

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session -- Sixteenth Legislature**  
**5th Day**

**Wednesday, February 5, 1969**

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

**WELCOME TO AIR CADETS**

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** —Mr. Speaker, I would like through you to introduce to the Members of the House, not a group of students but a group of Air Cadets No. 17 Yorkton Squadron who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are 35 in number and are accompanied by their Commanding Officer, Captain Ed Magus. I am sure that all Members will want to welcome this fine-looking group of air cadets from my home city to the Legislature. I know that they are a little disappointed. The trip had been arranged some time ago and they had expected to hear the Premier, but because things that are beyond our control they are going to be able to hear him today. I hope that the Members who do speak will make up for the air cadet's disappointment. I am sure that all Members want to join with me in welcoming them here and hope that they have an enjoyable and educational day.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House and through you to welcome on your behalf and on behalf of all Members, I am sure, the high school students from the Sedley high school in my constituency who are seated in the west gallery in the first two rows and are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Fink. Those of you who come from the Frozen North may or may not know that Sedley is a very thriving farming community southeast of Regina. They are served by very good roads and it is a very thriving farming community. At the present time there is a new industry you might say or a new school in Sedley and it is the Roy Wilson Centre. These students are here today to observe democracy in action. I know that all of us will serve as an outstanding example to them of the kind of representative democracy that we live in in this province and this country. I know that you would all wish them a very happy and successful visit here to the Legislature and a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** —Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the Members of

the Chamber through you a group of students situated in the east gallery. They are students from Howard Coad School in the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair. They are accompanied, I understand, by two of their teachers, Mr. Enns and Mr. Berryere. I hope that they have an interesting stay in the Chamber this afternoon and an educational one. I am sure that all Members agree with me on that and join with me in wishing them a safe journey home after today's visit to Regina.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you a group of students from the Rosetown high school. These students are seated in the west gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Klassen. They had quite a time getting here this morning on account of the snow storm. I am sure that the Assembly will join with me in extending welcome and wishing them an enjoyable afternoon and a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### POLICY ON ROAD GRANTS

**Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey). Does the Government have a policy for providing special road grants to rural municipalities? If so, under what conditions are these provided?

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer):** —On a point of order! Surely this question could be put in written form.

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** —Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the question was asked by a person who knows the answer. But I suggest that he follow the order found on page 20 and submit a question like this in the usual written manner.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### NEW POLICY ON VETERINARIAN INSPECTION SERVICE

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):** —Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a new policy which came into effect earlier this year which provides veterinarian inspection services to operators of domestic abattoirs not exporting meat products outside of the province. The policy

is provided for in an agreement with the Federal Department of Agriculture which became effective the 1<sup>st</sup> of January this year. The inspection is carried out by the Health of Animals Branch of the Federal Government. The Province pays the cost of this inspection which is \$2.37 for each beef animal and 59 cents for each hog, sheep, or calf. This fee is shared on a 50-50 basis between the Provincial Government and the operator. Inspection is on a voluntary basis and the plant must be approved by a Provincial Standards Committee comprised of representatives of the Provincial and Federal Health Department, the Department of Public Health and the Locker Plant Association. Operators who apply for these services will have their products marked with the Canada Approved seal. The Department of Agriculture has already received eight applications from operators in the province. Approval of the first plant receiving inspection services is expected to come from the Provincial Standards Committee in the very near future. The policy will allow these abattoirs to compete for sales to retail outlets and other establishments in Saskatchewan who keep only meat that is under Federal inspection.

Operators of domestic abattoirs wishing to receive this service should make an application to the Production Marketing Branch, Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, Regina.

### ANNOUNCEMENT RE HON. W. ROSS THATCHER

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer):** —Mr. Speaker, today I am sorry to have to announce to the House that Premier Thatcher will not be attending the Conference in Ottawa on the Constitution and that I will be taking his place.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University), and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition).

**Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):** —Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned the debate yesterday I had congratulated the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply for an exhibition of some valor and determination under difficult circumstances. I had remarked about the failure of the Premier's United States speech to conform with other than imaginary facts and I had spent some time in drawing attention to some of the immediate problems which are very much in evidence in the city of Moose Jaw, the city which my colleague Mr. Davies and I represent in this Legislature.

The months that have passed since this House prorogued last spring have been very eventful ones, Mr. Speaker, The Federal election of June 25<sup>th</sup> was of particular significance in our

province. Saskatchewan, in 1968, Mr. Speaker, was described by a number of political commentators as the only real surprise in that general election. No doubt there were a number of factors which contributed to the fine showing of New Democratic party candidates. I think it was particularly significant that the New Democrats won in areas where we have not held the Provincial seat for a number of years. I am told, Mr. Speaker, if the Federal vote is translated into Provincial votes in the next election, the New Democrats will win Saltcoats constituency, one which we have not had since 1948.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — It is a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, to observe that only a handful of votes separated the Liberal party from losing the two seats that they won on June 25<sup>th</sup>. While voters in other parts of the country, Mr. Speaker, appeared to be responding to the somewhat doubtful charms of Pierre Elliot Trudeau, Saskatchewan voters indicated their lack of confidence with the Liberal party, with Liberal candidates finishing last in all constituencies except two. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial seats won by the Liberals in which the New Democratic party took the most votes in the 1968 Federal election — Pelly 51 per cent by the New Democrats; Saltcoats 39.1 per cent; City Park-University 34.9; Watrous 40 per cent; Yorkton 35.4 per cent; Humboldt 36.7 per cent; Elrose 44.4 per cent. The Liberals, Mr. Speaker ran a very miserable third in a number of other seats that they hold in this House: in Morse, Mr. Speaker, the seat that is held by the Premier who unfortunately is not with us, the Liberals drew a miserable 26 per cent, with the NDP drawing 34 per cent. The Liberals ran third in Morse, Milestone, Kelvington, Last Mountain where they drew a miserable 22 per cent, Mr. Speaker. In Arm River and in Rosetown where the Liberals drew a miserable 24.8 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, in my travels about the province during the Federal election one over-riding feature was evident and that was the distrust across the province for anyone who called himself a Liberal, be he Federal or be he Provincial.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — And this didn't happen by accident, Mr. Speaker as the Liberals worked hard for that reputation. The electors of this province are still stinging from the \$34 million of new taxes that were heaped upon them last March. And they remember too well . . .

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** —35, 35!

**Mr. Snyder:** — . . . 35, Davey said yesterday, I'm sorry. They remember too well how the Saskatchewan Liberals claimed to have

the panacea for instant prosperity and reduced taxes. Probably the most significant individual contribution to the rejection of the Federal Liberals in Saskatchewan was made by the man who leads this Government in this House. I think the Premier's problem is perhaps best described by Mr. J.E. Burns of the All Canada Insurance Federation when he spoke to Eastview Rotary club in Regina last September. He said and I quote:

We have been left with the horrible notion that all the people of Saskatchewan aren't quite thinking on the same wave length as the Premier.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Burns could be congratulated on his powers of perception and I hasten to add that the Kelvington by-election will indicate just how correct Mr. Burns was.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — It is becoming increasingly evident, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of Saskatchewan people are not on the Premier's wave length. More and more Saskatchewan voters are ready to register their opposition to the theory, Mr. Speaker, that profits must come first and people second. They fail to appreciate the Premier's line of thought and the line of thought of those sitting opposite that profits are sacred and untouchable to be worshipped like a sacred cow.

The Leader Post of September 30, 1968 quoted the Premier as telling a meeting of Insurance Companies in Minneapolis, and I quote:

That business should wear its profits proudly.

