

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SECOND SESSION - SIXTEENTH LEGISLATURE
3rd Day**

Monday, February 3, 1969

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a good deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to other Members of the House a group of students in the Speaker's gallery from Herchmer School in the constituency of Regina Centre. They are a group of grade seven and eight students. They are a special interest group who are making a special study of public speaking and group dynamics. I don't know whether this is the proper place to hold out as an example of either dynamism or of public speaking but at least they have made their choice. They are here, Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of their teacher, Mr. Donald Dougall, and they were brought here by their driver, Mr. Hubick. I know that all of us including yourself, Mr. Speaker, wish them an enjoyable afternoon and hopefully an instructive one.

STATEMENT ON RADIO BROADCASTS

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I was asked on Friday by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) about arrangements this year for the broadcasts of the proceedings of the House. The number of radio stations carrying the broadcasts this year has been reduced to nine from 12. It was felt that a significant saving could be achieved without too great a loss of coverage by introducing a policy of rotating the broadcasts annually in cities or areas which have more than one station. For this reason the broadcasts were placed this year on one station only in each of the Regina, Saskatoon and general western and northwestern areas of the province.

If this system appears to work satisfactorily it will be continued, that is, the broadcast will be assigned to other stations in these areas next year. I might point out that in Saskatoon and Regina the broadcasts are being carried this year over stations which were not included in the network in 1968. Having decided on a one-station policy this seemed the fairest way of going about it. The broadcasts in 1968 cost some \$20,000. This year they will cost in the neighborhood of \$15,000. If for any reason this innovation proves unsatisfactory, we will of course be prepared to review it for the 1970 session.

ANNOUNCEMENT

APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF REAL ACOOSE TO SGIO

Mr. Thatcher: — While on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make another brief announcement. Chief Real Acoose of the Sakimay Indian Reserve near Grenfell has been appointed to the board of directors of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. Mr. Acoose will take his seat on the board immediately.

Mr. Acoose operates a mixed farm which includes 900 cultivated acres and is a member of the Sakimay School Board. You will I am sure realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is the second Indian Chief appointed to a Crown Corporation and we hope shortly to be able to announce that one has been appointed to the Saskatchewan Telephone Corporation.

His appointment to the board of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office is part of the Government's program of giving our native people a voice in decision making at the highest level of Government agencies.

QUESTIONS

RADIO BROADCASTS

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — I wonder if the Premier could tell us with respect to the stations carrying the broadcasts, is it being carried by Lloydminster and North Battleford, or North Battleford or Lloydminster?

Mr. Thatcher: — Neither, Mr. Speaker. The stations are CJME in Regina; CFMC-FM, Saskatoon; CJGX, Yorkton; CJSL, Weyburn-Estevan; CJVR, Melfort; CKBI, Prince Albert; CKSW, Swift Current; CKKR, Rosetown; CHAB, Moose Jaw.

Mr. Lloyd: — May I just ask a supplementary question. Doesn't this leave a great big gap in the entire northwestern part of the province by leaving out both North Battleford and Lloydminster?

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, it was the opinion of the Committee which prepared this that this was not so. You will realize that Prince Albert station, CJME, Regina, and the North Battleford station are all owned by the same gentleman, and we thought that if we gave two out of three of his stations the broadcasts we are doing pretty well. We decided that the Lloydminster coverage was such that we could, for this year at least, get along without it. But I have assured Mr. Shortell that next year we will try and put Lloydminster back on.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier's yardstick I think is a little off here, if I may say so. It seems to me that we are not too interested in who is getting paid for the service. We are interested in what kind of service the people of our area are getting. Are you not interested in the service?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University) for an Address-In-Reply.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, before I return to comments on the Speech from the Throne I think it appropriate that I follow the discussion which took place on the Orders of the Day a bit further.

Like the Member for North Battleford I feel that it is regrettable that both of the stations which cover the majority of Northwestern Saskatchewan should be omitted from carrying the broadcast this year. Surely either Lloydminster or North Battleford should be included in that list and I hope that the Government will look at it again. I agree heartily with the Member from The Battlefords that the important measure is certainly not who owns the station — that has nothing to do with it whatever — it is whether or not the people in the northwestern part of the province have a chance to hear these broadcasts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, in my remarks this afternoon, I want to deal almost entirely with two topics which are of major importance to all of the people in Saskatchewan. Those are the topics of 1. Agriculture, 2. Education. I recognize that there was some press speculation, Mr. Speaker, that Members of our party at the beginning of the session would be moving for a special debate on the matters of agriculture. I gather that even the Government thought that this was a possible situation and it seems that this may be one of the reasons for it changing the order of proceedings in the House from that which is traditionally observed. It appears that it thought that by changing the order in that way it might somehow or another forestall the possibility of a special debate on agriculture. However, our group decided against asking for a special debate at the beginning of the Throne Speech. We did so because in our opinion the handling by this Government of problems of farm people has been so bad that this ought to be the main focus of the Throne Speech Debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 3, 1969

Mr. Lloyd: — Nothing so much justifies a vote of lack of confidence as does this Government's non-concern with the problems of agriculture in Saskatchewan. This is a non-concern which affects not only the people in agriculture but people in every walk of life. The failure of this Government to act in what is a crisis and emergency situation for agriculture is I submit an inevitable product of their particular and indeed peculiar economic and political philosophy. This was the philosophy which the Members will recall was excelled and emphasized by the mover of the Address-in-Reply to the exclusion of everything else when he spoke in this House on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that this Legislature discuss agriculture in some detail for another reason. It seems obvious that the Federal Government is unconvinced that there is a problem with respect to agriculture and that it too is convinced that its programs are adequate. It would seem that it has closed both its eyes and its mind to the problems of this basic industry of Saskatchewan. Therefore it is important that we here try to convince the Provincial Government to try harder to convince their political blood brothers in Ottawa that there is a big problem with respect to agriculture. Now after all, Mr. Speaker, we have a Liberal Cabinet Minister in the Government at Ottawa. We were told for a long while that this sort of arrangement would settle almost everything. Instead of settling things it seems to have made it somewhat more difficult.

We will agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is good to see the Saskatchewan sun rising over potash mines and oil fields and pulp mills. That is good. We are not prepared to sit quietly as they are and see the sun setting over the remnants of Saskatchewan agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The problem of course has been with us for a long while. It has been made more crucial and more destructive by the presence of millions of bushels of damp grain in our province. But as the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) reminded us the other day, it has been here and I agree it has been accumulated for some 50 years. And this the Member from Cannington didn't say, all that while we had free enterprise government at Ottawa during that entire period. The problem has been here for a long time.

It has been made worse by the accumulation of damp grain this fall. I submit that the handling by the Government of Saskatchewan of the damp grain problem has been inept, inadequate, impractical, provident and inexcusable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Rip Van Winkle was a piker

compared to Saskatchewan's Minister of Agriculture. Old Rip, after a solid drunk as I understand, went to sleep for a long while. I don't know what it was that touched the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). I am sure he didn't sleep quite as long, but he slept just as soundly. And old Rip even recognized change when he did awaken and that is more than can be said for our Minister of Agriculture in this particular case.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The fact of the matter is that the Government of Saskatchewan waited too long before doing anything and then it did practically nothing. The advice that we got from the seconder of the Speech from the Throne on Friday was that all we had to do was to wait until the sun shone and all would be right. You know that sort of saying, "Wait until the sun shines, Mary" or "Nellie" or whatever it was, and the problem of damp grain would melt away like the mists of the morning with the morning sun.

In all of this it was ably sided by their counterpart at Ottawa. Admittedly it made one feeble request to the Federal Government for cash assistance for drying grain. When the answer to that was "No" then Saskatchewan's Government subsided again into its deep and comfortable sleep. Whatever it uses, Mr. Speaker, it ought to bottle it and sell it as something to keep people calm in the face of difficulty.

During all of this period there were Saskatchewan voices from all across the province and every group in the province expressed concern with respect to this serious problem. It takes some time to review what has been said by others about this problem of recent months but I wasn't the House to indulge me in a survey of what has happened. As far back as September 14th the provincial executive of the New Democratic Party sent a wire to Prime Minister Trudeau. We had at that time listened to the Speech from the Throne from the Federal Government. We saw in that Speech from the Throne little of any value to agriculture and we used these words:

We urge that the agricultural committee of Parliament hold immediate public hearings in the Prairie Provinces. This will assure that Parliament is fully aware of all the grave problems facing the prairie farmers and indeed our whole economy. These problems arise from the lack of wheat sales, low prices and vastly increased costs.

That telegram we sent since the Prime Minister expresses an interest in communication. Our experience has been, Mr. Speaker, that he soon tires of the conversation.

