule 37 which says one amendment and one sub-amendment may be made to a motion for Mr. Speaker to leave the chair. Of course this is not that motion and I am not too sure but I think I could look up in the records of this House, maybe the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) could help my memory on this, where sometime he moved a motion in this House and we moved an amendment when we sat over there. He sat over here and he moved an amendment to the amendment. I think we did that in this House, and had great fun doing it.

Mr. Speaker: — As I say this is a point which if I had been aware of the fact before I could have been checking in on the rules but it is the wish of the House then I will be prepared to rule that he has the right to speak to the amendment and also introduce an amendment.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is very important, Mr. Speaker, very important, if he does speak to stay with the amendment and his amendment.

Mr. Danielson: — It is an amendment and there can be an amendment moved to the amendment but that is where it ends. You can't do anymore until the sub-amendment has been removed. That is the rule of all legislative assemblies not only here but in the United States.

Mr. Speaker: — But not part of the debate.

Mr. Danielson: — Now then if he gets up and speaks on the amendment he can move that sub-amendment and when these two amendments have been disposed of and he has the last chance to speak.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That's right.

Mr. Danielson: — It is as simple as A, B, C.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, due to the lateness of the hour, I will be brief, I want to direct my remarks to the motion as amended and simply say in that regard, that, had it been my feeling that the assistance provided by the government for the rural telephone companies of the province was

adequate, certainly I would not have been moving a motion asking for substantial increases in grants and assistance, so I say, Mr. Speaker, that to be in the position of being asked to commend the government for something which we felt was inadequate, is slightly obnoxious and certainly indicates a lack of concern for the plight of rural telephone companies in the province by the mover of the amendment. I will have the opportunity in closing the debate to reply to the hon. Minister of Telephones and others who have spoken and so I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment to the amendment of the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnson). I move, seconded by Mr. Gardiner:

That the words “commends the Government of Saskatchewan for” be deleted, and the words “recognizes the inadequacy of” be substituted therefore.

The motion as amended would read:

That this Assembly recognizes the inadequacies of the assistance now being provided to the rural telephone companies in this province and recommends that further assistance be provided as deemed advisable.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I think we will have to raise a point of order on this amendment as to whether or not the same end could be achieved by voting down the amendment instead of amending it. I would suggest that if the legislature votes down this amendment which sets out to give some commendation to the government that is doing as much as what the amendment to the amendment does. I would suggest that you give consideration to this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foley: — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, that I discussed the wording with the clerk.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't think it is fair for members in this legislature to say that they discussed the motion with the clerk, the official that we deal with in this legislature formally is Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker's office anymore than you would say that you have discussed it with some other deputy minister on something like this.

April 3, 1962

Mr. McFarlane: — What he should have said was that he just discussed it with the Minister of Telephones.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it is now 5:30 and a very important issue has been raised I suggest that you call it 5:30.

Mr. Speaker: — I want to call it 5:30 unless there are other statements to be made on the point of order that was raised by the minister.

Mrs. Batten: — I think that, on a point of order, this is very much in line. Probably this is what the hon. member meant, it is very much in line with a prior decision that you made on the amendment. The result of the amendment may be opposite to what the original is without being a negative thereof and I think that this is that type of case. The hon. member doesn't want to commend but at the same time he is not condemning the government, he is merely suggesting to the original motion this is a third type of thing and I think that the original, the amendment and the sub-amendment are all asking for something different and therefore are in order.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

The Assembly resumed at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker: — A point of order has been raised on the sub-amendment which has been submitted by the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley). I have now had an opportunity to study the sub-amendment and the point of order raised thereon and I wish to advise the House that in my opinion the point of order was not well taken inasmuch as the sub-amendment, while suggesting a conclusion different from that suggested amendment. Indeed the amendment contains a dual proposition; first that the government be commended for certain things; second that the government do certain things. It is only the first portion that is altered by the sub-amendment and thus I cannot feel that the same results could be accomplished by voting against the amendment as by voting for the sub-amendment. I would cite Beauchesne

4th Edition Citation 202 (13). My own ruling of March 27, 1962 and the ruling of Mr. Speaker Wood of October 24th, 1961, both of which were sustained on appeal. The debate will continue on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Snedker: — Now what, Mr. Speaker, can we speak on the whole motion?