Well I think most Saskatchewan people would want to qualify that broad statement somewhat and would question the pride with which profits may be worn by those who are charging the aged every nickel that the traffic will bear in nursing homes that are springing up across the province and across the country. I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: are profits to be worn proudly by those who are prepared to lend money at a rate of interest which excludes all those Saskatchewan couples who earn less than \$8,000 a year and who are attempting to buy a home? I would have to suggest that it takes a degree of courage of perhaps callous indifference for the drug industries to wear their profits proudly in the light of revealing facts of recent years which indicate, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians have the dubious honor of paying more for their drugs than any other group of people on earth.

According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Mr. Speaker, corporation profits for the third quarter of 1968 showed sharply increased earnings, indicating that corporate profits

for 1968 will be well in excess of \$5½ billion. I suggest that these excessive profits constitute the big leak in our economy. They are the principal cause of inflation. In spite of the fact that there are some people who would like to lay the blame solely at the doorstep of organized labor, there are other matters that must be taken into consideration. The records of Canada will show, Mr. Speaker, that it was rising prices not rising wages that started the inflationary spiral.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — The Wall Street Journal, which can hardly be regarded as a Socialist publication, Mr. Speaker, in the November 14, 1968 issue states that too many people believe in the cost-push theory which says that unions win wages boosts and push up the cost of business, which then tries to recoup by increasing the price of consumer goods. The article states and I quote:

Perhaps the most obvious trouble with this theory is that it does simply not square with observable facts. It is more accurate to say that rising consumer prices cause rising wage demands. In this post-election period inflation remains a clear and present danger and it won't be diminished one whit by efforts to put the blame solely on labor unions.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the cold facts are that over \$5 billion, that is to say, \$5,000 million is being drained out of the Canadian economy annually. Much of it is escaping to foreign companies and never to be seen again. It really matters very little whether these profits are worn proudly or not. In the end they appear as debts in Canadian homes. These excessive profits, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you represent a leak in the economy which cannot be ignored forever.

Somewhat closer to home, Mr. Speaker, it might be appropriate for this Government to show some interest in the excessive increases in the cost of highway construction since it has assumed the reins of office only a few years ago. The rate of increase expressed as a national average is less than half of that of Saskatchewan, with all the provinces recorded showing an average increase of 26 per cent while Saskatchewan's increase was over 63 per cent over a three-year period. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, when this Government refuses to provide information to this Legislature concerning a contract between a wholly owned subsidiary of the Saskatchewan Timber Board and the Pulp Industry in Prince Albert, it would appear that there is something involved that cannot be worn proudly in public. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the agreement between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and North Canadian Oil involving the sale of gas from the Hatton gas fields remains a dark secret which the

Government refuse to divulge, giving Saskatchewan people reason to speculate not only about the wisdom of the transaction but even more serious, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the integrity of the Government is placed under a cloud, when these transactions involving large amounts of money are hidden under a veil of secrecy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, another factor which contributed to the rather miserable showing in Saskatchewan of the Federal Liberals on June 25<sup>th</sup> relates, I am convinced, to the unwillingness of the Saskatchewan voter to accept the Premier's theory that there is nothing wrong with the foreign investment except that we don't have enough of it. Vast numbers of Canadian people are shocked by the increasing ratio of foreign investment in Canadian industry compared to the investment by Canadians. The Watkins Report, a 4,016-page document compiled by six professors, confirms the fears on many Canadian people that we are in danger of losing our sovereignty and becoming a banana republic. At present the Report says that United States owns more of Canada than it owns in the whole of Latin America – \$15 billion in Canada as compared to \$9 billion in Latin America. The Report goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that the menace isn't simply the integration of the Canadian and United States economy with the attendant difficulties of implementing independent Canadian policy to combat unemployment and inflation. In the words of the Report United States subsidiaries have become instruments of American foreign policy and American military goals. The Watkins Report concludes that more than half of the 743 largest Canadian industries are foreign owned and controlled. The Report makes a pointed reference to the fact that these corporate giants have considerable political influence on the local level

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Mr. Speaker, the people of my constituency need not be reminded that the decision to close the Robin Hood Flour Mill emanated from the American headquarter in Minneapolis. More recently Gulf Oil formerly British American announced that the operation in Moose Jaw will undergo a conversion or be phased out with the operation being centralized around a new refinery in Edmonton which will apparently provide the prairie market probably by pipeline.

Policy decisions, Mr. Speaker, made south of the border, are I am afraid cold and impersonal. They fail to recognize local problems or community considerations and are based on economic factors with little or no regard for the impact that these decisions may have on individuals or the community in which they live. There are indicators which point to the fact that the potash industry is in trouble at the moment. This is apparently accounted for by the fact that there is an over-production and a shortage of Canadian dollars in some of the countries which are our potential customers. It should be a

matter of concern to this Government that American subsidiaries in Canada have regarded themselves bound by the American Trading With The Enemy Act, which forbids trade with mainland China or Cuba. Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, are becoming less and less impressed with the Premier's theory that American capital is vital to Saskatchewan's growth, and we suggest to you today that there are other alternatives which deserve this Government's attention and the attention of the Government at Ottawa.

MacLean's Magazine of January 1969 carries an article which deals with the stuffy and the research which went into the Carter and the Watkins Reports and the part that was played by a certain Geoff Conway. This article states and I quote:

The studies in which Conway has been involved tend to reinforce each other. His studies for the Watkins Committee and the Toronto Stock Exchange expunge forever the myth that Canadians are cautious investors. The reason Canadians own so little of their own economy, his figures demonstrate, is that large institutions, insurance companies, mutual funds and pension funds, are grabbing off most of the available stocks thus creating a serious supply shortage for the small investors. The figures show that, even if all the big companies like Eaton's and all the United States subsidiaries like General Motors were to sell one-quarter of their shares to Canadians, there still would not be enough equity to meet the demand. In other words we can afford to buy Canada if only the rules were altered to let us do so.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think these facts are impressive in spite of the fact that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) sits there chuckling like a little elf, but it should be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier, when he expounds his theory that there is nothing wrong with foreign investment except that we don't have enough of it, should remember also at the same time that during World War II we expanded our economy four times without the benefit of foreign capital. All of this has contributed over the past few years to a very suspicious manner in which the Liberal Party is being viewed by Saskatchewan people. The creditability gap is increasing. In the words of Mr. Burns, Saskatchewan people are just not thinking on the same wave length as the Premier.

The foregoing, Mr. Speaker, is intended to indicate some of the reasons for the current unpopularity of the Liberals in Saskatchewan. But add to this, Mr. Speaker, that \$7 million tax on the sick people, and I think you have all of the ingredients for the defeat of the Government which is out of tune with the mainstream of political thinking in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



**Mr. Snyder:** — This undoubtedly accounts for the Premier's reluctance to call that by-election in Kelvington. I think the chronological order of events is worth noting as they relate to deterrent charges, Mr. Speaker. We all remember the adamant refusal almost a year ago by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) to exclude cancer patients from this impost last April. His comment was that all patients must be treated uniformly and the Government bluntly refused to entertain any thought of excluding specific groups or special categories. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Members will agree that they have received more correspondence with reference to deterrent charges than all other matters combined over the past number of months. The measure, Mr. Speaker, is almost universally unacceptable in Saskatchewan where the vast majority of public opinion holds with the reasoning expressed in the Hall Commission Report which said and concluded that a policy of imposing partial payment would simply deter the poor and have no effect upon unnecessary demands of those in the middle and high-income categories.