In October the situation was visibly worse. Members of the New Democratic party caucus visited Carrot River and Melfort. We talked to individual farmers. We heard from representatives of farmers. We talked to individual businessmen. We heard

February 3, 1969

from boards of trade about this and other difficulties. As a result we issued a statement at that time urging:

The Provincial Government to examine the problem of storing large quantities of damp grain, to consider the possibility of purchasing grain dryers and make them available on an organized basis.

Had that been done at that time there would have been a lot less difficulty and worry in the Province of Saskatchewan today.

The Governments both Federal and Provincial should be consulting with the railroads so that as much damp grain as possible could be moved as quickly as possible to terminal elevators where there were some grain drying facilities.

Again, if that had been listened to at that time, there would have been a lot less difficulty in getting our wheat which we can sell onto ships to take to the buyers at this particular time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — A few days later, speaking in Lanigan, I drew attention of the Government and the public to some precedent for the Government of Saskatchewan taking action under somewhat similar circumstances. In 1951 we had a lot of damp grain in the province. The Government of that day assisted in the cost of bringing in the dryers to take care of the problem. The situation was much less. We brought in enough to take care of the problem . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The Government laughs and it has in the face of Saskatchewan people for the last three months and has done nothing about a problem many times as much.

An Hon. Member: — Tell us how many you brought in.

Mr. Lloyd: — I draw attention also to the fact that in 1959 and 1960 when there were large amounts of unthreshed grain in the province the Federal Government and the Provincial Government of that day acted again as the Government today has not acted. At that time some \$6 million was put into the pockets of Saskatchewan farmers by action of the Provincial Government. The situation wasn't nearly as bad as it is today. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, some other Saskatchewan voices made themselves heard and my hon. friends opposite laughed at them also. This time it was the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. They pointed out that not only was there a lack of action but there

was too much misleading information. They said the publicity relating to the availability of box-cars and grain drying facilities and storage terminals had led Saskatchewan farmers to believe that they would have little or no problem in getting rid of their damp grain. The Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) is singing the same song now some two or three months later. The Federation of Agriculture went on to point out that:

Prompt action had to be taken by all authorities, to put more pressure on railway companies to spot cars and speed up the eventual movement of grain to the terminals.

The Premier has finally caught up with this as of yesterday – that was November 14th, yesterday was February 2nd. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture added that, although the terminals might be set up to go, recent checks had shown they weren't being used and no damp grain had arrived.

Mr. Speaker, on December 5th the Saskatchewan Farmers Union speaking on their convention in Saskatoon added their voice to the situation. They wired the Prime Minister and they sent copies to the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) of Saskatchewan. They requested:

Immediate action in implementation of joint provincial-federal cost sharing program of direct financial assistance to farmers for emergency cost of drying out-of-condition grain on the farm.

That was December 5th.

On December 11th, three of my colleagues, the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman), and myself returned from a visit from North Dakota to see what they were doing down there to help their farmers beat this problem. We talked there with farmers who had damp grain. We talked with the farm members of boards of co-operative elevators who are processing damp grain. We talked with fieldmen for the Grain Terminal Association. We talked with the Farmers' Union and with co-operative organizations there. We were impressed with what these people had to say about their experience, not only this year but in previous years with the use of elevator-based drying facilities. We suggested when we returned that this was relevant to the Province of Saskatchewan.

At present in Saskatchewan, we said: 1. There is not enough drying capacity in the province. 2. Farmers are not organized for adequate use of present facilities. 3. Farmers do not have ready cash to pay the cost of commercial drying. 4 Experience indicates large amounts of grain are damaged due to a lack of knowledge of proper techniques. 5. Costs of drying in this haphazard fashion are excessive in terms of both operating and

February 3, 1969

capital costs.

And to these kind of suggestions my friends laughed as they did a minute ago. We went on to urge both the Government and the grain operating companies to act with regard to the installation of some elevator-based facilities, and we suggested that the Government and grain companies ought to be prepared to do something about financing. I am pleased to note that since that time some farmers and some grain companies have done something about it. The Government of Saskatchewan, however, simply laughs and says there is no problem there.

In order to emphasize our point of view, on December 12th we sent another wire to the Prime Minister of Canada. We pointed out to him that “the facilities for drying Saskatchewan grain were dangerously inadequate.” We urged “immediate action to install drying equipment at strategic locations.” We said that this was necessary if drastic spoilage was to be prevented. We urged in particular that as “many farmers without the ability to pay for drying” sizeable Federal assistance was essential to prevent drastic hardship for many farmers and further deterioration of the general economy. That was on December 12th. In order to elaborate on the comments I wrote to the Prime Minister the same day. And I want to read one part from that letter:

I cannot write too strongly about the seriousness of the problem which damp and tough grain poses for many individual farmers. The problem is of such a magnitude that it is completely beyond the ability of many farmers to handle. The cost of failure to take some immediate and comprehensive action is going to be of severe proportions. Consequences are more than economic since the most serious ones will affect farm families already very hard pressed.

I have to report, Mr. Speaker, that some six weeks afterwards I finally got a reply from the Federal Minister of Agriculture to that communication.

On December 12th, Mr. Speaker, the voice of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Directors was heard but not listened to by my friends opposite. They said this:

There is a danger that the system carrying grain from the prairies to the terminal elevators will be clogged up very badly with out-of-condition grain, thus Canada may not be able to meet some of its export commitments requiring shipment of dry grain.

They noted that a report from Vancouver reveals – and this was December 12th – that “ships are waiting at this moment for dry grain to take to Japan.” And still my hon. Friends across the way laughed and some of them hibernated. At least they were silent insofar as any leadership and support to farm organizations and farmers were concerned.

On December 13th, the Federal Minister of agriculture

(Mr. Olson) made a statement in the House which suggested that he had been getting wrong information from the Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). Because Minister Olson said and I quote:

Investigations by prairie provinces agriculture departments has ascertained there is sufficient grain drying equipment in place now in areas with damp and tough grain to handle the job of drying the grain.

When I saw this in the paper I wrote to our Minister of Agriculture asking him if he would inform me as to the basis which Mr. Olson had for making such a statement. The Minister very kindly wrote back to me and said that “the Department of Agriculture has not indicated there are enough dryers.” Now get the picture. Here is the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa saying investigations by the prairie agricultural departments say there is “enough grain drying equipment in place now to handle the job.” Here is the Provincial Minister of Agriculture saying that “the Department of Agriculture has not indicated there are enough dryers.” Clearly, Mr. Speaker, they didn’t know what each other was doing or what each other was thinking about the whole situation, and they have been some of the biggest culprits in adding to the confusion and the chaos in the grain industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, it was about this time that the Premier made his sole, single, solitary comment with the exception of a little bit yesterday, I understand. He is quoted in the Leader Post as saying that on December 18th there would be a meeting sought with Ottawa on the grain-drying question and that other Provinces would be invited to participate in a Federal-Provincial scheme to help dry the grain. Note the emphasis in that statement, Mr. Speaker. Not the great concern which the Premier showed in that particular statement. Compare it with what the Premier showed in that particular statement. Compare it with what the Premier can really do on some of these things when he takes off and gets into orbit on other things dearer and closer to his heart.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — On December 27th, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government announced that it was going to take action. It was going to make possible a loan of 10 cents a bushel up to a maximum of \$600. As I said at that time that “it missed the point or ignored the point.” They missed the point that “the farmer simply can’t afford the added cost of conditioning large quantities of damp grain so that it can be stored without spoiling.” And I added the comment “that this cost of drying grain plus the already bloated costs of farm production will put many farmers, particularly small farmers, reeling on the ropes.”

February 3, 1969

I revise that comment today, only to say that it will do more than put them “reeling” on the ropes. It is going to put a lot of them on their backs looking up wistfully at the ring but unable to get inside and take any part of the action. I say today as I said at that time, what is essential “is outright cash assistance to help farmers meet this cost.” And I add today as I added at that time that “the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan failed by not making a better case and by not making it earlier, by sleeping for two months after the problem was known” and it is now three months. The Provincial Government served to support the Federal Government’s position that the whole responsibility was that of the farmer. By failing to speak up sooner, the Provincial Government undermined its own request when finally in late December a request was made. But this move of the Federal Government to provide a mini loan was evidently okayed by the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan because the Agriculture Minister said on December 28th, he was “quite pleased” with it. The president of the National Farmers Union had pointed out that it was just another mortgage on the farm but our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) came out of hibernation long enough to say that he was pleased with this particular action, and then he went back into hibernation.

In the 1968 December White Paper of the Saskatchewan Government, we find admission that things aren’t as they ought to have been. It says and I quote the very words, “There are two major problems facing the agricultural sector.” It lists one of these as being a “lack of grain-drying equipment in order that damp and tough grain be dried.” Here it admits there is a lack of equipment but it still does nothing about meeting this particular problem and I have to ask what kind of Government is this?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — On January 1st of this year the Saskatchewan Farmers Union met – I take it with the Provincial Government. They repeated their request that there be a cash payment. They outlined at that time a schedule of payments which would start at 12 cents a bushel and which would reduce eventually to five cents per bushel come July. But again, the Saskatchewan Government gave no support whatsoever to this request. It comfortably hibernated some more.

