

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
4th Day

Tuesday, February 9th, 1965.

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

On the Orders of the Day.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DANNY FINK RINK

Mr. Walter E. Smishek (Regina East): — I would like to draw to the attention of this assembly that Danny Fink and his colleagues, Ken Runtz, Ron Jacques, and Larry Lechner of Regina Balfour Curling Rink, yesterday won the provincial curling championship. For the information of the house I would like to draw attention that the boys are all resident within the constituency I represent. Also Balfour Tech. is within the boundaries of the constituency I represent. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend them success in the national play-offs and express the hope that they will bring the national title to Saskatchewan. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I also wish to express my sympathies to the hon. member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) that their team did not do so well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the house to the fact that we have with us in the chamber today, representatives from the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Campus, and there is a representation here of students who come under the auspices of The Debating Director at the University, and that we also have a great representation of students from overseas who are attending our University. I would like to draw particular attention to the fact that we have with us Mr. & Mrs. G.W. Harrington of Saskatoon, and with the International Students Club they are not out of place. In the city of Saskatoon, when we think of International students we think of the Harringtons, and I would like to point to their presence in particular. I would also like the house to know that Professor Anstensen is with us with a group of students. Professor Anstensen has for many years been unofficially advisor to overseas students and is this year for the first time officially in that capacity. There will be a dinner in the cafeteria at 6 o'clock tonight at which we hope all the members will be in attendance and there will be an opportunity before the dinner and throughout for members and students to meet one another. I would like the house to welcome the students in their presence here.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE FLAG OF CANADA

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Before the orders of the day I have a brief announcement that I would like to make on behalf of the government. Next Monday, February 15th, the new national flag of Canada will be dedicated in the House of Commons in Ottawa in a ceremony which will be conducted by the government of Canada. I am pleased to announce on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan that, on this same date, a dedication service will be held at the Legislative Building in Regina to mark the occasion. All members and other invited guests will receive formal invitations to this function within the next day or two. The service will be attended by His Honor the Lieutenant Governor and members of the Armed Forces, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police will be taking a full part in the program. The program will have both a religious and a patriotic flavor with representatives of the major religious denominations taking an active part. A fly past of the R.C.A.F. of Moose Jaw will be part of the morning program. Canada's new national flag will be raised in Regina and will reach the top of the flag staff at 11.00 a.m. Regina time, at exactly the same moment that the national flag will reach the top of the flag staff in the ceremony in the House of Commons in Ottawa. The public are cordially invited to attend this program and all are asked to be in their places in the rotunda of the Legislative Buildings at 9.35 Monday morning. This is another historical landmark in the life of Canadians and one with which I

believe all of us would like to be associated.

Copies of the program will be presented to all members of the legislature later in the week and a copy of the program will be carried in the papers of the province. Members of City Council, of the Judiciary, of the Cabinet and of the Legislative Assembly and representatives from many other groups will be among the guests. A representative of the student council, Regina Campus, University of Saskatchewan, will make the presentation of the flag to Premier Thatcher.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE WHEAT PRICE DEBATE

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to ask the Leader of the House, if it is his intention that we proceed with the further discussion on the adjourned debate, my motion which was adjourned by Mr. Gallagher this afternoon, at a later time.

Mr. Speaker: — Before the minister answers the question, will the house permit me to make a brief statement respecting oral questions on the orders of the day?

In using this device we are, of course, copying a very well-known procedure at Westminster, but what is perhaps not quite so well known is the fact that the British house imposes a very severe discipline on itself, including the giving of notice respecting these oral questions. Our standing orders make no provisions for oral questions and unless and until the house is willing to make such provision, it would be my hope that the practice will not develop to any extent, unless the house is prepared to exercise a self-discipline which will ensure that the asking and answering of oral questions on the orders of the day does not degenerate into disorderly debate.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what you have said and I think I agree with it very well. But, I believe that there was something on the radio news about proceeding with this debate and I think if it was alright that the public be given it, certainly I think this legislature should be given this information.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no control over what the press and radio carry and I am sure if the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), follows extremely closely the proceedings today he will have his answer in due course.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy for Address-In-Reply, seconded by Mrs. Merchant (Saskatoon City).

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would like to say is a word to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) to say how glad we are to see him back in his seat again, and we hope that he is back with good health and strength to carry on with his work.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I can assure the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that he didn't miss very much by being away yesterday but I think he would have enjoyed being here on Friday. I'm sorry he wasn't here at that time.

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — You wouldn't have gotten away . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't get away with anything. I was just taking up a question that was of urgent importance, and the legislature, I'm sorry to say didn't do anything about it.

Now, I would also like to add a word of welcome to the University students who are with us this afternoon. It has been an old, old custom for nearly twenty years that on these occasions when the Leader of the Opposition gives his speech and on the day the Premier gives his speech on the Address-In-Reply, the University students are invited to Regina to sit in on this occasion. You people are, of course, interested in politics or you wouldn't be here. You are interested in your debating forum. If you take up politics, you won't find it a particularly easy life, and sometimes it may give you ulcers, but I will say that you will always find it interesting. You will find it sometimes exciting and certainly if you have a good philosophy and good ideals and you are true to them, you will get out of that kind of a life and that kind of work a good deal of very real satisfaction in accomplishment and in the contribution that you are making to the welfare of your province and your country.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I'm sure that many of you will take up politics and will be successful and make a real contribution to your province and to your country. Yesterday, it was only a few minutes after the house adjourned when I stumbled over typewritten copies of the two speeches that were delivered this afternoon, and again I just want to mention the fact that both of these speeches were apparently all written out beforehand and read, which is contrary to the rules. I think that hon. members should seriously take notice of this. You can make better speeches if you don't try to follow a written text. It is against the rules and I don't like it being done. I hope it won't be done in the future.

It only has this advantage, of course, that you are pinned down to some of the things that you have said. For example, the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) said, "Of late years we have lost our courage". I don't believe that is true. I think that is a reflection on the people who live in this province now. I think they are just as courageous, just as strong, and just as capable as the people that lived in any day and any age in this province . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . . and particularly the young people of today are courageous. Not only are they courageous but they are adaptable. The young people of today face some very difficult problems in the world ahead of them, because of all the technological changes that are coming, and are with us in fact. Because of the dangers that exist in the world today, young people have to be courageous. They must be courageous, they are courageous, or else they would be throwing up their hands in despair in facing these situations.

I can't deal with all the remarks made by the speakers yesterday but I do want to mention one or two. The lady member for Saskatoon, (Mrs. Merchant) said "We, who are committed to the ideal of a minimum of government". This is the old policy of the Liberal party, to do as little as possible. This is to create the kind of atmosphere in which monopoly capitalism grows and blooms. This is where they take over, where they rule, where they do or do not do the things that ought to be done. This is, of course, why the Liberal government already has closed up Embury House. "Don't interfere," the minimum of interference. This is why they are shutting down the Agricultural Machinery Administration Agency. "Don't interfere, the least government is the best government". They apparently don't care about the welfare of the people who are concerned with this.

It is for the same reason and because of the same policy, the same philosophy, that they propose to dispose of the flying corporation, Saskair, instead of continuing to operate it and to give good service to the people in northern Saskatchewan. You know, if Saskair is in trouble, it is almost completely the fault of the friends of my hon. friends opposite, who are at Ottawa and who believe in cutting down on this kind of service given by a government. It is the Air Transport Board that hemmed in Saskair. It was the Air Transport Board that let unfair competition in there to take away the cream of the business, that put Saskair in trouble. These are the people that are to blame for bringing about this state of things.

This is the philosophy of the Liberal party. They believe in

capitalism which grows to monopolies. All you have to do is read the papers and watch them to see how they grow. They believe in rugged individualism, which very often turns out to be ragged individualism. Now I don't believe that man was created to be just this kind of an individualist without regard for his neighbor. Man is certainly a social being, and man at his best recognizes this, that he is of the brotherhood of man and that he is his brother's keeper, and . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . . any philosophy which says we should do the very least we can do and get away with it, in my opinion is wrong. Turning to the speech made by the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy), I again want to refer to the very, shall I say, "un-nice" re-remarks he made about the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), the Leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first Conservative that we have had in this house for over 30 years and who got elected to the legislature without degrading himself and his party by conniving with the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The only ones we have had in between were some people who couldn't get elected on their own but they had to go around with some other political party.

The member for Athabaska, (Mr. Guy) also made mention on one occasion of the Mafia, and it occurred to me afterward that in the Liberal Party across Canada there are "Guys and Guys" who are conversant to some extent with the Mafia. He talked about the promptness of calling the Hanley by-election. I commented on this yesterday but now I have the dates. I just want to mention them. In Turtleford, there was a vacancy on January 17th; the writ was issued on January 18th. In Weyburn there was a vacancy on November 7th; the writ was issued on November 8th. We never let a session go by without a constituency having representation.

Mr. Guy: — What about Prince Albert?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Prince Albert? No session went by without them having representation. The Liberals have let sessions go by on different occasions and constituencies have gone unrepresented.

Then the member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy), also mentioned 10,000 citizens gathered on the steps of the legislature. Now according to the reports, it was someplace between 2,500 and 5,000 — say for fun it was 4,000. But he said 10,000 in his printed, written speech. I think he knows better; I think he was just trying to exaggerate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that was just about as accurate as a great many other statements made by and on behalf of the Liberal party. Even the Premier gets all mixed up once in a while, and a few weeks after his election as Premier, he was interviewed by Peter McClintock on the CBC and Mr. McClintock said "Do you seriously think the CCF-NDP is a dead horse in Saskatchewan" and the Premier said "I certainly do" . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — I still do.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Then on November 25th after . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Just listen, I wish they would listen, Sir. Then on November 25th after the Hanley by-election was announced, the following paragraph appeared in the Leader Post under a Saskatoon date line:

Premier Thatcher pointedly reminded Liberals that they can't afford to be complacent and write off the CCF as political opponents.

Mr. Speaker, that is what he said before the Hanley election, what he said

after the Hanley by-election I understand wasn't printed.

I must congratulate the government on the victory they achieved last April. The Premier deserves a good deal of credit for having learned his lesson of organization of a political party in the days of his youth. He was a hard worker, a tireless worker, in the campaign and we just didn't think he was that dangerous. We got fooled, but it won't happen again.

Now, no one could ever accuse me of expecting too much from a Liberal government, but I am sorry to say that even I am disappointed. They made some bad promises, and there is an indication that they are going to keep some of the bad promises. They made some good promises and there is an indication that they are certainly not going to be in any hurry keeping the good promises. That is natural. That is the outstanding great characteristic of the Liberal party. They don't need to dream up so many promises because they can use the same one a half-dozen times, over and over again. They . . .

Mr. Guy: — Like a pulp mill?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — We will talk about pulp mills too, a little later. Just hold your horses now. I am going to talk about all the pulp mills we have got now. This government deserves high marks if they are going to be scored only on the basis of talk, because there has been lots of talk. There have been news stories about old events, about things that took place in the past. Every time there is another few barrels of oil produced, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) issues a news statement, some record broken, and so forth. Well, do you know, Mr. Speaker, ever since the Liberal government was kicked out of office in Saskatchewan in 1944, records have been broken in the production of oil every year, every month, that is why we are where we are today . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . . and they get lots of headlines. Great big headlines. Now, the Leader Post is a Saskatchewan paper, and this paper is supposed to understand something about the economy of Saskatchewan. In the Leader Post the other day was the story of a little trouble in regard to the leadership of the federal Conservative party. At the same time we had a discussion on wheat. The Conservative party got the great big headlines, wheat was put down in the corner in tiny little headlines. This is the kind of publicity, of course, that this government gets. They get lots of editorials making excuses for Liberal government action, and some of them I will refer to as I go on in my speech, Mr. Speaker.

Whenever the Premier gets in a jam, he blames it all on the Socialists. He gets up and raves about the Socialists, what they have done and so forth. I don't know why he does this because I am proud to be recognized as a Socialist. I would much prefer to be called a Socialist today rather than to be called a supporter of the present monopoly capitalistic system. Much prefer it, and I want my hon. friends to remember if they want to make me mad, call me a monopoly capitalist, I'll mad then.

The achievements of the Socialist government over the past twenty years are something to be proud of. This province was suffering from stagnation. Did you ever hear that word, Mr. Speaker? I have good evidence. Here is an editorial published in the Leader Post on November 17th, 1964. They say:

However, instead of the stagnation of 1944, our economy is forging ahead.

Our economy is forging ahead, and it is true, Mr. Speaker. It is true that in 1944 Saskatchewan was in a bad way. We had the worst highways in Canada. We had the poorest local roads. Electric power off the high-lines to the farms was almost unknown. There were a couple of hundred farms in Saskatchewan had power and that was all. If you had gone out at that time and told people living in rural Saskatchewan that they would be having all-weather gravelled roads past their places, that they would have a power line running past their places, they would not have believed you. But this all came true.

A good Liberal in my constituency was telling me one time about going moose hunting, and he said, "We flew in an aeroplane to see where the moose were hanging out". He said, "We spotted three moose, and you know what we used for a landmark, a power line in Saskatchewan, in the bush". This was country that was all but forgotten by the Liberals when they were in power.

We had the poorest educational plant of any province. We had run down schools, log schools, homemade desks that were of rough lumber and all this sort of thing. This is what we started with at that time, and our teachers were among the poorest paid in Canada. They weren't paid, a great many of them. Many of the salaries that were earned long before 1944, were paid by the government after we took over in 1944. We were very short of hospitals. We had no oil production, the total annual value of mineral production was \$22,000,000. In 1963 mineral production reached \$274,000,000 — but my, oh my, Mr. Speaker, the headlines that the present government gets to tell about the great production of minerals in Saskatchewan! This development took place before they got there.

The revenue to the province from privileges, licenses and permits, and this included resource revenue, motor license revenue, and some other small permits and licenses, in 1943-44 was \$4,700,000. In 1963-64, it was \$42,000,000, Mr. Speaker, nearly ten times as much. This government, Mr. Speaker, is coasting on the good economy of the province which was developed under the previous government over the last 20 years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I want again to refer to an editorial and a headline in the Leader Post, The editorial is dated February 5th, and it's headed:

Promising Start

The government revealed its intention to carry out the somewhat unusual feat of major taxation reductions while expenditures mainly for highways and education, are increased sharply. The buoyancy of the economy —

Man, last year we heard it was down in the dumps.

the buoyancy of the economy and the extra revenues from the development of our natural resources likely will make it possible for Premier Thatcher, as a Provincial Treasurer, to perform this legerdemain.

I looked up that word "legerdemain", and according to Websters New International Dictionary, second edition, it means, "any artful deception or trick".

There's the headline "Major tax cuts, big spending boost". This headline, Mr. Speaker, is one of the finest compliments that was ever paid to the CCF government. This headline couldn't have been here if it hadn't been for the work, the development of our resources, of our industry and our agriculture that took place while we had a CCF government. This is one of the greatest compliments that was ever paid to our government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the sad part is that this government is bent on destroying many good things. They don't seem to realize that our present economic system, monopoly capitalism or whatever you want to call it, only works at all because of pieces of socialism which have been adopted. There are all kinds of them and my hon. friends are in favor of them. The Workmen's Compensation — pure socialism, this is what it is. Unemployment Insurance — it took a long time to get that from a Liberal government. Old Age Pensions — it took a long time for them to come too. Yes, when MacKenzie King had the gun, a political gun, at his head, he came through with Old Age Pensions. Prepaid, tax-supported health services — this is a good one too, and what we've got of that, we have only because the CCF government in this province started the provincial hospitalization plan which was later adopted all across Canada.