Mr. Speaker, the Government stuck with their guns zealously and firmly and then came the June 25<sup>th</sup> Federal election with the voters of Saskatchewan indicating their distrust and their lack of confidence in the Liberals in almost every corner of the province. Political commentators were in general agreement that the failure of the Federal Liberal candidates to make a respectable showing related directly to the current unpopularity of the Liberal Government here in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Well, apparently a stinging rebuke by the electorate is the kind of language that Liberals understand. In a matter of only a few weeks following the June general election, these headlines appeared in the paper. "Cabinet discusses utilization ceiling." "Family ceiling being considered." Now these news items, Mr. Speaker, point to the possibility of exempting cancer patient and pacing a family maximum of deterrent charges. Why, Mr. Speaker? For compassionate reasons? Not for a moment! This decision is being contemplated because of an obvious and a glaring need for this Government to mend their political fences.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — I understand that the brain trust of the Liberals have already concluded that it is too late to save Kelvington but they are still hopeful that the tarnished image of the party may be improved before 1970 or 71 or 72, when they must account to the people of Saskatchewan for their stewardship. There appears to be a great deal of confusion, Mr. Speaker, among Members of the Cabinet opposite with regard to the attitude of the public concerning deterrent charges. On November 18<sup>th</sup> last,

Mineral Resources Minister Cameron told the Moose Jaw South Liberals that utilization fees are no longer a matter of concern to the Saskatchewan people. Now the Moose Jaw Times Herald replied in an editorial of November 22<sup>nd</sup>. The editorial is entitled "Oh, really Sir?" which says in part and I quote from the editorial:

The situation may be likened to a family simply not discussing the fact that father is in jail. It doesn't mean that they have forgotten or like the idea. Mr. Cameron said that people have shown more interest in getting grid roads, oiling programs and grants for access roads. That kind of thinking loses elections.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems that other high-ranking Liberals are not in agreement with Mr. Cameron that the tax on the sick is an issue which is dead and gone, because only four days later the Premier was guest speaker at a graduation exercise of a class of psychiatric nurses at the Saskatchewan Training School at Moose Jaw. He devoted much of his address to a continuing attempt at that time to justify deterrent charges to this gathering. Yes, Mr. Speaker, for an issue that is supposed to be dead and forgotten it still appears to demand the attention of a good many people. Why even at the Liberal party's annual convention – the convention which is held each year unless the Premier decides otherwise – Welfare Minister C.P. MacDonald was assigned the task of explaining and justifying deterrent charges to the Liberal delegates. Well after almost a year of experience with these utilization fees there are a good many of our Saskatchewan people who require no explanation of how they work or how they affect large, low-income families. Many of those people, Mr. Speaker, a large number of them in their senior years, know this story by first-hand experience. Here is one example concerning a patient with a heart condition who underwent surgery twice between 1957 and 1968 at no cost to the patient. The third operation took place on March 12, 1968 at the Regina General. The patient was discharged May 17; the patient readmitted June 24; new admittance record, Mr. Speaker, a new start on another \$2.50 fee schedule; discharged July 16 and readmitted July 17 and back on the \$2.50 fee; discharged on August 10, and so on.

Now perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) will still argue that it is good exercise for people to participate in the getting well process. But my experience with those who have contacted me – and there have been many – is that it merely contributes further to the mental anguish that the patient suffers. The Minister of Health I understand was made aware of a case of a Moose Jaw woman, a cancer patient who had been in hospital well in excess of 90 days prior to April 15<sup>th</sup>. She had been a patient at the Moose Jaw Union Hospital. By error, Mr. Speaker, the husband was billed \$50 for deterrent fees which was an illegitimate charge because of her length of stay in the hospital, 90 days prior to the introduction of deterrent fees.

The bill was placed in the hands of a collection agency which threatened to garnishee and finally by this method intimidated an already grief-stricken husband to pay the \$50 bill. When I became involved, Mr. Speaker, the administration at the Union Hospital admitted their error and agreed to return \$35 of this \$50, suggesting that someone had to pay the collection agency's fee and by jove it wasn't going to be the hospital. And only at that point did the Minister of Health become involved, and I want to express to him my thanks for seeing to it the matter was settled on a satisfactory basis, prior to the patient's death last September.

These are a few examples, Mr. Speaker, of the many cases where hardship and anguish have resulted from unwise and unkind legislation. One doctor told me recently that his patient load has been reduced by a marked degree by those patients whom we call our senior citizens. Many older patients, some of them with high blood pressure and other chronic complaints which require regular care, he tells me, simply are not making those return office calls as directed by him, and he can only conclude that deterrent charges are discouraging many of this low-income group from seeking necessary services.

I expect, Mr. Speaker, that my community of Moose Jaw is no different than most others in the province. I expect that every Member in this House can, like myself, relate to cases where senior citizens are postponing medical and surgical treatment for hernia, for hemorrhoids, for thyroid conditions and other postponable maladies. To what extent this delay may be harmful or dangerous is not for a layman to judge. What we do know, Mr. Speaker, is that the entire concept of preventative medicine has been undermined by these utilization fees. I suggest that it would be somewhat difficult to judge the long-range effect of this tax on the poor, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps experience elsewhere may shed some light on the matter.

Time Magazine of November, 1968 in the section entitled "Medicine" carries an article "Treating the poor." This article tells how through funds provided through the Office of Economic Opportunity, a team of medical men have launched a counter-attack on medical poverty by setting up 51 neighborhood health centres in a number of depressed areas across the United States. The article draws attention to one of the first centres to be established under the program at Columbia Point, a community of 6,000 people near Boston. The article concludes that a program of preventative medicine saves money, and to quote directly from the account it says:

Cut off from routine preventative medicine, poverty-ridden people tend to be extremely ill when they are finally compelled to go to the hospital. A sample of 54 Columbia Point families was found to have a total of 200 hospital days in the year before the centre opened. Two years later because of better preventative care, this had dropped to 40 days or an 80 per cent reduction. Hospitalization

at \$50 to \$100 a day in true cost is the most expensive part of medical care. For those 54 families alone, the second year savings in hospital may have been as much as \$10 to \$12,000.

Mr. Speaker, a sober appraisal of these facts would seem to lend credence to the widespread belief that the Government has embarked on a narrow, short-sighted and ill-advised program with the imposition of a measure which has already shown conclusively that it has the potential to deny medical services to poor people and encourage the neglect of conditions requiring medical treatment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather sombre note upon which to conclude my remarks in this debate. The reference in the Throne Speech to a family ceiling on deterrent charges gives some indication that this Government has recognized to correct, at least in part, its largest single, strategic blunder to date. I fail to be impressed with the Government's reason for having reached such a decision. An examination of the facts and the chain of events over the past year seems to indicate beyond all doubt that the Government is running scared and motivated by political concern.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — There is little in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, to foster or encourage confidence or trust in this Government, consequently I will be voting for the amendment and against the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):** —Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in debate to the Throne Speech, I wanted to primarily confine my remarks to agriculture but first, Mr. Speaker, may I refer Members' attention to the speech yesterday in the House by the Member of Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan). It has been my good fortune to be a newly-elected Member of this Assembly. I have heard a number of speeches from various persons in that short time. However, no speech has made me feel so sad being a Member of this Legislature as the one from Last Mountain yesterday.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — It was absolutely shameful, Mr. Speaker. One expects when we enter into political life that there will be an honest class of opinions and ideologies, but we expect these conflicting class of opinions and views to be represented vigorously and hard by both Members. But we do not expect nor will the people of Saskatchewan tolerate speeches of the cut of the Member of Last Mountain based on basic disrespect for this Legislature.

This is a matter that cuts through all party lines to all the people. The Member's (Mr. MacLennan) speech was based on innuendo, gossip, hear-say and half-truths.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — At a time when all people in Saskatchewan expect us to act as parliamentarians in a truly dignified manner, the outrage of the Member from Last Mountain was a slur against us and will take a great deal of time and hard work to overcome.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Mr. Speaker, returning to the agricultural situation in the province, my first reason would have to most certainly be because of the disastrous crops that the farmer of Saskatchewan suffered in 1968. This was due abnormally to the drastic harvest conditions and the weather that prevailed on him during that year.