A statement on January 3rd also should have brought it out of this deep sleep somewhat, Mr. Speaker, but it failed to do so. But at that time Mr. George Heffelfinger, President of the National Grain Company was quoted as saying, “There is a real danger that up to 400 million bushels will be lost to spoilage in the spring.” Mr. Heffelfinger’s figure applied to the prairie provinces of course, but a good bulk of this is in the Province of Saskatchewan, 400 million bushels or Saskatchewan’s share of it. Mr. Speaker, as important as pulp or potash or peat moss or parcels of land for mineral development are, it will take a long time before these make up for the loss in Saskatchewan of

that amount or half that amount or even one tenth of that amount.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — We get some further information about the lack of satisfactory progress in news reports on January 16th. At that time Mr. McNamara speaking on behalf of the Grain Transportation Committee said, and I quote, “Grain dryers are not being utilized to potential.” He went on to point out that a questionnaire had recently been distributed and returned from delivery points in the prairie provinces. This questionnaire showed that only about 900 of 3200 dryers were being used. He went on to point out that “agents from 703 delivery points reported a lack of availability of dryers.” May I recall that a short time before that the Federal Minister of Agriculture was saying not only are there enough dryers but there are enough dryers in place. The agents of 703 points said No, 358 agents said it was too cold to operate them, 210 said they were too expensive and 132 said farmers hope to haul their damp grain to country elevators or use it as feed.

May I turn also for January 16th information, Mr. Speaker, to a comment in the Western Producer. It was commenting on the annual meeting here in this city of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. It quotes the Federation of Agriculture as saying:

We feel a direct payment would provide incentive to get things done.

And it quotes a number of delegates as saying:

The situation is desperate. Leadership is necessary to ensure that millions of bushels of grain will not be unmarketable by spring.

But even this didn't do anything to put any fire under Saskatchewan's Provincial Government.

On the same day there is a lengthy editorial in the Western Producer from which I want to quote at some length and refer to it at some length. It comments on the Federal Government's offer on interest free loans:

This in no way takes care of the problem of drying for most farmers. All along, farm organizations have said that in view of the miserable delivery quota situation and the enormous amount of damp and tough grain in the country, grants rather than loans are needed to get as much drying done as possible.

The editorial refers to the request and proposal of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union earlier in that month — on January 3rd I believe to be specific.

February 3, 1969

It refers again to the request of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture at its annual meeting the week before when this organization had strongly supported the principle of cash assistance to farmers for drying grain. Then the Producer editorial says this:

Without this or some other form of subsidy, thousands of farmers simply cannot afford to dry their grain, even if equipment is available. The final payment on last year's crop, expected to be the lowest in many years, won't begin to solve the low income problem faced by these thousands of grain farmers who may yet be forced to let grain rot in the bins. Their problem of course is lack of cash income, because of low quotas brought about by the slow movement of grain to overseas markets.

It goes on:

The Federal Government must face the facts, which are these: Although markets this year are slow, wheat now in storage is a national asset. As a matter of enlightened self-interest, the Government cannot afford to let the value of this national asset deteriorate; it must be put in storage, salable condition before the weather warms up. And it should be quite obvious at this time that farmers simply cannot go it alone.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask our somnolent friends across the way to listen to this in particular:

And Provincial Governments must share the responsibility of getting grain dried. It is not enough to say, as the Saskatchewan Government has said, that they are doing their part by encouraging diversification of production on farms. Somewhere along the line, someone has got to put up some hard cash to help farmers out of an awkward situation, not of their own making. It is a situation . . .

And listen carefully:

. . . that well could put thousands of smaller operators and the bigger operators as well, completely out of business, if help is not forthcoming. The crisis is now, and governments had better realize it.

That's the end of that editorial.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — My hon. friends in the face of this sort of thing sleep and laugh. This is a fine kind of response to one of the largest crises that have faced this province in many a year.

Inevitably the question must be raised as to whether or

not we are losing sales because of all that is happening. Well, let me refer to the James Richardson and Sons Newsletter of January 7th. You know, Mr. Speaker, information from that source ought to be listened to in Ottawa these days it seems to me. The James Richardson and Sons Newsletter said this, speaking of bid for Canadian wheat last week, "The Japanese were interested in 17,000 tons of Canadian wheat at Vancouver. They did take one cargo of Australian wheat."

Adding to that, Mr. Speaker, some of the Hon. Members may have heard the CBC farm broadcast at noon today. As I heard it, it carried the information that we have lost 740,000 bushels of sales to Japan because the wheat wasn't at the Vancouver port to meet the market.

On January 22, the Leader Post carried an article from their Ottawa correspondent, Mr. Sterling King. He says this, "Trade Minister Pepin said Tuesday the Government is doing all it can be asked to do." Then he adds, "Short of going there myself and administering the port of Vancouver and dealing with the boxcar situation, the Government has done everything that needs to be done." Mr. Pepin says, "Short of going there himself." All I can say is, please, Mr. Pepin, not all this and that too. You've done enough lousing it up by staying in Ottawa. Heaven knows what would happen if you get out there with your hands close to where the action is.

On January 22 we can get some more information from Hansard. At that time Mr. Alf Gleave, a New Democratic Member of Parliament from Biggar-Saskatoon, put some rather interesting figures on Hansard record. His figures showed very conclusively the breakdown in planning as to the handling of grain and transporting of grain in Canada. He pointed out that at the Lakehead there was a capacity of 90 million bushels, but there were only at that time 41 million bushels in storage. He pointed out that between December 6 and January 3, 1967 we had moved over 28,000 carloads of grain, but during that same five weeks period in 1968 had moved only just over 231,000 carloads of grain. That is 7,000 fewer carloads moved this year. That is we have moved less by 25 per cent this year than last year. I have some conversation with an acquaintance from Prince Rupert the other day, Mr. Speaker, who informs me that the elevator at Prince Rupert is only partly full. In the face of this, my friends opposite can sleep and laugh and Mr. Pepin says that Ottawa has done "all it can be asked to do."

Well since that time and in recent days indeed we have been getting some more information from another front indicating the Government's failure. A news item on January 22 had Mr. Zook, the president of the Vancouver Grain Exporters Association, saying this:

A grain shipping tie-up which has resulted in vessels lying empty here for up to a month could last well into February and even into March.

February 3, 1969

Mr. Speaker, here you have the sad story of ships that don't pass in the night, but simply sit anchored. While it may be alright to say, "they also serve who stand and wait" as applied to some people it certainly doesn't apply to ships that are supposed to be hauling wheat.

On January 24th, more evidence of this kind of tie-up:

A bulk carrier . . .

the news says

waiting to load grain for Europe called it quits Wednesday and sailed for Germany in ballast. This departure left 26 grain ships waiting to load in Vancouver, plus seven loading.

Indications were that this ship had arrived there on January 14. Had it been filled with grain it is expected it would have had to wait for at least a month for its cargo. Let us add up some of the figures that are represented there. It has been there for 10 days, it would have had to wait it says for another 30 days, that means it would have had to sit there or some 40 days. It is estimated that the cost of just sitting is some \$2,500 a day. This one ship had it waited until we were able to fill it with wheat, would have then had costs of some \$100,000 piled up just for sitting. This would be costs paid by the farmers who owned the wheat which it was waiting to load. The captain of the ship said he would be back in 51 days to pick up the wheat cargo he had expected to load the week before. He's going to be back in the middle of March to load a cargo which he hoped to load in the middle of January.

The next day more news items about more ships sitting in port. This time it reads like this:

The rust-streaked Greek freighter Oceania, taking on flax for Japan Friday, had been waiting for two weeks since coming from Japan. Some ships have been sitting empty for five weeks.

'Two weeks', exclaimed the first officer. 'Usually I would be here for five days.'

He had been there for 14 almost three times as many as usual.

Demurrage charges run as high at \$3,000 a day for an idle vessel.

Much if not all of the bill will go to prairie farmers. Nobody has made any cost estimate other than hundreds of thousands and hundreds of thousands seems to me to be relatively conservative. The port reports that, 'The towering Alberta Pool can handle 150 boxcars of wheat a day. The railways could supply only 16 the day before.' It says, "The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Terminal

said it was running at two-thirds of its capacity." A grain man who declined to use his name said, "There was no co-ordination in planning or any co-ordination with the railways."

