

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
6th Day

Monday, February 23, 1970

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — On behalf of all the Members of the Legislature I would like to extend a warm and cordial welcome to 45 students from St. Goretti school, Saskatoon, in the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair, represented by the Member, Mr. Brockelbank, under the direction of Mr. L. Schneider, Principal and Mr. Rieger; 33 students from the Imperial school, Regina, from the constituency of Regina North East represented by the Member, Mr. Smishek, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Dean Jackman; 31 students from Weyburn Junior High school from the constituency represented by the Member for Weyburn, Mr. Pepper, under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Weinmaster; 20 students from the Indian Head school from the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, represented by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. McFarlane, under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. D. Price; 55 students from St. Matthew school, Regina, in the constituency of Regina South, represented by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant), under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Sturgeon; 31 pupils from the R. J. Davidson school in the constituency of Regina North West, represented by the Member, Mr. Whelan, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Forrest; 46 students from St. Edwards school from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair, represented by the Member, Mr. Brockelbank, under the direction of their teachers, Mrs. Lapointe and Mr. Mansfield. I am sure all Members wish to extend a very warm welcome to all of these students and to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here in our Legislature both interesting and informative and will add to their education when they take their proper places and play their parts proudly and well in the life of a free self-governing nation. We wish them the very best and a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Welfare Allowance in Northern Saskatchewan

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). In view of the statement that I gather the

Federal MPs investigating the hardship in Northern Saskatchewan have made that people are being cut off welfare even during the winter, in view of the difficult unemployment situation, I wonder if the Minister is prepared to review the cases where people have been cut off or application for assistance has been refused.

Hon. C. P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition's question, I would like to read a telegram that I directed to Dr. Howard Adams this morning, to Father John Owen and Sister Ray Steuart:

I urge you to reconsider your decision not to release the names of starving Indian and Métis people. It is inconceivable that you made no attempt to contact the Department of Welfare, the agency of Government responsible for providing assistance to needy people. It is also inconceivable to me that you would refuse to provide names so that we could investigate their needs. If there is any truth in your statement it is your duty and my responsibility to see that help and assistance are provided. Every welfare worker in Saskatchewan is ready to provide immediate service. I give you my personal assurance that the complete and absolute confidentiality of the names will be respected. No one will suffer embarrassment. I will await your reply.

And I want to say to the Members of the House, if Dr. Adams is sincere in being interested in his people, then it is time that he produced the names of these people so that action can be taken. I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no question about poverty in Canada. The Economic Council of Canada indicates that there are five million people below the poverty line. I want to say thank goodness that the Throne Speech announced that there would be another increase in the welfare allowances this year; and I want to indicate that this is the third increase in the last four years. No other government in Canada can match this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons that poverty exists in Saskatchewan is because the Socialists from 1958 to 1964 absolutely refused to increase the welfare allowances and they are very, very much behind the rest of Canada. In relation to the indication of the woman that was cut off welfare, I have asked for a report from the northern region involved. I haven't got the details yet but as soon as I receive them I will report to the House.

Mr. Lloyd: — The Minister quite obviously didn't listen to my question

or else he quite obviously did a rather feeble best to avoid answering the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking about Dr. Howard Adams. The Minister has a staff at his disposal. He should have the responsibility of finding out who is out of work and not rely on Dr. Adams. If I may repeat and perhaps rephrase my question it is this: in view of the statement, not of Dr. Adams but of some Liberal-Federal MPs, that people have been taken off welfare at this time, during the winter time, and in view of the hard situation of employment, is the Minister prepared to review the cases of those people who have in recent months been taken off welfare in those Northern Indian and Métis communities?

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the Leader of the Opposition. As soon as I receive the information about the case or cases involved I will make a report to the House. I also want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that in relation to the employment practices of the Department of Welfare there has been absolutely no change from the time that he was the Premier of this province and I will demonstrate through letters and correspondence that this is the exact condition.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can try again. Is the Minister prepared to review the cases which have been taken off welfare in recent months in those communities? And for this he does not need to rely on Dr. Adams at all. He can go to the records of his own Department. Is the Minister prepared to review at this time in view of recent statements and allegations those people who have had their welfare assistance taken away from them in recent months?

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is hard of hearing. I just indicated that I have sent for the information and the report of all cases in that region. They will be reviewed and I will make a statement to the House.

School in Prince Albert

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac). We were promised a school, if you recall, in Prince Albert some years ago to cost \$8 million, but a half of \$8 million is still better than nothing. A press statement on Saturday was given by the Minister and, I think, by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that there is going to be a \$4 million school built. Now what I would like to ask is this: first of all I will read a paragraph out of the statement and I am sure the Minister will be able to enlighten me. It said:

The Provincial Government pledged support for the

comprehensive school when it first became a public issue some time ago. However, because of the high interest rate and difficulty in selling debentures we had to back track temporarily.

I would like to ask the Government or the Minister what better rates of interest and better opportunity to get debentures have you now. Could you enlighten this Legislature, please?

Hon. J. C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member, I think we finally got a figure for that school in Prince Albert that the local people can afford to support. This has been the big thing. The first figure was \$13 million, it came down to \$8 and \$10 million, and I think the present figure is one that the taxpayers up there and the school board and everybody involved will be prepared to support. As far as interest rates and debentures are concerned, it wasn't entirely a factor of interest rates alone. The mere fact was they couldn't hope to sell their 25 per cent of the cost to raise their own local debentures. For that reason the school boards had to hold back and ask us to look again and see what could be done.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am sorry the Minister refused to answer my question. I asked what more favorable interest rates did he have now than he had four years ago when he was first contemplating the school. He hasn't answered that. However, while I am on my feet I would like to ask a supplementary question on this whole point because we are glad to hear of this announcement. It is probably a pre-election announcement, but however that may be I would like to ask this supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, whether the school boards that are interested — and I know they are interested — have committed themselves to the Government before this announcement was made.

Mr. McIsaac: — Yes, they certainly have. The school boards were with us that morning in Prince Albert and they are well aware of the plans and agree completely. There is still a good deal of leg work and local work to be done and the local ratepayers have to support a bylaw as yet. But certainly with the agreement that seemed to be evident up there in the last few weeks I think you will have no difficulty in that regard.

Mr. Berezowsky: — One more question, Mr. Speaker, just how much of the cost of this project will the taxpayers have to pay, because, according to what the Minister said, the taxpayers will have to share some of this burden. Could he tell us at this time how much they will have to pay?

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — The taxpayers will be

paying for all of it.

Mr. McIsaac: — Yes, that's right, about 75 per cent of it approximately from Provincial and Federal sources and 25 per cent of the capital cost from local sources.

Hardships in Northern Saskatchewan

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to put this question to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). In view of the controversy that seems to have arisen and the concern that has been aroused everywhere by conflicting reports about hardships in Northern Saskatchewan, would the Minister consider requesting an independent agency, the Canadian Welfare Council, to conduct a thoroughly impartial investigation into all aspects involved and have them report thereafter to this Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: — No. At the present time we are awaiting the report of the Federal Committee. We have asked each regional administrator, each welfare worker to investigate in his own area. I have not received that report as yet but I am not contemplating asking anyone else to investigate.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-In-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Heggie (Hanley) and the amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition).

Mr. G. T. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned the debate on Friday, I had welcomed the newest Member to this Assembly, the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers), who will be following me in this debate. I had also drawn attention to the increase in the rate of unemployment in recent months and I had commented on a number of very serious economic problems that are presently confronting us.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the beginning of a new decade. It is a period in our history when we as legislators of this province owe it to ourselves and to those who placed their confidence in us to pay particular attention to the direction in which we are travelling and to the priorities which have been established in recent years. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that developments over the past four or five years have caused alarm and dismay in every corner of this province. Developments in recent years, Mr. Speaker, have caused increasing numbers of people to question the wisdom of this Government in its choice of priorities at a time when the allocation of taxpayers' dollars has become a matter of extreme importance.

I believe it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that even the most faithful and optimistic Liberal would have to concede that we are presently faced with an economic recession that has not seen its equal since those pre-1944 days, when the ancestors of this Government opposite were guiding the destiny of this Province. We have had a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan slightly less than six years, Mr. Speaker, although it seems like an eternity. Conditions which we have not encountered for a good many years are again manifesting themselves, Mr. Speaker, and we are seeing old chickens coming home to roost.

Prior to 1964, Mr. Speaker, the present Premier as spokesman for the Provincial Liberal party claimed that the only ingredient necessary for instant prosperity, for exploding population, for massive industrial development, was to shed that Social Democratic Government, the CCF of that day, and to elect the free enterprise Government with W. Ross Thatcher at the helm with his steady hand. Well, Mr. Speaker, for those who took the Liberal party seriously and placed their confidence in the Liberals in 1964 and again in 1967, developments in recent years must really have come as a rude shock. Saskatchewan is presently suffering an economic slump which is affecting every sector of the province. The slowing-down process was becoming evident as early as three years ago, Mr. Speaker, and, while the difficulties which are currently plaguing the agricultural sector of our economy are a factor, there are other deep-rooted causes which have contributed in a very major way to Saskatchewan's serious economic recession. The Throne Speech which is presently under discussion, Mr. Speaker, fails to come to grips with the root causes of our problems and offers very little in the way of encouragement in the immediate future.

Only a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the Premier appeared on television after the consummation of that potash agreement between the Province of Saskatchewan and the State of New Mexico. In an effort to explain the actions of his Government in entering into this price-fixing agreement, Mr. Speaker, the Premier explained that the agricultural industry was, to use his words, "in a mess", and he said "the oil industry was in a mess", and he proceeded to confide in his listeners that private enterprise had made such an unholy mess of the potash industry that it had become necessary for his Government to step in and use its expertise to rescue that industry from its own destruction. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was quite a revelation to hear our Premier admit to the sorry state which we find our province in today, but perhaps what was even more revealing was to see this champion of free enterprise abandon his long-held conviction that governments should keep their socialistic fingers out of the private domain of private industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — One might very well ask, Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the Premier's theory of supply and demand with free competitive enterprise representing the panacea for determining

what the fair market price of a commodity should be. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of the Government in entering into this questionable arrangement will be doubted by very many people in spite of the Premier's rather awkward assurances last Friday. It was my impression from listening to spokesmen for the Government that one of the principal concerns of this Government was to protect the industry so that jobs would be secure. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the net result has been the very opposite. The International Minerals and Chemical Corporation at Esterhazy has already reduced its employees by 100 people. This lay-off has been directly attributed to the prorationing requirements which have been established. For those 100 people who are without work and without any prospect for the immediate future, Mr. Speaker, I expect that the prospects for them will be very bleak indeed and I think that many people will wonder, if the cure which the Premier chose to apply to the potash industry, is perhaps even more deadly than the disease. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the arrangement can be credited with at least a 50 per cent success, because the Governor of New Mexico, the Hon. David F. Cargo, has claimed, and I quote him, "I don't think there could have been any solution for this thing that worked out better for the Carlsbad area." For the Carlsbad area, Mr. Speaker. Now unfortunately, I am afraid it doesn't follow that what is good for New Mexico is necessarily good for the Province of Saskatchewan. Potash producers have already expressed concern that this Government has apparently shown more anxiety for the problems of the producer below the 49th parallel than for those closer to home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that all those who saw the Premier on television found it to be a very sobering experience. The Premier, however, has no monopoly on the crepe-hanging department. Just a few weeks after the Premier's performance the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) appeared on television in an effort to offer an explanation for the Provincial White Paper of December, 1969, which outlined Saskatchewan's financial and economic position. The Provincial Treasurer for one reason or another, Mr. Speaker, just wasn't his usual witty and charming self. In fact he was a picture of gloom and despair and he conceded that things were really tough in Saskatchewan at the moment but the long-term outlook was good. And he encouraged us to be patient with him and his Liberal colleagues. "Why," the Provincial Treasurer said, "we have good land, the best farmers in the world, we have lots of potash and oil in the ground, and in the southeast corner of the province we have large reserves of lignite coal in the ground." Now, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that most of us were aware of these facts without the Provincial Treasurer taking us into his confidence. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the same statement of fact could have been made in the darkest days of the depression years.