Mr. Speaker: — No.

Mr. Snedker: — Just on the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: — Just on the sub-amendment.

Mr. Snedker: — Sub-amendment, I haven't seen the sub-amendment . . .

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, in connection with the resolution that is before the House at the present time and also in connection with what was said by the member for Nipawin (Mr. Perkins); he got up and as good as said that we should liquidate all our private telephone companies in the province of Saskatchewan. This is just one more indication of the desire for complete centralization of everything in the hands of the government at Regina. I forgive him personally for saying so; I don't think he knew any better. He has been so thoroughly brain-washed by the rest of the gang. That's an indication, Mr. Speaker, of what a socialist government will lead to — complete centralization of everything at the one centralized point. Centralization of the power corporation, centralization of the medical scheme, centralization of everything right down to telephone companies. You would even destroy our little locally elected telephone boards in the country. I see him snickering and laughing over there, he thinks it's a big joke. One of these days when you find that you have destroyed democracy, then you will wish you had it back and that is precisely and exactly what you are doing in our province at the present time.

Some of you may say that the local boards are a little less efficient. You know if we want democracy and self-government in Saskatchewan we have got to be prepared to make a few sacrifices for it, sacrifices in

April 3, 1962

dollars and cents sometimes, sacrifices in efficiency sometimes but I don't think there is any better way to propagate the democratic principle the principle of self-government than right in the roots of our people, right out in the country. Locally elected telephone boards are a jolly good way to do it and I suggest that if ever this government or any government at any time endeavours to centralize the entire telephone system in one city in the city of Regina, it will certainly receive my opposition and all down the line. I think the people of this province are just about sick of the bureaucracy and the centralization that is going on here.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snedker: — I think it is time to call a halt. To suggest that you centralize every local telephone company into the city of Regina, the last straw and I definitely oppose that.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I regret that the responsible minister in charge of telephones is not in his seat this evening. However, in closing debate on this motion I want to say first of all with respect to his comment, his fiery oration, suggesting that the members from Turtleford (Mr. Foley) and Melville (Mr. Gardiner) were riding shining white chargers with regard to telephone problems, that this is certainly superior to the broken down old nag that this government is riding across the way, Mr. Speaker.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foley: — After listening to his remarks this afternoon, we heard another typical reaction from this government to the many constructive suggestions that have been made by the opposition to assist the people of the province and the substitution of personal ridicule and innuendo, for facts and arguments does nothing to solve the problems of our rural people. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, how can we commend a government when after eighteen years in office there are still over thirty thousand farm homes in this province without telephone service. The minister can manipulate figures and rant all he likes but he cannot get around the fact that we have had little or no progress . . .

Mr. Speaker: — A point of order has been raised.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order, it is especially emphasized in all of the rule books that when the member is absent reflections should not be cast upon him and I think that when he said that the minister can manipulate figures all he likes, that it is not in order.

Mr. McCarthy: — That is mild compared . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — I would like to point out that on the point of order, I would suggest the point isn't well taken because it is the duty of the minister to be in his seat.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Whether it is parliamentary to say that a member manipulates figures.

Mr. Speaker: — I do believe that the point of order is fairly well taken and it is an imputation that the minister was deliberately falsifying figures which is not parliamentary.

Mr. Gardiner: — He never said falsify.

Mr. Speaker: — No I said imputation.

Mr. Gardiner: — No, no, no.

Mr. Speaker: — He said to manipulate figures and I think the member would like to clarify that.