About all of that, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan has been supremely silent and the Liberal Government of Canada has been supremely and surprisingly undisturbed about this emergency in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of all this, I sent another wire to the Prime Minister of Canada, on January 25th. Let me read the content of that wire to the Legislature:

The Saskatchewan New Democratic Party again draws attention to the rapidly worsening economic position of Saskatchewan farmers. We are dismayed at the apparent lack of understanding and concern by Federal and Provincial Governments. We repeat the suggestion made to you in a telegram last September that the Agriculture Committee of the House of Commons could come to Saskatchewan. Specifically, we urge the appointment of a grains movement co-ordinator to move wheat to terminals and onto ships; direct cash payments of up to 10 cents per bushel to farmers for drying grain with costs to be shared by the Saskatchewan Government; payment by the Government of Canada of demurrage charges on ships forced to wait for wheat so this added cost is not subtracted from the final payment to farmers; and additional and energetic effort by the Government of Canada so that more wheat sales are not lost and our shrunken share of the world wheat market is not further reduced.

I am glad that the Premier and other Premiers from the prairie provinces saw fit yester, I gather, to wire the Government of Canada and also urge the appointment of a grain movement co-ordinator or a transport control or whatever one wants to call it. I am glad they did it. You know I can almost hear as our Premier was doing it, the death rattle in the throat of the Saskatchewan Liberal party, so long they have waited to respond.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I have put on the record a rather long list of suggestions and recommendations from a number of Saskatchewan organizations. Certainly every organization in Saskatchewan that speaks for farmers has endorsed action and yet neither the Government of Saskatchewan nor the Government of Canada has responded in any satisfactory way. I ask, what is the most noticeable thing about this long list of suggestions and recommendations and comments? The most noticeable thing about it is the almost complete silence of the Saskatchewan Government. This problem is one which was predictable and which was predicted for a period of over three months. May I suggest that the response of this Government to it was also predictable for anybody who knows it and who listens to its philosophy.

February 3, 1969

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — This lack of response is dictated by its philosophy, that philosophy so loved and so caressingly discussed by the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) a couple of days ago in this House. This is a philosophy which all of us know or should know (we have been told often enough) is based on a blind faith in free enterprise which surpasses all understanding. It is a philosophy which believes in the old Spartan theory that only the strong deserve to survive. It is a philosophy which dislikes and downgrades and rejects public programs. It is a philosophy which refuses to use public spending to relieve and to save Saskatchewan farmers from economic ruin. But it is a philosophy which is willing to tax Saskatchewan farmers, as the Speech from the Throne tells us, to provide, I quote, “cash grants to industry to meet competition from other provinces.” It is a philosophy which is willing to tax Saskatchewan farmers to subsidize a corporation producing pulp wood. It is a philosophy which is willing to build roads to move potash to American railroads. It is a philosophy which is willing to tax Saskatchewan farmers to relieve oil companies and mining companies of paying royalties. Not willing, however, will it put up one single solitary penny to prevent a situation which, in the words of that editorial in the Western Producer that I read, “could put thousands of smaller farm operators and bigger ones as well completely out of business.”

During all of this period, Mr. Speaker, during the long cold winter and before, from October to February, the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) squeaked only once, and then to announce hoped-for meetings with the Federal Government. Let me ask this Legislature to imagine the leather-lunged screams, if the Premier will pardon the expression, with which he would have rent the air waves and inked the presses of the nation if for some reason ships had been held up and elevators so congested.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — If he could have explained the situation in such a way as to set farmer against worker, in such a way as to create suspicion, distrust and division, then his leather-lunged response to the applause of his supporters would have awed the multitude for miles around. Instead of that, Mr. Speaker, we have one mini squeak from the Premier in December and late in December at that, and even less than that from his sitting mate, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — During all of this period too, with rare exception, our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) has hibernated. You know, yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was groundhog day, February 2nd. This is the day when the groundhog is supposed to come

out of his hole of hibernation and look to see his shadow. I don't think our Minister of Agriculture even made it out yesterday to have a look to see if his shadow was there or not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — On occasion he has come out of his hibernation to urge the farmers to put their shoulders to the wheel, “to get out in 30 below zero weather and dry your grain, pay the bill yourself, including the cost of hauling it especially to eh elevator, take it back home and wait for a chance to sell it next year maybe. Where is your pioneer spirit boys?” And so he goes. Sometimes of course he adds, “Diversify, diversify, get yourselves some sheep and some pregnant heifers and all will be saved.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to add just one more comment, one more quotation in this admittedly long list. It is a statement by Mr. James Bentley, the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, just a few days ago. Mr. Bentley had this to say:

If large stocks of unsalable grain continue to pile up on farms there could be a shift to livestock production which could result in economic disaster if the increase is not tailored to effective demand.

He went on to say:

Unless greater drying facilities are provided along with financial assistance to operate them, many farmers could be in a serious financial predicament from which they would never recover.

I wish to goodness this Government would listen and would act.

The seriousness of the total situation I can point out by two further references. One of them was a statement by Mr. Gibblings, the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. He was addressing the annual meeting of that organization in November of 1968. I quote from his address:

‘Farmers cannot survive on a six-bushel quota.’ Mr. Gibblings said, ‘as long as production costs continue to rise and prices are not better than the minimum under the International Grains Arrangement.

Analysis of a large number of farm returns for 1967 showed that costs per cultivated acre averaged from \$17.36 to \$23.36 depending on the size of the operation.’

He went on to say:

A quota of six bushels, even if the grain sold for the

February 3, 1969

final price of \$2.00, would bring in only \$12.00 per acre, far short of covering the lowest average cost reported in that study.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the price is not going to be \$2, as a matter of fact there is going to be a lot of wheat sold for less than \$1 per bushel and even the six bushel quota seems very much in doubt as at this time.

The second reference since the quota has been mentioned is to the wheat quota situation in Saskatchewan as one measurement of how our grain has not been sold, of how our grain has not moved and as to how our farmers have not been able to deliver grain to the elevator. I take the figures for January 25th, 1969. I know there had been some change, some increase in quotas in some points since that, but I use the figures for January 25th, 1969, this year and on previous years.

First of all, almost 50 per cent of delivery points January 25th, 1969 were still on the basic unit of 400 bushels or on a one bushel quota. In the two previous years, there were no delivery points with only the basic units or just the one bushel quota.

Secondly, in 1969 about 280 Saskatchewan points were still on two bushel wheat quotas. Last year there were only 15; the year before, none on two bushel quota compared to 280 this year.

Third, last year at this time, January 25th, over 900 points had quotas of three or four bushels. This year, less than 200 points have quotas of three or four bushels.

Fourth, as at January 25th, 1969, there were no delivery points with quotas of four bushels. In 1967, more than 750 Saskatchewan points had quotas of over four bushels.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, on January 25th, two years ago, all points had wheat quotas, had wheat quotas of three bushels or more. Last year, 98 per cent had three bushels or more. This year the figure is 20 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the crisis of damp grain, the danger of grain spoiling, is just one more problem beyond the capacity of many individual farmers to carry. The totality of this has real meaning of course for more than just our farmers. As I said when I spoke briefly on Friday, it has real meaning for merchants, who have a lot of credit out, or who see their sales falling. It has a lot of meaning for employment inside and outside of Saskatchewan. It has a great meaning for possible employment of students come next year's vacation. It certainly has great meaning so far as our capacity to finance health and education and other services is concerned.

In the face of all of this, I ask this Legislature to not the Saskatchewan Government's failure to act, failure to speak, failure to support farmers and farm organizations. Small

wonder that the Government of Canada feels there is so little to be concerned about, when they get so little talk, so little support, so little information from their fellow Liberals here in Saskatchewan.

But, Mr. Speaker, what they didn't do is only one part of the story. They make their own contribution in another way to the problem. They not only fail to contribute to the solution but they become part of the problem as well. Let me recount a few incidences: Since this time last year farmers' cost have increased because this Government imposed a first-time-ever tax on fuel for farm tractors. Property taxes particularly for education have increased again; in part at least because school grants were inadequate. There is an increased sales tax on literally hundreds of items that farm families have to use as well as everybody else in the province. There's a brand new five per cent sales tax on a number of goods and services. Increased old taxes and new taxes to the tune of hundreds, Mr. Premier, in a short time. There's a brand new deterrent fee tax whenever a doctor has to be seen. There's a brand new deterrent fee tax whenever somebody is unfortunate enough to have to go to the hospital. There are higher fees at the University and the technical institutes for the young people from farm families and other families. If they want to drown their sorrow a bit, it costs more for beer or for liquor and there's increased costs for a large number of other services as well. All of this and more by a Government elected on a solemn promise to reduce taxes at all levels.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — To paraphrase a very well-known statement, never has so much faith been broken to more people in such a short time as this Liberal Government has managed to do. In a short time, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to urge some nine courses of action on this Government. I do so knowing that new policies alone will not be enough. Nothing short of a new government in Saskatchewan will be enough.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — However, even at this late date let me urge this Government of ailing, hibernating, anchor-dragging, barnacle-ridden politicians to turn up its hearing aid and listen to what Saskatchewan people are saying. Let me propose, and this will be supported by Saskatchewan people, the following actions: 1. The Government of Saskatchewan should urge the Government of Canada to make a cash payment of up to 10 cents a bushel of the cost of drying grain in Saskatchewan. 2. The Government of Saskatchewan should agree to share this payment. 3. The Government of Saskatchewan should provide the necessary administrative structure so that the payment can be made quickly and fairly. 4. The Government of Saskatchewan should urge the Federal Government to appoint a co-ordinator of grain movement.