For some reason which escapes me, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer seems to be quite enchanted with this new

discovery of his, because according to The Leader Post of January 27th, he repeated the performance in Melville where he is reported to have assured his audience that the farm land, the potash and the coal are still there. The Leader Post says he told his audience, "Don't lose faith, don't sell your province short." Now, Mr. Speaker, the news release didn't say so specifically, but I gather that Mr. Steuart was talking to a group of Liberals because those of us in our political party, Mr. Speaker, have never sold our province short. We have never lost faith in our province, nor do we need the Provincial Treasurer to give us any assurance as to the long-range prospects. We have some plans of our own which we propose to put into action just as soon as a general election provides us with the opportunity to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, one can't help but feel a little remorse for the poor old Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). He inherited the Treasury portfolio from the Premier when the old Liberal hot rod was only hitting on three cylinders. Now, Mr. Speaker, the lights have gone out and the vehicle is in the ditch, but the Provincial Treasurer, poor old Davey, finds it necessary to repeat assurances that things are fundamentally O.K., despite his own frightened and desperate appearance. He reminds us, Mr. Speaker, of the fellow who fell from the top of a tall building, and, as he rapidly passed the sixth floor window on the way down, shouted out, "I'm alright yet." Well, it certainly is a chore, Mr. Speaker, to attempt to conjure up a good and sufficient reason for supporting the Government on this 1970 Throne Speech. Its record of performance is so barren and inept that I suspect that there are a large number on the back benches opposite who will quarrel with their conscience before they vote for this document; but, of course, Mr. Speaker, vote for it they must.

There simply is no area of activity to which this Government can point with pride. Retail sales are down by 8.5 per cent. Taxes are at an all-time high, with municipal taxes having already passed the point of confiscation. Hospital workers are being obliged to work for wages that make social aid look attractive. Capital investment has dropped by 10.5 per cent in 1969. A thousand people a month are leaving the province. Dr. Riddell says that the University is in real financial difficulty because budgets have been inadequate for the past three years. During 1970, Mr. Speaker, we will see more school children packed into classrooms to meet the Government's dictated 25 to 1 proclamation.

It really isn't any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier chooses to launch an attack on his Federal Liberal colleagues on a regular basis in order to direct attention away from the deplorable mess that has been created here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — When all else fails, Mr. Speaker, the Premier can be relied upon to use his latest diversionary manoeuvre and

suggest that the West may decide to separate from Confederation if their needs are not recognized by Ottawa. It seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) was making some real genuine excuses for the Premier when he spoke last Wednesday. Now I don't know if the Premier is serious in his remarks about separating from the rest of Canada or not. I believe, however, that the matter was summarized quite well by Bruce Hutchison in his column in *The Leader Post* of December 11, 1969, when he said:

Mr. Trudeau need not worry, I think, about the lunatic fringe, the remnant of the imaginary Wild West, which begins to talk of separation from Canada, since that fringe is as narrow as it is noisy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I expect, Mr. Speaker, that there can be a large number of gauges which can be used to measure how well or how poorly we are progressing in terms of growth and development. The problem today is to find one which offers some optimistic assurance for the immediate future. I'm not at all certain that population growth is the best measure of development or prosperity, but it must be remembered that it was a favorite device used by Members who sit opposite when they were sitting on this side of the House. In spite of the fact that the population loss in Saskatchewan was brought to a halt in 1947, the Premier and his colleagues made much of the fact that our growth was less spectacular than that of some other provinces. I know that all Members who sit opposite will recall how the then Leader of the Opposition used to repeat with monotonous regularity, "Never has there been such an exodus of people since Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt." You don't hear it very much any more, Mr. Speaker. But if that was the Premier's assessment at that buoyant and prosperous time in our history, I truly wonder how he would describe the situation today, with people leaving Saskatchewan at a rate that has not been seen since the year of Our Lord, 1943. Never have there been so few opportunities for our young people in my memory nor in the memory of most of us in this Assembly. More and more of our well-educated youngsters are obliged to look elsewhere for work after we have provided them with elementary, secondary and post-secondary education. Saskatchewan taxpayers are bearing the burden of educating these young people and our sister provinces are reaping the rewards.

Members will also remember another favorite and often repeated saying of the Premier when he was in opposition. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) mentioned this the other day and it bears repeating. He used to say, "Our two principal exports are wheat and people." Then, with this preamble, he would go on to say that, if Saskatchewan people would elect a Liberal Government here and in Ottawa, things would undoubtedly change. And by Jove, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was 50 per cent right again, because as soon as we got a Liberal Government in Ottawa and one in Saskatchewan we quit exporting wheat but we are presently exporting people at a rate that is extremely

alarming.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — You know, if it is possible, Mr. Speaker, by some magic to influence all of the people who have left the province since the Liberals took office in 1964 to return next year, then the success of “Homecoming ’71” is assured. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics gives some extremely discouraging figures in connection with our population decline. Our population as of October 1, 1969 had dropped to 956,000, back to the level where it stood in 1966. From June 1, 1964 to October 1, 1969, all Liberal years, we had a natural increase of births over deaths of over 75,000, but our recorded population rose by a mere 14,000 which means that 62,000 people, Mr. Speaker, left our province since the Liberals took office. What is more serious, is the fact that the exodus of people is escalating with DBS figures indicating that over 6,000 people fled the province during the past 12 months.

Plainly, Mr. Speaker, the hoax that the Government invented, when it promised 80,000 new jobs during its first four years in office, has been a bitter pill for many Saskatchewan people, and especially our youth who accepted that promise in good faith, and supported this Government in large numbers in 1964. These same young people have every right to view this Government in job creation has been a disappointing failure and has resulted in the loss of many thousands of well-trained minds and skilful hands.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it would be unfair and unkind to suggest that all of Saskatchewan’s economic woes are the fault of the Government opposite, although modesty has never prevented them from taking full credit for any good or popular development which took place during their term of office. However, in the field of public health and in the provision of health services this Government has failed and it has failed in a deliberate and a calculated manner. The fact that Saskatchewan no longer holds its pre-eminent position in health care among the Canadian provinces can be directly attributed to the neglect of the Government offices and more especially to the two men who have at different times held the health portfolio. Prominent people from outside of Saskatchewan have taken note of this change in emphasis concerning health care since this Government assumed office in 1964. In The Leader Post of October 6, 1969 Dr. C. F. Culling, a pathologist at the University of British Columbia, warned that our province was losing its lead in health care. The news item quotes him as saying:

This has to be a tragedy. Saskatchewan led the way in Canada, but now it decides that because of the dollar, it cannot afford to treat some people.

He went on to say:

There is a brain drain when austerity programs are started in Saskatchewan could lose as much as 10 per cent of her best medical people.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the present Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) must bear the responsibility for desecrating a mental health plan which had no equal on this continent. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, other Canadian provinces have caught up and overtaken us with the help of some of our best-trained psychiatric personnel which this Government has been exporting at a frightening rate. I trust that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) will remember, when his estimates are before us that only half of that \$2 million suggested by Dr. Frazier to rebuild and repair the mental health plan has been voted to this date. We expect that the other monies will be forthcoming.

I didn't intend to repeat arguments today concerning the Government's adamant position with respect to the deterrent charges on doctors' services or on hospital care, Mr. Speaker. The Government knows full well what our position is on that matter and it will discover the sentiment of the Saskatchewan people in due course.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I do want to take this opportunity to raise the question about the application of these deterrent charges on outpatient physiotherapy services as they were announced by the Minister last September.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, one must question either the wisdom or the courage of the Minister of Health in imposing these charges on a group of people who are in no way instrumental in initiating the service. Once again, Mr. Speaker, that patient is referred by his doctor to the physiotherapist and it is the doctor who determines when treatment will be terminated.

I believe it becomes necessary to ask the Minister again whether it is his purpose to use these charges to restrict the number of people using the service, or is it because of some stubborn and dogmatic notion that these charges must be placed on the needy and, in many cases, on elderly people on a fixed pension. The Minister will remember a brief presented to him by representatives of the Moose Jaw Community Care Program, which indicated that 86 per cent of home-care patients receiving physiotherapy were suffering from long-term illness and require frequent treatment. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, 35 per cent of these people were not eligible for welfare, yet they earn less than \$3,000 a year.

I wish the Minister would consider carefully and justify to this House, or at least to his conscience, the case of a gentleman who has suffered a stroke and who is gradually

recovering from partial paralysis on one side of his body. He received physiotherapy treatments five times a week, Monday through Friday, at \$1.50 a visit – \$7.50 a week – \$30 a month to be paid for out of an old age pension cheque. Or consider, if you will, a case of another elderly constituent of mine who is recovering from a broken hip and is paying for this regular visit out of his not too generous old age pension cheque on a regular long-term basis.

In some respects, Mr. Speaker, this charge on the sick is even more hideous than the one previously levied on medical and hospital services because of the complete absence of opportunity for the patient to abuse the plan in any way, and more especially because the elderly will be the group which will be most greatly affected.

There is little comfort to be derived, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister's \$180 maximum charge with a refund going to the patient who pays in excess of that amount in any given year. The Department will apparently make a refund for overpayment in July, or within six months after the end of the calendar year. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Minister must be aware that in a number of cases of serious illness – I'm thinking especially in terms of terminal cancer cases – the patient will in many cases be deceased when the Minister gets around to making the rebate. This is clearly an effort, Mr. Speaker, to put a patch on a leaky old inner tube, an act which was motivated by a need to mend political fences, but which has provided no solution to a serious social problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have run out of time before I have run out of material. I can assure you that there is nothing in the Throne Speech, or in the performance of this Government, to warrant my support or confidence. Accordingly I will be supporting the amendment and voting against the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. N. E. Byers (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to join my colleagues and the other Members of this House as the newly elected Member for the constituency of Kelvington.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — May I add a word of appreciation for the personal welcome accorded to me on my arrival here by all Members. It was not my good fortune, Mr. Speaker, to serve in this House under the former Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Hanbidge. To the Saskatchewan people he was the symbol of a scholar and a statesman who brought dignity and grace to his office and I join with a multitude of Saskatchewan people in wishing him a long and happy retirement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to add my personal congratulations and those of my constituents, to His Honour Dr. Stephen Worobetz on his appointment as Lieutenant Governor for Saskatchewan. As he assumes this high office our prayers go with him, for we are confident that he too will discharge his duties with dignity and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the privilege to serve the people of Saskatchewan in this Legislature is one granted to very few people. It is my intention as a Member to carry out the responsibilities that accompany that privilege to you, to this House, to my constituents and to the people of Saskatchewan.

I am conscious of the fact that your office, Mr. Speaker, which you have filled with dignity and fairness, is among the more demanding tasks in this House. Since I am one who prefers to conduct business in an orderly environment, it is my hope that my presence here does not add appreciably to your work-load during sessions of this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — At the outset of my remarks, permit me, Mr. Speaker, to express my thanks again to the people of Kelvington constituency who gave me a substantial majority to serve them in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — I want to assure my constituents that I shall endeavor to carry out my duties and responsibilities to them to the best of my ability. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that that commitment is not an easy one. Over the years our constituency has been represented in this Legislature by some very capable people. Many Members of this House will recall Peter Howe, who sat in this House as the CCF MLA from 1938 to 1960 – a period of 22 years.

Some Hon. Members: —

Mr. Byers: — His warm heart and his abiding concern for people are difficult to equal. I am pleased to report to this House that Peter Howe is still enjoying very good health and following both Provincial and Federal affairs with a keen interest. He, in turn, you will recall was followed by Mr. Cliff Peterson, who served as the CCF MLA from 1960 to 1964. Mr. Peterson certainly represented the hopes and ideals of rural Saskatchewan people. That he was a Member of this House when such progressive legislation as medicare was introduced is living testimony of his ideals. I know that many Members welcomed, as I did, his presence at the official opening a few days ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge favourably Mr. Bjarnason's contribution to his constituents and to this House. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that any man who enters public life does so with some desire to serve his fellow men. As a result of Mr. Bjarnason's efforts the people of my constituency enjoy some facilities and services previously not available. These are well known and I commend him now for his work.