Mr. Foley: — I certainly would, Mr. Speaker, but first of all I want to suggest that after some of the imputations made by the minister towards myself and others on this side this afternoon this remark was relatively mild, but let me go on, I am addressing this to the Minister of Mineral Resources. This afternoon the Minister of Telephones agreed with my figure of total rural revenues in 1961 of \$1,356,000, the largest amount of that being made up from long distance toll fees originating from rural areas. When it comes to the remainder of his remarks, he quoted costs to the telephone corporation of \$103 thousand in administration, \$151,746 in pole grants, \$56,002 for maintenance, \$140 thousand in other assistance, chiefly new telephone sets, for a total cost of the S.G.T. of about \$450 thousand.

April 3, 1962

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the ministers own figures, total revenues of \$1,356,000 total cost to S.G.T. in grants and other assistance, \$450,748 and if my arithmetic is correct, this leaves a net revenue of \$905,252 almost one million in net revenue. Then in almost the same breath the minister goes on to state, that the government spends a quarter of a million dollars more in its various programs than it clears from the rural companies. If that isn't manipulation of data, Mr. Speaker, then I haven't seen anything like it since I have been in this House.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — It's good arithmetic.

Mr. Foley: — It's good arithmetic and since the minister is in his seat, I want to repeat this. From his own figures and returns contained in the statements by his department he states that the total revenue derived from the rural \$1,356,000 — total costs accruing to S.G.T. \$103 thousand in administration, \$151,746 in pole grants, \$56,002 in maintenance, \$140 thousand for other assistance, which the minister stated were chiefly new telephone sets. This totals \$450,748 and if we subtract the total cost and grants paid out by S.G.T. away from the total revenues we get a difference of \$905,252 in profits to S.G.T. from the operation of the rural during the year 1961.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Surely you don't believe that.

Mr. Foley: — If that is correct, and I gather from the minister's silence that it is . . .

Hon. Mr. Williams: — It is not; it is away out.

Mr. Foley: — If that is correct from his own figures then how can he make the statement that the government spent a million dollars more in various programs than it cleared from the rural companies.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, he asked me a question, how can I make that statement. I would like to answer him.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Foley: — So, Mr. Speaker, I say then that in this matter of

statistics certainly the remarks of the minister muddied the water and did nothing to clarify the situation with respect to the rural telephone companies that are concerned. It is certainly clear from my point of view that the rurals are not receiving anything like their fair share of revenues from the total revenues accruing to the Saskatchewan Government Telephones of over \$3 million in the last fiscal year. I repeat again that according to the total revenues, \$23,143,000 total expenses of \$19 million over \$3 million in net income.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I notice that the figure of the number of actual rural telephone subscribers was bandied about quite a little bit in this debate. Since I wanted to use comparative figures between the years 1956 and 1961 I selected the only data available for that comparison and that was the total number of rural telephone subscribers listed in the minister's own report of 51,268. The hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnson) wanted to include in that figure some 7,000 non-rural subscribers to make a total of 58,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, since these were non-rural subscribers, people living in urban centres, and listed as on rurals, I didn't feel that it was realistic to include them and the minister agreed with me and he concluded also that the actual number of subscribers was about 50,907 so I am glad to see that the minister and I are within just a few hundred of each other, and I merely mention this to point out why I used that figure. I was certainly aware of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there were 7,000 non-farm subscribers on rural systems.

Now, again I say, this government has little to commend itself for with over 30,000 farms still without telephone service and with nearly 80 rural telephone companies last year receiving no grants whatsoever. I went on to say that during the debate the minister disagreed that he is suffering from an urban complex. I went on to say that rural companies were not receiving a fair share of provincial revenue. He took issue with the statement that all of the people of the province are not asked to bear an equal burden of the provincial debt. Mr. Speaker, the debt for telephones is about \$83 million with an advance in 1961 of \$7 million. We can play about with words but the minister was suggesting that the provincial debt is self-liquidating and that the people of the province, don't bear any of the burden of the \$83 million gross debt of the telephone corporation. This is an amazing statement and I suppose by the same reasoning then the people of the province have not one iota of responsibility for over one half