My second reason in dealing with the agriculture is because of the total lack of recognition that the Government gave to the seriousness of this problem in the Throne Speech. Even the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) when he delivered the Premier's speech yesterday only donated two minutes of time to agriculture and then sporadically mentioned it during the remainder of the speech, showing no concern for the agricultural problems of this province. The statement in the Throne Speech, that reduced income to the farmers of Saskatchewan is being constituted and made up for by industries outside of agriculture, is going to be of no help to the Saskatchewan farmer. I ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) what satisfaction is this going to give to farmers who have piles of grain in the fields which they have lack of finances to dry, farmers that have grain out in the field that was not worthwhile drying, farmers that have grain that it is debatable as to whether it is worthwhile spending the money to dry.

The statement by the Government that, despite poor growing conditions and extremely unfavourable harvesting weather, our province was still able to harvest its seventh largest crop in history is of no concern to the Saskatchewan farmer and of no comfort to him in the situation he now finds himself in. The further statement of working with the Federal Government and that they have made every feasible effort to make certain that adequate grain drying facilities are available to the farmers, this is of no relief to most Saskatchewan farmers.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) tried to assure the Saskatchewan farmers that the surveys, according to him, stating they showed excessive amounts of grain in the province that were tough and damp, that these statistics made available to the farmers were unrealistic and

inaccurate. He went on to say and mentioned that the grain in the Province of Saskatchewan is an asset to the farmer and that both Provincial and Federal Governments had done something toward solving this problem by the way of the maximum of the \$600 loan towards drying grain. He went on to say that perhaps the Provincial Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) deserves some credit for this. Now, Mr. Speaker, if he only knew what the farmers of Saskatchewan are being confronted with, he would retract such statements simply because the problem is far from being solved.

Mr. Speaker, the crux of the situation is not as to how much tough and damp grain we have, whether it's a 100 million bushels or 200 million bushels, the crux of the situation is not whether Saskatchewan has just had its seventh largest crop in history, the crux of the problem and situation is that the farmers of Saskatchewan do not have the available capital to dry the crops that are an asset to this province, Mr. Speaker. The Government has been negligent in solving this problem that any department could have foreseen that there was going to be problems in regard to agriculture this year because of the drastic climatic conditions that prevailed in the province. But there was absolutely nothing of a constructive nature that came from either the Provincial Department of Agriculture or the Federal Department of Agriculture in regard to recognizing and solving the grain problems that were confronting the farmers until the first or second week in December, and they only made recognition because of pressures that were being brought upon them and it was not only to bring forth positive policy or constructive policy that would solve the problem. I, however, must admit that there was a time when a positive program toward the drying of the grain was brought forward. I say this because on December 19<sup>th</sup> an article in the Leader Post by Mr. Steuart and Mr. McFarlane stated that they would pay the full cost of fuel, either propane gas or fuel oil up to the maximum used, based on receipts provided by the supplier where grain was dried. The plan proposed to pay 50 per cent of the cost assessed by the custom-drier to a maximum of 6 cents a bushel or \$300. Mr. Steuart, who is ever aware of apparent problems and was extremely concerned as to the fact that some of the fuel may be used to heat perhaps some freezing farmer's home, said that the apparent problems or difficult areas would be smoothed out. Well, Mr. Speaker, the entire proposal was smoothed right off the table during the smoothing-out process as it never did come into effect. Instead, Mr. Speaker, they came forward with a policy that they did carry out, which was co-ordinating dryers in the province. This program has been and will be of very little assistance to the farmers who have no means of drying grain, no financial means of paying for drying grain. And the advances of up to \$600 which the Federal Government feels so proud about is of very little help to the people who are already in debt and in effect will find it difficult to pay back the loan because of the poor quality and grade of grain that they have. The only thing that this advance does for the farmer is to put him further into debt in an already disastrous situation.

The Premier of this Province (Mr. Thatcher) stated on Monday that the farmers were not making use of the dryers available and I must agree with him, but I want to point out to the Members opposite (and I'm sure that a great many of them are already aware) the impossibility of drying grain in 30 to 40 degree below zero weather. The bulk of the machinery that is required is just not built to operate in such temperatures. Perhaps if the Hon. Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) and some of his colleagues could go out in the country and experience these conditions, they would find out how utterly ridiculous these statements are. In all due respect to the Premier in his present condition which I'm told is pneumonia, perhaps he did go out and take a look at this and this was the result that came about.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — I want to bring to the Government's attention that, if it were possible to dry and farmers did take advantage, the 10 cent per bushel loan (at least he did more than you fellows did over there if that's what he did get it from) would cover less than half the cost of drying under these conditions. The cost of drying grain in the province is fluctuating between 20 and 30 cents per bushel at the present time. I might add that if the Federal Government and related handling industries had been better informed before opening the 3-bushel quota with Liberal propaganda made in their favour, they would not have had the problem of the magnitude that they have now, simply because the farmers would not have harvested the quantity of tough and damp grain that they did.

Mr. Speaker, because this grain is an asset to the economy of not only Saskatchewan but of Canada, the only realistic and positive program that should have been initiated and carried out by the Provincial and Federal Governments was one of direct financial assistance to farmers, but their continued refusal to bring forward positive programs towards alleviating this problem can only mean that the economy is going to suffer and that the farming industry is going to receive a blow and setback.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the portion of the Throne Speech that was donated to agriculture is no different from the entire body of the Throne Speech. It neither answers nor does it bring forth any concrete policy that would be of assistance to the people of this province and to the farmers of Saskatchewan in particular. It mentions diversification which in itself is fine but it does not go on to say what the farmers' story is in regard to the lack of income, whether he's diversified or a single grain farmer. It praises the program of swine production, but if the Government of Saskatchewan has been able to encourage only 153 farmers since the program was put into effect in 1967 it seems rather dismal results for the type of publicity the program is getting.

The ever accelerating rate and increase of accidents in

the Province of Saskatchewan should have been included in the Throne Speech to try and come forth with some answer in regard to improving the type of machinery that farmers now use. There should have been mention of improvements and research towards establishing a weather-forecasting system that would be closer involved with the agricultural field. There should have been mention of a farm credit policy for the farmers at this time. There should have been mention of the strengthening and encouraging of the Wheat Board's selling position and the inclusion of crops such as flax, rye and rapeseed. Mr. Speaker, these, too, are not only all of the growing concerns of the farmer in Saskatchewan that the Province has been negligent in recognizing and taking progressive steps to solve, but, Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking the Government or saying that the Government should be taking the needs of agriculture into consideration and entering them into the Throne Speech only because of the Province of Saskatchewan's bad crops that the farmers reaped last year. But I say it should be looking into these matters because everywhere you look in the agricultural field there are problems.

Canada's exporting of grain is down drastically from last year and will be down considerably more by all estimates for 1969. One reason that will contribute to this backlog is the ships that are waiting at the West Coast to be loaded with grain, grain that is not there. Many of these ships have already left. This situation is costing the prairie farmer a great deal of money – demurrage charges of up to \$3,000. The farmer is a two-way loser in this situation. It costs him money to have the ships leave and not take the cargo of grain, it costs the farmer money to have the ships wait to be loaded because of the demurrage charge that has to be paid to them.

This situation at the West Coast along with our carryover and production trends for future years definitely proved that government should be aware and working towards a closer relationship between marketing and production. The Premier says he was aware of agricultural problems being major and critical and that over-production is our problem. Perhaps he should have done something about this by looking more closely at the problem in the West Coast and informing the Federal Government of that situation.