February 3, 1969

This person should be armed with all the authority necessary to get grain moving from local elevators to terminate and on to ships. This has been done before in Canada. I recall the appointment of not many years ago of Mr. Milner as a transport controller to do this sort of thing when the circumstances were less difficult even than today. 5. The Government of Saskatchewan should take more action and responsibility for seeing that existing drying capacity in the province is used to capacity. 6. The government of Saskatchewan should urge the Federal Government to contribute to demurrage charges on ships forced to wait an unconscionably long time for wheat cargo. Otherwise these costs will further reduce the shrinking, final payment to Saskatchewan wheat farmers. 7. The Government of Saskatchewan should offer to share with the Federal Government and the grain companies the capital cost of installing grain drying facilities at strategic locations. 8. The Government of Saskatchewan should, together with farm organizations and grain-handling companies explore the value of using elevator based drying facilities in parts of the province even in normal years. This is particularly important in those areas of the province which are rather consistently subjected to questionable harvesting conditions. 9. The Government of Saskatchewan should offer to join in a study with the Federal Government involving railways and grain companies and shipping companies. This study should examine from stem to gudgeon the whole process of handling and moving grain from local elevators to ships bound for the markets of the new world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I know that's a sizable bill of fare, but surely we can't overlook the fact that agriculture is still more important to more people in Saskatchewan than any other single economic activity. It's also of great importance to all of Canada. This last year has been a year of emergency for this industry and for the people in it. This in turn has created real difficulties for many urban business people and people in the non-farm labor force as well. This difficulty is bound to multiply as the months go on and eventually if not already, it will affect transportation workers and factory workers from one end of Canada to the other. This particular year has done something else. It has shown the inability and unwillingness of the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan to act when the going gets tough. The dismal failure of this Government to support agriculture with energy, initiative, imagination or investment defines the real nature of this Government. This definition makes nonsense of the Government's claim which is urged from coast to coast and south of the Gulf of Mexico and into the Caribbean Islands, that unrestricted private enterprise will be itself solve all of the problems of all people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I've been talking about agriculture

and its considerable importance to all the people of Saskatchewan. I turn now to another topic which is also of tremendous importance to all the people of Saskatchewan and of Canada, and that is the item of education.

This Legislature cannot close its eyes to the growing chaos, conflict and confrontation in education. It's real, it's here, and it's getting bigger. There's a dollar gap, there's a generation gap and there's a communications gap. This Government has failed to help close any of these gaps. As a matter of fact it has contributed to the widening instead of helping to close it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I submit that this Government has lost the confidence of so many groups and individuals with respect to education, that I doubt if it can resolve the several crises that are devouring education in our province. I admit the continuing difficulty in a province such as ours because we don't have all the money we could well use. I admit the irritation that results from that, but in addition to that, the actions of this Government has led many people to suspect both its motives and its methods. One result has been to set group against group, to widen the gap between groups of people, and to increase the areas of friction between groups of people involved in education. As a result, more and more people have lost confidence in this Government with respect to education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I said shortly after the 1967 election that the main casualty of that election was education. There have been a hundred events since that time to demonstrate the fact of that statement. Now if the Government had listened one year ago the situation would have been somewhat less serious. It might even have been controllable although even that would have been somewhat uncertain. I want to deal with this in sort of two or three perhaps main groups.

This costly and important enterprise of education requires a partnership to the full extent possible between teachers and trustees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — There's bound to be some inevitable differences. This I know but their efforts need synthesizing. They need some leadership and help in getting those efforts synthesized. This Government has not fostered that relationship. On the contrary it has helped to drive bigger wedges and drive them deeper between teachers and trustees in Saskatchewan. It has created a situation in which trustees and teachers have been placed as opposing gladiators on a province-wide front.

February 3, 1969

Lat year, Mr. Speaker, you will recall this Government forced through some incompletely conceived legislation. Having done so it tossed it to the teachers and the trustees and said, "You know you make it work, it's yours." In putting this legislation onto the statute books of this province, it ignored the advice of the Moore Royal Commission which it had appointed. It turned a deaf ear to reasoned argument in this Legislature. The unfortunate events since then were all predictable and indeed were all predicted if the Government stubbornly, blindly pursued its proposals. It did so pursue. The predicted results to the detriment of education have occurred. Had the Government accepted even some of the amendments urged from this side of the House last year, some of the trouble in this respect would have been prevented. It didn't. We've had the trouble. Regrettably the end is not yet in sight.

You know today, February 3rd, 1969, with some minor exceptions, school boards don't know what the salary bill is since September, 1968. They don't know what they can offer to teachers, some of them now being hired for September, 1969. Teachers don't know what their salary has been since September, 1968, don't know what their salary is now and don't know what it's going to be in September, 1969. They don't know whether the rights they have acquired for sick leaved and sabbatical leave or other conditions of work will be continued or not.

School boards and taxpayers don't have a clue as to what to expect with respect to grant changes. Since 1964 as a government, and for many years before that time, the Liberals have been talking about a grand new system of school grants that will set everything right. And each year they postponed it again. Many school boards are finding that the percentage of costs carried by school grants is less rather than more than what they were. A few years ago the Government introduced something called 'incentive grants' and let it work for a year, and then thank goodness withdrew it the next year.

School boards can't plan a building program because the Government frequently changes the rules. If the Department of Education does approve, the Local Government Board is likely to disapprove in the next voice. All across this province and in the University there is chaos and conflict and confrontation.

No I'll admit the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) is resourceful in some ways, Mr. Speaker. Take for example this bold, imaginative action of his. He wants to continue the recruiting of British teachers and that's all right. In order to select British teachers, to determine their qualifications and allocate them, he appoints who to do this job? He appoints a carpenter in his own constituency, a carpenter who may be a good carpenter. I don't know but his main qualification for this job is that he had been an active pillar of the Liberal party in the Minister's own constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — This admittedly is a small thing in the whole scheme of education but it seems to me that it suggests the key to many difficulties. The difficulty is that the Government simply doesn't appreciate the problem which it's facing. I would hope that even at this late date the Government would be willing to consider some changes in legislation, some changes in its own attitude which would establish better relationships between important groups in education. Let me talk about some ways in which I think it should do this.

One of the vital areas needing clarification is how the condition of work which trustees can offer teachers can be discussed, agreed to and written into binding contracts. This has been one of the biggest courses of controversy, has taken a lot of time of teacher and trustee negotiating teams since the legislation of last year. A clarification of right and responsibility in this respect would remove one real area of conflict. I realize that the spread in the salary proposals is wide, but I have enough confidence in teachers and trustees to believe that salary items in the main could be settled by the usual procedures if this conflict-causing situation were in hand. What's the situation? The area bargaining committees for trustees say they can't discuss conditions of work and non-salary items. And the local trustees say we have no authority to discuss such matters. Teachers, who have enjoyed contracts containing such rights for years — the Minister says some of them for 20 years, they've been in the contract and they've got them there — today can't find any way of guaranteeing the continuation of these rights. Last year the Government deliberately left decisions and direction regarding this out of last year's legislation. The Government, led by the Minister, voted down an amendment from this side which would have included a responsibility and a procedure for discussing and agreeing on such matters. In the discussion of the Bill and the Minister agreed that it might be included in the regulations and provided for that way. He failed to put it in the regulations. He ought this year to introduce the necessary amendments. They won't cure the whole thing — nobody suggests it. But this would be one way of decreasing the area of friction between boards and teachers. It would be one way of giving to teachers a proper right to take part in making decisions that are decisions that are important to them and for education. Certainly there are few if any other organized employee groups who don't have this opportunity. Certainly the creation of an environment which will help recruit to teaching enough good students and keep enough good teachers in Saskatchewan is important. This Government should become part of the solution and stop being so large a part of the problem. Let me relate again a number of the ways in which it has been that.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, refused to include any specific and plain procedure for agreeing with regard to these non-salary items. Secondly, it was this Government that lumped city and non-city areas together for purposes of bargaining. And this I admit, may very well have some long range value, but in

February 3, 1969

The absence of the Government putting in substantially increased amounts of money in the way of school grants, it constitutes a major initial problem and is one of the big reasons for stumbling blocks in the negotiating today. Thirdly, it was this Government that stopped negotiations during the September to December, 1968 period. This complicated the new arrangements. This made it necessary for the bargaining to include pay scales retroactive to four months of 1968. The cost of these increases will have to be added to the 1969 tax bill and that will cause some more confusion.