I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is my intention as a Member of this Legislature to attempt to render to my constituents the kind of service to which they are normally accustomed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Speaker, I believe there are some facts worth placing before this Legislature concerning the Kelvington by-election. The New Democratic vote in Kelvington increased from 2,432 to 3,135 between 1967 and 1969.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — That's an increase of over 700 votes in less than two years. That should indicate to some of the Members opposite, some of whom I understand sit in this House with razor-slim majorities, the rate at which Saskatchewan people are abandoning the Saskatchewan Liberal party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Excluding the Advance Poll vote, the New Democratic party had a majority in all but eight of the 41 polls. And I want to assure the Members opposite that we'll be going out for a majority in them the next time round.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — For over a month our country was virtually overrun with Cabinet Ministers, Liberal backbenchers and Liberal party organizers. The Premier could have called a caucus meeting on any given day without any Liberal MLA travelling too far to make up a quorum.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — The question that people frequently asked was:

why were Cabinet Ministers, when there were such pressing problems to be solved at the Provincial level, able to abandon their offices in the capital city, day after day, to drive about the country soliciting votes for a government whose majority would not be severely endangered even in defeat?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Little wonder that the Liberal party had to send in the Chief Electoral Officer to direct the votes and the Highway Traffic officials to direct the traffic.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the people in my constituency are good-natured folks. They really didn't expect the Saskatchewan Liberal party to lose its shirt in Kelvington without a good fight. But I don't want to hear any Liberals running around Saskatchewan saying that the people of Kelvington voted without having the facts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Speaker, the people of Kelvington were literally swamped with election literature. They were the best politically informed people in the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this House and to the people of Saskatchewan some of the Liberal party propaganda that was circulated in the Kelvington constituency prior to the by-election and presumably paid for from the public purse. I regret that I may not have in my possession copies of all the literature circulated in this manner. But all were printed either by the Queen's Printer or by the Government Information Service. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, each publication was circulated through the mails to every householder in the Kelvington riding. Now these are certainly not samples of election literature that a New Democratic party candidate or a Conservative candidate would circulate in massive quantities. The publications, Mr. Speaker, are as follows:

On February 18, 1969, copies of the Budget Speech delivered by the Hon. D. G. Steuart to every home in the Kelvington riding; February 21, 1969, the Estates Tax speech of the Hon. W. Ross Thatcher; March 5, 1969, the Indian and Métis Bill, Speech of the Hon. Ross Thatcher; and on March 17, 1969, the International Wheat Prices, speech of the Hon. W. Ross Thatcher; received about March 28, 1969, Saskatchewan Today, published by the Government Information Services. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly willing to table these if the Members opposite have not seen them. I really have no further use for them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — But I think it is an accepted fact, in Saskatchewan politics, Mr. Speaker, each political party pays its own election bills. I accuse the Saskatchewan Liberal party of spending thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money for pure political purposes in the Kelvington constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — And I challenge them to apologize to the people of Saskatchewan for this gross and deliberate misuse of public funds.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment upon a few specific problems and government programs which affect Kelvington constituency. As my time is limited today, this is not to be interpreted as a complete list or a penetrating analysis of the problems in my constituency. The people of Kelvington constituency have certainly benefited from many public programs which were started and financially assisted by the former CCF Government.

The grid road program, rural electrification program, school construction programs, water and sewer programs for towns, villages and farms have strengthened our communities and made life more meaningful, attractive and pleasant for thousands of rural Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — The existence of these government-sponsored programs over the years has had a stabilizing effect upon our provincial economy. They have provided jobs for our workers and additional businesses for our retail men. It is true that the present Government has continued, often reluctantly, many of these programs. But I believe it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that under the present Liberal Government in Saskatchewan there has been a marked slow-down and frequently a total shut-down of publicly sponsored programs which benefit rural Saskatchewan communities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — The farmers and the townspeople can rightfully claim to be the forgotten people of this Government. This fact in itself is one reason why the true unemployment rate in Saskatchewan has now reached 7.5 per cent, the highest unemployment rate in all the Prairie Provinces.

I want now to comment briefly on the Premier's announcement last Friday that the Government plans to prime the provincial pump through a program of public projects. Our party has repeatedly urged this Government to institute a massive Provincial public works program in cooperation with the municipal governments so as to alleviate the current chronic unemployment crisis in the current recession. The effects of the current recession are more severe because of this Government's refusal to take action at an earlier date. We on this side of the House have been rightfully critical of this Government's failure to take meaningful and positive action to provide job-creating employment, alien though this idea is to this Government's philosophy. Its announcement Friday is an open admission that it has been derelict in its duties and oblivious to the needs of the Saskatchewan people, plunging deeper and deeper into the current recession.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Meanwhile the unemployment rate soars upwards. Thousands of Saskatchewan people, left jobless, have migrated to Alberta and British Columbia. Hundreds of others have sought a new life in the land of new hope — Manitoba.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, and the hope of our depressed people that this Government, having at last admitted and recognized its failures to combat unemployment, will pursue this program with vigor and honesty. This province can ill-afford a further loss of workers, business and professional people because this Government has let them down and denied them their right to develop their potential and to give their talents to this great province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Speaker, our people have strong reservations that this Government plans instant action to lift them from the current recession. This Government's past record of performance for instant action is not a good record. Promises of instant tax reductions and instant loans to young farmers were soon forgotten once it obtained a mandate to govern. Are we to believe now that it has reformed? Mr. Speaker, my concern is that this Government will not act quickly and adequately in a justifiable manner.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — The Premier stated last Friday that the engineers and the architects would be put to work immediately to draft plans for this shelf of public works. The spring construction

season will soon be upon us. Our labor force, farmers, and business enterprises have been caught in the grips of the current recession for the past 18 months. Many of our people have been in a state of depression ever since this Government took office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Speaker, I say that this Government's failure to have construction plans ready and contracts awarded for the beginning of the normal construction season is unpardonable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — My plea to this Government is that it proceed now and without further delay. It is my hope that this program will provide employment, not only for the architects and engineers, but also for the carpenters, the plumbers, truckers, bricklayers and mechanics and, yes, to our farmers with mountains of unsold grain, who are wondering where their next dollar is coming from. If this Government fails to act now, the people of Saskatchewan will have precious little to remember it by, for it is soon to go into involuntary retirement by public consent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — I say act now. You owe the people of Saskatchewan that much.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of some of the Ministers to a few projects which require attention in the Kelvington constituency. Last Friday, the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan), presented a rather lengthy list of claims for his constituency. I stand to be corrected, but I thought that some of his requests were planks in his 1964 constituency program.

A few years ago, the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation announced a three-year program to bring natural gas to smaller communities. In that program no communities in Kelvington constituency were designated areas to be served by natural gas. There are within Kelvington constituency a number of villages which would welcome natural gas service, and I invite the Minister in charge of the SPC to include the interested communities in the new program.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no great rush by this Government to include grid roads carrying a high volume of traffic into the provincial highway system in my constituency. The main connecting link between the two largest centres in my constituency — and I'm sure most of the Members have travelled over this many, many times — is the grid road between Foam Lake and Kelvington. It is true that this Government reluctantly included a 10-mile

stretch of this road within the highway system, but only on the eve of a by-election. Much of this grid road was built in the early years of the grid road program. Some portions were not built to full grid standards. This grid road carries a high volume of farm, tourist and commercial traffic. I call on the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) to give consideration to including all this forty-mile stretch within the provincial highway system, and further that he give consideration to including the portion between Foam Lake and Fishing Lake within the resort highway program.

I had the opportunity to attend last fall with the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) the official opening of the new Kelvington Hospital. The people of Kelvington and district are certainly to be commended for their considerable contribution toward this new hospital. There is considerable interest in the district to proceed now with a nursing home to service this area. I bring to the attention of the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) that a local committee has been organized to promote this project. It is my plea that the Minister of Welfare give his consideration and assistance to this necessary and worthwhile project. I want to assure the Minister that he will receive my whole-hearted co-operation and assistance in this nursing home project.

Mr. Speaker, this is by no means a complete list of requests of needs for my constituency. Time does not permit me to discuss a more detailed list. But I will during the Session be discussing some of the other problems with the respective Ministers.

I have welcomed, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to take part in this Debate. I realize there are many other problems affecting my constituency and the Province of Saskatchewan on which I would like to have commented. I will of course have the opportunity to bring these up in subsequent debates. I want to thank the Members on both sides of the House for their attention and courtesy. It is evident that I will not support the motion regarding the Speech from the Throne but that I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park University): — Mr. Speaker, to start with I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder in this Debate for the very fine job they have done and I would like to add my welcome to those of the other Members in the House to the new Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers). Certainly I had hoped to be able to congratulate him on his maiden speech but I must say that I will have to withdraw this at this time because of the tone and the content and the innuendoes that were there. I must say they are hardly becoming of a maiden speech in the traditions of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — And I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to extend my sympathy to the three old stalwarts on the opposite side of the House who have been so rudely pushed to the backbenches. I must say that this is a great display of gratitude from their famous Leader. It certainly is a great thing to be belittled in front of your colleagues in this way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about the diversification that we have in the province today, about the benefits we have enjoyed through the achievement of this diversification and the sound base that it gives us at this very critical time in our history.

Quite often in the past few months we have seen some very discouraging articles written, particularly in our newspapers, and these are written in such a pessimistic manner about the economic conditions in our province that a great deal of damage can be done, if we were to take these too seriously. And if we should start to think in a pessimistic way as a total body of people, then there is no question about it we will simply destroy ourselves with a mental attitude that is completely unnecessary. It makes me think of the group of people who just a few years ago declared that the end of the world was coming and that the only place they would survive would be Sooke in British Columbia on Vancouver Island. Well, their day of doom of course has come and gone sometime ago now and the world has survived reasonably well in the meantime. It seems that we will always have some people who enjoy living in an atmosphere of despair and not the least of these, Mr. Speaker, are the Members who sit opposite.

No one can deny of course that we have our troubles and certainly they are not minor ones. They are quite serious, but at the same time because we as a people have had the foresight and good fortune to achieve a great deal of diversification in our economy, I say we should not be overly pessimistic about the future. We should be very, very optimistic and I would like to mention some of the reasons why. I'm sure that speaking generally all of us as people of Saskatchewan can be very grateful for the fact that the years of the '60s have been good years for us. Many of these years have been the most prosperous ones in our history. The city of Saskatoon is a typical example of this. Since 1964, Mr. Romanow, when the building permits jumped by \$10 million, they have never been below \$35 million and in one year they exceeded \$57 million. I should have marked down here what they were in the days of your government. These have been fabulous years and I think we should remember that a very large amount of this money has been spent in the establishment of a diversified economy which will give us a base for the future years ahead that will be our economic salvation. I would suggest that a real measure of our success as a people in the 1970s will depend on an optimistic

and a dynamic outlook for the ten years of this next decade. We are on a very sound base indeed compared to what we were ten years ago and this is why we should be optimistic about our future. In counting our blessings I think we must recognize the benefits of diversification in this province.

Our Liberal Government has accomplished many of its objectives in helping people of this province to diversify in every direction possible. The effort can be seen in every department of government and it is this base that we have established that will see us over the rough spots of the immediate future and will account for a full bloom of prosperity in the 1970s.

When we review what has taken place in our economy we are naturally inclined to start with agriculture. It is easy for many of us here to recall the early days before the 1930s when the great success of our agriculture was due mostly to the grace of God and good, hard work. Then this success disappeared in the great drought of the 1930s and while the lesson of that decade was severe, it was a very valuable one indeed. It caused us, as a people looking for survival on this vast prairie, to realize that in order to survive we must seek out new methods and new economic bases other than those of agriculture. It prompted a great amount of very valuable research in agriculture itself with the result that farmers today are able to cope with dry years and still produce in reasonable quantities as was demonstrated in years like 1966. This research has been very highly diversified and has enabled our producers to achieve not just the conservation of moisture, but we have overcome such things as soil drifting, sawfly, rust and so on. Besides pesticides, like NDPs, we have developed . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — . . . and are using the most modern fertilizing methods – you fellows aren't too bad at that fertilizer either – and it caused us to produce not just wheat and oats and barley but flax, alfalfa, rapeseed, mustard, birdseed and so on.

And as for mixed farming it has always been an important part of our agricultural scene but now in recent years, as we have seen, the world grain markets shrink away from us. We have seen the importance of spreading this mixed farming more and more. Obviously it cannot apply to all farms but it offers a boon to a great many under the conditions that we face today.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend this present Government for having the foresight and the imagination to continually encourage the agricultural diversification and to present incentives to the farming industry in this direction.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — As a result we now have SEDCO loans for hogs, for sheep, for poultry, for feed lots and these have changed the economy of many of our farms. Both the hog and sheep population has continued on an upswing since this loan program was introduced and just recently we had the announcement of a 40 per cent increase in hog production.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — Cattle production is a similar story. Our legislation has been designed not only to relieve farmers economically but also to allow for initiative, for example, the legislation that is coming in this Session to guarantee the loans and to subsidize the interest rates for farmers wanting to expand or establish livestock operations. This Government has been doing a great many practical things to relieve the plight of our farmers and the end result points to a very highly diversified agricultural economy which over the future years will prove to be of great benefit to our people.