The economic branch of the Federal Agriculture Department started in a study, presented to the annual Provincial Agricultural Outlook Conference in the fall of last year in Ottawa, that the farmer is the only member in the agricultural industry who is not making more money every year. I believe this statement to be true. It is true because the farmer is in a cost-price squeeze, as the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) stated several days ago. It is also true that the farmer was in the same position, as the Hon. Member stated that it was 20 years ago, that the price of grain was high or higher than it is now. But other than giving a weak excuse that, because the farmer now has power, sewer, water and roads which should show the farmer's income position is better, he stops there.



I would like to bring to his attention and the attention of the Members of this House that 20 years ago the farmers carried very little debt. I am told by a release put out by the Royal Bank of Canada just recently that the prairie farmers are now carrying more than \$2 billion worth of debt, and this, Mr. Speaker, is why he has the conveniences of life that he did not have 20 years ago. He has them because he went into debt for them and not because his operation was earning him the money where he could outrightly buy them. Consequently the farmer is still and will remain in the cost-price squeeze that he is now in unless strong government action is taken. I believe also the Member from Cannington said that the answer was in strong government action. Unfortunately I see no action on behalf of this Provincial Government. In fact the only action that I have seen on behalf of the Federal Government is the Prime Minister touring the country making statements that he and his Government are not responsible for selling grain but it is a direct problem of the farmer. Mr. Speaker, this statement is so preposterous it is almost difficult to believe that it came from a supposedly educated man. It is an absolute impossibility for the farmers of Saskatchewan, or for that matter the farmers of nearly any exporting country, to be able to compete with governments of other countries who are selling the farm produce of that country. We have been aware of this for a great many years and have been trying to establish better marketing means. Then when we have the Prime Minister of Canada come forth with a statement such as the farmer should be responsible for selling his own grain. Mr. Speaker, it can only appear by the lack of action and regard to the present agricultural situation in the prairies and by the statements for which the Prime Minister is wholly responsible that we are not progressing in the agricultural field but indeed regressing.

I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, if these people who are making the statements that agriculture should be able to look after itself, that it is already a industry that is sponging off the rest of the country, I wonder if they know, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan contributes 40 per cent of the gross value of commodity production, generally speaking and in some years has reached a much higher percentage than that, closer to 50 per cent.

Do the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and his colleagues and the other people that go along with the neglect toward agriculture know and realize that farmers earn 20 per cent of our foreign exchange? Do they know that he now produces enough basic food to feed 45 people? Do they know that in 1966 the farmers of Saskatchewan spent \$137,017,000 wholesale price for machines and repairs and that out of the total agricultural sales in Canada, Saskatchewan bought 29 per cent of them? Do they know that nearly half of the total income of the people in Saskatchewan is derived from agricultural persons engaged in agriculture and its related service and industries that make up the largest single group of the labor force in Saskatchewan?

Do they know that agriculture is a major purchaser of petroleum, rubber, automotive parts, hardware, paint and electrical materials? In fact \$146 million was spent by agriculture on petroleum in 1967 and \$90 million spent on chemicals, pesticides and fertilizer. Do they know that 22 per cent of our manufacturing industry use raw materials from farm origin, that 20 per cent of the gross value of factory shipments are made from farm products? Do they know that in 1964, 7,400 out of a total of 33,000 manufacturing plants were processing foods and vegetables and paying 215,000 workers over \$1 billion a year in wages? Are they aware that the Canadian family is now taking less and less of its take-home pay to be spent on food? In the early 50s it was 25 per cent; it is now closer to 20 per cent and this is due only to the efficiency of farmers. But this will not continue unless an immediate long-range program in regard to agriculture is taken. I am a farmer myself, Mr. Speaker, and I am speaking on behalf of farmers and I want to tell the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and the rest of their colleagues that the farmer of Saskatchewan is fed up. He is sick and tired of the Governments using them, moving, shuffling, and even sacrificing them for political gain, as if they were of no more value than a pawn in a chess game. That, Mr. Speaker, is why we in the New Democratic party have laid out a positive and realistic program in regard to the tough and damp grain in the Province of Saskatchewan now for the Western farmer, a nine point program. For the benefit of those opposite, especially the Premier as he seems to have had a lapse of memory the other day in regard to them including some of the other Members, I will read them again:

Urge the Federal Government to make a cash payment of up to 10 cents a bushel towards the cost of grain drying, sharing of that payment by the Provincial Government, provision by the Province of the necessary administrative structure to carry out the payment program. Urge the Federal Government to appoint a co-ordinator of grain movement who would have authority to get grain moving from elevators to terminals and ships. More action and responsibility for seeing that existing drying facilities are used to capacity. Urge the Federal Government to continue to contribute to demurrage charges of ships forced to wait for wheat cargo. Offer to share with the Federal Government and grain companies the capital cost of installing grain drying facilities. Work with the farm organizations and handling companies to explore the value of using elevator-based drying facilities in parts of the province even in normal years. Offer to join in a study with the Federal Government involving railways, grain companies and shipping companies to examine the whole process of handling and moving grain from elevators to ships.

Mr. Speaker, I will not because of the lack of initiative on the part of the present Government in its Throne Speech, I will not, Mr. Speaker, support the motion but I will support the amendment.

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to take this opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply on their material and delivery. As you are well aware the problem they face is to outline the tremendous development taking place in our province in the limited time that was allotted to them. Under these circumstances they did extremely well showing the people of Saskatchewan the progress that has taken place, particularly in the last 12 months under a Liberal administration.

I wish to spend some time this afternoon looking at the political picture in Saskatchewan since I gather from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) that there is a feeling of hope that the political tide is swinging back in their direction. I would remind the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that because he presented a new look for a few months is no reason to suggest that this same new look is being portrayed by the party which he leads. The fact that he did not have the courage to face the Government with his new growth proves he is aware that nothing he does could revive a party that has been dead for some time.

Since the NDP still maintain aspirations of again forming the government in this province, I will provide an in-depth look at their political party for the people of Saskatchewan, so that they will be fully ware of the dangers of trying a second dose of Socialism at a time that our province is showing unprecedented development and progress. I will show this afternoon that the NDP are the same old party with the same old leaders and the same old philosophy and ideas that they were in 1944 – which I might remind you is a quarter of a century ago. Nothing has changed in spite of the hopes and dreams of some of the younger Members opposite, from the party that the people of Saskatchewan repudiated in 1964, in the by-elections in Moosomin and Bengough and again in the general election of 1967. They are further out of touch with the realities of today than at any time since their birth during the Dirty Thirties when a few optimists felt that there was room for a Socialist party on the Canadian scene.

However, after a mild flirtation with the CCF, most serious people in Canada returned to the philosophy of free enterprise that has provided our people with the greatest freedom and the highest standard of living in the world. Even the NDP party's brothers behind the Iron Curtain have been forced to dilute their socialistic theories with a substantial infusion of free enterprise to prevent absolute chaos in their economy. Socialism can't work and it won't work even when force is used to back it up. I would thus remind the people of Saskatchewan that in the foreseeable future their choice – in fact their only choice – will continue to be the Liberal Government of the day.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The NDP for 20 years proved

They were incapable of translating their socialist dreams into the action that would allow Saskatchewan to develop its human and natural resources as equal partners in our Confederation. One needs to look at the leadership of the NDP both on the Federal and Provincial scene to realize how completely they have been left out of the main stream of today's politics. Within the last two years all federal parties have assessed their leadership. The Conservatives were the first at which time they took the opportunity to replace a 73-year old leader with one who had just turned 54. Unfortunately for them age was not the only problem within the Conservative party. Although they recognized the need for a younger man who could speak the language of the day, they failed to elect one at their Leadership Convention.

The Liberal party was much more fortunate and as we are all aware at the Leadership Convention replaced a 71-year old leader with one who was 49 and entirely in tune with the times. Mr. Trudeau's election victory and his continued growth in popularity from one end of the country to the other show that he is certainly the man for Canada in these changing times.