Mr. Speaker, there's one other thing I want to ask the Minister to stop doing. I want to ask him to stop talking about the necessity and advantage of increasing the student-teacher load. When he's doing this he's simply parroting the Premier in some of his comments about the University last year. Both the Premier and the Minister have tried to justify this proposal by using the misleading statistics of averages. Using this they try to demonstrate that their proposal would be non-harmful. The plain fact of the matter is that there are more students in classes too large than otherwise and the Minister should not be encouraging more students for classes too large.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — May I turn then to the second of the two fields, which is again a non-money item, and this has to do with conditions at our universities. It will be recalled that last year the Government rejected the request of all the major groups at the University and the urging of New Democratic Members in the Legislature to give faculty representation on the Board of Governments. The request came from the University. A new Act was being presented, several other universities had recently created the precedent. The Duff-Berdahl Report had recommended it, so too had a Royal Commission in Quebec. The Opposition in Saskatchewan urged it. The Government refused it. It should act on this this year.

Last year, we on this side of the House urged opening up the decision-making process in the University to enable students to have a direct and regularized channel of influence and vice versa. The Government refused.

I want to repeat some of the proposals and some of the urging of one year ago. I go back to the debate on The University Act in the spring of 1968. I said:

As I understand it, the University authorities were quite in favor of the idea of having students on the Senate of the University.

I urged the Minister to think about that. The Minister wouldn't move last year. I added that I urged his to discuss with University authorities and other groups, the possibility of including student representation on the Board of Governors.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that had the Government acted last year and the months in between, some of today's problems could very well have been avoided.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear.

Mr. Lloyd: — Channels of discussion opened up them might have prevented centres of crisis today. Unfortunately yesterday's solutions don't necessarily solve today's problems. But the evolvement of methods by which faculty and students can share in determining the disciplines under which they work is of utmost importance and I hope this Government gets on with the job.

And here again, Mr. Speaker, not only has this Government made no contribution to solving the problem, it has here again become part of the problem, it has deterred some solution. I submit that its own chip-on-the-shoulder or log-on-the-shoulder attitude has widened the generation gap, has created an atmosphere of abrasion and of challenge. It almost appears at times that the Government is prepared to have its actions provoke some kind of unfortunate action.

Let me quote some more of the supporting arguments which I used last year and which fell on deaf ears. I referred to an address of Professor Bohrson of the Ford Foundation. He was speaking at a conference sponsored by the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association in Saskatoon. I quote:

Professor Bohrson stated the opinion that: 'Students should be extensively involved in decisions on curriculum change, school organization and the teaching process.'

Educators must design ways to listen to these youth who see their own world and their own problems more clearly than we.

May I draw the next part of Professor Bohrson's statement particularly to the attention of the Member of Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) who spoke in this House on Friday:

We will need to turn directly and soon to those most deeply concerned. We will need to listen closely to the young idealists, and the young militants, whose voice of dissent is heard now more loudly and strongly as a conscience of the schools in confused society. Schools must be shaped, moulded, formed on the concerns and needs of their constituents.

Even though the militant groups are not in accord, and are sometimes in conflict, all of them will demand a voice and will be heard, one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Government are not prepared to listen to that kind of a voice, perhaps here's one that some of them would listen to. I refer to a news article of January

February 3, 1969

31st. It reports an address given by former Prime Minister Pearson. Speaking at Queen's University, he said this:

Not dissenters but those who would diminish or deny the right to dissent are the really dangerous revolutionaries. By damming the avenues of peaceful and evolutionary change they make violent change inevitable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I ask some of my hon. friends across the way to read that and digest it if they are competent of digesting statements of that kind. "Not the dissenters" said Mr. Pearson, "but those who would diminish or deny the right to dissent" are the ones who are dangerous. And he went on to say, "By stopping the avenues of peaceful evolutionary change, they make violent change inevitable." The other quotation was in the newspaper the same day when Chancellor Peter D. Currie of the University of Manitoba said:

Students really have something to tell. They're telling us, 'Treat us like adults' and they are. I'm afraid that the public at large quite often is not aware that we're dealing with people over the age of 21.

Speaking of the students, he said:

They are genuinely interested in the kind of education they're getting.

I again urge some of my hon. Friends to think about statements coming from eminent people of this kind.

To go back to some of the reference of last year, I recall a statement from the Duff-Berdahl Report on this same topic. It said:

The issue is not whether to welcome or stifles this new wave of student sentiment, but rather how to develop channels into which it can flow constructively.

It went on to give voice to confidence in Canadian students in these words:

We suggest that students will respond with unexpected maturity when treated as adults.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The Royal Commission Study in the Province of Quebec a year ago said much of the same thing:

University students ask to be treated as adults, said this Commission, and it's fitting and fortunate that this

should be so. Experiences show that there is little risk in extending confidence to them and in having them sit on various committees. Many difficulties should be averted if the students felt themselves more closely associated with the administration of the various levels of the university and if they were kept informed of the difficulties and problems confronting their institutions.

I'm glad to be able to report as many Members in this House know that a number of our own University teachers have been making some very commendable progress along these lines as far as their own courses are concerned. I know many of them who will eagerly give evidence anywhere that everybody's educational experience has benefited as a result. This kind of progress must be facilitated and encouraged. It must, in particular, not be discouraged or repressed.

Mr. Speaker, Some of what I said applies to high schools as well as universities. There, too, a lot of our best students are restless, they have some criticisms, they have some suggestions. They, too, constitute a source of ideas, because after all they have a prospective and a sensitivity with regard to their own needs which we should use more than we do.

There is much concern and has been for many years, and so there should be and so there should have been, with the matter of school dropouts. Dropouts frequently reflect a situation in which the school has excluded the student as well as the student excluding the school. Dropouts from school, high school or university are frequently students looking for a more meaningful way of getting an education. I urge the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) as I did last year, to encourage and arrange so that high school students at the school level and at the level of the province can discuss and articulate their ideas and have them considered. The school is their environment. Let's give them a maximum chance and responsibility to productively influence. Here again I'm happy to realize and to recognize the action of a number of our schools in Saskatchewan in doing just that.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I say again that the biggest revolution in our time, in the last five or ten years in particular, has been the change in the way in which young people look at themselves and their relationship with their society. They have more maturity and more experience. There is more readiness and more demand on their part to assume responsibility for shaping their environment. They are not content to be just consumers of a predetermined diet in a pre-arranged environment. They are seeking a wider chance to assume responsibility in making decisions that count; and our job is to facilitate that, not to repress it.

Turning to another aspect of education, all of us need to be concerned that the facilities and the finances are available so that people can get that opportunity which comes from attendance at university or technical schools.

February 3, 1969

A Return tabled February 2nd, 1968, showed some 549 persons who applied for technical and vocational courses last year were turned down because of lack of space. A Return the year before showed an even greater number. The congestion on the Regina campus of the University at least can only get worse given the anticipated building program. I draw attention to a statement which was released to the press by the Faculty of Arts and Science of the Regina campus on October 3rd, 1968.

The second current threat to excellent academic programs on this campus is the over-crowding that is conspicuously worse this year than it was a year ago. If space cannot keep pace with enrolment, it seems clear that enrolment must be trimmed to fit space. Moved therefore that the faculty of Arts and Science request Council to take steps for curtailing enrolment until there is evidence that facilities and resources are adequate to meet projected growth will be available on this campus.

This statement was adopted by the Council on October 9, 1968. Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the full reasoning which was applied in regard to this resolution. I am not prepared to endorse it without knowing many more of the details. But the fact that the faculty felt so keenly about it that they would make a motion, which must have been awkward for them to make, obviously merits us having a hard look at the situation. As a result we will all await with interest the budget information on space and on teachers for the growing number of people wishing to go to our technical institutes and the University.

We will also wait, Mr. Speaker, with interest Government proposals about financial assistance to students. It is evident already that the need in 1969 is going to be greater. The agricultural situation and the prospects for employment make that certain. There is every prospect that employment prospects for students will be worse this year than last year.

Last year, I submit that the Government of Saskatchewan undoubtedly started out with every intention of restricting even student loans. The administration of the student loans was rough and ragged until a couple thousand students from both campuses interviewed the Prime Minister of Canada. After that, matters improved somewhat. One campus survey showed that before October 1, only 26 per cent of those applying got full loans. After October 1, 65 per cent got full loans.