Of course, you go back to some things that are older, publicly owned and operated education. This is socialistic. Everybody takes responsibility through their taxes for the costs of education, rather than

the rugged individual saying, "you must pay for your own education" — allowances which are paid for the unfortunate poor people and there is more that has been adopted. Now, socialism believes in humanity. Monopoly capitalism measures things in dollars. I was interested to note an editorial in the London Free Press, Ontario, reprinted in the Tisdale Recorder and it's headed: "Deciding Who Shall Live". It mentions our affluent society in this time and a situation that exists in Vancouver that may exist other centres. There is an artificial kidney machine in the General Hospital of that city for a group of patients who cannot survive without it. The very young cannot keep its connections in the blood vessels, the elderly have been eliminated because they have less to live for, so an impartial jury will literally make a life or death choice among those who need the machine, which can take care of only nine patients. It is our peculiar system of priorities that is to blame. Money for all kinds of things, but not money to buy more of these machines. We don't have our priorities right; there is a great deal of room for improvement in that respect. Socialists believe in priorities for people. Some of my hon. friends heard a lot about that, last session, and some of them made a deal of fun about it, but it is good, it is right.

As I said before though, the government took over Saskatchewan when everything was booming. You don't have to take my word as evidence. Just read the papers, you can't help but see it. Here we have the Leader Post of October 23rd, the heading: "Four Fold Increase In Assets" — "The province now holds a net asset position which amounted to more than \$33,000,000 at the end of the 1963-64 fiscal year". This is coming from a net debt position of about \$160,000,000 a while ago, or if you only want to go back ten years, the net debt was \$60,000,000. Now the net assets \$33,000,000. My hon. friends opposite used to say — "oh this is only the bookkeeping". Well, is it only the bookkeeping now? Are you telling the truth? We'll have to ask the Provincial Treasurer when he gets further into the business of the session. Here's another article: Under The Dome — written by Sterling King, January 23rd, 1965:

There is one significant thing about all of these top revenue sources, and that is they come from direct taxes. For the past ten years, they have been solid sources, growing steadily as the provincial economy grew.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that these people are coasting on the good economy, the boom in Saskatchewan that they inherited when they won the election last April. I hope they don't destroy it. Here's another one. Again it's from the Leader Post, and it is dated January 23rd. The heading is, "Oil Industry Helps Boost Province's Status". Now the Leader Post apparently never knew that before, but they suddenly discovered that the oil industry was boosting the province. In the article, they say:

In a dozen years, Saskatchewan has risen to an average daily production of 230,000 barrels per day.

and then they say:

With the new found riches in potash, base metals, chemicals and manufacturing . . .

Potash was discovered back in 1945 or 1946 when the Liberals laughed at it and made fun of it in this house. Base metals, we've known for a long time. Oil has been constantly on the increase.

Then the Premier made a foray into eastern Canada. The Leader Post of October 23rd, 1964, had a big headline: "Great Enthusiasm In East!" But then they took a little insurance on that statement, and they have a little headline up above it that says: "No Immediate Results Expected". One of the paragraphs said:

There has been a major increase in oil and gas industry activity in Saskatchewan, and Saskatchewan potash reserves stagger the imagination . . .

That isn't what the Liberals said 18 or 20 years ago. Here's another one: "More Industry Key To The Future". This is the Minister of Municipal Affairs speaking at North Battleford. The date is November 3rd:

Together with other industry, these two

developments alone, in oil and potash . . .

Both of them old, neither of them new, both of them old but new stories about them —

will have the vital effect of opening up new fields of opportunity for our young people, who might otherwise seek employment further afield.

Well let's hope that's right. Then we had a guest speaker at the Canadian Society of Laboratory Technologists. This was the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. A.C. Cameron). The date line is June 23rd, 1964:

To close the gap of economy in Saskatchewan and in other provinces, we have oil production.

He just found out last June that we had oil production in Saskatchewan. "We are in the middle of a great wheat belt!" (That's right.) "We have a fisherman's tourist paradise in the north and a large ranching area in the south". Listen, Mr. Speaker:

The biggest boom in Saskatchewan's economy came in the late 50's with the discovery of potash by an oil company drilling for oil.

Of course, potash wasn't discovered at that time. It was discovered long, long before that.

Now these are some of the things that indicate that our economy is booming and that it didn't happen just yesterday. Ever since 1944, oil production has been going up, and as I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, the total value of the mineral production in Saskatchewan has been growing. If it doesn't continue to go up, there's something the matter with the government of today.

Now there have been some comments about potash recently, quite a spread about Cominco or Consolidated Mining and Smelting and the potash at Delisle. It should be noted that Cominco came into Saskatchewan a year ago when it started construction of a \$5,000,000 chemical fertilizer plant at Regina. Now let's look at a little bit of the background in regard to potash. Potash was discovered at Unity in July, 1946, and after detailed analysis, the commercial possibilities were announced by the then Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. J.L. Phelps, in February, 1947. The Leader Post took note of Mr. Phelps announcement on February 24th when it published an editorial entitled: "Potash and Potlatch". Now this was the way the Liberal members in the legislature (there were only five in the legislature at that time) looked on this potash. They laughed at it. The Leader Post editorial quoted Mr. Phelps as saying:

The mineral is of the same relative international importance as uranium.

The Leader Post asked: "Who's kidding whom?"

Mr. Phelps, the Leader Post said, was guilty of "a surge of irresponsible enthusiasm" and he was "too much disposed to allow his enthusiasm to gallop off with his better judgement."

You see, Mr. Speaker, Consolidating Mining & Smelting came in a year ago, and took out a couple of permits, and now they have announced the go ahead. Do you know why they are going ahead in the potash mining here in Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, they are going ahead because they can't help it, if they are going to stay in the potash business. Now this is from the Financial Post:

At grades running 25 per cent to 35 per cent potassium oxide, the material compares with the best of the Carlsbad, New Mexico field running from 20 to 25 per cent and with grades 10 to 20 per cent in Germany, France and Russia, the world's other principal sources.

I have seen samples of potash that ran over forty per cent potassium oxide

and so, with this kind of ore, development by the companies that are interested in potash is inevitable.

Let us take a look at some of the Liberal promises. For one thing, they promised an early session and we didn't have any early session. They made all kinds of excuses why they couldn't have it. At one time the Premier intimated that his ministers were so green that he just wouldn't like to put them into a session right away. I don't think that was right. I think they were probably just as wise as he was. At least that wise, Mr. Speaker. Then they began to tell stories that they didn't take over in time and all this sort of thing. Well, as a matter of fact, the only comparison that we can make is, again, to compare 1944 and 1964.

In 1944, the CCF government took over on July 10th, and none of the members of the government had had experience in government before. A few of us had experience in legislature or in the House of Commons. We took over on July 10th, and on October 19th, exactly one hundred days later, we started the session of the legislature. About 80 bills were introduced at that time.

In 1964, the government took over here on May 22nd, not July 10th. From May 22nd to February 4th, the opening of this Legislature was 257 days, compared to one hundred days. So the first promise, to have an early session, they didn't keep, and there was no excuse for them not keeping it. Of course, every month they put off having the session, when they might have to keep some of their promises about reduction of taxation, they were making a lot of money. They were saving about \$1,000,000 a month by not having a session. As a result, a great many people have been disappointed. They didn't get the proposed tax reductions. Farmers have been complaining about not getting purple gas, and in the local paper every once in awhile, I have seen such items as this: "A minimum fine of twenty-five dollars and costs was levied against Frank Kapeller of Mistatim. His vehicle was also ordered impounded for seven days when he pleaded guilty to a charge of using purple gas illegally". I could read you a dozen more of them. This was the one that they were going to fix with an early session. They didn't have an early session, and a lot of people are disappointed. They will be talking to you when it comes around to the next election, too, and they will be talking in a very plain kind of language.

We were promised sales tax reductions also. We haven't got that yet either. It is still talk, still just in the Speech from the Throne. The only thing we have got so far is a tax increase, of course.

They promised to maintain and improve trade union rights and security. Here is the heading of an article from the Financial Times published in Montreal under a Regina date line: "Thatcher Liberals To Rewrite Pro-labor Trade Union Act." You can read the article and this can only mean that they are going to make this act much, much less "pro-labor" than it is now. It isn't pro-labor at all. They are going to make it more in favor of the employers. Now I noticed that it wasn't mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, I hope they have thought better of it and leave this good piece of legislation alone. I'm not sure of that. Instead, of course, on different occasions they have abused union members' rights and forgotten their own promises since they have been in office. I think with their philosophy, they probably want to see unions develop as slowly as possible.

It is interesting to note what the member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) had to say about labor, too. On page 11 of this speech he says:

The power-hungry group of labor leaders and politicians are out to feather their own nests.

These are the labor leaders that they are talking about. I am sure that the president of every labor union in Saskatchewan will be interested to know the opinion of the government. Again he says:

This problem of communication was deliberate on the part of the labor leaders. They had no desire or willingness to receive direction from the rank and file for fear that they would loose their prestige and power.

and he says that is right. He doesn't believe apparently in the presidents, vice-presidents and leaders of the trade union movement, in Saskatchewan. Then he says:

Now that you are free, get rid of your irresponsible leaders.

My hon. friends need not comment. It is just interesting to know what they think about the labor movement and the labor movement leaders.

The first thing this government did that was of much importance was to increase taxes by twenty dollars per family, ten dollars per single person. The personal tax for medical care and hospitalization is in fact a poll tax. It makes no recognition whatsoever of the ability of the people to pay. The poor family paid the increase, had to pay the increase of twenty dollars the same as the millionaires or the big ranchers. This is the kind of taxation that they believe in, to tax the poor. This is what they were doing, taxing the poor. They promised tax reduction in the Throne Speech. You see and hear:

My government believes that taxes in Saskatchewan are a burden greater than that borne by Canadians in other parts of the country.

Well, of course, that is not true. They put something into the mouth of His Honor the Lieutenant Governor that just wasn't true, when they put that in the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, there are three provinces with a higher burden of taxes than Saskatchewan, not taking into account Saskatchewan's additional services, such as medical care. These provinces are Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia. There are more people in Canada subject to a tax load higher than Saskatchewan's than there are below. So this just wasn't true at all.

As a matter of fact, this legislature, years ago, saw fit to trust the cabinet, his Honor the Lieutenant Governor and council of that day with the levying of personal taxes for hospitalization and medical care. When this government, Mr. Speaker, raised this personal tax by twenty dollars per family, when the revenues of Saskatchewan are booming, when they are bragging about the revenues from oil and all the rest of it, and when they are talking about reduction of taxes — when they then raise this tax, they are not fit to have this power. This legislature should take away from the government the power to change the rate of personal tax because they are not responsible. There was no need to raise the tax.

You don't have to take my word for it, Mr. Speaker, look at the newspapers. Here's the Star Phoenix back on January 15th, and the heading is: "Resource Revenue Climbing".

Mr. Cameron, in a press release, said revenues to the province from minerals reached a record \$35,000,000. Total revenues in 1963 were \$27,500,000 and \$23,000,000 in 1962.

I suppose the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) will get up in this house and support the idea of raising that tax twenty dollars per family on the Saskatchewan people.

Another article also from the Star Phoenix, says:

Saskatchewan Retail Sales Set All Time Record.

and it points out that Ross Walker, secretary-manager of the Retail Merchants said the 1964 totals were about \$100,000,000 higher than in 1963, or an increase of 9.48 per cent. This kind of an increase in retail sales is an indication of the kind of increase yield there is going to be from the sales tax. There was no need to impose upon the poor people of Saskatchewan, a requirement that they pay an additional twenty dollars. Another headline in the Leader Post says:

Consumers Went On Spree — Retail Sales Records Set During 1964.

This was a repetition of what was in the Saskatoon Star. The Leader Post again, on November 12th, when they were forecasting, said, the sales were supposed to be up ten per cent. Changes in the equalization formula and an increased tax abatement for the province will bring Saskatchewan an estimated \$3,500,000 more from Ottawa in the 1964-65 fiscal year.

Millions more from resources, millions more from Ottawa, millions more in yield of the sales tax in Saskatchewan, but they go out and levy twenty dollars a family on every poor family in Saskatchewan to pay for medical care. I say they should not be trusted with the responsibility of levying this tax. This legislature should take that away from them.

It is a different kind of treatment they have given the mining and oil companies. They give them better treatment than that. They have provided a three year royalty-free period for new mines. We had the provision that there would be a three year period, royalty free, for new mines, provided that they did not go beyond \$2,000,000 in net profits from mining. This meant, in effect, Mr. Speaker, that under those provisions, a new mine would be exempt from about \$250,000 in royalties.

Now, if we should get another mine like Gunnar, or like Eldorado, or like Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting — in three years one of these new mines could very well get off with \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 — some place in that range, — a large profit! Not only that but they have reduced the maximum royalty from 12 1/2 per cent of net profit to a maximum of nine per cent. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba has increased the maximum royalty to eleven per cent. This just happened the other day.

Then, what about oil? Today if oil is discovered in the Devonian Formation, 100 feet below the top of the Devonian, there would be no royalty on production from that oil field until 1970. Now, I want to see just what they are giving away here. If a new oil field were discovered and it turned out to be only as good as the Steelman field, which is a fair field, the oil companies operating it would be getting away with \$12,000,000 to \$18,000,000 in royalties. If it was as good as the Redwater field in Alberta, they would be getting away with \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 in royalties. But the poor people of Saskatchewan pay twenty dollars a family additional tax for their medical care and hospitalization.

Now, when we sat on the opposite side of the house, I remember my hon. friends, on many occasions, telling about what was happening in Alberta. So I couldn't resist just bringing this along. The Leader Post, the other day, had a headline: "Sales Net Alberta Government \$20,000,000." Why don't you have a sale of oil land here that will get \$20,000,000? What is wrong with this Government here?

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Wait.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — This is the kind of criticism they used to give to us when we sat over there. Now they will find out how it all works.

I would like for a few minutes to take a look at my own constituency. First of all, I want to comment on the new sawmill and supposed-to-be pulp mill to be built by Dumont Industries at Hudson Bay. In the first place, the Government apparently believes that sawmills grow from seeds. They've cleared some land and planted some seeds but the seeds didn't sprout. There is no sawmill built yet. Oh, they cleared some land, destroyed some nice trees, and that sort of thing. Of course, there is no more chance of this turning into a pulp mill than there is of the Premier flying, and he won't do that. There is no chance of that at all.

Now, what's the matter with these chaps, Mr. Speaker, because these are the people that knew how to get pulp mills. Let's look at some newspaper reports:

Powell River, B.C.

Expansion will cost \$90,000,000. The McMillan Bloedel and Powell River Company put \$90,000,000 expansion in pulp.

Prince Rupert, B.C.