Agriculture, of course, while it is still our economic backbone, is no longer the only main source of our livelihood. Let's not forget to count in our blessing of diversification the oil and mineral industry, our potash, our lumber with the pulp industry and then the many secondary industries that are involved that we certainly did not have at the start of this decade.

The incentive programs of this Government have attracted capital which is creating the diversified development of our primary resources. For example, the oil and gas industry while it is not at its peak at the present time is still a major factor in the stabilization of our economy and there is every reason to look to the prospects of the future. Drilling licence figures are well up and there is no sign of the present drilling intensity slackening. Let's not discount this industry or try to describe it as being sick.

Let's look at the things that are happening like the natural gas discovery at Beacon Hill. As a result of this discovery we have a gas line being laid from Beacon Hill to Prince Albert. This is an \$8 million project and, beside the direct employment benefits of this project as a result of this line, the town of Meadow Lake gets natural gas . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — . . . the city of Prince Albert and the pulp mill are finally assured of an adequate supply of gas the year round.

Think of the many economic activities that are generated

throughout the province from happenings of this kind. One very good example is the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Their \$36 million expansion program for '69-'70 is only allowing it to keep abreast of the needs of industry in our province and its projected programs go far beyond this.

Other industries that are secondary to gas and oil benefit a great deal and are active. The 1970 program of the Trans-Canada Pipelines for Saskatchewan is \$28 million. This is a very major item. It isn't too long ago that this amount would exceed the annual building program for either Regina or Saskatoon, and by the end of this year the tax benefit to municipalities from pipelines will exceed \$1 million – and this is without any service requirements from the municipalities involved.

As we consider further how one thing affects another and sets off a chain of activity we see what is happening to the IPSCO plant here in Regina. Its present program will increase its plan by one-third and it involves the addition of a second spiral pipe machine. This expansion requires a capital expenditure of \$1 million and it will mean the employment of an additional 100 men.

These things certainly don't indicate a sick industry. Our potash industry is still a giant figure for our future wellbeing. Our present difficult situation was forecast very accurately right from the beginning by the people in the industry, and I suggest to you that we should have regard for the very bright forecast that this industry has predicted for itself for the mid-1970s.

As for hard minerals, who knows how well our exploration incentive program will pay off, but who can question its success? And again I would like to remind you of the continuous effort on the part of our Government toward the encouragement of private enterprise to open up our natural resources.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — Through the efforts of this Government diversification is improving the base of our economy throughout the entire province, not just the Prairies and not just the far North, but the middle part too where we are witnessing our timber resources being put to use with particular benefit to the people that are living in this area.

What about the Prince Albert pulp mill that was scoffed at so heartily by the Members opposite?

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey): — What about pollution?

Mr. Charlebois: — This mill is producing . . . What kind of a foolish

question is that to ask about the pollution. It has always been under control at that mill since the day it started.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — This mill is producing regularly beyond its rated capacity and its product is being sold at a good price.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Who put up the money?

An Hon. Member: — You don't even know there isn't any, Roy. Read the papers a little bit.

Mr. Charlebois: — And as we consider the way our natural resources are being put to use we must not forget the effect that this has created in our secondary industries. Here we have accomplished diversification in a very real sense indeed.

As a result of our oil, our mining and pulp, we have thriving chemical plants, mine supply houses, specialized machine shops, new and expanded metal fabricating shops and many other industries that do not depend on agriculture for their livelihood. These are businesses and industries that will play their part in the survival of our economy.

Our construction industry is certainly not facing the rosy picture it had ahead of it in the years of the late 1960s, but I think it is encouraging to note that in the city of Saskatoon there is a carry over of \$60 million worth of construction into the year of 1970. And let's not overlook the fact that the building permits there for 1970 are presently well ahead of what they were at this time in 1969. Further I think the state of retail sales must be taken into consideration as an indicator. In Saskatchewan for the year 1969 retail sales were \$1,207,881 and I think it is important to note that the forecast of the Retail Merchants Association is for sales to rise.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I think we should recognize the value of our economic diversification. I am sure we can all agree that, while the immediate road ahead does not look too smooth, our general future outlook is very bright indeed. So, I will take great pleasure when the time comes to vote in favor of the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I am taking part in this Debate because I am a wheat farmer and I am on the side of the farmer. In all the years of farming I have never seen the Wheat Board, the

Wheat Pool, and the farm organizations in a worse mess than they are today. Never in the history of the farmer have the wheat quotas and the wheat deliveries from the farm to the elevator been as low as they are today. Never in the history of the farmer have his own organizations been so guilty of misrepresenting the farmer and his welfare.

Saturday's Leader Post informs us that our wheat export sales have dropped by 31 per cent while Australia increased its export sales by 50 per cent and Argentina increased its exports by 11 per cent and the United States only dropped by 6.6 per cent. What is even worse is that our farm deliveries to the elevator have dropped by 50 per cent in the first six months of this crop year from 168 million bushels last year to only 108 million bushels this year. All this adds up to non-confidence in the setup of the present Wheat Board, particularly its personnel, the Federal Government and his own farm organizations that have led the wheat farmer to the path of destruction. The Wheat Board has done a tremendous job of storing grain and making storage payments to grain companies but not a word of criticism of the Wheat Board comes from the Socialists nor from some farm organizations. No, the moment we criticize the Wheat Board they seem to hear that we are speaking for the Grain Exchange. It is interesting to note that a good number of farmers are selling their wheat for less than during the Dirty Thirties under our present marketing setup. The wheat farmer has not been destroyed yet and he can easily be saved from destruction if the Federal Minister (Mr. Lang) will just clean up the present Wheat Board and put some hard-nosed, business-like farmers to sell wheat, barley and oats.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The present Wheat Board regulations are making it difficult for the farmer to operate under, but Otto Lang says, "You are going to operate under the present regulations or you will be prosecuted and charged." The Wheat Pool and the United Farmers encourage him to go along and give the farmer heck. Well, I agree that regulations must be honoured but the present regulations don't work for the benefit of the farmer. So they should be changed, not tomorrow but today. Instead of moving and selling wheat the Wheat Board officials are fooling around with the farmers' permit books, having seized hundreds where a mere technicality is involved and projecting in the eyes of the public that the farmer in Saskatchewan, the elevator agents, the implement dealers that have taken wheat in trade, the feedlot owners and the feedmills, are all crooks.

Mr. Speaker, I aim to say a few things about the changes that, I believe the majority of farmers would like to see made, but first I would like to comment on a few things that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said the other day.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we have a Premier

of Saskatchewan that at times has a fight with the Federal Government with some results.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) need not concern himself with the differences of the Liberal party here in Saskatchewan and the Federal Liberals. It is no secret that he had to move his young rebels to his leadership to the front benches to keep peace in his family. I just wonder if those fine gentlemen can hear us from over here. I wonder if Mr. Willis can hear me from 'way out there. Let the Leader of the Opposition pluck the boulders out of his eyes before he comes to pick the slivers out of ours.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The other day the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said that the barter deals are a sham. He criticized the Premier for making these barter deals and he quoted from the Western Producer which apparently agrees with him. Let's look at what the Leader of the Opposition had to say as reported in the Star Phoenix of August 23rd, 1969, regarding barter sales. The headlines read:

Lloyd wants Federal action on wheat bartering plans.

The article is as follows:

Federal action to support Premier Thatcher's proposal to barter wheat for Japanese goods was urged by W. S. Lloyd, Provincial NDP Leader.

And commenting on the barter idea Mr. Lloyd said:

I am pleased to see the Premier promoting a good socialistic type proposal.

Now he calls it a sham. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is somewhat disturbed and I suggest to the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) that he should be offered some treatment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — He wants the Federal Government to inject some cash immediately to all farmers. I believe he said \$250 million. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists always have a master plan to solve the current crisis — issue them a cheque and all will be well. This is how they handled the welfare people when they were in power. They just issued them a cheque, for 20 years, until the taxpayer got fed up with this kind of solution and they were kicked out of office. And we

have now a different philosophy on welfare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Hon. Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) who was moved to the front benches now has a Resolution on the Order Paper calling for an immediate cash injection to the farmer, while at their annual convention last summer it is reported that he opposed this type of assistance. I quote from the Star Phoenix:

Mr. Messer also opposed a resolution calling for immediate cash payment of \$5 an acre to a maximum of \$2,000 to help farmers.

He opposed it. Now he's got it on the Order Paper.

An Hon. Member: — That's the price he paid to . . .

Mr. Boldt: — You know, Mr. Speaker, the word injection is somewhat repulsive to me but I can forgive the Hon. Members opposite for using it so frequently. When I watched their convention in Winnipeg last summer on television with all the hippy-type, long-haired, fuzzy thinkers as delegates, I am sure they got the full treatment and injections. And they are still not quite back from that trip.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Let's not put too much weight on the editorials of the Western Producer regarding barter deals for I can recall the first year sitting in this House when Mr. Brockelbank Senior said the Western Producer is the political arm of the CCF.

Last year Opposition Members cried blue ruin for the farmers within a few months. Well, a year has passed since the day they cried blue ruin. The United Farmers of Saskatchewan, and their leader in particular, last year organized a group of Socialists and perhaps some Communist agitators . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — . . . into one of the most shameful demonstrations that this province has ever witnessed at the time the Prime Minister was making a tour of Western Canada. If Roy Atkinson believes that spitting the Prime Minister in the face and dumping rotten wheat on his doorstep will get some action from the Federal Government, then he must be more senile than I thought at first he was.

I think it is a downright disgrace when the Premier of the Province finds it necessary to apologize to the Prime Minister on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan for actions taken by an irresponsible citizen of Saskatchewan who thinks he has the support of the majority of the people and farmers.

The action taken by the United Farmers of Saskatchewan last summer under Atkinson's direction has at least proven one thing and that is, it has proven to a good number of farmers elsewhere in Canada particularly in Quebec and the Maritimes that the Saskatchewan farmer is much better off than they are.

To demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, in a \$10,000 to \$14,000 tractor, many of them equipped with \$1,000 cabs, wasting farm fuel and labor, disturbing tourist trade, causing numerous accidents which the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office has to pay for . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — . . . and disrupting — oh, I've got the statistics — and disrupting construction in some areas for three days, certainly did not garner a great deal of sympathy elsewhere in Canada. Nor do I think was the Prime Minister too much impressed.

The farmers of Saskatchewan should re-examine the operation of the leader of the National Farmers Federation before placing too much confidence in him. It might be wise to look at how he manages his farm operations before too much trust is put in him to manage the business of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. D. G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Disaster area!

Mr. Boldt: — One need only look at the financial statement of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union to realize that he is no manager in any sense of the term.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

He keeps on telling Ottawa and Regina what to do, how to finance the farmers, when his own organization last year showed an operating deficit of \$43,959. His own organization went belly-up so he made a great plea to organize into one National Farmers Union, which was done last fall, and the assets and liabilities, mostly liabilities, of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union I imagine have been turned over to the national organization.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am keenly interested in the marketing of wheat for several reasons. First, the provincial economy is largely dependent upon the sale of wheat,

and it is obvious to every individual in Saskatchewan that our economy has been drastically reduced because of the lack of sales of our main agricultural product.

Secondly, I am still actively engaged in wheat farming and I find myself in the same position, as do most wheat farmers, of having thousands of bushels of wheat on the farm and constructing more bins to put the grain in.

The situation the wheat farmer finds himself in today, to a degree, is the responsibility of those farm organizations who seem to give advice to the Federal Government and the Wheat Board, of those responsible for the movement of grain, the two railways and the labor bosses who systematically seem to call the unions to strike when the movement of grain is so essential to the farmers' income.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I believe it would be very wise for the farmers to examine some of their so-called “sacred cows”, such as the Wheat Board, the Wheat Pool and the United Farmers of Canada organizations, to see if they have really worked for the farmer or for the benefit of their own organizations.