There were several things about this that become apparent. The need for a higher ceiling as to the amount to be loaned is, I think, apparent because of increasing costs. I am appreciative of what the Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) said the other day that more students would get loans and the average loan is higher than it has been in the past and this one would expect. But the very fact that that is true emphasizes the need for more scholarships to take up some of this financial burden being carried by loans. I would remind this Legislature that two years ago or a few years ago, this Government stole

\$2 million from the Student Aid Fund.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — It did this to balance the Budget so it said. Like Little Jack Horner, it stuck in not its thumb but its whole mitt and pulled out \$2 million of money that had been set aside to assist in education. It used it to pay for the bacon and beans of that year's operation of the Government and this it calls balancing the Budget. Had it not done so then, had it not robbed the Student Aid Fund of this \$2 million it would have been in a better position to expand bursaries and scholarships today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Instead this Government has almost completely opted out of student assistance with the exception of approving loans for the Canadian Student Loan Plan. Now even this Government ought to agree that we should be making some progress towards universal accessibility to education. Instead of that we move further away from it. This particular year, at this particular moment there is a recurring rumor that fees are going to be increased substantially again this year. This Government is entering more and more into influence through financial control of the University. Let's remind ourselves that, when we give the University the right to set fees, we in fact gave it the right to levy taxes on those who attend. I hope that the Government before it brings in its Budget and boasts about how much it's doing for the University will let us know what the proposed change in fees at the University are for 1969. It should not present its Budget here until it has done that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of us on this side of the House would agree that before all is to be done that should be done, the Government of Canada must do more to take some of the financial burden for education from the provinces and the local governments. There is solid educational and economic justification for it doing so. In particular, it must assume a much greater share of the costs for post-secondary education including vocational. It can get the revenues, it can more equitably finance those costs than can Provincial Governments. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, we will support the Provincial Governments' urging of the Federal Government to accept that role which necessity demands and which will benefit all Canada. The arguments for such expenditure by the Government of Canada are based on sound economics. They are convincing and they are comprehensive. Just recently the National Planning Association of the United States has estimated that one-half of the growth in output in that country in the last 50 years has come from investment in education, training and health. Edward F. Denison, a rather well-known economist, has estimated that between 1960 and 1980 education will account for about one-fifth of the economic growth in that country. Studies of the Economic Council in Canada have led to similar conclusions in our country. Admittedly economic facts aren't all and

February 3, 1969

for many of us not even the major factor in deciding how much goes into education. But they do justify and they do encourage on economic grounds more expenditure on education by the Government of Canada.

But before we are going to really solve this task, we need to stop considering dollars for education as an expenditure without return on investment. If we are going to do the job, we are going to have to bury the myth that public spending is bad while private spending is good. This myth is a major impression left by the Premier, especially when he goes on his Liberal party fund-raising trips into the United States and makes speeches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Before we solve the problems of education we are going to have to accept as reality the fact that spending in schools and in health and in housing and community development is investment, not squandering of resources. Those who control the centres of power and affluence and persuasion in society are going to have to stop opting so completely for private affluence at the expense of public needs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Canada can afford good education, good housing and good community service. We have the resources, how we use them is a central issue for all governments today. The philosophy of the Government which sits opposite does little to assure the use of resources to serve these public human needs. We need a commitment and it would have to be a commitment based on understanding of how great the problem is and how great rewards are. I have no confidence in this Government's understanding of the problem. I have no confidence in its hope for people to share fully in the affluent production of which we are capable. Consequently I am afraid we can look for no commitment from it. We can expect chaos, conflict and confrontation in education until it is removed from officials.

The only other topic which I want to turn to for a little while is one which we used to hear a lot about from the gentlemen who sit opposite in this House. I have been talking about agriculture and education which are important to people. Let me talk a little bit about numbers of people in Saskatchewan, about population, Mr. Speaker, and about population growth.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Population growth was a main measurement proposed by my friends opposite as a definition of progress and good government. For years before 1964 we heard that and we heard it a little bit ever since. In the 1965 Throne Speech they had the Lieutenant Governor say, "My advisors have expressed concern . . ." and went on to talk about numbers of people. And often in the years, 1964 and 1965, we heard the comment, "We

have stopped exporting people.” Whether the Premier spoke to the private power people in California or the chambers of commerce in the Midwest or the American Medical Association in New Orleans, he popped off about population in Saskatchewan. Even in North Dakota where they had a Republican Government which is a little bit to the left of the Premier’s beliefs I would say, in most cases, their population picture has been a much more difficult one than in the Province of Saskatchewan, but even there he talked about it. But you know he is getting milder and very appropriately so because on October 18, 1968, speaking way down in the deep south to the American Medical Association, he confessed finally, “We have not completely reversed the population trend.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Then he went on to add, “though there are now hopeful signs.” Are there indeed? Let’s see about these hopeful signs as a measure of population change, as a measure of good government, the measurement chosen by the Liberals. Let’s see about them as a measure of the Premier’s credibility. You know, Mr. Speaker, in the 12 months before the Liberals were elected, the increase in population was 10,000. In the first year after the Liberals were elected, the increase was still 10,000. Not even the dead hand of the Liberals could stop the growth in the province in that period of time. But it didn’t take them long. They soon got busy and in the second year after the Liberal Government, the increase in population was not 10,000, 9,000, 7,000, 6,000, 5,000 but it was 2,000. And in the third year after the Liberal Government, the increase was the grand total of 3,000. Then in the next year and four months, they did increase 4,000. In the Economic White Paper instead of measuring from June to June, they measured from June to October. So by stretching in another four months, they finally got an increase of 4,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Now when you look at the figure in the last 40 months, in the last three years and four months of Liberal Government, the increase has been 1,000 less than it was in the 12 months before it was elected. In the last 40 months, in the last three years and four months of my friends opposite in government, the increase is 1,000 less than it was during the 12 months before they were elected. The Premier says that we have not completely reversed this. The Premier says there are hopeful signs. Well, maybe so. The Liberals chose the population growth as a measurement of an effective government. It’s their baby, Mr. Speaker, they should have to live with it.

You know there are hopeful signs in Saskatchewan indeed. There are hopeful signs in Saskatchewan. These hopeful signs however are not with respect to the growth of population. These hopeful signs are with the growth of understanding by Saskatchewan

February 3, 1969

people that this Government is unable or unwilling to devise programs which Saskatchewan needs and deserves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this is more apparent with respect to the handling of the agricultural problem. As a result I want to move, seconded by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) by leave of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that the following words be added to the address:

but this Assembly, recognizing the vital importance of our farm economy to all people in Saskatchewan, regrets in particular the failure of Her Majesty's Advisors to give leadership and support to meet the problem caused by large amounts of damp grain; urges the Government of Canada to provide cash payments to ensure the drying of damp grain, and that the Government of Saskatchewan give consideration to matching such payments; and further requests the Government of Saskatchewan to make representation to the Government of Canada with respect to a thorough investigation and reform of methods of handling and transporting grain in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.R. Thatcher: — (Premier) Mr. Speaker, of course my first remarks must be to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech, I think they perform the task which they were given ably and well.

Now we have listened this afternoon to a rather vague, wandering harangue that at no point, as far as I could hear, touched on the economic realities of Saskatchewan, or offered solutions. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) talked for one hour and forty minutes, and I think I listened rather carefully and I couldn't find one new idea, one new thought or one new suggestion. Not a single one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Indeed he was able to put the Hon. Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) sound asleep for about 10 minutes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition made it very clear again this afternoon that the Socialist Front Benchers are composed of old and tired and weary men who should join the former Member for Kelsey back on those seats behind the Legislative seats.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition described the Throne Speech as a pretty anaemic document. He said it was sterile. He said it was about the thinnest bowl of soup we've ever had. But I found it significant, Mr. Speaker, that he immediately then went on and spoke favorably of numerous provisions and proposals. He said he favored a ceiling on utilization fees. He supported an extension of irrigable land in the South Saskatchewan River area. He was all for the new Municipal Development Corporation. Indeed he claimed credit for it. He said, "We advocated it." Need I remind you, Sir, that they had 20 years to do something about it and didn't.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — And he agreed with the suggestion of a committee to study rules of the Legislature. He favored a committee to bring in amendments to The Election Act. The Indian suggestions weren't too bad. Well if the Throne Speech was so sterile what was wrong with those suggestions? The Hon. Leader of the Opposition didn't mention some of the other provisions. An increase in crop insurance: surely he is not against that suggestion! Assistance for swine barns: is that a sterile suggestion? Expansions of the Regina and Saskatoon campuses: is he opposed to that suggestion in the Throne Speech? More equitable grants for separate schools: doesn't he agree with that proposition? A flag for Saskatchewan: surely he is not against that! Aid in the payment of small debts. He is always talking about the consumer. Now the Liberals are going to give him a chance to vote for the consumers. Legislation to help libraries. He wouldn't be against that I'm sure. Aid to our major cities in preventing pollution. Are my hon. Friends opposed to that? A highway program that means something, a highway program under which we will spend about \$60 million again as compared to \$27 million the last year my hon. Friends were in office. Now is the Leader of the Opposition opposed to that? I could go on and talk about other things and matters which are contained in this Throne Speech. I say that when the Socialists were in office, and I used to sit over there, all we would listen to in the Throne Speech was a lot of propaganda, a lot of things that they had done in the past year and very little about what they were going to do in the future. I want to say again that I think this Throne Speech is a constructive document with programs which will continue full employment in this province . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — . . . yet at the same time maintain a balanced budget. I wonder how many Hon. Members noted this afternoon that the Leader of the Opposition hardly spent one minute talking about the Throne Speech.