Columbia Cellulose Company plans another \$80,000,000 mill.

The Kruger organization is to build a new mill in Italy, but none in Saskatchewan. There is a big pulp mill planned in Nova Scotia, but none in Saskatchewan. Facilities will be expanded at Vancouver — Crown Zellerbach has announced a \$20,000,000 modernization and expansion program all at

Ocean Falls and Elk Falls. Plans for pulp mills announced in Newfoundland.

Hon. David G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — How many . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Now, listen to them talk. "Fowler Refutes Capacity Fears". Fowler is the president of the Pulp Association of Canada and he says, "Any surplus capacity arising from the extensive capital expansion in the Canadian pulp and paper industry should be only temporary." So if you've got that pulp mill ready to go, let her go, it will only be a while until it will be needed. Come on, fellows, and hear from the Financial Times, Pulp and Paper, Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, Maritimes, all over — except Saskatchewan.

I know why they are not getting a pulp mill. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, have they learned yet why they're not getting a pulp mill? Maybe they will sometime. Maybe they will be able to go on and kid the people some more.

What does the Premier do for the forest industry in Saskatchewan? Well, we have a very nice forest industry at Hudson Bay — the Wizewood Plant which is utilizing a very plentiful species of trees, common poplar. It doesn't have to be high quality stuff and they're making a very good product. Now, it's true they've had some problems and they are not through all of them yet, but they are coming through. The Premier helps this by calling it a "financial fiasco". He calls it a "bankrupt company". He says someone is going to take a bad beating.

This isn't appreciated up in my country. It was published in the Hudson Bay Post Review and the manager published a statement there too. He says, "For the past eight months the company has been operating at better than the cash break-even level, due to the fact that all operating obligations of the company are met on a current basis. The only way that the company could become bankrupt would be if the Government chose to bankrupt it".

I want to know, I want the Premier to tell us whether he proposes to put this plant into bankruptcy. This plant is now working three shifts a day. They've got a market for their products. There are a lot of people who have got shares in this plant who don't appreciate this kind of remark. The Minister of Natural Resources, according to the record in the Provincial Secretary's office, had a substantial number of shares in this plant. A number of other Prince Albert people and lot of good people around Hudson Bay, scores of them have shares — and these people don't deserve to be wiped out. They had the courage to go ahead and try to develop the forest resources. Now this man, the Premier, is trying to knock them down, to take away the little they have. This is what he does to help the forest industry. This is exactly what he did with the Inter-provincial Steel and Pipe Company a few years ago. He tried to call it a bankrupt company to make its reputation bad.

In the Tisdale Recorder there was an advertisement the other day: "Sawmill for Sale". Sawmills are beginning to be put out of business by the policies of this government.

In regard to Wizewood, here is some information about that, Mr. Speaker. A group of shareholders wanted to meet the Premier in early December but he didn't see them. Maybe he was arranging some trip to Montana or North Dakota, or some place else. Before this announcement about "a financial fiasco" was made, there was no consultation with either the Board or shareholders.

The loss for the year 1964 was \$80,000 and accumulated losses to date \$364,000. That is bad. This is a big plant though. I think it can still come through. They are budgeting for a profit of over \$200,000 this year and I hope they make it. On this side, we hope they make it.

Mr. Steuart: — How many . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Now this is not the time to ditch the plywood plant at Hudson Bay. If I hear anymore about it, I will be raising Cain some more too.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there were some other things in regard to my own constituency. They failed to rebuild highway No. 23 which was on the program. The government gave no satisfaction to the request from

Porcupine Plain village for a new hospital. Instead of this, they tried to close the hospital at Arborfield, or else make the taxpayers cough up enough money to keep it operating. Then they talk about looking after local governments, about looking after the property taxpayer. I don't think the property taxpayers are going to have a very good time.

They didn't carry out any construction on the forest access road south of Armit. This road was under the Forest Access Roads Agreement with the Federal Government and the Federal Government would have paid half of the cost if it had been properly done.

We did not get very good maintenance on our local improvement district roads last summer, — some of the economy that is being put into effect! And new industry and new jobs are not coming very fast. Kick through. You know we all thought, when we got this Government, the roads would just be crowded with people coming to Saskatchewan to get the jobs. As a matter of fact, when they announced this Dumont Industries at Hudson Bay, there were a number of people came up there looking for jobs when there were no jobs.

Here is a clipping from the Tisdale Recorder. It says, "Orin Qualley, Dennis Lavent, M. Lacompte, and Vic Laguais, entrained for Prince George on Friday to work in the bush camp".

It is still going on and I expect, it will still go on, and this is a natural thing. This was supposed to be horrible when they sat over here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that. I heard a Liberal lawyer talking about the many people from my constituency who are away this winter, working in B.C. As a matter of fact, he wanted to get them for witnesses, you see, but he said they are in B.C. Now, I thought that would all be stopped, and they would all have jobs here in Saskatchewan.

There is no place where this government falls down more completely than it does in its regard for and treatment of the farmers in the Saskatchewan economy. The insult is right in the Speech from the Throne where it says that although grain production did not reach the record level of 1963 it was above average and good prices and ready markets prevailed.

I want to give a little picture of the farming industry in 1931. Thirty per cent of the population of Canada lived on farms. In 1961, years later, this was reduced to eleven per cent. Nevertheless, farm production increased. In the 1930's one farm worker fed ten to people. Now, one farm worker feeds about thirty people. But it is very important to look at the index for prices for agricultural products. I think it is true, Mr. Speaker, that no other industry has absorbed, by means of efficiency of production, more of the costs of production than this industry.

In 1951, the index for agricultural prices, the selling price reached 296. In 1964, it is down to 252, or 44 points down. On the other hand, the cost of the goods the farmers buy went up, in the same period of time, sixty-nine points. So it is no wonder that farmers scream when they see wheat prices sliding. The Liberals promised a guarantee of two dollars a bushel for wheat, and this may be certainly not enough to put the farmers on a basis with the rest of the economy. They did not come through with this promise. I don't know whether it is going to be like other promises that the Liberal -party has made . . .

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think we have a resolution on the order paper dealing with the matter that the Acting Leader of the Opposition is attempting to deal with now. I suggest that he is out of order.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I agree that I'm near the edge. I don't agree that I'm out of order but I'll leave it alone.

We have the Liberal government at Ottawa, what do they do? Free trade on cars, but just free trade on cars for manufacturers. The manufacturers get a two-price system for cars alright. The manufacturers are going to be able to import cars and parts. They are going to be able to net an additional \$50,000,000 in a year, but you won't be able to go car, Mr. Speaker, at a reduced price because of this change.

This is what we have been told.

I agree you can't always believe what a Liberal tells you. It might be wrong. Suppose the Liberals were telling the truth for once. Then you could have the situation down at North Portal, for example, where a man who lived in the United States, across the border, could buy a Canadian-made car imported into the United States, duty free, at a lower price than the farmer on this side of the border could buy the same Canadian-made car. This is the kind of a situation that is liable to arise out of this. This is the kind of help they give to manufacturer, — to big business, — and these people have done pretty well in it too.

But they propose to cure the ills of the farmer by letting him use purple gas in his farm truck that will maybe amount to about \$20 per truck. He is only losing millions, of course, and they are going to take off that mineral tax of \$4.80 per quarter section. If the farmer has his minerals rented, he gets a refund of 7/8 of that so they are going to relieve the farmer of 60 cents a year on his mineral tax. That will help to put him in good shape. They are going to take one per cent of the sales tax off. The farmer, of course, has always had exemptions, in the main, on farm implements, from this sales tax. Now they are going to take it off on fence posts, I think, and barbed wire. Of course, the farmers have to pay the \$20 more for hospitalization and medical care and it will take them quite awhile to recoup that from these other reductions. If the government keeps on with what they have been talking about it won't be very long before the farmer is paying more property tax too.

Actually the greatest good that could happen to the Canadian farmer would be to get a New Democratic Party government at Ottawa. My hon. friends meet that with guffaws.

Hon. D.T. McFarlane: — Heaven forbid!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, and heaven forbid, says the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I sat here on this side before when there was a Liberal Government acting just like they act today. They laughed when we said we were going to take over the government. We did. We were there for twenty years. My hon. friends will be lucky if they are there for two years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — As a matter of fact, neither old party has had a policy or was willing to give to the farming industry of Canada anything but crumbs, — an acreage payment of \$200. This won't put the farmer in the right position. This isn't a cure for his troubles. The cure for his troubles is to get a proper price relationship in regard to the cost of production. This is what is needed, economic justice. And here in Saskatchewan we're going to have master farmer awards to fix it all up.

Mr. W. R. Thatcher (Premier): — Are you against it?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — No. I don't care if you have master farmer awards or not. If you want to play around with it, it's alright with me. But they won't cure any of the agricultural problems in Saskatchewan.

There are some other people that are doing pretty well. For example, and these are all on this year's operations, Stelco had a net profit of \$43,000,000 compared with \$37,000,000 last year; — General Motors' dividend is up ten cents per share; — Imperial Oil earnings up 11 per cent over 1963; — International Harvester income hits a record; — Dominion Bridge's net income is up from \$1,000,000 to over \$4,000,000; — Hiram Walker, you people know that is up from \$9,000,000 to over \$10,000,000 — up a million dollars; — Jockey Club profits are up from \$1,300,000 to \$1,600,000; — Canadian Industries Limited profits are up from \$7,000,000 to \$9,000,000; — Canadian Pacific Railway profits are up from \$35,000,000 to \$43,000,000; — Crown Zellerbach of Canada profits are up from \$13,000,000 to \$15,000,000; — Dominion Foundry and Steel Company, or Dofasco, up from \$19,000,000 to \$23,000,000; — Inter-Provincial Pipeline up from \$17,000,000 to \$19,000,000; — Montreal Trust Company reports profits away up from last year; — Massey Ferguson, volume increased 13 per cent and net income 87 per cent over the previous year. So there are places where people are doing very well in Canada. I think it is time the farmer got into a position where he could do well too and where there could

be a few more farmers who could get away for a holiday and go south sometimes in the winter.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — At least as far as Montana.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Yes, at least as far as Montana.

Mr. Steuart: — Jealousy will get you nowhere.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — But there is a contrast, farm incomes decline. Just at the same time all these other items come out — "Provincial Economy Reviewed — Farm Incomes Decline". This is in the Leader Post of December 31. If any of you want to read it, certainly you can look it up.

This is the situation. The Agricultural Machinery Administration was closed down and the poor people of Saskatchewan are going to have a tax increase, not a tax reduction because the poor people who have low incomes of less than \$4,000 a year, with a family, are not going to buy enough taxable goods to recover, on one per cent, that \$20 which has been added to their taxes. Only the rich in this province will have a tax reduction. This you must put beside the big concessions which are made to mining and oil companies.

Well, let us see if there is anything in this Speech from the Throne for poor people besides the tax increases they got last fall. There is nothing about improvement to the hospitalization or medicare plan, nothing about drugs being supplied under these plans. The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart), has been arguing all over the country that we just can't afford that now. This is different from the way he talked before the election. In addition, he is trying to persuade the Federal government, Mr. Speaker, that they shouldn't go ahead with the national health plan.

Mr. Steuart: — They should or shouldn't?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Shouldn't. This is what he tries to persuade them, that they shouldn't go ahead with it.

Mr. Steuart: — Did you say that I had tried to persuade the Federal government that they should not . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I'll get the quotation and quote it because . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I've done everything in my power . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The Minister said the Federal government would be ill advised, you can make your speech later, would be ill-advised to go ahead with the implementation of the report at this time. There is headlines in the paper the other day, "No Medicare Plan Until After 1970". Well, if it comes in 1970 with the Liberal government, that will be awfully fast.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! On page 134 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Guide, citation 155, it says that it is unparliamentary for any member to use, or to utter, or to create, an imputation of false motives. I think unless the hon. member can produce, chapter and verse, the statement that he has made re the Minister of Public Health, he will have to withdraw the statement.

An Hon. Member: — Withdraw.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I certainly had no intention of any imputation like that in regard to the Minister of Public Health. We can look up the references and see actually what he has been reported to have said. Now, he may be mistaken. I may be mistaken. Maybe I'm mistaken then on this. I withdraw my imputation in regard to the member and I accept his statement that he didn't say it. It may be that the clipping will yet be produced.

Now, the Liberal party, of course, promised a national health insurance program in 1919. They are good on promises. Most of the university students won't remember that. But this was in politics a long, long time ago. None of it was willingly accepted by Liberals and never has been. They believe in the minimum amount of government. They don't believe in governments going into health plans or health insurance or anything like that, if they can get out of it. The only time they do these things is when they get into a political jam. That is the only reason we got hospitalization. The Liberal government was repenting at the eleventh hour in 1957 and they passed some laws in regard to it. But it was after the Conservative government was in power that we actually got hospitalization across Canada.

Some day, the medical care plan that we have here will spread to the rest of Canada, but certainly not with the help and blessing of the Liberal party either in Saskatchewan or in Canada. They say they are dedicated to the minimum of government. The Liberal party not only believes in minimum government but also that the poor people should pay the same dollars in taxation as the rich. That is why they increased the medicare poll tax, — that is why they increased the personal tax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the motion before the house by adding to the motion these words:

but in view of the present high provincial revenues and the promised reduction in taxes, this assembly regrets that Your Honor's advisers have increased the personal tax for hospitalization and medical care.

Seconded by Mrs. Cooper.

Now, it's quite evident that if nothing is done most people will have a tax increase, not lower taxes. Every member in this house can vote for this amendment if he really considers the welfare of the people. With all this wealth from resources, from yields from other taxes, we shouldn't have to increase the taxes to the individual. A vote against this amendment, of course, is a vote for the wealthy and against the poor of this province. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: — There is a motion before the house which I think everyone will be willing to take it as read to which an amendment has been moved by the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), seconded by the member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper):

That the motion be amended by adding thereto the following words:

but in view of the present high provincial revenues and the promised reduction in taxes, this assembly regrets that Your Honor's advisers have increased the personal tax for hospitalization and medical care.

I find the amendment in order and the debate continues on the amendment and the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I propose to address the house only very briefly this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Initially I would like to join with the temporary Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Brockelbank) in welcoming the university students to this legislature. Saskatchewan is an expanding province. It needs young people in public service. I hope many of the young men and women who are here today with us, at least some of them, will one day sit in seats in this legislature. I know, of course, that if they are really intelligent, they will probably want to sit on this side of the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate for the first time as Premier of Saskatchewan, and I can say that I am well aware of the responsibilities of this office. In the eight months I have been here, I have become acquainted with many of the disappointments and frustrations which are associated with the Premiership. I am well aware of my own shortcomings without all the opposition members telling me. However, I will tell the legislature and the people of Saskatchewan that, in the months ahead, I will work as diligently as I can in giving leadership, and I will do my best to be worthy of the confidence which was placed in me last April.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I know that I speak for all my colleagues and associates, when I say that we will try to provide an administration which is honest, fair minded and progressive. I say again, we live in a wonderful province, if only that province could be given a chance to develop.