The NDP had a great opportunity to replace their 64-year old leader with a younger man. Tommy Douglas's personal defeat for the second time during an election, plus the fact that the NDP failed to make any election gains, gave them the opportunity and the motivation to replace the federal leadership with a younger man and it appeared for a short time that this approach might be taken.

July 2<sup>nd</sup>, black headlines announced to the country in general, that T.C. Douglas was to quit as NDP Leader. Following this announcement, several young hopefuls emerged as possible candidates. Allan Blakeney, Deputy Leader of the Provincial NDP party said he was considering letting his name stand. However, he didn't wish to commit himself too fully until he saw what happened at the Provincial Convention. He would prefer the provincial leadership to the federal, but both appear out of his reach at the present time.

Many of us were surprised on June 27<sup>th</sup> to read that Henry Baker, NDP MLA for Regina South East was also considering the national job. His actual words were, and I quote:

It's been suggested that I take over, Mayor Baker said in an interview Wednesday. I could be one of their strongest contenders.

He continued:

The NDP has got to find men who are looking for something different, we need about 90 good men across the country who can win seats. To get them we need somebody who knows people across Canada. I could get them, he said. We've got to have people with a name.

One thing our Member opposite is noted for is his self-assurance and lack of modesty.

It soon became obvious that his colleagues in the NDP did not share Mr. Baker's own feeling that he was the man for the job. His Provincial Leader said the NDP was satisfied with their present leader and that no one is seeking an alternative to Mr. Douglas. Ed Whelan, one of Mr. Baker's colleagues in the city of Regina said that he had been so disappointed at Mr. Douglas's defeat that he hadn't given any thought to his successor. Roy Romanow, an NDP MLA, whom I would have thought would have been in favour of younger leadership, said that he was disappointed that Mr. Baker saw fit to make his comment in light of the fact that Mr. Douglas has not yet announced his intention. Jack Messer, the freshman NDP Member from Kelsey, was a little more outspoken than the others when he said that he felt that Mr. Baker did not have the federal experience needed to lead the party in Ottawa.

**An Hon. Member:** — Too old, too old!

**Mr. Guy:** — Other NDP MLAs who for the sake of saving them embarrassment were not named in the paper, were even more outspoken than that. They said:

You've got to be kidding, my on-the-record comment would be so fluffy as to be worthless, my off-the-record comment would be so intemperate as to be really worthless.

Another one said, "I'd say I would be willing to run for President of the United States if I thought it would get me a headline", suggesting that perhaps Mayor Baker is more interested in publicity than actually attaining the job.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — To our mind it is unfortunate that the Mayor is held in such low esteem by many Members of the NDP and that these Members did not have the decency to refrain from belittling one of their colleagues in public. Thus it appeared that any attempt to replace the aging Mr. Douglas would meet with considerable objection from the Saskatchewan NDP MLAs.

The NDP then had a second opportunity to bring a younger man to the fore in the House of Commons when they appointed a new House Leader but again age won out over youth with the appointment of 60-year old David Lewis. In two instances the Federal NDPs selected men of yesterday's generation, 64 and 60 years old respectively, to lead a party which claims that they are the party of youth today.

In Saskatchewan a similar pattern evolved during the summer. The Saskatchewan NDPs also had two opportunities to show

that they were on the side of the youth and in tune with the times. At their annual convention last July, the leadership and the presidency of the party were both up for grabs, but in both cases age won out over the youthful contenders. In fact they were so enamoured with a Leader who has been around for 25 years and led them to two election defeats, they would not even let the young mayor of Moose Jaw's name be placed before the convention. This must be disappointing to the younger members of a party that claimed in this Legislature less than a year ago that they were the party of the youth.

All across Canada today, political parties are choosing men in touch with the times, are trying to narrow the generation gap, except in the NDP where age is still a premium commodity. One can only suspect that they are fearful of the youth of today, knowing that in all probability they would take the party away from socialism towards the more successful and acceptable free enterprise approach. Among the youth of today the only ones that have time for socialist dreams are the kooks and radicals on our campuses, the social misfits and dregs of humanity found in the hippie jungles, and the subversive elements and anarchists that are using the NDP party as a vehicle to obtain their own selfish ends.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — What can be said about the leadership of the NDP being outdated is equally true of their philosophy. I will give you several examples to show you, Mr. Speaker, that they have exactly the same philosophy and intentions today that they had when they were born during the depths of the depression, and that they secretly maintained during their term of office in Saskatchewan. They were committed to the destruction of the free enterprise system then and they remain committed to the elimination of the free enterprise system today, as shown this afternoon by the speech of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder).

For a short time after the federal election, the NDP were elated by the fact that they had elected some young men to Parliament. However, elation soon turned to despair when it became evident that although young in age, they were still bound by the outdated philosophy of their political party. John Burton, MP for Regina East was a young man who should have been expected to make a speech in tune with the thinking of his own generation. The biggest disappointment of 1968 for the people of his constituency, of which I happen to be one, occurred when he made his first speech in the House of Commons during the Throne Speech Debate. It was reported in the Leader Post:

Mr. Burton hewed to the basic party lines as set out in the Regina Manifesto.

His first words were:

The task of eliminating inequality in Canada is unfinished until the economic power held in the private sector is wrested away and re-structured . . .

One would have thought that a young MP making his first speech could have found something more original and in tune with his society than a quotation from the Regina Manifesto of some 36 years ago. The time spent as research assistant to the Leader of the Opposition must have shackled any thought of his own that he might have had. What more proof do we need than that of the antiquity of the NDP.

As those of us who have lived in Saskatchewan are well aware, political expedience was another trademark of the NDP. Their motto during their term of office was, "If it doesn't bring you votes, don't do it. If it does bring you votes, try it over and over again". A prime example was the manner in which they manipulated the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. Prior to each election the rates would go down and then immediately afterwards they would go up higher than ever. This philosophy has not changed, Mr. Speaker. If any further proof of this was needed it was provided by Lea Benjamin, the other Regina MP, when he requested that the Federal Government withdraw its financial assistance to Saskatchewan's Medical Care and Hospitalization Plan until the utilization fees were dropped. It was quite apparent from this request that he had no concern over the future of the health plans for the people of Saskatchewan, but was concerned only with the political gain that might accrue for the NDP. Truly another disappointing performance from a man, young in age, but already barren of ideas. Their political party first, then the people of Saskatchewan, has always been their motto and it appears that it will continue to be so.

Another basic philosophy of the CCF and later the NDP was to eliminate local governments. We all remember how they were stripped of their authority under the NDP government. WE all remember how the attempt was made to impose a country system against the wishes of the rural municipalities. Only the watchfulness of the Liberal opposition supported by local opinion prevented this.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — A speech by the NDP Member for Saskatoon Riversdale, as reported in the Saskatchewan Teachers' Bulletin, November 15<sup>th</sup>, 1968, revived the fear that local government has had of the NDP. He told a meeting of teachers that the first point in a plan for education was the abolition of local school boards. As is the NDP when they were Government had not done enough to limit and erode the powers of the local school board, they would not abolish them altogether. This would be the thin edge of the wedge and the abolishment of local municipal government would soon follow. Further proof of this became evident last

week when the NDP passed a resolution at their convention calling for the nationalization of all farm lands in Canada. This resolution is not surprising for when the NDP were the Government, they nationalized everything but the farmers' land.

They tried to nationalize the trappers and fishermen. They nationalized the lumber industry and drove hundreds out of existence. They nationalized airlines and they spent thousands of the taxpayers' dollars attempting to nationalize the shoe, wool and the leather industries, all of which failed. Now a return of the NDP party would see every farmer in this province lose his lands to the state. Of course once your land belonged to the NDP you would no longer need a municipal government. This happened in Russia and China and would happen here under a Socialist regime.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Leaders of the NDP today try to maintain that they are a party for all classes, but again the facts do not bear this out. The NDP has always been a party that was dominated by one segment of society. With the inception of the CCF it was a farm-dominated movement. Following the depression it became dominated by intellectuals, and since the change of name from the CCF to the NDP it has become wholly dominated by the labor unions.