February 3, 1969

Well, he talked for quite a long time about agriculture programs. He spoke of gloom and doom. Members on this side of the House know that our agricultural industry faces major problems and critical problems, but we still think that the future of agriculture in the longer period is excellent. Of course we've got difficulties. Many of those difficulties are very real. Let us never forget that the agricultural problems which we have in Saskatchewan and in Canada have been caused by surpluses, by over-production and by abundance. In the Iron Curtain countries, in the Socialist countries on the other hand, the greatest shortcoming of the Communist system or the Socialist system has been its failure to make collective agriculture work. Virtually without exception, those nations can't produce enough food for their own people and they are plagued by inefficiency and by underproduction. So I say that the difficulties which our farmers have today in Saskatchewan under the private enterprise system are surely minor indeed when we compare them to the agricultural woes of Socialism. Whatever difficulties we have today in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, surely our farmers know that Socialism isn't the answer to them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon spoke at some length on the problem of wet grain, and with the contention that this is a serious problem, few will disagree. It has been estimated in this province we still have about 90 million bushels of grain which have to be dried. Anyone can pose a problem of that kind. It is another thing to find a solution, and certainly the Leader of the Opposition didn't come up with any solution this afternoon. Now what has the Provincial Department of Agriculture been doing to help the farmer cope with this problem? We don't claim there is a magic formula, but we do say that since last fall the Department of Agriculture has been working diligently with farm organizations, such as the Wheat Pool, with individual farmers and with the Federal Government in trying to find measures that will be helpful. Now the first problem, of course, was to make certain that there were adequate dryers on the prairies and particularly in our province. I want to say that on November 1, we had about 800 dryers in Saskatchewan. By the end of December that total had been boosted to 1,340. In order to encourage the wide use of dryers, I ask you to note that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation agreed to provide gas or electrical connections at no cost to the farmer wishing to dry grain. Well, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) this afternoon, said, "Why my party was so worried about this problem, we went down and visited a few places in North Dakota to see what they were doing." When he came back he made a very profound statement which he repeated this afternoon. I quote the Regina Leader Post:

At present in Saskatchewan there is simply not enough drying capacity in the province.

Now, is this statement correct? Well it is not correct

according to W.C. MacNamara, the Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board. I quote from the Western Producer of January 23, "Are there enough dryers in Saskatchewan?" Here's what Mr. MacNamara said. The headlines – "Enough Dryers to do Job if Put in Full Use."

There are enough dryers to deal with Western Canada's damp grain problem if they were properly distributed and used to the fullest extent.

Now whom do we believe? The Leader of the Opposition, or Mr. MacNamara? The facts are that either the Leader of the Opposition didn't know the facts, didn't know what he was talking about, or he was trying to make political capital out of a critical farm problem.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now from the outset, we know that our farmers have not been using the dryers which were available. A recent survey was conducted by the Canadian Wheat Board and I am sure my hon. friends wouldn't question the word of the Canadian Wheat Board. Their report indicated that only 25 per cent of the grain dryers are being used in Saskatchewan at the present time. I do suggest that it is absolutely essential for farmers to realize that time is running out and that all dryers should be used to capacity from now until spring. Now the Provincial Minister of Agriculture has arranged dozens of meetings around this province with farm groups trying to point out the gravity of this problem. They have tried to set up community committees that would bring a united and co-operative approach to the problem. This Government sent a delegation to Ottawa last December consisting of several Cabinet Ministers and some agricultural representative from the Wheat Pool and other organizations. They did not go to Ottawa to meet with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture and others to see what specific help could be given Western farmers. The Federal Government was asked at the time whether they would be interested in paying a cash subsidy for drying on a 50-50 basis. Now because of its financial position – after all it has a deficit of about \$730 million this year – Ottawa rejected the proposal. Our Government does not feel that we can proceed on our own in this regard. But while the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, refused a cash subsidy, it has taken some major steps which should help to alleviate the problem. First of all, as Hon. Members know, it has indicated that advances of 10 cents per bushel will be made up to \$600 to any farmer who needs funds for drying. So drying is not being held up through lack of funds. Then the Federal Government established a three-bushel quota for wet grain so that it could be delivered and dried at the terminals. While my hon. friends try to make political capital over the situation in Vancouver, the main reason for it, of course, is that the Wheat Board has sent out wet grain to Vancouver in order that it can be dried. I want to say that 19 million bushels were dried at the terminals in December alone. Ottawa wiped out the duties against farm-drying

February 3, 1969

equipment. It agreed to an accelerated write-off for tax purposes on grain-drying equipment purchased by farmers. Now of course these measures haven't solved the problem but most assuredly, Mr. Speaker, they have helped.

Now on December 10, our old snoose-chewing friend, the former Minister of Agriculture, got into the debate. He made a statement and I quote:

Positive action should have been taken from last October to encourage the movement of farm dryers from the United States, as was done in 1951 when transportation assistance of 30 cents a mile was made available by the Provincial Government.

Now that statement interested me, Mr. Speaker, because 1951 was a wet year. Almost half of the total threshed crop was damp. So I looked up the records to see just what the Santa Claus Government had provided in that year. A subsidy of 30 cents per mile to a limit of \$300. You know, Mr. Speaker, that 65 dryers were brought into the province in total. All the money these friends of the farmers paid that year was \$11,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — How differently they talk this afternoon from the way they acted when they were in power. I ask the farmers of Saskatchewan to compare the 65 dryers the Socialists found in 1951 with the 1,340 that are available today. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I asked the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Agriculture, and our Finance Department to go back all the records of the 20 years when the Socialists were in power to see what they had done in the form of subsidy for wet grain. I want to tell you today that as far as we can find, not one five-cent piece was found by the Socialists to dry wet grain in all the 20 years they were in office. Not one five-cent piece!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — All talk and wind; never any action when they were in power. Oh in 1959, Mr. Speaker, there was some assistance. It wasn't for wet grain, but that year it seems that a lot of the crop, particularly in the north, wasn't able to be combined. John Diefenbaker made a speech in Winnipeg. He said, "This is a very critical problem and the Federal Government will put up 50 per cent of the cost if the Provincial Government wants to match it." Well there was an election year coming up in a few months so John caught my hon. Friends with their pants down. That year they had to find a little bit of money for helping up in the north. Even then it wasn't very generous. Anybody who would thresh more than half his crop didn't get a nickel. Anybody who had threshed 200 bushels or more didn't get any, so the assistance was only limited. Now, Mr. Speaker, I've watched

the Socialists this afternoon and I've watched the Socialists for several months endeavoring to make political capital out of this farm crisis. I'm sure the farmers will be touched by this sudden solicitude, because it seems whenever there is a strike which puts farm costs up, the NDP are silent. Where were they when the Great Lake shipping strike took place? Silence. Where were they when the railroad strike took place? Silence. Where were they when the terminal elevators strike took place, something which was costing the farmers a terrible lot of money? Silence. Where were they last fall when the St. Lawrence Seaway strike took place? Always they took the part of the labor unions. The NDP, Mr. Speaker, have never taken the part of the farmer in any strike that has taken place in the Dominion of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists can try to make all the political capital they want, but the hard facts are contrary to what they are saying. What does the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool say about the present crisis? I quote the Leader Post of December 12th:

The only solution to saving millions of bushels of grain lies in the hands of the producers, in their ability to organize and co-operate in handling the problem. The Pool director said even if the governments provide some form of financial assistance the grain-drying projects would still remain largely in the farmers' hands.

This is what the Pool directors say. Now who will the people of Saskatchewan believe? My Socialist friends opposite, or the Wheat Pool? I think that they will believe the Wheat Pool. And I can only echo the words of their director:

While the governments can help the problem, the real problem must be solved by the producers themselves. And if huge amounts of spoilage are to be avoided the farmer must immediately make use of the dryers which this Government has helped to make available.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Well now, Mr. Speaker, let's get down to the hard facts on this farm problem. We listened, as I said earlier, to the Leader of the Opposition who talked for one hour and 40 minutes. What solution have the Socialists come up with to deal with the farm crisis? Well the Saskatchewan Young New Democrats had a convention in Moose Jaw on January 20th and I think that they let the cat out of the bag. I quote from the Moose Jaw Times Herald:

Young NDP call for farm nationalization.

February 3, 1969

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: —

Saskatchewan Young NDP voted to press for the nationalization of all farm lands in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Saskatchewan will be interested to know that the solution of the Socialists for wet grain is to socialize their farm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Collective farms failed in Russia. They failed in China and indeed they failed anywhere they have been tried. And I say to the Leader of the Opposition and his friends that they will never, in 100 years, persuade the farmers of Saskatchewan that their land should be nationalized. Our farmers are too wise. I repeat, they know that they have problems but they certainly know that the Socialists haven't any answers which would be practical or effective.

Mr. Speaker, I shall have a few things more to say tomorrow and I would like to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:42 o'clock p.m.