Yesterday, the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) expressed regret at the illness of the Leader of the Opposition. Again, on behalf of my associates and colleagues I would like to concur in his remarks. My understanding is that the member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) has a serious back ailment. On behalf of the government, may I express the hope that he will have a speedy recovery and soon be back with us in the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you as is customary, on your elevation to this important office. The success or failure of the legislature frequently depends on the wisdom that the Speaker has in making his rulings. I am quite sure he will carry out his duties with impartiality, and I wouldn't be surprised if he doesn't go down in history as one of the better speakers and one of the more outstanding speakers in this house.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation of the speeches made by the mover and seconder yesterday. We have all known for a number of years that the member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) has a good deal of ability. The speech he made yesterday simply proved that. I know that all members on this side of the house, at least, enjoyed it very much. I also thought that the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) did an outstanding job for a new member. The views she expressed were interesting and novel. I thought her feelings were expressed in a very pungent and dignified way. I am sure she will be a major asset not only to this side of the house but to the legislature as a whole.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I listened to the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) yesterday and today. The hon. member is the dean of the present legislature. With a weak case, an unbelievably weak case, he did his best today. It only took him two minutes to get back to the depression, but that is usual. I have known the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) for about 20 years. Over that long period I have found him to be a bit grumpy, often cantankerous, invariably sarcastic, and even on occasion a little mean. Despite those characteristics, I have always had respect for his views, and down through the years I think the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) has served his constituents and the province with courage, with tenacity, and with fortitude. I almost hesitate to say it, but I want to tell him that we have a kind of a sneaking admiration for him, on this side.

Now, a few days ago, we witnessed the death of a great Englishman, Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill. As the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) was speaking, I couldn't help but think of the description which Sir Winston had of socialism. He said, "Socialism is the philosophy of failure and the gospel of envy". How pungently that sentence describes the philosophy of my hon. friend opposite. Down through the years I have found that there is not too much wrong with socialism, except that it won't work. Now since the end of World War II, we have watched

this Canada of ours go ahead by leaps and bounds. I think one of the reasons that the Liberal Party is on the government side at the present time, is because in those 20 years Saskatchewan lagged far behind the development of other provinces.

Who cares what happened back in the depression? Those days are gone. Our people are interested in the future. They want to know what kind of development took place in Canada from the war on. Because they weren't satisfied, I think my hon. friends are sitting opposite.

There was one part of the speech which my hon. friend the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) made, that I didn't particularly appreciate. I suppose he will say I am a right winger, because I didn't appreciate his remarks. It seems to me that the Socialists are far too frequently critical of business. They always refer to business in a sneering and disparaging way. The Liberals believe in capitalism. Certainly we believe in capitalism. The hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) said today, I think I can paraphrase his words, that this party has sold out to big business. Well, we are very pleased that some big companies have decided to come to Saskatchewan since the Socialists left. Does the hon. member suggest that when U.S. Borax, employing 500 men, decided to come here, that that is selling out to big business?

Does my hon. friend from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) suggest that when Consolidated Mining and Smelting announced that they were coming here, going to employ another 500 men, that that is selling out to big business? When Canada Cement said they were going to come, employing 80 people, is that selling out to big business? When . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — They were here . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . when Anglo-Rouyn Copper Mines . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — They were here, not new . . .

Mr. Ross Thatcher: — When a former federal cabinet minister (Mr. Winters) said "I'm here because the Socialists aren't here", is that selling out to big business? Providing 400 jobs . . .

Some Hon. Members: — All here . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — The hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) knows that Simpson-Sears are going to go into Saskatoon, and will be employing three-hundred people. Is that the kind of capitalism he doesn't want? Or the Hudson Bay Company here in Regina, employing three-hundred people? My hon. friends surely should have learned by this time that business will come to a province for only one reason, because it is profitable for them to do so. Any business which can't make a profit, can't expand. When a company can't expand, it can't employ young people. That is a great weakness in the viewpoint of our former government. When they were in power, thousands of young people had to leave Saskatchewan to find employment elsewhere. This government is getting them jobs here, at home, in companies that will employ them. The hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) talked about the oil industry. Why, he said "We got the oil industry, what are these Liberals talking about". I was very interested in a speech which was made at an Oil Symposium here a few weeks ago by a man named Dr. Sproule. He had been the head of Imperial Oil for many years in this province . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — No, he wasn't . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, yes, he was, and this is what he had to say:

The Saskatchewan government of 1945, Thursday, was credited with being a co-discoverer of the Leduc Oil Field In Alberta.

He said:

Imperial Oil abandoned its exploration efforts in Saskatchewan in 1945 and moved into Alberta as a result of the exprop-

riation clause that was added, at that time, to the mineral resource regulations by the Socialist government.

Those aren't our words, those are the words of the Oil Industry. Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) knows, if there has been any development in oil in Saskatchewan in the last 20 years, it has been in spite of the Socialists, not because of them. That development was carried out by private enterprise.

Then the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) was very disparaging about some of the new regulations that have been introduced in the field of minerals. Mr. Speaker, we reached the point, that when this government took over, there was hardly a prospector left in the whole of Northern Saskatchewan. We thought that something had to be done about it because every other province was getting mineral development. So we changed the regulations. What did the northern miner say about these regulations? I quote:

Saskatchewan has been lagging far behind most other Canadian provinces in its take of this country's sub-soil riches. Of last year's \$35,000,000 in the Canadian exploration budget, that province attracted less than one per cent.

These are cold facts. This week's announcement that the Saskatchewan government is writing new legislation into its books to attract the prospector points up the forward thinking of the new Liberal administration of the mid-prairie province . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . and so, Mr. Speaker we make no apologies for saying that the "Welcome Mat" is out to big business and to private investment. As far as American capital is concerned, our only objection is that we are not getting enough of it, and that we are going to try and get a lot more of it.

Mr. Speaker, we are having quite a bit of success. Many more companies registered last year than the year previously. I was just look over some of those companies that have come in, in the last few weeks. Maybe the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) would be interested in them. These are some of the company registrations.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . . tell me about . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes, I will. Will you wait a minute? Aquitaine Company of Canada Ltd., \$3,000,000; Jefferson Lake Petrochemicals of Canada Ltd., \$6,000,000; Canadian Industrial Gas Limited, registered a few weeks ago for \$10,000,000; Stuart House International Limited, \$2,000,000; Pennzoil Company, Pennsylvania, \$17,500,000; Consolidated East Crest Oil Company Limited, \$7,500,000; Eddy Match Company Limited, \$10,000,000; Kern County Land Company, \$20,000,000; Building Products of Canada Limited, \$25,000,000; and so we go, pages of them, Emco Limited of London, \$3,000, 000; Noranda Mines, \$10,000,000; Potash Company of American, Inc., \$10, 000,000; Champlin Petroleum Company, \$5,000,000; Homestake Mining Company, \$31,000,000; and listen to this one, Mr. former minister, Massey Harris, \$50,000,000. Now, these are the companies that are coming into the province of Saskatchewan. I am not interested in who takes the credit for it, I don't care whether these companies are coming here because of something the Socialists did a few years ago, or something the Liberals did in the last few months. I don't think people are particularly interested in which party was responsible. All we want to do is to get plants and mines which will provide jobs for our people, and I can tell you that this government will do anything feasible to see that these companies come.

The hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) suggested that I should say something about Wizewood. I hadn't intended to, but I will be glad to do so. The hon. member for Wizewood or for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) said that I had accused this company of being a financial fiasco. Mr. Speaker, down through the years we have maintained, the Liberal Party has maintained, that these Socialist Crown Corporations were ineffective, that they were not doing a good job. I know that Wizewood isn't a Crown Corporation, but nevertheless, it is largely financed by the taxpayers of

Saskatchewan. My hon. friends suggested a while ago that it wasn't doing too badly. They admitted it had difficulties but that it was getting on its feet. The member for Kelsey said, "This year they are only going to lose \$80,000". Well, you know that is typical socialistic arithmetic. Socialists apparently can't even add . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Wait, I didn't say that they were only going to lose \$80,000, the member put the word "only" in to give this a different face altogether. I said they had lost \$80,000 and that this year they were going to make a profit.

Mr. Thatcher: — I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the report which is put out by the Government Finance Office, by Mr. Preston, whom you hired, so I suppose you will take his figures . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Table it.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, you will get it tabled. It shows the losses this year will be not \$80,000, they will be \$335,000 when depreciation is taken into account. The hon. member doesn't believe in taking in depreciation. In other words, this company has lost in the neighborhood of \$28,000 per month. Can you blame this government, Mr. Speaker, for being concerned with a company that is losing that kind of money. We intend to do something about it. There are a lot of these Crown Corporation that have been losing large sums of money. We have been trying to sell Wizewood. I'll tell the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) that. One time we thought we were pretty close to having a buyer for it. Then we got officials and experts up there who looked through the plant, and I am going to quote one paragraph from the company's letter:

It is the opinion of the engineer's that the plant is not only run down and worn out in places, but major . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — On a point of order. The minister must table an official letter when he quotes from it.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I do not have to table it, if I accept responsibility for it and I do so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now, may I quote. I accept full responsibility for the letter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — On a point of order, a year ago I quoted from a letter from a bank manager in Saskatoon and I was required by the rules of this house to table the letter, and I submit that the Premier must table this letter which he is reading from if he wishes to follow the rules of this house.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been made quite clear that the hon. member is going to take responsibility. He doesn't have to table the letter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — If I may finish quoting from this letter. I'll tell the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) that if he wants to see it, I don't mind him coming across and looking at the letter. All we are trying to do is serve the community of Hudson Bay. I will quote again:

It is the opinion of the engineers that the plant is not only run down and worn out in places, but major improvements are required at once if it is to operate continuously on an efficient basis. It is estimated the improvement program could cost as much as \$1,000,000. In

addition a sum of money in the amount of \$400,000 is required for additional working capital. The return on such an investment, after interest, including the tax benefits, leaves much to be desired.

Now this company, I am afraid, is not going to be too interested in purchasing Wizewood. But I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this government will make every effort to keep Wizewood operating. If we can sell it and expand it, we would be very delighted to stop the hemorrhage of money that is going on at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) had something to say about the recent increase in medicare rates which were made by this government. Actually they weren't increases at all. All we did was put the rate back to where the Socialists had it before the election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes I get a little discouraged by the way the Socialists always smugly assume that they have all the virtue, that they are the only party interested in human beings. The Socialists have talked one way this afternoon about medicare premiums. How did they act when they were in power? Mr. Speaker, there were four elections while they were in power — 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960. It is a true fact that after every single one of these elections when they were in power they raised the head tax for hospitalization and medicare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — As a matter of fact, these paragons of virtue, in 1960, reduced the hospitalization tax two months before the election from \$45 back to \$35. But, as soon as the election was over, it didn't go back to \$45. It went up to \$48.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Interested in the poor people, they certainly weren't when they were in office.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) made a statement with which most members of this side of the house must agree. He chided the government for taking one long month, after they were defeated, to turn over the reins of office. One of the reasons, he said, why they refused to turn over the reins of office was to clean out their files, to destroy them, to get rid of incriminating evidence. Mr. Speaker, I say this, as Premier of the province, that there are thousands of government files which have disappeared . . .

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I suggest that the hon. member knows quite well that it is not right to attribute to the previous government, members of which sit on this side, that they had in their files incriminating evidence. That is attributing a crime, Mr. Speaker, against members in this house and I am sure Your Honor recognizes that this is improper, and should be withdrawn.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to withdraw "incriminating" if it hurts the sensitivities of the former Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that thousands of government files had disappeared. I want to give you one example. It happens that The Government Finance Office comes under the Premier's office, or the Provincial Treasurer's office, I'm not sure which. Now in March, it happened under the previous government that an up-to-date index of all the files was made. I happen to hold this index in my hand. They forgot to burn it, I guess. Fourteen hundred and seventy-one current files. I say this afternoon that forty-five of these files are missing, some of them on very interesting subjects. C.S. Edy, expense account; D.T. Tansley, 1962; I.B.F. rejected loans; Wool bankruptcy; Bank of Montreal Claim; and in the non-current files of this Government Finance Office there are

twenty-four drawers, or there were twenty-four; nineteen of them were cleaned out, disappeared, evaporated. Now, my office, when we took over, a few months after, contacted the corporation. The Secretary was Mr. Gerry Williams. We asked him: "where have these files gone, where can we lay our hands on them?" I would like to quote a letter which I received from Mr. Williams, who incidentally was appointed by the former government. I quote from his letter of October 6, 1964:

On May 22nd a number of empty cartons were delivered by Jack's Moving and Transfer and were subsequently filled with files and were picked up on the 22nd of May. This is evidenced by the attached invoice copy sent to this office by Jack's Moving and Transfer.

and there is a photostat of the invoice from Jack's Moving and Transfer.

These cartons were supposedly delivered to the Legislative Buildings. Having seen the labels which were put on these boxes, I can report that they were all addressed to Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey), and in the afternoon of the 22nd, Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey) and Mr. A. Johnson, visited this office and were assured by Mrs. Chuka that the cartons had been sent to them. Well, now, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — On a point of privilege, these cartons were never sent to me. I never had them; I never had them in my place at all

An Hon. Member: — Where are they?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I think the truth of the matter is that they were sent to the Legislative Buildings.

An Hon. Member: — In what province?

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only go by what my hon. friends, one of his own civil servants said. They disappeared . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — No, Mr. Speaker, he can go by what I say too.

Mr. Thatcher: — I can't believe you.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Oh, yes, you can, you . . . Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must withdraw that. He said "I can't believe you".

Mr. Thatcher: — No, I didn't say that . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — You've got to accept my statement.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher: — I won't argue, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw what my hon. friend said. However, I want to know this — I want to know why the socialists were so afraid that they stole government records? Why were you so afraid?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — What were you trying to hide?

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member has no right to impute an offence against the laws of this country to any member of this house and he knows it.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member thinks that Socialists stole public documents then he had better report it to the Attorney General. That is what he had better do instead of making political capital out of it in this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Let him withdraw that . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, the government is giving very serious consideration to having some kind of a commission look into this whole matter because we want to know where the files have gone. We would like to know what the socialists are afraid of, or what are they hiding. Because they have obviously taken thousands of public documents. Mr. Speaker, some hon. members maybe think I am exaggerating a little. A few weeks ago there was another socialist civil servant who resigned. A Mr. M. Greenwood — he cleaned out his files just before he left. He threw many of them into one of the waste paper baskets expecting them to be destroyed. Fortunately one of the secretaries thought the files might have some importance, so she turned them over to the minister of Municipal Affairs. Now the files that I refer to, and I have a great many of them right on my desk here, were letters which bore the signature of one Ray Woollam. Who is Mr. Woollam? A senior clerk. He was a senior civil servant put in charge of our Indian Affairs and our Metis affairs, the Hutterites and so on by the former government. The way these files read, I began to wonder if Mr. Woollam knew exactly what his duties were. I'm only going to pick out four or five of his letters to read to this house, because I think they indicate one of the reasons why the Socialists have been destroying files.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I want to know if these are public documents he has in his hand . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — These are CCF socialist letters, carbon copies . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — These should be tabled, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — All right, if you want them tabled, I'll table every one. Believe me if you want the whole file you may be in trouble. So be careful before you ask for it.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I thought he was claiming they were public documents, but from his answer, well, maybe he has been snooping and stealing too.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, all right, Mr. Speaker, here are a few of the choice selections which have come from these files. Here is a letter dated October 20th, 1961, addressed to Mr. T.K. Shoyama, with copies to the Hon. T.C. Douglas, the Hon. W.S. Lloyd and Mr. Percy Brown. Mr. Woollam writes and I quote:

I seem to get caught up in conversations with many Indian people and others concerned about NDP prospects of securing their share of the Indian votes in the forthcoming election. The Roman church wields a particularly strong influence on the Indian vote. On the reserves their tactics are sometimes unbelievably direct. The problem of ice cream cones for votes is a big one. A general program of cash and liquor distribution on reserves would have a large appeal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Here we have a civil servant . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Shame, shame.