At the NDP convention in July one of their labor bosses told the convention that he was concerned that the people in the NDP said they would not dare go out in the country and say they would throw out the compulsory arbitration bill the Liberal Government has placed on the statute books.

Len Wallace, an official of the Wholesale-Retail Workers Union, told the convention that the party had better make up its mind. Farmers might well ask, "Make up its mind to what?" It had better make up its mind that labor is dominant and the farmer is of little concern. They are particularly vocal now about the farmers' problems because for one labor unions are not involved, but I would ask the farmers to recall how much sympathy they got from the NDP when strikes prevented the movement of prairie grain. The NDP sympathy was then with the unions as it would be now if the unions were involved. Len Wallace admitted further that the NDP had not invited labor and farmer to sit down together. He said there is no formal program to invite labor people to attend rural constituency conventions and that there is no formal program to invite farm people to address labor gatherings. From this it is evident that no attempts are being made to bring labor and farmers together in Saskatchewan, because the NDP are committed to labor and farmers have nothing in common with them.

Further proof comes from the fact that Tommy Douglas advised trade unionists in the United States and Canada to step



up their political activity. Speaking to a convention of the United Packing House Workers of America in Saskatoon, Mr. Douglas told them that these unions must widen their political interest. Just after this speech they passed a resolution to work towards the defeat of the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. Thus it appears that when Mr. Douglas and Mr. Lloyd call on labor to widen political interest, it means only for the interest of the NDP. But as Tommy Douglas once said, "He who pays the piper, calls the tune." At the NDP annual convention it was reported by their treasurer that the party is financed by membership fees and by affiliation fees of trade union organizations. He went on to show that out of income of \$292,000 in 1967, \$21,000 came from membership fees and \$271,000 from trade union fees and other contributions. From this it is obvious why the NDP must play the game the labor union way.

The final aspect of NDP philosophy which I wish to deal with this afternoon is their attitude towards our neighbors to the south. I am not surprised that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), the Member from Moose Jaw and the rest of them are out of the House at this time, because if there has ever been a disgrace in this province, it is the actions of our Members opposite when it comes to their relationships with our friends.

**Some Hon. Members:** — hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — From their inception they have been strongly anti-American and this feeling grows stronger every day. But, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what the NDP try to tell us, we must remember that Canada and the United States have been at peace for 157 years. The defence of our country is a joint United States and Canadian responsibility and we couldn't defend ourselves without their aid. The majority of our export and import trade is with the United States. Our pulp mills, our potash mines, our base metal mines all our other industries, depend to a large extent on American investment.

They have been good neighbors. They believe in the same values we believe in. They want freedom, they oppose totalitarianism and they believe in democracy, values which are abhorred by the Communists and the NDP. With this friendly relationship existing with our neighbors to the south, it was with revulsion and horror that we heard of the burning of the American flag in Naicam this summer by members of the NDP. Regardless of the country involved, a flag is a symbol of a nation's identity, a pride of being. Men and women are prepared to die and have died for it. Respect by everyone is due to every flag of every nation. But do the NDP have respect for this? Obviously they do not, as they wilfully and deliberately burned the flag of a friendly country whose young men dies for Canada in two world wars. In their boorishness, the leaders of the NDP have no respect for anything or anyone that is not part of their philosophy. Lowell Monkhouse, a member of the NDP

provincial executive said that the burning was sponsored and financed by the NDP. He also said that he clapped when the flag was burned and said it was too bad that they didn't burn a couple of five star generals too. Such a statement could only come from a depraved party whose moral conscience is non-existent.

So, Mr. Speaker, sitting to your left are the party responsible for the most deplorable action ever taken by a political party against a friendly neighbor since Confederation. The shame and disgrace from this action will unfortunately be with Saskatchewan long after the NDP are gone and forgotten. Let us hope, however, that this incident will continually remind our people of the true character of the Saskatchewan NDP.

It was only a few days after this that we find that the NDP, not satisfied with burning the American flag, were sending telegrams to Prime Minister Trudeau, demanding that United States bomber training flights over Saskatchewan be stopped. The same day, however, another black headline appeared in the daily papers, "Russia still deep inside Czechoslovakia." Did the NDP convention send a telegram to Moscow to withdraw troops and tanks that were killing innocent people? No, they did not! To this day not one member opposite has spoken out against the aggression of their Communist friends.

They were quick to demand withdrawal of American training flights from Canada that were here with the full knowledge and approval of our Government. They remain strangely silent when one country deliberately invades a friendly neighbor with no excuse and no explanation and destroys their government with force and bloodshed. Could the difference be that they are more in sympathy with Communist totalitarianism than with the democratic ideals for which the Czechoslovakian people were prepared to die?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, I have tried this afternoon to show the image of the NDP as they are today. By concrete examples I have shown that their image, their leadership and their philosophy have not changed in the last 30 years.

Today they offer two alternatives I have outlined: a party as it is at present with old leaders, an old philosophy and a fear of change or a party as it would be if the younger members of the NDP took control; members dedicated to the abolishment of local school boards, to the nationalization of farm land, to anarchy in our universities, to the abolishment of the Indian treaty, to the destruction of the United States and the establishment of a Communist government in Vietnam, all of which were approved by formal resolution at the young NDP Provincial Convention in Moose Jaw less than a month ago, thus becoming part of their program to be implemented when opportunity allows.

In view of these alternatives, which are the only ones offered by our friends opposite, one can only say, "Thank God for the Liberal party in Saskatchewan, which is dedicated to freedom and democracy for all."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, I might add that the image of the NDP that I have pointed out this afternoon is not only the image as the Government and the people of Saskatchewan see them, but it is the image of the NDP as seen by their own members. From their own mouths they admit that what I have said is true. Just a few examples to prove my point. Rod Thompson, the NDP MP for Battleford-Kindersley, and a former campaign manager for the Leader of the Opposition, is certainly one who should know the inner workings of his party. He told the delegates at their convention last July that their party is too negative, too smug, too self-righteous and too opportunistic. He continued that one of the most damaging charges other parties have been able to make is that the NDP is an old party going nowhere. He praised us by saying that the Saskatchewan Liberals have taken the right track. Premier Thatcher promised to do something positive and he did it. He promised to clear up Socialist stagnation. What greater condemnation is needed than these words from one of their own members.

Mr. Gilbey, another strong leader of the NDP, was critical of a tendency in the party generally to reduce its approach to merely seeking methods of getting votes. He claimed that Mayor Baker would not make any speeches during the political campaign for fear it would hurt him locally.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Finally, a local school teacher said that 95 per cent of the Commonwealth subscribers never read it, but it was good doormat material. Certainly a shame that our friends opposite would spend one-half million dollars of the taxpayers' money on doormat material when they were the Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are words of condemnation and confession from leaders within their own party who are openly admitting what we have known to be the truth. The NDP is an old party, too smug, too opportunistic, too self-righteous and going nowhere.

Since the Throne Speech Debate began there have been several comments from both sides regarding the unrest that is present on the Regina campus. It has been made quite plain by speakers from this side of the House that, as a Government, we have no intention of letting the activities run our universities which belong to all the people of this province. One point, however, that had not been brought out clearly and which is of

the utmost importance to the people of the province, is the relationship between this group of activists and disturbers on the Regina campus and the NDP party of Saskatchewan. We have always had our suspicions that the unrest on this campus was related to our friends opposite and it has been proved beyond suspicion during the last two days.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Monday was a black day on Regina campus. It was the day the Board of Governors took the time to visit the University to meet with the Students' Council in the hope that some progress could be made in settling the fee dispute. What did they gain for their efforts? They were pushed, shoved and rudely treated by members of the SRC and a small group of hoodlums which they represent. Related to this uncalled for and childish display towards the Board of Governors was boycott of classes and an all-night teach-in.