April 3, 1962

billion dollars of the gross debt of this province. Mr. Speaker, if they don't have any responsibility, I would certainly like to know who does. As far as I am concerned the responsibility for the repayment of the over-all gross debt of the telephone corporation rest surely and squarely on the residents of Saskatchewan, irrespective of what anyone may say, and while I hope that a good deal of this debt will be self-liquidating, nevertheless it is a very serious responsibility indeed and the point I was trying to make mainly was, that if the people of Saskatchewan are responsible for this large debt then surely every resident of the province should be entitled to receive rural telephone service.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think the hon. member is introducing new material in this debate when he introduces material from the budget debate in regard to the provincial debt.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I think if the minister reads the transcript of my remarks he will find that I made reference to the gross debt of the telephone corporation.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — If he is reading his speech that he made before, we can't accuse him of introducing new material but certainly it is repetitious.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, the minister can joke and attempt to interrupt if he likes but I feel it is a very serious matter and by that same token I have moved this resolution requesting assistance for the rural telephone companies and requesting action by this government to encourage the wide-spread formation of new rural companies to gain additional rural service.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He voted against everything like this a week or so ago.

Mr. Foley: — I was interested to note that the minister continues to defend the new telephone building expenditure of \$2½ million just as the minister of the power corporation continues to defend the fourteen storey structure presently vying on our skyline with the Hotel Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is all the

proof that I need of the urban complex, not only of the minister but of this government and the fact that more and more of the rural people are to be sold down the river and not given their fair share of provincial revenues and provincial services. I here suggested that more encouragement, more incentive, more promotion could take place with regard to a rural telephone program in this province.

Many other provinces in Canada are getting along with far less luxurious facilities for the headquarters of their utilities than is the case in this province. Certainly in one province not too far removed from us, the headquarters of a provincial utility servicing many more people than this one is getting along in an old hangar building or did so until just recently and we would cite other instances across Canada. While I recognize the need for the proper administration of provincial utilities I want to reiterate again that there must be a proper balance between investment for headquarters buildings and other types of buildings and investment for the extension of rural service whether it be telephones or what other utilities that there may be.

Now, the minister went on to agree with me that a great deal of money has been extended to the other utilities of this province He agreed that his government has spent literally millions of dollars to extend rural power and rural natural gas programs and yet having said that and agreed with that he couldn't seem to find it in him to agree that the government could do more for rural telephones. Does he suggest that they are not in the same category as power and gas? Is he suggesting that they are not as necessary as power and gas for the rural people of this province?

I was very interested in some of the remarks that the minister made to further illustrate the lack of faith that he seems to have in rural development in this country and in some cases, urban development, remarks that he made the other day concerning the future of what I consider to be one of our promising smaller cities in the province. It seems to me that unless the ministers of the crown have a sincere concern about the welfare of the whole province and not just about that element of the population who return the most revenue to the provincial treasury, certainly we cannot then have equitable administration in government for all the people. I think that this should be the aim of any responsible government, and the lack of such purpose is, I think, the heart of the problem

April 3, 1962

with regard to the providing of service and utilities to rural people.

Therefore, in concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I feel that . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) speaking or the member for Turtleford?

Mr. McFarlane: — That is the first time the member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) has spoken. It is the first time that he has been in his seat.

Mr. Foley: — In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that this government has improved its service to the rural telephone companies over the years. I am prepared to agree that the engineering service, courses for rural linemen, that the assistance in the purchasing of debentures and many of the other things which the minister mentioned have been of assistance but, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to examining what this government has done in actual expenditure, I think the record is almost a disgrace over the years. Financially their contribution has not been very great and I believe that the situation in 1961 where the Saskatchewan Telephone Corporation made almost a million dollars in revenue from the rurals, can be borne out in figures throughout the years. In the last 18 years almost without exception more revenue has accrued to S.G.T. than has been paid out in actual dollars and cents. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to request the government 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. As far as I am concerned any suggestion of commendation is slightly ridiculous.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 26