Mr. Thatcher: — This is the kind of program that a senior civil servant in charge of the Indian program has to offer. Liquor for the Indians, and these Holier-Than-Thou people across the way hold up their

hands in horror. Is this the kind of "Brothers' Keeper" policy you were talking about a few minutes ago?

Well, then on November 20th, 1961, this socialist civil servant, who incidentally is still working, but won't be for long, wrote to a Dr. Peter Worsley:

This NDP thing is really gaining steam. Woollam has moved to Meadow Lake and is living and working out of a shack. He is building up pretty sound support for the next federal election and has high hopes of making the grade. Please do two things — first, sent me a subscription to your new Left Review.

Instead of working for Indians at the taxpayers' expense, this civil servant was up campaigning on the taxpayers' time. This is the best kind of Indian program apparently the Socialists could come up with. And here is another one, Mr. Woollam displayed much interest in involving the Hutterites in politics. This letter of February 28th is addressed to the Hon. Everett Woods, Minister of Municipal Affairs. Its heading is "Politics and the Hutterites". I didn't think the Hutterites voted, but this is what writes:

On numerous occasions, I have tried to point to some of our MLA's that we ought not to assume the unreadiness of Hutterite brethren to participate in provincial or federal elections. Partly as a result of my work during the last four years, colonies in both Alberta and Saskatchewan are very sympathetic to the CCF-NDP point of view. With a little patience and an occasional visit from some of our people, I am confident that all the colonies in Saskatchewan would vote CCF in the next provincial election.

Then he says:

A case in point is a colony which we established about two years ago near Cut Knife, .I began pursuing political discussions with this group as soon as they came into the province.

A copy of this letter was sent to Woodrow Lloyd, Mr. Brownstone, Mr. Thiessen, Toby Nollet, and A. Kuziak. Mr. Speaker, Socialists have always claimed that the treatment which Alberta gave its Hutterites were most despicable. Apparently the only interest the honorable opposition members seem to have in the Hutterites is to get them to vote CCF. Their own people say that and their ministers apparently, according to this file, didn't say anything to deny it.

I am going to take time to quote one more letter. There are so many here, but I don't think I need more to make the point but this letter came from Mr. Woollam to Dr. Brownstone. He says:

I've gone Hutteriting, will be back early next week. I intend to see Sam Cornier with respect to the Arneson and Kamsack committee. I think this is a good time to wake Sam up to this crisis. I wish also to steal what I can from the files of Mr. Breach.

Here is a civil servant who freely admits a desire to steal. Well, now Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Now, now you spoke all afternoon, now just let me speak for a while.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — State your point of order . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The hon. member I'm certain he claims these are public documents, and he read parts of them, and I think it is fair that the house see all of them.

Mr. Thatcher: — I will be very pleased to table the letters that I have referred to. Indeed, if you want all of them I think that can be arranged too, because I think you would be pretty shocked, but we will only table the letters after we get a chance to make copies of them. I'm not going to give you these files for a while.

This government has accused us repeatedly of dismissing civil servants for mere political activities. Since we have taken office, there have been very few civil servants dismissed for this reason. When the people of Saskatchewan can see what is going on in the CCF machine, one can understand why we have been a little dubious over the years about the happenings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I accuse this government, Mr. Speaker, of building up the rankest . . .

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Point of order, Sir. I believe the hon. Premier said Mr. Woollam is still in the employ of the government.

Mr. Thatcher: — I did, Sir, by a contract.

Mr. Wood: — By a contract?

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes.

Mr. Wood: — He was dismissed, I suppose from the government, from my employment as an employee of our department some two years ago, I believe.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry but I can't let the hon. member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) play on words. What are the facts? On October 5th, this man entered the Department of Education at a salary of about \$479 a month. On March 1st, 1960, he was made Director of the Provincial Committee of Minority Groups at a monthly salary of \$600. Then on October 1st, he was given another salary increase to \$641 per month, and these letters, most of them, took place and were written during that period of time when he was a civil servant.

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Not the last one . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Then on February 28th, 1963, technically he left the employment of the public service, but actually he was hired at an amount of \$11,000 per year by your department, Sir, as "the Group Resources Consultant Service", and he has still got that job, as I say, temporarily.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, may I say that, under the contract with this Group Consultant Services, he was an employee of the Group Consultant Services . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, he is the company, he is the company. Now, I suggest that during the twenty years they were in office the Socialists infiltrated the civil service with dozens of their party workers — not to serve the people of Saskatchewan but to do political work like Mr. Woollam admits he has done. That is the reason why these thousands of files are missing. One hears about the Dorion inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If the day ever comes when we find these files, I think the Dorion inquiry will look pretty pale in comparison . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I am not going to speak very much longer. Just after the Hanley by-election, the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) made some extremely interesting statements about wire-tapping. You will notice in the Throne Speech we are going to prevent wire-tapping. We understand it has been illegal all along, but if it hasn't been, we will make certain. When the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) on this side of the house took office, what did he find on his telephone? A wire-tapping machine. So the matter was made public. The hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), said, "Well, I had to have that wire-tapping machine because my secretary wasn't very good, she couldn't take dictation fast enough, so I had that machine to make sure that everything was taken down. We made inquiries of the civil service and we found that she was one of the best secretaries in the city of Regina, and could take dictation faster than most other girls in the civil service. So we didn't think she was very inefficient. Pretty soon the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) decided he needed another excuse. He said he was trying to trap the Mafia . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I quote from a Saskatoon Star Phoenix of December 19th. The report says "It was installed after I had been offered a bribe of over \$300,000 by a person whom I later believed to be connected with an international crime syndicate." Mr. Speaker, when we checked into the matter, we found that this so-called bribe or letter was seven years old. Now if somebody was trying to bribe him, why didn't he do something about it? Why didn't he prosecute? Why didn't he take some action? I say that the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) indulged in a dishonorable, a despicable, and an unethical practice by having wire-tapping in his own office. Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the words used by the Premier in regards to the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) are completely unparliamentary and they should be withdrawn.

Mr. Thatcher: — Which ones do you object to?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The member, I think, knows very well, despicable behaviour or something like that . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — If his feelings are hurt I'll withdraw. Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech which is now before us, and about which I am going to talk tomorrow, is a document containing the legislative program of this government. Before the session, in the last election, we made eleven major promises and we made eleven or twelve minor ones. I can tell you that every one of those promises will be carried out over the next four years, and more than half of them will be carried out at this session. It will be more than interesting to see how our hon. friends opposite vote when these various bills come forward.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly recessed from 5:30 until 7:30 p.m.

WHEAT PRICES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):

That this assembly request the Federal Government to establish a guaranteed minimum price for No. 1 Northern wheat in storage at Fort William or Port Arthur of at least two dollars per bushel and that guaranteed prices for other grades of wheat be properly related to the guaranteed price of No. 1 Northern and that guaranteed prices for all grades of wheat at other shipping points such as Churchill, Manitoba and Vancouver,

British Columbia be properly related to the guaranteed prices at Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on the motion of the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) the other afternoon, I mentioned the fact that the members that sit to your left seem to show a great concern for the plight of the prairie farmers. As in the past they are always ready to cry loud and long to the senior government at Ottawa. They find themselves in a position where they can make irresponsible statements and unreasonable demands on the government at Ottawa, knowing that they have never been, nor they never will be the government of Canada. I am a little bit surprised, Mr. Speaker, that when the member worded the motion, realizing their record in the past, that he hadn't, instead of using the figure \$2.00, used the figure \$3.00. Because he knows that he would never be expected to carry out this particular promise.

They are the self-styled spokesmen for the farmers of western Canada in their own opinion. They can make any demands upon government, no matter how ridiculous they might be because they know they are never going to be in the position of having to fulfil the promises they might make. I would think that if these people were sincere in their support for the western farmers that they would look back at their records and realize that over the history of their past in the last thirty-two years they have accomplished nothing. In fact, I would go so far as to say the only members of their party that ever had any influence on government were the more enlightened members of their party, who realizing that they had no influence on governments in Ottawa left their party and joined the Liberal party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Point of order, Mr. Speaker, this motion deals with the fall in wheat prices and the possibility of a \$2.00 bushel guarantee . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . they will talk about purple gas yet . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . . price for no. 1 at the head of the Lakes. I think then the hon. member starts speaking about the history of political parties, and about some mavericks that left, that aren't welcome where they are, or not very welcome, he is out of order.

Mr. Gallagher: — Well, Mr. Speaker, on the member's point of order, he rambled on all over the field the other day when he was on this particular subject, and I am only answering some of the things that he said. He set themselves up as the self-styled spokesmen of the farmers of Saskatchewan. He tried to make this house believe that nobody was concerned, only those people, and I am saying at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the only people in the CCF party that ever had any influence on Ottawa were the people like the Premier of this province and that last member of parliament from this province who got elected on a Liberal ticket, Mr. Argue, who joined the Liberal party to get something done for the farmers of this province.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — He just wanted to keep the Liberal party honest, that is all. Keep them honest if we can.

Mr. Gallagher: — I mentioned the other day, before adjourning the debate, Mr. Speaker, some statements made by the member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) that he is not the only person who is the spokesmen for the Saskatchewan farmers, and I pointed out the fact, I believe, that although they make a lot of noise it seems ironic that there were at least three times as many farmer members elected to the government side of this house in the last election as there were elected on NDP tickets, members who were farmers. The member for Cut Knife also suggested when reviewing the Liberal platform of 1963, that the NDP was in agreement with the Liberal platform and he went on to say that the people of Saskatchewan just didn't trust the Liberal party so that is why they didn't vote Liberal. Well, let me say this, Mr. Speaker, if his argument is valid, and he must believe it himself, well then they certainly must have trusted your party

even less, because the results of the 1962 federal election showed that we elected one member to the House of Commons on a Liberal ticket from this province, you elected none. In the 1963 election I believe that our percentage of the popular vote in this province was higher than that of the NDP. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) is not the spokesman for western agriculture. As is shown by the result of the 1964 provincial elections, I notice that there are only nine rural seats that were elected on that side of the house. Two of the members elected only temporarily, I might say, the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) and the member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) who, I am sure, are going to have a very short stay in this legislature.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Let's get down to the price of wheat.

Mr. Gallagher: — I suggested on Friday last that I would like to see the federal government institute a \$2.00 floor price for wheat, no. 1 northern, basis Fort William. If there is one thing that might cause a price war amongst the major wheat exporters of the world, Mr. Speaker, it is public statements like those like those that a price war exists. You will all recall the public statements made by the now National Leader of the NDP (T.C. Douglas) back in 1953, and the former Leader of the NDP, or the CCF, Mr. M.J. Coldwell, on the same particular occasion. These people not only spoke out in Canada, they spoke out so that people in other countries might hear them, and I will say this, that partly because of utterances that came from these leaders of your party at a time when wheat surpluses in Canada were growing, we exported 255,000,000 bushels of wheat in the crop year 53-54 when the year before we had exported some 385,000,000, and during that same period of time because of some of the statements made by your National Leader and the Premier of this province at that time, that the farmers of this province took a 25 cent drop in the price of wheat. Because of statements made by people like yourselves, irresponsible statements, it cost the farmers of Saskatchewan hundreds of millions of dollars.

I want to say at this time that the recent drop in the asking prices by the Canadian Wheat Board were announced here a couple of weeks ago, were brought about for several reasons. First of all, world wheat supplies have risen. France, which at one time was an importer is now an exporter and a country where farmers are highly subsidized, and they are certainly in an advantageous position to sell wheat to those countries that are in the European Common Market, who are their close neighbors, and are importers of wheat.

Then there was a deal that was in the offing, a deal between Australia and China; Australia was willing to cut the price of no. 5 wheat considerably to promote a deal with China. In order to meet this competition the Canadian Wheat Board, a couple of weeks ago adjusted the price of no. 5 wheat by 12 cents a bushel to sell 27,000,000 bushels of wheat to Red China. I don't think any member of this house is going to be too critical about the Canadian Wheat Board's action on that particular occasion, because having followed the market page of the Western Producer for the last number of months, I noticed that the asking price for no. 5 wheat had certainly been closer to the price of no. 4 northern than it had been a year ago or two or three years ago, and I think that the Canadian Wheat Board did the right thing in making this price adjustment to make a 27,000,000 bushel sale to China. Immediately after this was done, you all know that the United States cut the price of all bread wheat, so the Canadian Wheat Board had no choice but to adjust the price of all bread wheat so that they would be competitive with the other wheat exporting countries of the world.

From statements that were made the other day, Mr. Speaker, by the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson), I want to correct some of the impressions that he might have left in the minds of some of the people in this house and certainly that he tried to create in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan. I think the essence of his talk was that if our old friend, Alvin Hamilton, had been operating the Wheat Board this would not have happened. We would have been able to sell more wheat. Well, I thought when you came into this house, Mr. Speaker, I thought the member would know better than to peddle this line of Alvin's. Because if he stopped and went to the trouble of reviewing what has happened in the last five years, in the last ten years, in the last fifteen years, he would realize that this good friend of his, and the saviour of the western farmer in his right, just didn't do so good a job after all.

I went to the trouble the other day of getting the last report available, the annual report, of the Canadian Wheat Board, and I am going to read into the records of the house at this particular time some of the figures from tables, or all of the figures from some of the tables that are in that report. This report is available to every member of this house.

First of all, I am going to give the members of this house a comparison of what happened in the last five years of the liberal government when Mr. Howe was in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, and a comparison of what happened in the next five years when his friend was in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board.

For example, producer marketings, table no. 4, p. 4., in the annual report of the Canadian Wheat Board 62-63. In 51-52 producer marketings amounted to 455,000,000 bushels, in 52-53 — 535,000,000; 53-54 — 396,000,000; 54-55 — 319,000,000; 55-56 — 352,000,000. Now these were the last five full years of Liberal government in Ottawa when Mr. Howe was in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. During these five years the Canadian Wheat Board sold an average of 411,000,000 bushels per year. This is just not too bad.

Now we will see what happened with the friend of the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) took over the Wheat Board in 1956-57. I am not going to use this particular year although it would be to his advantage to use it. I am not going to use it because it is partly a Liberal year and it is partly a Conservative year. I should say it would be to my advantage to use it, but I am not going to use it. We will start with 57-58 in which the producers marketed 378,000,000 bushels; 58-59 — 367,000,000; 59-60 — 378,000,000; 60-61 — 396,000,000; 61-62 — 305,000,000, for an average of 365,000,000 bushels. Well, there is a difference here, Mr. Speaker, of 46,000,000 in the five complete years of a Tory government in Ottawa and the five previous years of a Liberal government.