The Federal Minister (Mr. Lang) is optimistic about sales of wheat and I hope he's right. I hope the Wheat Board will be able to sell 550 million bushels this year. I hope they will sell 800 million bushels. If they do I am sure it can only have been done because of the severe criticism this Government, including myself, has levelled at the Wheat Board and the Government and it finally awoke from that deep slumber it was not aware it was in.

The Hon. Mr. Lang has now suggested that a farmer with wheat supplies on hand to meet next year's quotas should be better off not to seed any wheat at all. He said in fact that the farmer would make money by not seeding at all. If this is the attitude of the Federal Government and the Federal Minister (Mr. Lang), our young married couples might get the same advice from the Federal Government, “Don't raise any children; there are enough in the world as it is.”

When nation upon nation is starving our direction should be to sell wheat to them with the utmost speed and at a price they can afford to pay.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Certain changes in marketing and shipping of the grain have now apparently taken place. We have the “block system”. We have been told of the Russian and Chinese wheat sales. We are told that we can expect 550 million bushel sales this crop

year. Yet the marketing of wheat from the farm to the elevator to the terminals has never been in a greater mess. We are 50 per cent below last year and this is what counts.

Some Hon. Members: — Liberals!

Mr. Boldt: — In essence the Wheat Board controls the sales and the delivery of wheat, oats and barley, also the delivery but not the sale of rye, flax, rapeseed and other grains, although small, that are produced by the Western farmer. This situation has existed for more than two decades. Farmers in general up to a few years ago whole-heartedly supported the Wheat Board and no one dared ever to criticize it. To many farmers it was regarded as a "sacred cow". As long as there was no real competition the Wheat Board had no trouble selling wheat. Today many farmers, including myself, are very critical of the Wheat Board. I believe that the Wheat Board under its present methods has utterly failed the Western farmer and I intend to prove it.

The Wheat Board could be compared to a Crown corporation where it has the monopoly of the three major grains. In my humble opinion it has not pursued sound salesmanship and has let a good number of sales of wheat, oats and barley, slip through its fingers with the result that we have lost markets to other exporting nations.

I have been criticized by the Wheat Pool and the Western Producer for making this statement claiming that it isn't true. Well, Mr. Runciman of the United Farmers says it's true, and I quote him from an item in the Country Guide of October 19th, 1969 issue, and he says this:

I believe we have lost a lot of feed grain sales to United States corn because our prices haven't reacted fast enough and similarly we have lost malting barley sales for the want of a few cents, said Mr. Runciman.

Let's look at how the Wheat Board was able to compete with the United States corn imports to Eastern Canada. In 1955 imports of corn to Canada, mostly from the United States, were 3 1/2 million bushels. By 1967, the import of corn from the United States to Eastern Canada had amounted to 31,740,000 bushels, while the Saskatchewan farmer was not able to sell his barley because the Wheat Board would not lower its price to be competitive.

The farmer should ask himself: could it be that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was enjoying this kind of trade because it was receiving one cent a bushel per month or 12 cents per bushel per year to store this barley. Now that the farmer is in a real crisis the Wheat Board finally had enough sense to reduce the price of barley and our export sales have jumped from 3 million bushels to over 13 million bushels from the August to December period over last year, and our deliveries to

the Wheat Board have about doubled for the same period as compared to last year.

But the folly of it all is that the farm organizations asked the Wheat Board not to lower its price. Today it has to be lowered and some barley already has a 12 to 15 cent storage charge against it, which of course goes to the elevator companies. This is what some farm leaders and some farmers and some politicians call real sound, orderly marketing. I call it real orderly messes, and no head of the Wheat Board can regain my confidence after having permitted these things to happen.

We are now being told by those in charge of the Wheat Board that the Wheat Board is now pursuing a course of action foreign to it a few months ago. This is a sure indication that it has been in default for a good long time.

We have had major wheat surpluses since 1957. If a diligent sales promotion had been attempted our wheat surplus could have been reduced by possibly 500 million bushels.

But the Wheat Board might argue that the Government and farm organizations asked it to adhere to a certain price, but it failed in advising them that this was not practical and today it has proven to be nonsense. It is reducing the price today without the consent of the farm organizations and it is getting away with it, and I personally approve of it.

It would appear to me that the Wheat Board is run by some diehard bureaucrats who just like to throw their weight around without any consideration for the farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Liberals, Liberals!

Mr. Boldt: — At the beginning of the 1969-70 crop year the Wheat Board announced that farmers would not be able to over-deliver their quota for gristing purposes and had it not been for this Government fighting for the privilege, I doubt whether the Wheat Board would have agreed to this concession. Surely the farmers are harder up than they were a year ago, but apparently the Wheat Board doesn't think so, or gives the lame excuse that every farmer who gristed grain is a potential crook.

It also announced last fall that Prairie farmers would not be able to over-deliver their quotas to purchase registered seed. Here, too, it has given in after vigorous protest but not to the full extent and privilege of a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I remember about 1957, when the farmers were asking for cash advances on farm-stored grain. The Minister in charge of the Wheat Board at that time, the late Hon. C. D. Howe, was advised by the Wheat Board that advances on farm-stored grain were impractical and impossible to administer. Well, when

the Conservatives were elected they told the Wheat Board to make advances and I have never heard of any administrative difficulties.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — This advice of the Wheat Board in 1957 is perhaps one of the main reasons the Federal Liberals have been unable to elect members from Western Canada. The irony of this advice is even more apparent when we realize that this crop year the Federal Liberals have increased advances from \$3,000 to \$6,000, and MacNamara has not said that it would be an administrative impossibility. The Wheat Board is definitely in a rut and it appears that the Federal Government is unable to make it change. The farmer should ask himself . . .

Mr. G. R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — You should . . .

Mr. Boldt: — . . . and the Member from Shellbrook – whom I would have put on welfare a long time ago, I don't consider him a farmer – but if he would listen he might smarten up. The farmer should ask himself: why is it that he can only deliver to one delivery point? This is the case of almost every farmer except in isolated cases where the farmer has land in two or more localities.

During the war years when permit and ration books were quite numerous, individuals could buy his sugar, liquor or butter in any locale just as long as he had the coupons to compensate for his purchases. Alternate delivery points would be to the farmers' advantage particularly today when the Wheat Pool and line companies are selling out to one another, leaving only one company at one delivery point. Why doesn't the Wheat Pool, which claims 60 per cent farm membership, ask for this privilege? No, it dare not because it might lose some elevator storage payments. I maintain that the farmer has been brainwashed by his own organization and by the Wheat Board, and today he is realizing the hard facts of life – and they are painful.

Why is it that the Wheat Board is so dogmatic about opening quotas? It has been the policy that quotas would only be opened on Mondays. I suppose Monday was the only day the controller got to his office. The opening of a quota in midweek just before last Christmas, was to my knowledge, the first time a quota was opened on a day other than a Monday – except during the last week of a crop year-end. I hope that my criticism of its past record during the last few months has brought about this change and that farmers may expect quotas to open in midweek as room is available.

Now let's look at the quota system in general and see if the Wheat Board and farm organizations are really interested in what is fair and just to the wheat farmer. Can the Wheat Board

justify the fact that a wheat farmer on the Regina or Rosetown wheat land, where land prices are high and mixed farming is not desirable – nor should it be encouraged – should have the same delivery quota as a farmer on lighter land where mixed farming is practical and desirable? The unfairness of the quota system as it exists today is that the farmer in the dairy business or on light land can still sell just as much wheat as can the wheat farmer in the Regina and Rosetown wheat lands.

The quota system must be re-adjusted to take some of the unfairness out of it. Then there would be less bootlegging of grain from the good wheat areas into the permit books of the mixed farmer, who at times seems to have room in his permit book. Why didn't the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union or the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool work out a better method than to maintain that the Wheat Board has done nothing wrong? It was good in 1947 and it therefore surely must be good in 1970.

No, these organizations have looked after themselves very well. They made sure that the executive members got the best pay in the country; the field staff and secretaries were well paid. They made sure that the elevators were filled in order to draw the maximum storage payments, and for that reason not too concerned if the local elevator received boxcars or not. But they forgot one man, Mr. Speaker, and that was the wheat farmer.

The Wheat Board and the Federal Government in its wisdom decided many years ago that licensed grain companies should be paid for grain storage for every bushel they held in excess of some 178 million bushels of grain. I have no doubt in my mind that these storage payments are the root of most of the problems of moving grain. If I, as a farmer, were paid one cent per bushel or 12 cents per bushel for the wheat in storage on my farm, I doubt whether I would want to deliver my wheat. That would be a real good pension plan for me and so it is for the grain companies.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, where is the incentive to move grain? I suggest that a premium should perhaps be paid for every bushel moved rather than payment on storage to the elevator company. And why should the farmer not receive storage for his grain rather than the huge grain company? We often have heard that the middleman is the root of the high cost of the product. Why not do away with the middleman and give the storage to the farmer where it rightfully belongs? This is done in the United States. Why not here?

Then let's look at another of the present irresponsible policies supported by the farm organization and the Wheat Board. This policy on grain storage was one of the platforms or one of the articles in our brief that the Premier brought to the Federal Government. But the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the Wheat Pool of Saskatchewan voted against storage of grain to the farmer. The Prairies is one region and we are all Canadians, yet when it comes to hauling grain to my farm in Alberta from my farm in Saskatchewan I become a criminal. Many

farmers find themselves in such a situation, but this Wheat Board policy is apparently being endorsed by the Saskatchewan farm organization.

Here again a Saskatchewan farmer having a feed lot in Alberta must first sell his wheat to the Wheat Board and then buy from the Wheat Board in order to get grain for his livestock. Let's do away with this middleman – the Wheat Board in this instance – and save the farmer about 30 to 40 cents per bushel. This, too, was recommended by the Premier at last week's Conference. But this too, was turned down by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and it was turned down by the Wheat Pool of Saskatchewan. Yet the Federal Minister and the Wheat Board are going to get tougher and prosecute. This action, again, is being endorsed by the Saskatchewan farm organizations including the Wheat Pool, and they are urging the Federal Minister to get tougher and prosecute.

The present quota system is not endorsed by the majority of farmers. If it were, they would respect the Wheat Board regulations. But as it is today, wheat farmers are bootlegging grain, the implement dealers are involved, the elevator agents and maybe a good number of other business firms.

In some areas, I am told, 90 per cent of the farmers have at one time or another overstepped the regulations. This is a sure indication that the farmers are fed up to their ears with the present Wheat Board regulations and the Wheat Board didn't have the courage when they overstepped these regulations to convict, to prosecute and charge the offenders.

As I said at the beginning, the Wheat Board is not entirely to blame for the wheat crisis. The farm organizations must shoulder a good deal of the responsibility.

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey): — How about the Government?

Mr. Boldt: — Oh, you always talk about the Government. Let's talk about our own organization. They have on many occasions insisted to the Wheat Board and to the Federal Government that the price of wheat be set at \$1.95 1/2 per bushel. They practically handcuffed the Wheat Board so that there was no room for flexibility, price-wise. I want to tell this House that the laborer is a lot worse off asking \$3 or \$4 an hour with no job than if he were working for \$2.50 an hour.

If the farmer had received an average yield of 15 bushels an acre over the past ten years, at \$2 per bushel our bins would be empty and we farmers would be quite happy with our returns. However, the Good Lord has blessed us in the past few years with twice as many bushels. In some cases three times as many bushels. Surely farmers will agree, and the organization should agree, that, if I receive 15 bushels an acre at \$2 per bushel, I will gross \$30 per acre, and if on the other

hand, I get 30 bushels per acre I should be willing to sell for less than \$2 per bushel and still realize well over \$30 an acre. Here again the farm organizations say No. I'd like to sell my wheat for \$1 per bushel but they say No, you can't do this. If farmers are bootlegging their wheat today for as low as 30 cents a bushel – which they are – a price of \$1 per bushel would look mighty good to them. But our farm organizations, the Wheat Board and some politicians think otherwise and our huge surplus is part of their own doing. The surpluses are growing while more people are starving in the world than ever before.

A two-price system might be the answer to help the smaller farmer stay in business, but a two-price system, I believe, must be implemented with acreage control or more farmers will be raising more wheat than ever before.

My third criticism must be levelled at the railroads and the labor unions. I believe it is inexcusable for the railroads not to be able to deliver wheat when and where needed. Whether this is the fault of the Wheat Board or the railways is hard for me to assess, but I think it is just not tolerable for a farmer to accept the fact that grain is not available at the ports, when sales are made and ships are waiting and leaving ports for lack of the right quality of grain. The Block System apparently doesn't get grain moving any faster than the previous system.