Messieurs

Lloyd	Davies	Johnson
Meakes	Willis	Perkins
Williams	Thurston	Thiessen
Blakeney	Erb	Snyder
Brockelbank	Nicholson	Stevens
Walker	Turnbull	Dahlman
Nollet	Stone	Michayluk
Kuziak	Berezowsky	Peterson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Kramer	

NAYS — 11

Messieurs

Thatcher	McFarlane	Horsman
Barrie	Gardiner	Coderre
Danielson	Foley	MacDougall
Cameron	Boldt	

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, these amendments refer to the Teachers' Superannuation Act and I would suggest to the member that the amendments proposed have been checked with both Teachers Federation and the Superannuation Commission. The amendments do involve some new money, but they are modest in their upgrading and I must confess that we perhaps didn't move as far in this direction as some of friends in the teaching profession would have liked to see us go. But nevertheless I think these represent a satisfactory adjustment in two main areas. First main one has to do with a group of teachers that enables superannuates to obtain higher teachers' pension to the age of seventy and to maintain a relatively equal income before or after the age of seventy. This was necessitated by adjustments in the old age pensions, by the federal government and we will be discussing this in detail when we come

April 3, 1962

to it in the committee of the whole.

The other one has to do with a new combination of plans. Members will recall that there are a variety of plans offered to teachers and teachers make their own selection from amongst this variety. This one has to do with a question of allowing a slightly higher single life allowance to the teacher with a reduction of about one-half of the amount to the wife with dependent husband after the death of the teacher. We will be discussing this again. The only other adjustment has to do with a matter that is referred to in the Lloydminster High School District disappeared some years ago and as I understand it, in its place a Roman Catholic High School District was organized. In order that the people that are teaching in this district can obtain the same benefits that they would have under the different organization, this type of an amendment was necessary. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend the Larger School Units Act

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Bill No. 42, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the Larger School Units Act. There is one part in here that all members will be interested in, I am sure, that is relating to the power of the minister which gives him the right to adjust boundaries of school units to the boundaries that will be determined by the municipal advisory commission. The concept here, is that the boundaries to be decided by the commission and the community, will be finalized by order in council by the government. This will be done after a very careful and thorough-going consultation and some method of appeal for the community so that we are reasonably sure that the boundaries are in the right place.

At this particular juncture in time, the Minister of Education will have the power to adjust school unit boundaries to conform to those boundaries that will have been so defined. There is one problem in this and that is that it is conceivable that there may be an area so described that never was in a school unit before. We feel that it wouldn't be quite proper to put such an area into a school unit without a vote, so to meet this sort of a situation, we will introduce a House amendment so that such an area described would have the same privileges of taking a vote to decide on its form of school-government exactly in the same way in which the people who now reside in municipalities would also vote to decide whether or not they wished to change their form of government. When I

say in exactly the same way, I don't necessarily mean the same method that will be used, but "exactly" the same in terms of principle. The principle here is that the boundaries cannot be decided by a vote. Once these boundaries are determined groups that reside within those boundaries are going to experience a different form of administration and if in this case the area totally described never has been, in a school unit, then we feel that they should have the right to so decide by a vote. We will be introducing a House amendment with this objective in mind, Mr. Speaker.

The other part of the Bill No. 42 has to do with the use of a cheque signing machine, as I recall, and the other main part has to do with amending those sections that are related and tied in with the question of school grants. This is necessary so that we could make the necessary amendment in the School Act and the other acts that are related to it in order to adjust the school grant upwards. With those explanations, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) would like to speak in this particular . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I have not yet put the motion.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, I am sorry; I'm sorry.

Mr. Gardiner: — I wonder if I could ask a question of the minister? His explanation wasn't entirely clear on the amendment that is going to be brought in and I think rather than giving this second reading that the minister should withhold it. That amendment sounds to me like a . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If you have a question, just ask it and after the question the Leader of the Opposition has indicated that he wants to ask that it be standing in committee and not be passed for second reading. If you want to ask a question . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — I don't think it should be presented unless the minister is prepared to present the bill in second reading.