To go on to another table, Table no. 7, p. 6 of the same report. This gives a comparison of exports. In the five year period when the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hamilton), was in charge of the Wheat Board here are figures; 294,000,000; 277,000,000; 353,000,000; 358,000,000 and 331,000,000; or an average of 321,000,000 bushels of wheat per year exported by the Canadian Wheat Board under the guidance of the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Hamilton.

Last year, according to an executive member of the Wheat Pool, the Canadian Wheat Board exported 591,113,000 bushels of wheat and this year in the first six months, producer marketings are 239,000,000 and exports 195,000,000, that was up until January 20th. So it looks like we are going to have at least 400,000,000 bushels of exports and probably 450,000,000, and probably around 450,000,000 bushels of producer marketings in this particular year, for an average in these first two years, after Mr. Sharpe took over the Wheat Board, of something around 500,000,000 bushels if not more.

Then we will go on to another chart on page 15, table 17. This gives us the percentage of world trade that Canada enjoys. In the last five years while Mr. Hamilton was running the Wheat Board, and the previous five years before he became the Minister of Agriculture, 51-52, we had 32.4 per cent of world trade, 52-53, 39.2 per cent . . .

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I must rise again in a point of order. I have read this resolution very carefully a number of times and I just don't see how he gets his . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The member can relate this discussion . . .

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I think he has an amendment to move and all we need is an amendment, but the amendment is not before the house. If he has an amendment, let's have it, then maybe he'll be in order, but certainly all this about the Wheat Board and marketing has no relation to this year which only asks for this guaranteed price.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Gallagher: — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Now Mr. Speaker, I wish you would rule on this point of order.

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, I am answering questions that were raised by the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) the other day, and if he suspects that I have an amendment, the amendment is not related to the figures that I have used.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, maybe the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) was out of order, but this doesn't give this member any . . .

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, the member for Arm River, (Mr. Pederson) may have been out of order and if he was out of order, why didn't you call him on a point of order the other day? May I continue, Mr. Speaker? May I continue, Mr. Speaker?

I will have to start over and repeat what I started to say, Mr. Speaker. The percentage of world trade was in the last five Liberal years, in 51-52 — 32.4 per cent, 53-54 — 32 per cent, in 54-55 — 26.1 per cent, and in 55-56 — 28.6 per cent, or an average of 31.6 per cent of world trade. In the next five years, in 57-58 — 26.8 per cent, in 58-59 — 22.4 per cent, in 59-60 — 20.9 per cent, in 60-61 — 23.1 per cent, in 61-62, which was the last year of a Conservative government in Ottawa, 20.8 per cent, or an average of 22.8 per cent of the world's trade. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, the member for Arm River, (Mr. Pederson) doesn't think that 22.8 per cent of world trade is bigger than 31.6 per cent of world trade.

There is one more chart that I would like to present to this house, Mr. Speaker. This is the schedule of Wheat Board payments that appeared in the same document, the annual report of the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Pederson tried to leave the impression that we were getting less for wheat today, and always got less until the Hon. Mr. Hamilton became the Minister of Agriculture and started handling the wheat board. Well, according to table 21, on page 18 of the annual report, 62-63, of the Canadian Wheat Board, here are the figures. The schedule for payments for no. 1 Northern wheat at Fort William and Vancouver in 51-52 — \$1.83, in 52-53 — \$1.81, in 53-54 — \$1.56, in 54-55 — \$1.65, in 55-56 — \$1.61, or an average of \$1.69.1 per bushel. In the next five years, in 57-58 — \$1.62, in 58-59 — \$1.59, in 59-60 — \$1.59, in 60-61 — \$1.79, in 61-62 — \$1.91. In 61-62, one of the poorest crops in the history of Saskatchewan, we did realize \$1.91. But in the five years, we averaged \$1.70 while Mr. Hamilton was looking after the affairs of the Wheat Board or 9 cents more than the previous five years. From 1960 to the present day, the average price of wheat is something around \$2.00 a bushel. I think the member also suggested that if the Minister of Trade would do what his minister did and make these flying trips to China and try to promote more international agreement between those exporting countries, that we would do a lot better job in selling wheat. I have here my home town newspaper, the Yorkton Enterprise, which reports a press conference that Mr. Sharp had in Winnipeg last week. He has been criticized severely by members of the Conservative party for not going out and doing a better job selling wheat, for not visiting Red China and some of these other countries. Well, Mr. Speaker, he had this to say. He said he was not going to Red China to talk wheat because Canada does not recognize that government and it would be inappropriate to do so. He said he had talked with company officials of a Chinese export company in Hong Kong as Mr. Hamilton had done when he was the minister, but he pointed out that Mr. Hamilton had never visited Red China itself when he was a member of the government.

Mr. Speaker, where does this all bring us? The Canadian Wheat Board, I think, has done a good job, but I think if there is one thing that will undermine confidence in the Canadian Wheat Board, it is attacks on the Minister who is in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board and the job that the Canadian Wheat Board has been doing for the people of Western Canada. Attacks such as were made the other afternoon on the debate on the motion by the member from Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank). We know that as a result of the drop or adjustment in prices that was forced on the Canadian Wheat Board, we the farmers of Western Canada are caught in the midst of this squeeze, according to the price index of Commodities and Services. I have here the Dominion Bureau of Statistics pamphlet. Using 1935-39 period as 100 as a base, in 1945 the price index of commodities and services used by the farmers was 140, by 1950, it was around 200, by 1964 it had risen to about 280. Farm prices, according to this same

pamphlet, using the same 35-39 period as a base of 100, show that in 1951 the index stood at 268.7, and that by 1960, it was down to 232.8. As a result of the price drop that was forced on the Canadian Wheat Board and if nothing was done about it, I believe that the farmers of Western Canada who are producing wheat, cannot afford to lose this ten cents a bushel or whatever it might amount to be. I could produce figures here for the next half hour to build up a case to urge the federal government to take such appropriate actions as might guarantee the farmers of Western Canada that they would not suffer because of the actions that were forced on the Canadian Wheat Board by some of the other exporting countries of the world. As the members of the house probably all realize, every major exporter in the world is subsidizing their farmers except Canada. I believe that we have got to the point today, that we have got to look to the federal government for a subsidy for western farmers and I think that that subsidy must be on wheat. I think that the Canadian people from one end of Canada to the other should be expected to pay two cents more for a loaf of bread to guarantee to the farmers of Saskatchewan a fair share of the national income.

I want to go further, Mr. Speaker, in view of what is happening in other exporting countries. It is a fact that every other major exporting country in the world guarantees their farmers a price for their export wheat and that we, the farmers of Canada, must buy on a Canadian market or an American market and sell our product on a deflated world market. It is a fact that we are not out of line in expecting the government of Canada to pay an export subsidy on the wheat we sell on the world market. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Canora, (Mr. Romuld): That all the words after the word "That" in the motion be deleted and that the following substituted therefor:

While this legislature reaffirms its confidence in the Wheat Board system of wheat marketing, and expresses its appreciation for the tremendous achievements of the Canadian Wheat Board, assisted by the Canadian government, in marketing the record 1963 crop at the highest prices in recent years, we are concerned at the recent decline in wheat prices, and the possibility of a price war between exporting countries.

This assembly, therefore, urges the Wheat Board and the Canadian government to do everything possible to reinforce international co-operation to protect prairie producers from the unfair competition of subsidized wheat exported by other countries and respectfully request the Canadian government to take such measures as are consistent with the achievement of international price stability, and to give consideration to implementation of a two price system for wheat and to establish a guaranteed minimum price for no. 1 Northern Wheat Basis Fort William of at least \$2.00 per bushel.

Mr. Speaker: — I find the motion in order.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before you find the motion in order, can I read the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Because I am sure that this motion is out of order, because it is impossible to make sense of it. It starts out by saying that all the words after the word "that" in the motion be deleted and there are three words "that" in that motion, this doesn't say which one is the one that counts, so I think this motion is completely out of order. I imagine it's the last "that" and then it just strikes three lines from the motion.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Further to the point of order, I would like your

ruling of the amendment as offered. The first half of it is a preamble to the second part of his amendment, and it's been a longstanding rule custom of this house that preambles are not acceptable to motions because the preamble is part of the argument. I think that, Sir, if you will look at the motion on the order paper from the motion which was dropped, the words were the same because I listened to you read it, Sir. That is a preamble, and preambles have always been considered to be out of order in this house.

Mr. Gallagher: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I will be out of order in inserting or asking that I be allowed to insert "That" in the first line. As far as what was suggested by the hon. member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), I have been in this house long enough to know what he would allow as an amendment to a motion.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, up to the points of order, I wish to thank the hon. members for their views. I am informed that as often as possible where a speaker is sure of what the original intent of the amendment was, that he can insert a word to make it intelligent. We could alter it to read: "That all the words after the word "that" where it first appears in the motion." I don't think there was any intention, any question about what the hon., member intended and I think all hon. members are aware of that. So therefore, on that basis, I consider the matter to be in order. Now the question of preamble. A preamble, if I am informed correctly, usually begins whereas, this begins "that" and the house proceeds if it adopts this, to reaffirm its faith in the Wheat Board. I can hardly think this qualifies as a preamble. I think it's more of a statement that the house is expected to make in support if the amendment is put to the house. One way' or the other, I still rule that the amendment is in order and because you have an alternative motion here, the debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. K. Gordon Romuld (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, as I arise to second the amendment as proposed to the motion by the member from Yorkton, (Mr. Gallagher) I would like to commend him for the splendid manner in which he presented the true facts to this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romuld: — I feel there should be little doubt in the minds of any member of this house if they have any consideration for the farmers of Saskatchewan at all, as to how they will vote. I would like to say a few words about the opening day because I think it concerns the motion and I understand that I can speak on the motion as proposed by the opposition and our motion, our amendment, pardon me.

I remember on the opening day, the first day that I ever sat here, when the member from Cut Knife, (Mr. Nollet) who had been the Minister of Agriculture in the previous government, went to some length to talk about the plight of the farmers in Saskatchewan, and I think that perhaps I would be right to say that he only reiterated a lot of the statements the Liberals in Saskatchewan made for many years and that is that there are too many farmers leaving Saskatchewan. I am sure that every member on this side of the house agrees with the hon. member and I also believe that part of the reason of the departure of farmers from this province was because of the government that we had in the province for twenty years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romuld: — I would like to present some statistics to prove this. In the Dominion Bureau Farm Statistics, you will find the figures from 1941 right down to the bottom of the page, and you will find that Saskatchewan has the lowest return in farm products of the Western provinces. Now I could include Ontario and Quebec, but I am going to refer to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, because these three provinces are comparable. Why do we have lower value for our products in Saskatchewan? I think it's a simple matter that we have had a government here for twenty years that didn't give a hoot what the farmers received.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romuld: — I know it has always been the policy of the former government that now sits on the opposite side to lay all the blame on the federal government whether it was Tory or Liberal, and as the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), had mentioned before, that isn't hard because you know you're never going to be there so you can say anything you wish. When they blame the government they never think about looking in the papers. When they brought this motion up, I think they were perhaps in a hurry. I don't know how they wrote it up, but I'll deal with that later, but if you looked at last night's Leader Post, you will see where they have had a meeting with Mr. Parker, a representative of the Wheat Pool of Manitoba, who met with members of the Australian government or with their Wheat Board or whatever they have over there, and he explained to theirs why we were on a quota system. The members from Australia explained why they had reduced the price. Mr. Parker had warned them that this would create a price war. He also explained to them that they could do one of two things. They could either do such as the States have done, or they could implement the quota system such as we have in Canada. I'm sure there's not a member on the other side of the house that would like to see our Wheat Board thrown out and go back to the old marketing system, although sometimes the way you talk, that's the only interpretation I can get. Now being a farmer myself, I think I know a little about conditions of farms in Saskatchewan. I am greatly concerned about the price drop we have just had, and I certainly know that it affects my income because I am a straight grain farmer. I know that in the last period of years, we have been caught in a cost price squeeze. What did the government, you fellows on the other side, ever try to do about it? I can tell you one thing, as provincial Liberals, we are going to do something about it and we're going to assist our federal government to do something about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romuld: — I must say to the farmers on the opposite side that I expressed disappointment in the motion that you brought in on the opening day. As I said before, I think some of you wrote it up as you were walking up here. It is the most watered down resolution that I have ever read, particularly when you think that it came from a party that has offered such lip service to the agriculture industry in this province for the last twenty years. Our amendment that we brought in today, is concise and to the point. It is designed to help all farmers. Your amendment asked the government to bring in \$2.00 wheat and it stopped right there. You had a lot of other words that didn't mean anything, but we went on further than this and the reason we did this and why we adjourned the debate was that we wanted to bring in a motion or an amendment, to the motion that would help the farmers of all classes. We did not just ask for \$2.00 wheat because when you do that, you are helping one group of farmers, just the farmers that have thousands and thousands of bushels, but if you ever visit the area in which I live, and where the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) comes from, you would find that there are a lot of farmers in the area who don't have thousands of bushels of wheat, and that the only amendment that would help them would be a two price system. This is why we wanted to bring this amendment in. I am sure that any man who sits on the opposite side and votes against this amendment will probably have representation down here within a few days asking him to resign his seat in this legislative assembly.

I can recall hearing a lot about this for many years, and I've also been a strong supporter of the two price system. Let us think of a farmer that has 75 acres or acres or 100 acres, who puts in 25 acres of wheat. In the northern part of the province, it is not uncommon to receive 40 bushels to the acre. We generally are blessed with a fairly good crop. If this man could sell 300 bushels, if the price is to be a dollar more, he would receive \$300 more. If he received an acreage payment under the Tory system, he would receive \$75 more, therefore, I believe that this amendment is definitely an amendment that is going to help the farmers of Saskatchewan. When you think of all the farmers here that receive perhaps an income of \$1800 a year, and you increase their income by \$300 you are increasing it by almost 20 per cent. The NDP motion fails to say anything about the Wheat. Board. We believe that we should support the Wheat Board, every chance we get, because I still maintain it is the best marketing agency there has ever been in Canada and has been of real benefit, to the farmers of western Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is not a political issue at all. It is one that deserves the support of all members of this legis-

lature. I hope that we are not going to sit and bicker over the price or a two price system because you want a motion that only calls for \$2.00 wheat. We on this side want \$2.00 wheat and a two price system. I hope that you will find it within yourselves to vote for this. This only reaffirms the stand of the Liberals in Saskatchewan. We worked for a two price system to get it into our federal policy but apparently the people on the other side and the people of Saskatchewan didn't vote for it because they didn't send anyone down there. Now they complain about it, but I can tell you that the day will come when we will have representation down there and a two price system will be forthcoming.