The railways, more or less, still operate on the basis of 1905. Unit trains of any given grade of grain certainly are a possibility. Here again, I see every day freight trains loaded, maybe with No. 1 wheat, I am not sure, but they have also hooked on cars of oil, potash, motor cars, farm machinery, stopping at every siding, because this is the way it was done in 1905 and we dare not change.

Again I must caution . . .

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — CPR.

Mr. Boldt: — CNR. You had better wake up. Again I must caution the farmer that here he is partly to blame for the slowness of grain shipments from the country elevators. If the farmers want to maintain our 800 plus delivery points in Saskatchewan, then we should perhaps not be too critical of the railways in the handling of grain. Efficiencies would come about automatically if fewer delivery points were established.

I want to point out here that the Wheat Board, although not a Crown corporation but a very close sister of it, and the Canadian National Railways, a Crown corporation operated by the Federal Government, have real difficulty in co-ordinating their forces to give prompt service. The two railway systems must be told by the Government what their responsibilities to the wheat farmer are and made to honor them, because the farmer will not

tolerate these lame excuses that boxcars, right grades, or ships are not available and lose sales because of it.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the labor unions, representing the railways, the longshoremen, the dock workers, plus many others, have hampered the movement of grain. Not a year seems to pass by but the NDP and the unions get together preventing the movement of grain. This has cost the farmers of Saskatchewan the sale of millions of bushels of grain throughout the years. It appears to be a semi-annual fight, and I am convinced that the average citizen of Canada is concerned as to what will eventually come to pass, if strikes are allowed to continue as they have in the past, forcing to a degree, an increase for our products. Surely there must be some other solution. If the Federal and Provincial Governments want to keep the cost of living down there must be some other way of negotiating settlements.

This is one area that I believe must receive top priority in any government. In order that every citizen may participate in holding prices down a Prices and Trade Board similar to the one we had during the last war, should be considered, together with anti-strike legislation. I am telling you that, if I was the Prime Minister of Canada – which I never will be – that is the first thing that I would implement and the majority of the people would support that kind of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the farmers, to the organization, that they re-examine their stand on certain issues and recommendations made to the Wheat Board and to our Government. The farm organizations are continually asking the Wheat Board to take over the sale and control of flax and rape. When we look at the Wheat Board's performance on the sale of wheat, and barley in particular, how could anyone including the NDP be so foolish as to suggest that rapeseed, flax and rye should be also given into incompetent hands?

Some farmers and their organizations have over the years suggested that the Wheat Board take over these grains. They argued 25 years ago that, if flax were sold on the open market in years of good prices, the farmers would go into flax and flood the market, with the result that the price of flax would fall out of bed. I suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that for the past 25 years farmers have been at liberty to seed all the flax they wanted in the world. They were never told to curtail it and prices have continuously been stable and good. The price of rapeseed has gone up as high as \$1 per bushel, 60 cents per bushel higher today than it was at harvest time. Farmers are receiving a good return.

Some rapeseed houses maintain today that the Wheat Board is sticking its fingers into their business, and we are losing sales because it won't allocate cars to the rapeseed houses.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that, if we want surpluses in rapeseed and flax, let's turn the sale of them over to the Wheat Board and it will twiddle away our existing market, and we will

have surpluses. May I suggest to the Federal Government that the Wheat Board's function, policies and sales be re-examined. I know that the NDP will get up immediately and say, Oh, he is talking about the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. I am doing no such a thing.

You know the NDP have a funny philosophy. They listen to their Leader and they do everything that he says. There are no other thinkers. May I suggest to the Federal Government that the Wheat Board's function, policies and sales be re-examined immediately by a group of individual, hard-nosed, businesslike wheat farmers and I hope they wouldn't be associated with farm organizations, that the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways should be told in no uncertain terms what their responsibilities are to the wheat farmer. If the past six months is an indication of their maximum efficiency, which Otto Lang says there is, I doubt very much whether the farmer will be able to deliver more than three bushels per cultivated acre. Surely to goodness it hasn't taken 26 weeks to deliver 108 million bushels. If he wants to sell 500 million bushels, that means that he has to move 450 million bushels in the next six months, where in the first six months he was only able to deliver 108. This is the crisis. I don't care how many bushels he sells to China or India, I am concerned about how many bushels are delivered from the farms to the elevators, because that is when the farmer gets paid.

The bartering of wheat should not only be encouraged by the Provincial Government but by the Federal Government as well, and that the Federal Government should trade with the nations that are willing to buy our wheat and potash from our province. Let's not have these Socialists opposite tell us that the bartering is a sham. I, as an individual wheat farmer, recommend a complete reorganization of the present Wheat Board. If this Board is to regain the respect of the Western wheat farmer it must be reorganized. It must have a new purpose. It must get rid of all its red tape and irresponsible policies such as I have mentioned. Failing this, Mr. Speaker, I see very little hope for the wheat farmer for the next three or four years.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Address-in-Reply to the Throne Speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this traditional Debate on the Speech from the Throne I first want to apologize for a bad cold. Also, the first thing that I really want to do is congratulate the Hon. Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) first of all in that great victory on the last May 25th, but more so for his maiden address in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — All of us who have gone through it know that a maiden address is not the easiest thing in the world to do. I think that he came through with flying colors. I feel that he made a great and real contribution to the Debate and I know that we can expect great things from him in the years ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — There is no doubt, and it was understood by all the people of Saskatchewan, that the Kelvington by-election was a repudiation of the Liberal Government that we have in Saskatchewan today. The people of Kelvington spoke. They were the only people who could speak at that time, but they spoke decisively. They wanted a New Democratic government. And I suggest that whenever this Government gets up the nerve to call an election, it will find out that this is what happens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — I want to say to the mover and the seconder that I am sorry that I missed the moving and the seconding that day. I had to be out of the House. I did read the press reports of what they said. Really I came to the conclusion, in all kindness to them, that I didn't miss too much. It seemed to me from the newspaper reports that neither one of them spent too much time on the Speech from the Throne. Neither one of them, it seemed to me, got down to the fundamental issues facing the people of Saskatchewan. Neither did they get down to any real cures for the issue. I can hardly blame them for ignoring the Speech from the Throne. After all it is a pretty sterile and dry document filled with only the same Liberal propaganda. The Speech radiated the stagnation philosophy of this Government. It is full of worn-out phrases and 18th century philosophy. It ignored the plight of agriculture and it suggests programs that will pull agriculture deeper and deeper into debt. Let me show you, Mr. Speaker, what I mean.

In the Speech from the Throne, this Government gave only four lines to the terrible situation that agriculture finds itself in at this time. It did give two lines to the encouragement of signs in the world wheat marketing. It spends 14 lines on diversification, but not one suggestion for the farmers to get cash into their pockets now. Not one suggestion to the Federal Government on the Wheat Board. Not one thing that this Government is going to do to help to get money in the pockets of the farmers for this winter and for spring operation. It had nothing to suggest on a moratorium of overdue farm bills. Nothing to suggest about large sums of money to be injected into the agricultural economy. Nothing about stabilizing industry to protect the farmer against price slumps. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that I say that it is an empty document.

I listened the other day to the Premier and I listened carefully to his remarks. Well I was disappointed. He evaded reference to asking Ottawa for large sums of money to bolster agriculture. After all there is no partial remedy that will save agriculture from complete disaster. Sure we need to be paid storage on grain on the farm but that is only a drop in the bucket. It is fine for the Hon. Otto Lang to say, "Don't grow wheat," but I ask: what are the farmers to do? I suggest that the time for advice is past; it is action that is needed. If Ottawa is not going to do anything let this Government do more than talk just about diversification.

The Premier said that he went to Ottawa to ask for money for the Saskatchewan Government. Let me tell you that is what the farmer wants – money. Lots of it and fast, otherwise it will be too late.

The state of agriculture in Touchwood, Saskatchewan and Western Canada is a national disgrace. For governments of a supposed Christian society such as Canada to use some of its citizens the way it is doing, is criminal, heartless, inhuman and heathenish. I am convinced that the Liberal Governments, both in Ottawa and Regina, don't care if there are 30 or 40 thousand farmers forced off the land in the next two or three years. Statements out of both Departments of Agriculture, talking of the drop in numbers of farmers in the years ahead, never speak with regret of this loss nor do they talk of what will happen to the displaced farmers.

You see, Mr. Speaker, if one takes the attitude that, as long as production increases, one should not worry whether it is done by less farmers, or by farm miners, or by large agri-businesses working large corporate farms, then there is only one ultimate end to farming. The end will be that farming as it is known in the 1960s and 1970 will vanish and in its place agri-business will do the farming. As I see it, this will be the end of the family farm and the end of our small farm villages and towns.

I have not heard this Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) across the way lamenting the passing of the small and medium-sized farms. Instead I hear him boasting of the large loans for hog barns, etc. I do a lot of driving around this province and I see hog barns that will house 2,000 pigs a year or more. What will this do to the average small farmer who has four or five sows? It will drive him out of the market the same way as the large turkey farms have driven out the small producers.

The Premier said the other day that the farmers should be using SEDCO more than they are. This leaves little certainty that he was referring to building large barns.

Fifteen years ago, as I drove around my constituency, most farmers' wives had from 50 to 100 turkeys. Today they have none. The large producers gobbled up the market and when they got control of the market they soon pushed the little fellow out.

The same thing happened with chickens, and mark my words, Mr. Minister, when the price of pork drops, as it certainly will, then the little producer will be pushed out. It will be the last chance for him to diversify. The large producer will then move in and corner the market. If they haven't done so already these large producers will join up with the packing houses and agri-businesses. They will then be in the position to squeeze both the consumer and the small producer.

I want to comment on this Government's diversification program. I say it is near-sighted, ill-advised and ill-timed. As one cattle farmer said to me, "I've been diversified for 22 years and I am in trouble too." He went on to point out that you can't trust a Liberal government. He reminded me that only a couple of years ago the Liberals were saying, "Grow wheat and we will sell it." I was reading recently in the Farm Journal, an American farm magazine, that cattlemen down in the United States are requesting their government to place an embargo on Canadian meat coming over the border. I want to point out to the Minister that the \$6,000 loan program has already pushed the price of female stock so high that it is doubtful whether farmers will ever get them paid for before they die, and in the meantime they will be paying high rates of interest, even though there is some government subsidization on interest.

There really would be very little difference in the population of cattle because all you would be doing is transferring one heifer from Farm A to Farm B and she isn't going to have a calf on both farms. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what this Government is really doing to assist the farmer in this time of dire consequences. Really, nothing. Is it willing to put a floor price on wheat, or beef or pork? No, yet it will do this for the potash companies. For whose good? The potash companies is the answer. The Governor of New Mexico said, "It is the best news New Mexico and the potash companies operating there have heard for a long time." I want to suggest to New Mexico, "You can bet your bottom dollar it is not good for Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — What was this Minister of Agriculture doing while all this was going on? Was he saying that the same thing should be done for agricultural products? Was he asking his Liberal friends in Ottawa to do it? Was he asking Ottawa for large sums of money to be poured into the agricultural economy to bolster that economy? Of course the answers that my friends have said is, No. If ever a man fiddled while Rose burned he did! I suggest that he should have resigned in protest at the complete thoughtlessness of both Governments. Instead, he and the Premier sit on their ivory towers having sham battles with the Federal Government. You know he reminds me of Don Quixote, that fabled soldier who went around attacking the windmills with his spear.

If it wasn't so deadly serious, this Liberal party would make me laugh. During the 1968 federal election the Federal Liberals were trying to separate themselves from the Provincial Liberals, "We're different," they cried. The year before in the 1967 election, the Provincial Liberals were trying to divorce themselves from the Federal Liberals. "We're different," they screamed. Now they are back in that same position again. The Premier jumps at that Liberal windmill again and swings a spear at the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board. Yet at the Liberal Convention last fall, in Saskatoon, the Provincial Liberal Convention, what did he say, "Oh we must not have two organizations, the Federal and the Provincial people are one, and we must work together." Mr. Premier and Mr. Members across the way, you can't have it both ways. As one of my constituents says, "A Liberal is a Liberal, is a Liberal, is a Liberal. They all act the same, they all work for the same corporations, and whenever there is Liberal Government in Ottawa and in Regina at the same time, there are sure to be tough times."