Mr. McFarlane: — This is very important, I am going to ask the minister

April 3, 1962

a question, what the purpose of this thing is? He suggests there will be an amendment brought in but because this amendment is going to deal with areas in this province that are not in larger school units as he has suggested, I wonder if it wouldn't be proper before we go into second reading to have that amendment brought in for use of the members in the House? After all there is a principle here that is going to have to be debated and we are not going to have access to the informant on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — You are not asking a question, you are making a statement.

Mr. McFarlane: — No, I am asking — Mr. Speaker, I am asking if it would be possible to have the amendment brought in for the use of members on this side before we go into second reading.

Mr. Gardiner: — I would like to put a direct question to the minister with regard to his explanation and that is, if I gathered right from your remarks that areas that are not now in school units that under the amendment that you suggest that you are going to bring in to the bill, that if any portion of those areas not now in a larger unit was put into one of these new units, they would have the right under your amendment to vote or does it have to be an entire area that is now outside of the unit that has to be included in that area. I just didn't quite get the explanation on what the minister said.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — The amendment that we would propose to bring in would have to do with an area of which no part of it had been in a unit. In other words it would deal with a whole new form of school administration for the entire area. In respect to the other question, Mr. Speaker, about withholding second reading until we bring in a House amendment I don't think that is valid because it refers to a specific section. I think we introduce it at the time of third reading when we are dealing with it clause by clause.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, sometimes when we are doing second readings of bills we get discussing details of clauses in the bill. Now we have exceeded ourselves a little bit and are discussing or

endeavouring to discuss details of a clause that isn't in the bill but the minister has said that it will be introduced as a House amendment. It can't be introduced to the House except in the committee and I think that this discussion about what is going to be introduced in committee is a matter of detail, we can discuss it then, the House can throw the amendment out or change it, and deal with the bill then as finally amended on third reading.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I would indicate that the suggested change of the minister is the entire principle of this amendment and has not to do with any clause, the entire principle behind this change and that is the reason, the minister brought it up not the members on this side of the House and I would think that when he mentioned it that surely we can ask him questions about it. I just wanted to ask a supplementary question with regard to my last one. If the minister knows of any such area that might be created under the county system . . .

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — No, not at this time.

Mr. Gardiner: — I thought you wouldn't.

Mr. Speaker: — The point that was raised by the Minister of Mineral Resources is well taken that we cannot on second reading discuss details of the bill, that will be done in committee and we cannot withhold second reading. I must pose the question otherwise the minister would have the right to speak all over again, because the question would not be before the House.

Mr. Gardiner: — He didn't speak tonight, he might as well speak the next time.

Mr. Danielson: — May I ask a question? I don't want to ask any silly questions. This bill confers new power on the minister, that is correct isn't it? It confers on you as the Minister of Education a new power that you do not have at the present time, now then, what I want to know, when you stated that this power . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think that your question will be in order after I put the motion. You are coming in on the debate now.

April 3, 1962

Mr. Danielson: — Just a moment, I am not repeating anything at all, I am just pointing out that the principle of the bill is conferring new power on the minister.

Mr. Speaker: — That is part of the debate.

Mr. Danielson: — Now then . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! That is part of the debate. You will have a chance.

Mr. Danielson: — He made a statement when he said this . . . It is not a part of the debate, I am stating a fact, I am stating a condition that is right in the bill. The whole bill is nothing else than the principle conferring you new power, or more power on the minister. What I ask is this, and he doesn't have to answer it, and there is a third question before we go any farther, and that is, if I understood you correctly you said that this power would be exercised only in case where the territory is not now in an organized district, is that correct.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that we are now in the sort of jamb we are in when we start doing in the second reading what should be done in committee. I think the Minister of Mineral Resources stated quite correctly that until we give second reading and get into committee it is not in order to have the type of discussion we have had the last few minutes.

Mr. Speaker: — Those questions will be better brought up on committee of the whole or after the bill is officially before us in the House for second reading. Any question after of the minister must be just of a minor nature on what he has stated on his second reading and we cannot pursue it in debate at this time.

Debate adjourned (Mr. Thatcher).

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