Mr. G. Romuld (Canora): — Before I resume my seat, I take great pleasure seconding the amendment to the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all compliment the member for Canora, (Mr. Romuld). He did a wonderful job of trying to defend the Liberal party on a very delicate issue. But he wasn't talking to the right people, Mr. Speaker, he should go and talk to the hon. H. Hays, Minister of Agriculture of Canada. He should go and talk to a leading Liberal newspaper in Saskatchewan, the Leader Post. I happened to have in my hand here an editorial from the Leader Post, December 1st, 1964, and the title is "Resurrecting A Ghost". The editorial starts out with:

The Liberal rank and file avoided embarrassment of the Thatcher government at last week's provincial convention by refraining from passing resolutions requesting substantial increases in provincial services. However, they did drag out the ghost of an unfulfilled promise of the federal Liberals. The inauguration of a two price system for wheat.

Again it says:

With the responsibility of office on their shoulders, Prime Minister Pearson and his government have not implemented the promise to adopt the two price system.

And then again they say:

They have been wise in leaving this promise hidden away.

Later in the editorial, it says:

Accordingly, the Liberals appear to be trying to resurrect a morbid condition. They certainly haven't found in this manoeuvre a way of winning back the electoral support the federal Liberals have lost among the wheat producers.

I thought that was very interesting. Here's another from the Financial Times, published in Montreal. It is an editorial of January 4th, 1965, and it starts out:

Mr. Harry Hays is a Minister of Agriculture with a style of his own, and his characteristic bluntness sometimes cuts through political tangles which other politicians find impenetrable.

Now watch him cut. In his recent speech to the Farmers Union of Alberta, it is reported that:

Mr. Hayes rescued the Liberal party from

an impossible wheat policy which had hung like a noose around his neck since before the last election. Instead of pussy-footing around it or hoping it would disappear if it were not mentioned, Mr. Hays simply told the farmers that the Liberal policy dreamed up by Mr. Hazen Argue was not in their interest and he added that it never had been adopted.

Another paragraph says:

The Liberals are just rid of a promise . . .

Isn't this good!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): —

. . . to guarantee a wheat price of \$2.00 a bushel and to establish a two price system with different prices for domestic consumption.

And the final paragraph I will read:

Now at last it has been openly repudiated and publicly buried. The Liberals have another chance to restore their position in the prairie provinces. They may not get much help from Mr. Argue, but to judge from experience, they will be better without it.

I have in my hand some pamphlets that were circulated in the general election in 1963, but apparently they are not policies of the Liberal Party. I remarked across the floor of the house a little while ago that what we are trying to do is to keep the Liberal party honest, keep them fulfilling some of their promises at least. Here is what, the little book says:

A new Liberal government will maintain a minimum price for wheat of \$2.00 a bushel for no. 1 Northern at Lake Head on all sales made under the current international wheat agreement and on all domestic sales. If the \$2.00 price is above the world price level, then a deficiency payment to farmers in respect of domestic sales of wheat will be treated as a consumer subsidy.

The hon. member for Yorkton, (Mr. Gallagher), and the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Romuld), were talking as if this \$2.00 guaranteed price didn't amount to anything for wheat. It really wasn't much because we proposed it from this side of the house. If that is true, why did they have it in this great Liberal platform. To try to fool the people of Saskatchewan and other places and get them to vote for them? My hon. friend over here says that a higher proportion of Saskatchewan people voted Liberal in that election than voted for the New Democratic party. If he is right, why were the Liberals in this house, Mr. Speaker, so delicate about supporting a motion that asked plain and flat for \$2.00 a bushel?

Now what I want from the Liberal party, is not promises, but action and I think we need to ask for something definite and something that was in that program and try to get some action on it. But instead, a great wordy amendment comes out and I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, you helping the hon. member to get his amendment in order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! That's an unparliamentary statement. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I will certainly withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, but I meant no harm. But this amendment is a long wordy amendment with a whole

lot of things in it. It is no better coming from the Liberals in Saskatchewan than the Liberal platform, which has been repudiated by Mr. Hays, repudiated by Mr. Pearson and backed up by the eastern papers. Now I know that I would sooner see this legislature pass this amendment than a motion that does nothing but I think we would be doing better to ask the government at Ottawa for one fine clear cut thing at a time.

I am going to vote against the amendment as long as it is an amendment, but when it is substituted for the motion, I will have to vote for it, I would have to vote for the amendment. And I want to say this, before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, last Friday, hon. Members opposite agreed this was an urgent matter, then when it came a little later in the day, they didn't think it was urgent, and all the members stood up on the opposite side to vote against considering it.

Mr. Gallagher: — I think that the member is out of order in bringing this matter up at this time. He is speaking on the amendment that I proposed to this house. He is entirely out of order for bringing this matter out.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, you told us that the debate was on the amendment and the motion and I can cover the whole debate since this affair was started on Friday. I want to remind the hon. members, whether they like it or not, they stood up and voted to the effect that this matter wasn't urgent on Friday and again on Monday night, Monday afternoon, they stood up and said it wasn't urgent and finally I am very happy indeed that they got their courage up to face this motion and get it dealt with today.

Mr. George Leith (Elrose): — I also, like the member from Canora, (Mr. Romuld). I am a new member in this house and I am very happy to be here and see some of the things that I never really believed about this legislature until I got here. I was particularly impressed at the agility of some of the tactics that have been used, and I'm going to note them for future reference. I hope that I too can become as able and as quick as the tacticians on both sides of this house.

I would like to speak, Mr. Speaker, to this motion and amendment, and I would like to tell you first, Sir, that I represent a constituency that last year shipped 8,000 carloads of grain of all kinds. I must confess that this wasn't the calendar year, because I sent a questionnaire to every shipping point in the Elrose constituency and asked someone there to find out how many carloads of grain were shipped of all kinds, how many carloads of seed grain came in. Some of the people who answered misunderstood me. Some used the crop year of 1963-64, and others the calendar year of 1964. But the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that over 8000 carloads of grain were shipped. This doesn't qualify me as an expert on the price of wheat, but it does qualify me as a representative of a number of people who have a big stake in the question which is now before the house.

I think that the average size of a farm in that area has some bearing on it. I would guess that it is between 640 and 800 acres, large perhaps for Saskatchewan. I have prepared a table to which I would like to refer from time to time. It is based on five different sizes of farms, ranging from 160 to 1600 acres. Believe it or not, there are a few farms in Saskatchewan that have acreage of 1600 or more. Most of the farms are 160 acres, a great many of them have 320 acres, 640 acres probably is what we should be thinking about as the maximum size; 1280 is not an usual size, but 1600 acres is unusual.

Sir, let us suppose that the average crop on each of these farms is 15 bushels to the acre. I don't think that this is far out as the long term average, although some areas will have an average of 30 bushels. In my own particular area, over a ten year average it is 15. The point I am going to make, Mr. Speaker, to the members of this assembly, is that the measures that we're asking for are not approved by all the farmers in Saskatchewan. Up until a couple of years ago, I was against any kind of subsidy, but looking at the figures that I present to you now, and looking at the quotas that we are going to be facing, if we accept a subsidy figure I want to tell you that a ten per cent cut in the price of wheat is going to mean that more than ten per cent of the farmers in Saskatchewan are going to have to leave. The profit margin is too narrow now. I would guess that the average costs of farming in an ordin-

any straight grain farm would run between \$12 and \$18 an acre and this is considering everything including depreciation on equipment, depreciation on buildings, interest on investment and a small wage to the operator. I want to point out to you that with a five bushel quota on a 160 acre farm, the operator will be able to sell 500 bushels. If you take the price of wheat at \$2.00 in our country, this means the effective price the farmer gets is about \$1.75 and I think some of the members opposite and some of our own non-farmers in the province would be interested to know that when we talk about \$2.00 wheat, what we're really saying is that the farmer gets about \$1.75 or \$1.80. On this five bushel quota on a 160 acre farm the farmer can sell 800 bushels at \$1.75. His income, his total net income if he sells wheat that year is \$1400. For a 320 acre farm, his total net income would be \$2800. For a 640 acre section farm, his total net income would be \$5600. The total income of the farmer who farms 1600 acres, if he sells a five bushel crop is \$14,000. On our eight bushel quota on the other hand, a quarter section farmer will sell 1280 bushels. A section farmer will sell 5120 bushels and the 1600 acre farmer will sell, 12,800. A ten bushel quota, of course, is just double the five bushel quota, and at this quota, if the quarter section man sells 1600 bushels at \$1.75, his total net income is \$2800. A section farmer would receive \$11,200 and if we take the cost of production into this, I think that everybody in this house will agree that this isn't nearly enough money to operate on. I now support the two price system. The two price system, if it were paid on the unit, that is if the farmer were to get a dollar extra for the unit that he sells, this would mean an addition of \$300 for each farmer. I don't consider that is enough. I believe that the cost of farming has gone up faster than any subsidy can keep up with. We could subsidize some of the grain producers in this province to the rate of \$2.00 or \$3.00 a bushel and still they wouldn't be getting a sufficient return to raise a family and to operate their farms properly.

In respect to this Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the number of delivery permits that have been issued to producers in the last twenty-five years has dropped considerably. In 1941, there were 114,275 delivery permits. In 1962-63, there were 102,399. An interesting sidelight on this is that the Agriculture Department tells us that there are about 7,500 farmers in Saskatchewan. That means that there are 14,900 more permit books out in Saskatchewan than there are farmers. I find this very interesting and especially so if we are going into a two price system. If we are thinking about paying a dollar extra on every bushel sold on the unit delivery quota or something like this, this is one of the things that this house is going to have to consider and that the Canadian Wheat Board is going to have to consider. These 14,900 people who now have permit books and who are not farmers shouldn't get this extra money.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to bore you with more figures, I just want to say that I support the amendment and that I will vote for it.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, in rising in the house at this time, I would like to take this opportunity to compliment you on the high office to which you have been raised in this house. This is the first time I have had the opportunity to speak and I would like to take this opportunity to speak and I would like to take this opportunity to say this. I have, as some members are aware, spent some, a short time in the chair which you now occupy. I guess I wasn't too well qualified as I wasn't left there too long, but I am sure from my association with you that you have the mental ability and the characteristics that will enable you to be a good Speaker in this house. I am sure that you will fulfil your duties in this regard to the best of your ability and this is no mean ability and I am sure that you will go down as one of the best Speakers we have had in this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — The motion and the amendment that we have before us at this time deal with a guaranteed price for the farmers of Western Canada of at least \$2.00 per bushel. Now, I don't think that there appears to be a great deal of argument about the necessity of this and of the eligibility of the farmer to receive this type of assistance. I think it is generally conceded throughout Canada, at least in Western Canada, that the farmer entitled to this sort of treatment. I would like to quote, if I may, from Mr. J.M. Bently, the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in his annual report to the Canadian Federation in its recent annual meeting in Regina which was reported in the Leader Post of

January 28th. He said:

During the last five years, compared with the five years following the Second World War, the index of costs that come out of these services used by the farmers increased by 60.9 per cent, while the index of farm prices increased by only 15 per cent. The average net income of each farm operator went up by 7.8 per cent in 1963 compared with 1949.

While using the same years the average weekly manufacturing wages increased by 42.8 per cent, while the income of the farm operator went up by only 7.8 per cent.

I think this is an indication of the fact that farmers do need some assistance. I think if we were to carry this on further, we can look to the loss of population which we have had in the farming areas in this province. I know that the members opposite have cried, what I consider crocodile tears, over the last number of years in regard to the loss of population in Saskatchewan, but they haven't always, I think, stopped to look to see where this loss of population was and what was the cause of it. The cities of Saskatoon and Regina were the third and the fourth fastest growing cities in the Dominion of Canada. This would indicate to me that there was industrial growth in these areas. When you're looking for industrial growth, you don't look for it out in the farming areas, you look for it in the city areas. Our urban populations have increased quite satisfactorily as compared to other urban areas in Canada. But our farm population dropped. I believe this was due to no small extent, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that income on the farm is not adequate. The farmers are leaving the farms for the simple reason that they could not make an adequate living and they are moving to urban centres in order to obtain what they felt was a better opportunity to provide for their families.

I think that this is quite clear to any unbiased person that the farmers of Saskatchewan and the other parts of Western Canada have been entitled to a better income than what they have been getting and I am quite sure that this matter of subsidized, established price for wheat is one way in which it can be achieved. Now the hon. member from Yorkton, (Mr. Gallagher) spoke considerably upon some of the reasons why the price of grain had dropped and he went on to defend the position of the Wheat Board. Now I am sure that there is no one in this house, especially on this side, that has any words to say against the Wheat Board. Throughout the years, we, members of this party which I represent, have stood staunchly behind the operations of the Wheat Board and we will certainly continue to do so. We're very pleased to see that the hon. members opposite are also taking this position. However, I don't think that the matter of the pros and cons of the market situation at the present time are too relevant to the matter we have before us. We realize that there are troubles abroad in regards to the price of wheat which the farmers of Saskatchewan and Western Canada are to receive, but we feel that the important issue before us is the farmers of Western Canada and Saskatchewan be not left alone to combat this drop in the price of grain. We feel that it is imperative that we have some other support from the federal government in this regard. They feel that they must have subsidies, now I feel that it is quite apparent that these subsidies must come from the federal treasury.

The hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher) the other day indicated that we should not be moving a resolution of this type, crying to Ottawa for assistance, that we should be prepared to stand on our own feet and some of the remarks that have been made today by members from Yorkton, (Mr. Gallagher) and from Canora, (Mr. Romuld), indicated they felt that we were out of order in asking Ottawa for this assistance. I cannot for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, see how they can expect to get this kind of assistance within Saskatchewan. We're not talking here of few dollars to improve the farming communities by allowing them to use purple gas in trucks, or refunding or turning back to the farmers a small proportion of the mineral tax or things along this line. We are talking about what Mr. Gibbings says is between \$50 and \$75,000,000 for Western Canada. I agree this would not amount to so much in Saskatchewan alone, possibly some \$43,000,000 or so, but Mr. Gibbings, may I say, was talking in regard to only this recent drop of price, and I do believe that if we are going to talk about at least a \$2.00 bushel of

wheat we have to talk about something further and beyond what we have been earlier receiving. Last year, I believe, Mr. Speaker, we received for no. 1 wheat F.O.B. Fort William was \$1.90. This was the price that was received by the farmers of Western Canada and this is what was received under buoyant market conditions. Now if these are going to drop by 15 cents or so, and its going to take \$50 or \$75,000,000 to return, to bring it back to where it was before, we must also take into consideration that farmers had not previously been receiving \$2.00 wheat at Lake Head, so I do maintain that, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here for the farmers of Saskatchewan is something well in excess of \$60,000,000 that must be found in the treasury somewhere to assist the farmers of Saskatchewan in this regard.

Now I don't think that you can look for this sort of assistance from the treasury, from the Saskatchewan government or from the people of this province. I think that this must be found outside of this province. I think it must be found in the federal treasury and I can see nothing wrong whatsoever, in us putting this request at the door where it belongs, the federal government.