I couldn't help but think of the attacks that my hon. Friend who just sat down made on the Wheat Board. After all the Wheat Board is only the servant of the Federal Government, and it can only do what the Federal Government allows it to do under the Wheat Board Act.

I want to come back to this jousting of the Premier and the Hon. Mr. Lang. Here the Premier proved his lack of knowledge of what the farmers of Saskatchewan want. I must agree with Mr. Lang. There is need of firm administration of the Wheat Board. People of my age – and I am younger than the average age of farmers in Saskatchewan – can remember when there was no Wheat Board and we had the Grain Exchange selling our grain. They remember when wheat was sold at 22 cents a bushel, barley at 12 cents and oats at 8 cents. It was only after a Liberal government was kicked out that a Conservative government brought into being the Canadian Wheat Board. I want to suggest that the Premier has done considerable harm in his irresponsible remarks on the Wheat Board, and I include that for the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). I am not alone in this thinking. Both the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the National Farmers' Union were quick to come to the defence of the Wheat Board after the Premier's remarks. In a democracy, I suggest that the leader of a government should not imply that laws can be ignored. I am sure that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) would not like it if I were to suggest that certain regulations of the Highway Traffic Board or The Direct Sellers' Act should be ignored, and I would not blame him.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — What laws did the Premier break?

Mr. Meakes: — I don't know. I am not talking about any laws the Premier breaks. I talked about his words in which he inferred they should be ignored. I say that the farmers of Saskatchewan are entitled to an apology from the Premier. I want to make

it clear that I believe, as the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) said this afternoon, there is need for overhaul of the regulation of the Wheat Board; but until they are changed, the regulations should be adhered to. I want to suggest again that the Premier's screams and the screams of the Minister of Highways this afternoon show their philosophy is typical Liberal – Liberal philosophy of the 1930s, no Wheat Board.

I want to come back to the dilemma that our farmers are in. If I've been asked once in the last three months, I've been asked 200 times, "What shall I grow next spring?" Governments are saying, lower wheat acreage by 10 million acres. Fine, but what does the farmer grow? His granaries are full of wheat, oats and barley that he cannot sell. After all, only so much flax and rape can be grown and it is hazardous to grow when they are not under the Wheat Board. Prices can fluctuate so much. I know the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) will say, "Grow grass." Fine, but growing grass is not the whole story. Many farmers, if they are going into cattle, must buy wire, pickets, staples, hire men to build fences, dig wells, before they can raise cattle. Maybe the Minister doesn't know it. They have no money, interest rates are too high and their credit is already stretched to the limit. Most of our farmers, in my area at least, haven't sold their first bushel an acre. I realize that the Minister may be able to get along with his farm operation, but he has his salary to inject into it. Most farmers do not have this kind of income.

I want to suggest the Minister should study the report done by Hedlin, Menzies and Associates, dated April 1969, named "County of Vulcan Agricultural Survey." The Minister is always advising the farmers to go into livestock. In their report they refer to a small farm as one under 640 acres, a medium farm as one with acreage of between 640 and 1280 acres and a large farm over 1280 acres. This report deals with livestock costs and returns in the years 1965 and 1966. It points out that the year 1966 was an exceptionally good year in the area and that the increase in 1966 could become a decrease in other years. On page 35 of that report, there is a table showing livestock costs and return comparisons for the years 1965 and 1966. I would like to read those into the records. Livestock receipts on large farms 1965, \$6,423; 1966, they were \$13,306. The total livestock expenses in 1965 were \$6,944; in 1966, \$12,289. This meant that in the year 1965 the large farmer lost \$521 on his cattle and in 1966 he made \$1,081. Let us look at the medium farms. In 1965 the livestock receipts were \$4,941, their total expense for that year was \$5,665, a net loss of \$724. In 1966 the average livestock receipts for medium farms were \$5,947, the total expenses were \$6,016 leaving a net loss of \$70. Looking at small farms in 1965 the total receipts were \$4,233, total expenses were \$4,429, a net loss of \$195. In 1966 the good year the total receipts were \$5,688, the expenses were \$5,869 leaving a total loss of \$178. This table shows that even in that exceptional year the medium and small farmer lost money on his livestock operations, and in 1965 even the largest farmer lost

money. With figures like these available, this fall this brilliant Minister recommended farmers to go into livestock. Surely the Minister has advisors who knew the figures of this report, even if he didn't know himself. Perhaps he doesn't listen to them. This I don't know. I do know he should resign and go back to milking cows.

I want now to turn to the other aspect of farming, that of costs. Not only have farm products dropped in price, but the cost of everything the farmer buys for his production has risen. Here, this Government has done something, that something is to help raise those costs. In 1964 the new Premier and his little men went running around the province screaming at the top of their voices, "Taxes, taxes, taxes", "Return a Liberal Government and taxes will be reduced", "Property taxes are exorbitant." What has happened since? Everyone knows. Property taxes have climbed and climbed. If taxes were too high then, how about now? I will call as witness one whom I'm sure members across the way will not dispute, one who spoke with authority, vigor and power. On February 19, 1965, the then Provincial Treasurer, the Premier then and still Premier, brought down the first Liberal Budget. I want to quote from page 442 of Debates and Proceedings. He said, and I now quote:

The beliefs of the government that taxes in Saskatchewan are dangerously high, as compared to the rest of Canada.

Then on page 462 of that same document he said, and I quote again:

Saskatchewan's 5 per cent sales tax is working the most hardship on parents of large families; people least able to pay, including widows, old age pensioners, etc. Farmers are finding this 5 per cent levy particularly burdensome.

Very commendable statements. What have you done about it? If property taxes were too high then, dangerously high, let me tell you today they are explosive and have exploded. Property taxes since then have doubled and in some cases tripled. Ask any farmer, any property holder in any rural municipality, any village, any town, any city. They will tell you, and in no uncertain terms, what they think of Liberal promises. And then, as though this wasn't enough, Mr. Premier, for the first time in the history of Saskatchewan you put a tax on farm fuel. Taking it off now will not make any difference. Let me tell you, there aren't many farmers talking to Liberals these days. In recent months I've had dozens of Liberals tell me they are finished with both Federal and Provincial Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — They know there is only one Liberal party and that they are both on the way out. Let us take a look at the taxes taken by the Government in 1964-65 and in the year 1968-69. I will now

quote from the Financial Statements for Saskatchewan for the year ending March 31, 1969, pages 90 and 91. In 1964 the Government took in education tax over \$44 million, in 1969 \$63 million; gasoline tax in 1964 \$29, in 1969 \$46 million; individual income tax \$16 million in 1964, \$54 million in 1969; corporation tax in 1964, \$9 million; \$19 million in 1969; liquor profits in 1964 \$15.3 million, for 1969 \$22 million; in motor licences just about \$9 million in 1964, in 1969 \$13,995,000.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on all the way down the list, but all Members know to what extent this buccaneer Government has dipped its sticky fingers into the pockets of the taxpayer. Take those figures on page 91; it shows that the Government had revenues in 1964 of \$207,061,000. By the year 1969, this figure had risen to \$344,600,000, an increase of over \$137 million. That is only the difference between 1964 and 1969. Each year in between this buccaneer Government took tens of millions of dollars extra from the taxpayers of this province, and this doesn't take into consideration the rise in property taxes.

Now when we find the farmer in the worst squeeze since 1944, does this Government help them? No. It continues to take more and more money each year, and it screams to Ottawa for help. I'll say this, that the Premier should be screaming to Ottawa. It is imperative that Ottawa wakes up to the realization that the agricultural community is on the ropes, ready to fall.

But let this Government act and do something concrete to assist in this dilemma. It is not only the farmer that is in trouble. As I travel round my constituency and talk to the business men, I find that in a way they are even in more trouble than the farmers. Most of them have stuck their necks out by selling to the farmer on time. Farmers unable to sell their grain have not been able to pay for their fuel and supplies, leaving the business men holding the bag. Many of them are in deep trouble unless these two Liberal Governments get cracking and inject enormous sums of money into the agricultural economy. They are fed up to the teeth at this Don Quixote jousting at windmills. I just plead with the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture to get cracking, to quit fiddling while agriculture is sinking into the quicksand.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — This money, invested in agriculture to help it regain its health will be cheaper than letting the farmer be pushed off the farm to settle in our urban slums and be fed through social aid. Besides it will make them much happier and content.

I would like now to turn, Mr. Speaker, to another subject, and I hope the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources doesn't leave his seat because I want to talk to him. When I heard the news

that Sask-Tel was to service that area south of Foam Lake which covers some of the Touchwood constituency, I was happy. These people have been waiting for a phone for a good many years and deserve the telephone. The people concerned were happy too with the news. Let me tell the Minister in charge of Sask-Tel they are not so happy now, after having to fend with the different construction crews that came along. These people are completely fed up. Surely these crews are told they should have some consideration for other people's property. During the summer they came along with a tractor and dozer to clear the way for telephone lines straight along the fence line. Trees were chopped on to good fences, pushed into fields of grain, all in all making an awful mess. The crews assured the farmers after they had completed that the trees would be cleaned up for harvest. Several weeks later when the crops were ready to harvest the farmers had to dig the trees out of the crops themselves. After the harvest was over they had to go and fix their fences before they could turn their cattle into the stubble. This project was finished towards the end of January. Let me tell the Minister not to go into that area, I won't guarantee his safety, unless he goes incognito. Surely these crews should have some feeling for other people's property. Within the last 15 years these farmers had rural electrification and the high power line cross their property, and they say this is the first time they had so many problems with crews of such kind. I'll tell the Minister why I didn't bring this to his attention when I found out about a month ago. Shortly before this I had pointed out to the press at a meeting at my home town in Lestock what a dirty deal my village was receiving in not getting dial telephones. The Minister went into a frenzy, denying my statement and I was fearful he might have a heart attack or a mental breakdown. So I decided I better not razz him again. After all I like the Minister, but I don't want to be held responsible for his health. I like him but I don't think he is the man for the job. I just question his ability to judge facts and his ability to administer them. He released a press statement demanding apologies for my savage attack on employees of Sask-Tel. Well I am not sure whether the Minister can read or not. One thing I am sure of he didn't read my statement right through. I can assure the Minister I had no intention of apologizing, I just have no intention at all. My accusation at that time was not against the employees of Sask-Tel. They were pointed straight at this Government across the way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — The Minister can wiggle and squirm and deny and scream or do anything else, but the fact remains intact. There are only two villages between Melville and Nokomis that have not got automatic telephones. These two are Goodeve, the home of the Member from Melville, and Lestock my own village. He can make as many lame excuses as he likes. He is not going to convince any of those two towns that this is not political skulduggery.

An Hon. Member: — Why is that, Alex?

Mr. Meakes: — I am inclined to agree, you know; otherwise it is certainly a remarkable coincidence. Anyway whenever the Government gets the courage to call an election the people in those areas will show it what they think. You know especially when the then Minister of Education, the Member for Touchwood at that time, was saying automatic telephones would come in 1968. Just another broken Liberal promise in the walls of memory.

I'll leave the Hon. Minister alone for a while and I'll turn to the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I know he is getting sick of me talking about bringing natural gas to . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — . . . to my area. Each year I bring up the fact that all the towns between Melville and Nokomis have no natural gas. I make no apologies for doing this. I am convinced that this area has been discriminated against and I am happy at long last that the Hon. Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) — that I have started getting some support from him. For a long time he has been very quiet, been mute, not a peep. I want to say that I received letters from his constituency commending me for fighting for natural gas. I have come to the conclusion that the Hon. Member for Last Mountain has just had no idea what his people want. Either that or he is afraid of my hon. friend the Minister in Charge. I can assure you there is no reason to be afraid. Most of the time the Minister in Charge of the Power Corporation and I are fighting but still are good friends. The thing I regret, Mr. Minister, is that back last fall when I made that statement in my home town and issued a press statement in regard to natural gas, you were down East to a Health Convention. Seeing you were away the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) took it upon himself to answer for you. As usual he went into orbit and said a bunch of words and really said nothing. I have never seen anyone who can gargle facts like he can. I know that you, Mr. Minister, would never have got things that mixed up. I suggest if you go away again that you leave orders for no answers from the Minister of Mineral Resources. He'll just spoil things for you. Just imagine, he said that in 1966 the towns and villages from Ituna to Raymore were told by the Power Corporation there would be no natural gas along the CNR because some proposed gas line had failed to materialize. I haven't found an official of any of these towns who admits being told this. It is possible that the then MLA and Minister of Education told his Liberal executive which would explain why so few worked for him during the election of 1967. Nevertheless the people of that area deserve the convenience and the economy of natural gas, and all this bologna about being too expensive in that area is nonsense, unless I read the remarks of the Hon. Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) as meaning that it's coming soon. If it

doesn't come soon it will certainly come soon after this Government is driven out and we are put into power.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, there is one other subject that I want to deal with for just a very few minutes, and that is the subject of our Indian and Métis people, our native people.

In the past year I have watched closely the Department of Indian and Métis Affairs and I hoped that I might see some action being started to get at the fundamental problems that face our native people. I was happy to see the Saskatchewan Power Corporation bring power to the Muskowquan Reserve and I am hopeful that when this power gets in that it may help keep the children at home at nights and off the streets. I have just finished reading, "The Unjust Society," by Harold Cardinal, the Chief of the Alberta Federation of Indians. I may not agree with all he says but I suggest that we ignore him at our peril. He is the voice of the youth. I hear our young Indian friends saying many of the same things he says. I suggest that the book should be read by every Member of the Legislature if we are to avoid the pitfalls of neglect and find redress for the native people. We are going to have to start listening to them for a change, I mean to get out on the reserves, to the grass roots, see for ourselves the conditions, listen and ask questions of the Indians. Ask them for suggested cures and then get them to lead and let us help to assist them. In the first chapter of Mr. Cardinal's book he talks of the white man's attitude to our native people and I am going to quote:

It sometimes seems to Indians that Canada shows more interest in preserving its rare whooping crane than its Indians. And Canada, the Indian notes, does not ask is crane to become Canada geese. It just wants to preserve them as whooping cranes. Indians hold no grudge against the great, beautiful nearly extinct birds but we would like to know how they manage their deal. Whooping cranes can remain whooping cranes but Indians must become brown, white men. The contrast in the situation is an insult to our people. Indians have aspirations, hopes and dreams but becoming white men is not one of them.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislature, let us remember that. Let us stop trying to make them brown, white people. Let us try to help them to remain Indians and at the same time Canadian citizens, with the same opportunities, the same aspirations that we have. Our society says, and I hear them saying it, "Look we are feeding them, building homes, electrifying those homes, bringing natural gas to them. What more do they want?" In chapter 6 of "The Unjust Society" the author talks of the welfare trap. He says so eloquently what I have said for years.

The Indians do not want welfare. What Indians want is a chance to develop the resources in his home land, the Reserve. They don't want, and I agree, that they should be dragged into the larger urban society. Rather we could do much better to see that some industry is brought to the Reserve. Last year I referred to the town of Digby, North Dakota where the Bulova Watch Company has a diamond cutting factory near the Reserve. This industry provides work for nearly all the able-bodied Indians of that Reserve. Indians are no different than anyone else. They like to have a decent job, a decent living and to be respected as another citizen of our country. If we ignore those wishes then we may well be in trouble. When the Estimates for the Department of Indian and Métis Affairs come into Committee, I will have much more to say, but I do want to point out that in my opinion that we have not too long to act or else there may well be red power.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that I might go on and speak about, but as I said at the beginning I have an awful cold. I think that what you, Sir, have gathered and from what I have said I am sure this House realizes that I will not be voting for the motion but rather voting for the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A. R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, my first remarks today must be to offer congratulations to our new Lieutenant Governor, Dr. Stephen Worobetz. I am sure that his distinguished career in medicine will be continued in the office of Lieutenant Governor.

The mover and seconder of the motion must also be commended for setting a positive tone to the Government's legislative program.

I would also, at this time, like to welcome our new Member in the Legislature. I am sorry that he is not seated on this side of the House, and as mentioned we did our best. But I would wish the Member from Kelvington a very enjoyable and a rewarding stay for the short period that he will be with us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I will have a few more things to say about some of his remarks that he made earlier today because I would like to give him a little guidance before he falls too far into some of the problems on that side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — You know, Mr. Speaker, in years past, I have sometimes had the feeling — I don't know why — that Members opposite are

not paying as close attention to my remarks as would be desirable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — However, I am pleased to find that this has not been the case. Last session when I remarked that I had never seen an older or more tired group of politicians than were represented in the front row of the Opposition, I did not believe that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) would be so quick to take remedial action. But I am pleased to see that he did. I would like to congratulate the Member for Saskatchewan Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), and the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman), on their promotion to the front benches. Although you have less seniority than most other Members on that side, they have been by-passed in your favor. However, I am sure they congratulated you heartily as you cart-wheeled over them into the front benches. Little did I dream last year when I jokingly said to the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) that, if he didn't stay awake longer and make more speeches, he would be removed from the front bench. However, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) with some 15 years' seniority, the Member for Melfort-Tisdale with 18 years' seniority and eight years as a cabinet minister, have been demoted to the extreme back row in view of the contribution that they have made to this Legislature and to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I am also sorry to see that my friend from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) has been removed from the front row but not quite as far back as the other two Members. I know that this will not sit well with his constituents who were proud of their Member and had good reason to be so. Although never obtaining cabinet rank during the previous Government, he was acknowledged as a great Opposition Member by being seated in the front benches. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) if the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland is a good boy during this Session and doesn't refer to the Anglo-Rouyn Mine as a "peanut mine" or doesn't make any more disparaging remarks about the Prince Albert pulp mill, if perhaps he would reconsider re-instating him before the next session of the House. It would appear that this demotion is responsible for his change of mind regarding his political future. Last spring there appeared in the Prince Albert Herald an article "Bill Berezowsky won't retire - too young to quit." But, unfortunately, a few days ago this decision was reversed and we have in fact a little older picture showing that the NDP MLA won't run again. When the Leader of the Opposition was asked why the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland was considering retirement at this time, his remarks were, "Well, he is a little too old and he is retiring due to age." We on

this side will be sorry to see the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland go, but I suppose it is understandable when his service and contribution appear to mean so little to Members of his own party. The Liberal party I can assure you would have treated you with far more consideration if in years past you had had the wisdom to join a party that appreciates the contributions that its members make.

Mr. Romanow: — Hazen Argue.

Mr. Guy: — I am sure the Mayor of Regina (Mr. Baker), the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank), Redberry (Mr. Michayluk), Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) must find it difficult to explain to their constituents why, although still young and with more experience and seniority, they were not moved to the front benches, as there are still many more there who could be replaced. A more sensitive leader would have taken this into consideration before showing the lack of confidence by leaving them far behind. I hope this re-arrangement does not mean that my MLA from Regina South East and the others have been written off as possible leadership candidates, if and when a Leadership Convention is held.

I would also like to congratulate Cass-Beggs for his appointment to the Manitoba Hydro Commission for their NDP Government. I am sure he will be long remembered by the people of Manitoba, for his first action was to urge the 14 1/2 per cent rise in hydro rates – another example of NDP relief for the taxpayer.

I also want to congratulate Premier Schreyer today who announced that the sales tax is to be raised from five to six per cent – another example of relief for the taxpayer.

Now I would also be very remiss if I did not congratulate the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on his election as President of the National NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — This is a position of honor that I am sure will be filled by the Hon. Member with a high degree of competence. I would think it would also provide a spring board for the leadership of the National Party, should he desire it a year hence, and an opportunity to leave a sinking provincial party in a similar manner as the present Federal NDP Leader. I would suggest that his stock has gone up considerably today if you are considering betting on the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) making the Federal scene, since Douglas Fisher was defeated in his bid for the candidate for the Selkirk by-election in Manitoba.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — That's right, that's right. I would like to say a word about the Member for Moose Jaw but I was waiting for him to come back to his seat. You know it looks like history is going to repeat itself. I remember in 1964 and in 1967, the year of an election, they were saying enthusiastically, how they would welcome an election. They could hardly wait for it, but what the Members opposite forget today, as they did in those years, was that from 1960 to 1964 the Province of Saskatchewan had the best years in their history and even during this greatest period of an economic boom the people left the NDP behind. The people of Saskatchewan could not have confidence in the government of the NDP even when they were having relatively good times. So there is no danger, regardless of what Members opposite think or say, that the people of Saskatchewan would have confidence in them now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — As for the Member for Touchwood, (Mr. Meakes), after listening to his speech there is nothing to say but it is easy to see who will be the next one to be moved to the back row.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I would like to congratulate the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) for his maiden speech in this House. I listened to it with interest as I'm sure that all Members did. It appeared to me that perhaps the remaining Members of the old guard in the front row of his party listened with even more intent than we did, because if ever there was a Front Bench speech from a back bencher, it was here this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And I am sure that the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), who I understand had something to say about the moves that were contemplated earlier this year, is also considering that maybe his time will come before the next election, and maybe he should.

Now the new Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) mentioned that the Liberal Government as he saw it put out propaganda from public funds during the election campaign. Now if the Member hadn't been so new, I am sure that he would not have raised that subject in this House. It was raised once about three years ago and we have never heard it mentioned since, but I guess the Member from Kelvington was too young to know what was going on in the party before he became a member of the NDP. It is well known on the records of this House the way the NDP or the former CCF operated. At least the Liberal party, when we have information to put out, put it out through our

Information Services and we are proud for the people of Saskatchewan to receive the information that we feel they need in order to understand our programs. The Budget Debate was mentioned. Well I guess if you have watched the papers within the last few days you have found that Premier Bennett thinks that his budget speech is good enough to spread across Canada, because all you have to do is fill out an application form and he will send you one free of charge.

But how did the NDP operate? For the benefit of the Member for Kelvington and for others who may have forgotten, back in the early days when the NDP or the CCF became the Government they set up a printing company. And who owned that company? Well, T. C. Douglas, the Hon. J. H. Brockelbank, who I am pleased to see is with us today, the Leader of the Opposition today, the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis), all had shares in this company. Do you know where the money for this company came from? It came from the taxpayers of the province — \$475,000 worth. Do you know what it was used for? It was to print the Commonwealth. That's the way they put out the information. From under the table not on top of the table.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Misappropriation of funds. And that wasn't enough. They had every Crown corporation in Saskatchewan under the CCF forced to take out an advertisement in the Commonwealth in order to help pay the costs. And it is significant, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, that since you left the Government in 1964, the Commonwealth has lost money every year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now to come back to the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers). I was amazed when he stated that he would not vote in favor of the Speech from the Throne. I can't understand how a Member can change so quickly and I am sure his constituents will feel the same way. The Throne Speech was carefully thought out by the Government and was drawn up to emphasize three major points: 1. Aid to the agricultural economy. 2. Assistance to our municipalities so that they would not have to increase taxes. 3. Help for the taxpayer and special groups hard hit by inflation.

I am sure that those of us who participated in the Kelvington by-election saw and heard the platform of the candidate and his party.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Were you there?

Mr. Guy: — Oh, I was there and I heard

it, I heard it. In fact I took home some of the little programs that were handed out. But now today he is repudiating that program.

Mr. Romanow: — Get someone to read it to you.

Mr. Guy: — During the election he promised he would help the farmer. Yet he says now that he will vote against loans to farmers for breeding stock, grants for swine buildings, irrigation projects and re-seeding of land to grass. During the election he promised to help municipalities but now he tells us he has changed his mind and will vote against grants for police protection, snow removal and other municipal programs. Being a teacher, naturally he is concerned for education and he promised to increase grants to education and the University. But now that the Government is doing this, he says, “No, I’m going to vote against increased grants to education, and also free grade XII text books. I think the parents should pay for the Grade XII text books.”

During the election he promised to lower taxes and assist the less fortunate than ourselves, but now he says, “I was only fooling, I just wanted to get elected. I don’t want to see the homeowner grant increased, food and clothing increases for people under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, I don’t want increased pensions for school teachers and civil servants and I don’t want reduced bus fares for old age pensioners.” Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that our new Member falls so quickly into the same irresponsible habits that have characterized his party since its inception. That is why I am sure that his stay will be a short one, unless he reconsiders his position, stands up and is counted in favor of all the things in the Throne Speech that he promised he would support during his election campaign.

Mr. Speaker, the past year has been a year of complete irresponsibility for the NDP at a time when responsibility was needed. Because I have considerable more to say about the irresponsible statements and actions of the Leader of the Opposition and his NDP party, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:15 o’clock p.m.