After all, other people do these things. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool refers to, and Mr. Gibbings of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool refers to the federal government. Mr. Bently, whom I quoted, from the Federation of Agriculture, these and other people at this conference passed a resolution asking for these subsidies from the federal government. Everybody looks to the federal government for these things and yet if it is mentioned in this house, we are entirely out of order. I think that this is a very false conception and I think it is endeavouring to put a false picture before the people of this province, that we here in Saskatchewan are responsible for the conditions of the wheat situation. We definitely are not, never have been and never will be, so long as we have the federal system working as it is at the present time. I maintain that this is a federal problem . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — It was the federal Liberals who made this promise. They accepted the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, when they made this promise, They realized it was their responsibility, they realized that they had the power and it was their responsibility if they were elected as Government of Canada to look after the price of wheat in Western Canada. And they made this promise that we should have \$2.00 wheat, at least \$2.00 wheat, at the Lake Head if they were elected. I can see nothing wrong and I think it is very right indeed that we should bring this matter to their attention. I feel that the farmers of this province and of Western Canada, do have, it is their due that they should have this type of assistance given to them. After all, the prices of the things that the farmer has to buy are in many cases artificially held up and there is no reason in the world, that I can see, why the prices of the things which they have to sell should not as well be artificially maintained. There is no reason why we should not have the price held at \$2.00 a bushel for the farmers of Saskatchewan and Western Canada, irrespective of whether this money is found through a two price system or whether it is found from the treasuries of the Government of Canada. I can't see that it makes too much difference, Mr. Speaker, whether we are talking about a two price system for wheat or whether we are talking about subsidies. So long as the people of Western Canada receive this type of assistance which is going to enable them to keep in business, because, otherwise, I'm afraid you are going to find that the family farm is in many ways and in many places, going to become extinct, that we are going to find that the farmers of Saskatchewan as we now know them, are not going to be able to carry on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I wanted to mention, that was that the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) said that we should not be talking about a price war because this is a thing that we should not be mentioning at this time. It is dangerous. Well, I notice in the statements that were made that Mr. Gibbings, in a report from the Saskatoon Star of January 26th, is quoted as speaking of the fact that it could develop into an international price war and Mr. Parker, whom the hon. member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) was quoting, also says "I told him this could precipitate a price war".

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker, that rather amused me I may say, in regard to the words from, I believe it was the hon. member from Canora (Mr. Romuld) that castigated the members on this side for bringing

in such a resolution without giving it sufficient thought. He said that if they had stopped to read what was in the paper, last night's paper, they might not have done it. Well, we didn't bring this in today, we brought it in last Friday, and it was rather an impossible thing for us to have read last night's paper before we brought this thing in. I have the clipping here . . .

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — We're not that close to the editor . . .

Mr. Wood: — But we are not psychic, we couldn't tell what was going to be in last night's paper, but we brought this resolution in on Friday.

I do feel that, these people did not feel that they were doing wrong by mentioning the price war, I feel it was something that they wanted to raise a warning about, and I also would like to point out to the hon. member from Yorkton, (Mr. Gallagher) that in his motion itself, he mentions the possibility of a price war between exporting countries and the price war itself. I don't believe is mentioned in the resolution that was brought in by Mr. Brockelbank, the . . .

Mr. Leith: — Promoting for him . . .

Mr. Wood: — . . . hon. member from Kelsey. Now, we may have been promoting a price war but we surely didn't go out and call these things by name and really go into the matter like the member has himself and what these other members are from these other organizations. Not that there is anything especially wrong with it, but I would like to point out we are not the people who are endeavoring to bring something that is going to be hurtful to the people of this province so far as the farmers are concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the question before us is not that we should have subsidy. The question is as to who should pay this subsidy. As I have pointed out I don't feel it should be extracted in any way from the people of this province, I feel it should be laid to the door of the federal government who have made these promises and they are the ones who should be expected to keep the promises which they have made. It is very necessary that we have a floor under the price of wheat. Something upon which we can depend, something solid by the way of price structure that the people of Western Canada can depend on. All we have at the present time in this regard is a promise from the Liberal party that when they were elected they would do this. Now I ask the hon. members opposite, is this sufficient, is this a sufficient guarantee that the farmers of Saskatchewan will not have to sell wheat at a lower price than \$2.00 a bushel for no. 1 at the Lake Head? It is a good question. If the Liberal party is prepared to keep their promise, this is a very good guarantee. But I think that we should call on them to make sure that they implement this guarantee, and I don't think that this house should be castigated for bringing this matter sharply to their attention at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking in the debate the other day, Mr. Premier, I think, established rather another first for Saskatchewan. He intimated that the Socialists are like the Bourbons, in that "they never learn". Well, I think that this is the first time in history that anybody has accused the Bourbons of having anything that was similar to socialism. I can think of other persons who have possibly a little more similarity to them than what the Socialists have. After all they were removed from office by the people of France and after a term of years came back into power again by the use of force outside of their country. It was said of them that they never learned. Besides this, I believe the quotation goes on to say that "'they never forget". Now, I didn't want to make any comparisons between the Liberal party here and the Bourbons but apparently they are not like them in this regard, because it seems that they are quite able to forget. They have forgotten that the last Liberal government that was in Saskatchewan between 1938 and 1944 did feel it sufficiently important that they stop the business of this house to bring to the attention of the Federal government the necessity of doing something about the price of wheat in Western Canada.

When this government opposite had the opportunity to do something for the western farmer and for Canada in this regard, they turned it aside. They said, "This is not an urgent matter. We shall adjourn

this debate".

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — Let's vote now.

Mr. Wood: — They adjourned the debate again, and I think they lost a good deal of the benefit that this resolution could have had by the fact that this is the third day that we have been dealing with it. I think that if it had been passed unanimously at that time by the house, the impact upon the people of . . .

An Hon. Member: — Who is doing the talking now?

Mr. Wood: — . . . Canada, and upon the Federal government, would be a great deal more than what it will be by being passed as the situation is now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — Apparently, the Liberal party in Saskatchewan has forgotten that they do owe this sort of thing to the people of this province and that was recognized by the former Liberal regime back before 1944.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have maybe held down the floor for long enough. I think that it would be very good if we do pass a resolution here that is going to be effective in bringing to the notice of the people of Canada the plight with which the western farmers find themselves, and make this as forceful as possible.

I think that the original motion would have been more forcible and more suitable than the one that is now proposed. So I do not at this time, Mr. Speaker, propose to support the amendment.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to delay the house very long. I have listened carefully to the contributions to this debate the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), and the member for Canora, (Mr. Romuld) and the member for Elrose, (Mr. Leith), and members on this side of the house, and it struck me in listening to the debates that the principal objection which members opposite had to the resolution as it stood in the order paper in the name of the member for Kelsey (Brockelbank) was some apparent lack of decisiveness in the motion. I believe the member for Canora (Mr. Romuld) referred to it as "watered down".

The suggestion was that what was called for was a resolution which asked for immediate action of a hard-hitting nature.

Then, I read again, the amendment to the resolution which had been submitted by the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and I saw what I thought were perhaps some unfortunate words, in that it purports to "request" the federal government to "give consideration to" a two price system. It occurred to me that this might not put into words the urgency and decisiveness which is obviously felt by both sides of the house. With respect to this, as I interpreted the contributions to the debate, I felt that members on all sides of the house want not consideration but rather immediate implementation of a two price system as well as the establishment of a guaranteed minimum price. It occurred to me that the house might be better expressing its intention if we changed a few words in the resolution and accordingly I am proposing to move, seconded by the member for Watrous, (Mr. H.A. Broten):

That the words "give consideration to implementation of" be deleted and the following substituted therefore: "implement forthwith".

Mr. Speaker: — To the amendment moved by the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), seconded by the member for Canora (Mr. Romuld), a sub-amendment is being moved by the member for Regina (Mr. Blakeney), seconded by the member for Watrous (Mr. Broten). I presume the amendment as read and I will now read the sub-amendment.

An Hon. Member: — Read the amendment again.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

An Hon. Member: — The sub-amendment, I should say.

Mr. Speaker: — The amendment is being called for and I will read the amendment. On the motion of the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) seconded by the member for Canora (Mr. Romuld):

That all the words after the word "That" where it first appears in the action be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

while this legislature reaffirms its confidence in the Wheat Board system of wheat marketing, and expresses its appreciation for the tremendous achievement of the Canadian Government, in marketing the record 1963 crop at the highest prices in recent years, we are concerned at the recent decline in wheat prices, and the possibility of a price war between exporting countries.

This assembly, therefore, urges the Wheat Board and the Canadian Government to do everything possible to reinforce international co-operation to protect prairie producers from the unfair competition of subsidized wheat exported by other countries, and respectfully requests the Canadian Government to take such measures as are consistent with the achievement of international price stability, and to give consideration to implementation of a two price system for wheat, and to establish a guaranteed minimum price for no. 1 Northern Wheat Basis Fort William of at least \$2.00 per bushel.

To which amendment a sub-amendment has been moved by the member for Regina (Mr. Blakeney) seconded by the member for Watrous (Mr. Broten):

That the words "give consideration to implementation of" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "implement forthwith".

Debate continued on the sub-amendment.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to talk at any great length, as I presume the house would like to dispose of this matter tonight, but the sub-amendment that has been moved and is now before the house, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, does nothing to improve the original amendment. It is common courtesy for one government to ask another, or even for an opposition to ask a government, to do certain things or to give consideration to doing certain things, and I think that the wording of the original amendment is a much better wording than the wording "implement forthwith". Are my hon. friends so touchy over this subject that they must attempt to clutter up the amendment that has been proposed by my colleagues . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — We just don't trust . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Well, if you don't trust the Liberals, I am going to read into the records of this house, — I won't do it tonight, I haven't got time, — that I have a document consisting of forty foolscap pages of promises that were made by my hon. friends opposite over a period of twenty years and that were never kept. Now, if there is a political party on the face of the earth that could not keep its promises, would not keep its promises, and had no

intention of keeping them, it is my friends opposite . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — What question are you talking about?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . and I guarantee I will read them into the record again this session.

To return to the point in question. I think that if we were to accept the sub-amendment, we do nothing but weaken the case we are making for western farmers. I would ask members on both sides of the house to defeat the sub-amendment, to pass the motion as amended.

Surely to goodness, this house has the common courtesy and the desire to thank the Canadian Wheat Board for the efforts they have made on behalf of farmers in Western Canada. The resolution expresses our thanks in this regard. It says that we are concerned about the cutting of prices of wheat, — where this started, I don't think matters at the moment. But in the interest of the farmers of Saskatchewan, that the 12 cent loss, which is an average of 12 cents from grades one to feed, is a loss that the farmers of Saskatchewan and Western Canada cannot carry themselves. It is a loss that the legislature of Saskatchewan cannot compensate our farmers for, I agree. The loss will amount to about \$48,000,000 if we sell 400,000,000 bushels of wheat this year. Fifty per cent of that wheat will come from the province of Saskatchewan, which means that our farmers will lose roughly \$24,000,000.

We are asking that policies be implemented that will reimburse our farmers for this loss. I sincerely hope that the sub-amendment will be defeated and that the resolution as amended will be passed and can be forwarded to the national government tomorrow.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, this is three times that this motion has been altered, or four times. When the hon. members opposite put a motion on the order paper, and I always got ahead of it, they change back. It was a milk and water resolution.

May I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this second amendment of theirs, this second version of their viewpoint is also watered down milk and water. If the hon. members opposite really felt keenly about a subsidy and the two price system, they would have said something about this long ago. But nothing is mentioned in the first resolution brought into this house. Now the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) says that "the word 'forfeit' will weaken the resolution, that it is impolite". He seems to forget that the Liberal party at the last election made a solemn pledge to the farmers of the prairies that they would guarantee them a price of \$2.00 a bushel and also a two price scheme toward domestically consumed wheat.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) says that the amendment adds nothing to the resolution. It strengthens the resolution tremendously because a pledge was made and it merely asks the federal government to now implement that pledge immediately in both regards, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Question.

Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River): — I only want to speak for one moment on this and that is to direct my remarks chiefly to those members who sit on this side of the house.

I believe that one of the things that have been missed, perhaps in all the discussion on this motion, is the fact that we want to present to the federal government, as far as possible, the feeling of unanimity of purpose in making this request. I want to make a special appeal to those members who sit in the official opposition to your left, Sir, an appeal to support the amendment, should their sub-amendment be defeated so that we may present a united front from Saskatchewan on this question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the house is on the sub-amendment, by the member for Regina (Mr. Blakeney) seconded by the member for Watrous (Mr. Broten):

That the words "give consideration to implementation of" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:
"implement forthwith."

Yeas — 24

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Nicholson	Broten
Wood	Kramer	Larson
Nollet	Dewhurst	Robbins
Blakeney	Smishek	Brockelbank (Sktn. City)
Walker	Michayluk	Pepper
Davies	Link	Pederson
Thibault	Baker	
Willis	Wooff	
Whelan	Snyder	

Nays — 30

Thatcher	Loken	Leith
Howes	MacDougall	Bjarnason
McFarlane	Coderre	Romuld
Boldt	McIsaac	Weatherald
Cameron	Trapp	MacLennan
McDonald (Moosomin)	Grant	Larochelle
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Asbell
Heald	MacDonald (Milestone)	Hooker
Guy	Gallagher	Radloff
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Coupland

Mr. Speaker: — On the proposed motion of Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey) an amendment has been moved by the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) seconded by the member for Canora (Mr. Romuld). The question before is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 31

Thatcher	MacDougall	Romuld
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	McIsaac	MacLennan
Boldt	Trapp	Larochelle
Cameron	Grant	Asbell
McDonald (Moosomin)	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	Radloff
Heald	Gallagher	Coupland
Guy	Breker	Pederson
Merchant Mrs.)	Leith	
Loken	Bjarnason	

Nays — 22

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Whelan	Wooff
Wood	Nicholson	Snyder
Nollet	Kramer	Larson

Walker
Blakeney
Davies
Thibault
Willis

Dewhurst
Michayluk
Smishek
Link
Baker

Robbins
Brockelbank (Sktn. City)
Pepper

Mr. Speaker: — We have a matter of procedure here in question. The clerk didn't see the member for Watrous (Mr. Broten) stand when the 'Yeas' were called for and I must say that I didn't see him standing either. I didn't see him standing either. I think the rules and the regulations say that if he wished to give his vote with the 'Yeas', he had to stand with the 'Yeas'. I do not think that, according to our procedure and according to all the authorities that I can recall, it is possible to record his vote with the 'Yeas'. At this stage if any member wants his vote recorded with the Yeas, he has to stand with the Yeas. If he wishes it recorded with the Nays, he has to stand with Nays, when they are called.

An Hon. Member: — What is he going to be called now?

Mr. H. Broten (Watrous): — I am willing to follow your ruling. I want to vote with the 'Yeas'. Yes, I want to vote with the 'Yeas'.

Mr. Speaker: — You wish to vote with the 'Yeas'. But I think if . . .

Mr. Broten: — I will follow your ruling on it, Sir. I don't know what to do under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker: — I am sorry, but you didn't rise with the 'Yeas', did you?

Mr. Broten: — No, that is right.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I am afraid that your vote will be disallowed on that basis. If anybody wants to vote 'Yea', he must rise with the 'Yeas' when called. If they want to vote 'Nay' they have to rise with the 'Nays'. I think we have to be very careful in regard to this, in view of the three parties we have in the house at this time.

Now, the question before the house is on the motion as amended. Will the house take it as read?

The motion as amended was agreed to unanimously.

The assembly adjourned at 10:16 o'clock p.m.