The suggestion for these actions was made by John Gallagher, SRC Councillor, who, as first speaker, set the tone of the gathering by saying that militant action at this time is quite in order and he hoped that the issue wouldn't be settled so that they could have a strike, thus showing his concern for the whole student body which he supposedly represents.

The second speaker was Don Mitchell, another SRC member, who carried on in his usual loud and irresponsible manner. The interesting fact, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Saskatchewan is that these two SRC members that organized the teach-in are both members of the Saskatchewan New Democratic party. If you look in the last issue of the Commonwealth it will be borne out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — these two young Communists were backed up by Mike Lloyd, son of the NDP Leader of the Opposition. Gerry Kusiak, son of a former CCF Member from Canora, and a chap I must say I am not too well aware of by the name of Karl Marx, whose name was most appropriate to the gathering which opened and closed with the signing of The Internationale, the Communist theme song.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — There may be some who might say that the fact that the leaders of this SRC are members of the New Democratic Youth party is only coincidental. However, when the main speakers of the evening showed up, it became obvious that it was not coincidence, but was a well-planned, strategic move by senior members of the NDP. The first keynote speaker to appear on the stage turned out to be Len Wallace, an ardent supporter of Mr. Smishek and Mr. Davies' SFL, which is affiliated with the NDP

in Saskatchewan. This waterfront gangster proved to be an embarrassment to the whole union movement that he claims to represent, when he stated that all union members are illiterate, stupid and uneducated. This is no doubt true for the officials, but not the union members. When he went on to advocate harassment and embarrassment of members of the Board of Governors by picketing their homes and private business, he brought shame to the men whose fees support him in luxury.

When I read the last paragraph of his speech it proved to be a shocker. While we had been thinking that his concern was for the students of the University, we find that it was for the SFL. The truth appeared when he suggested that students amalgamate with the trade union movement. I would remind the students that if they joined the SFL there would be no question of who would collect their fees. I am sure there are many good union men who will think twice before welcoming those students, who will never be anything but a burden and disgrace to our society, into their ranks.

Now, again one might say this was a coincidence that Len Wallace was a speaker at the teach-in. However, even the most tolerant saw the connection when the next speaker was introduced. For who strolled out on the stage but Walter Smishek, NDP MLA for Regina North East and an executive member of the SFL. He must be one of the uneducated that his colleague Wallace referred to, because the best contribution he could make was to attack the University Senate, of which he is a member. But loyalty to a group of which he is part comes second to his loyalty to the NDP.

After four speakers, the common denominator proved to be they were ignorant, activist, and are all members of the NDP. This intellectual and serious gathering ended with a dance and a rock and roll movie to show their deep concern for the problems of the University.

From this it should be clearly recognized that the student unrest in Regina is nothing more than the result of the NDP agitators mostly labor-orientated, helped out by a few outsiders using the NDP party as their tool, with the aim of embarrassing the Government. If they destroy the University in the process, they could care less. Fortunately, however, the people of Saskatchewan care. It is their University and they will not tolerate the interference of the NDP or any political party for their own political gain.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The Government has great faith that the Board of Governors, the administration, faculty and students can solve the problem without political interference from anyone.

Just before I take my seat, I am reminded as I look at the

weary haggard victims of circumstance sitting across the way, tired from a successful summer of burning American flags, helping to organize demonstrations in Chicago and creating unrest on our campuses, that there is one prominent member of the NDP who has found a more rewarding way of life. I refer to an article that appeared in the Fort Lauderdale Florida News, December 31<sup>st</sup>, 1968, where it was reported:

In the mail there is one word from Clarence and Lillianne Fines. Over Christmas they were in Sydney, Australia. We've been entertained by government officials in Melbourne and Canberra too, writes Lillianne. New Zealand was so interesting, great scenery and everywhere so lush and green.

Next month they hope to return to Lauderdale and start building a new home.

I am sure the people of Saskatchewan are please to hear Mr. Fines is building a new home and travelling extensively, whether this is financed by his former teacher's salary or his Cabinet Minister's salary, I open to considerable speculation. One thing we know is that he was smarter than the rest of those that were with him and are now still lounging on the front benches of the Opposition. One other thing that is apparent is that his brand of socialism is somewhat more sophisticated than that advocated by our NDP friends opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, because I belong to a party that are the extreme opposite of this old tires group whose leader is now faltering back into the Chamber, I take great pleasure in supporting the Throne Speech and opposing the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** —I wonder if the Minister will permit a question before he takes his seat.

**Mr. Guy:** — I have already taken it. Sir, you'll have you . . .

**Mr. Willis:** — I wanted to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker . . . I take it that the Minister has refused, Mr. Speaker. Is that right?

**Mr. Guy:** — No, I didn't refuse, I said he would have his chance to make his speech once somebody writes it for him.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Chair will let him go ahead and ask it anyway.

**Mr. Willis:** — In spite of the answer the Minister has given already I would like to ask the Minister when the Members of the House can expect to hear of the activities of the Department of Public Works.

**Mr. Guy:** — He will hear it in due course as he always has in the past sessions.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — I just wanted to say thank God that is not my address, if I have to die and leave this scene of time with anything on print or on record that equals what the House has been treated to for the last half hour. If ever a Minister of this Province, if ever a party was running scared, we have had the greatest proof of it for the last half hour.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — If ever a Minister of a Cabinet of a party in power took the time that the Minister who has just taken his seat has taken to blow smoke screens to cover up the utter failure of statesmanship for the last four years, this regurgitation of this Minister's address in this very Legislature that I have sat and listened to him takes the cake.

**Some Hon. Members:** — hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — Mr. Speaker, in many ways 1968 may have been a momentous year, but for western agriculture it was a disaster. When I look at the opening paragraph of the Speech from the Throne which says:

The past year was a difficult one for Saskatchewan farmers.

May I say that that was the understatement of the year.

The year has been difficult.

Anyone who would coin such a phrase for a Speech from the Throne is proof positive, Mr. Speaker, that they are simply unaware of realities or worse still refusing to face up the stark naked facts of the situation. Agriculture in 1968 faced a year with weather conditions completely out of time with farming operations as we know them on the prairies. But so far weather conditions are uncontrollable.

Farmers have also faced this situation, Mr. Speaker, with Provincial and Federal Governments so out of touch with reality and so callously indifferent, that taxes, fees, plus the cost of living have steadily gone up to an all-time high, creating an impossible economic situation affecting not just the farmers but the whole economy of Saskatchewan. The weather was cold and dry over much of the province in the early spring, resulting in a very uneven germination of the crops. When rain did come toward the last of June it made a patchy uneven crop, a sitting target for an early frost which in 1968 came around August 11<sup>th</sup>. The frost produced a mixed grade of wheat over a large area of the province, grades varying from No. 4 to feed and in many cases nothing in the head at all. I could enlarge on that one but I will let it go by. The frost was followed by a cold wet harvest culminating in the longest harvest season in Saskatchewan's record. I have neighbors who started the first week in August who haven't finished yet, and I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this is why the northwest corner of the province is left out of the broadcasts this year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — This has left the country full of tough, damp, wet grain impossible to market, impossible to store and during the weather such as we have had the last month, Mr. Speaker, impossible to dry at practical costs. So much for the weather conditions.

The Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) spoke very decidedly against outright grants for grain drying, because he said his area got only five bushels per acre and had little or no grain drying problem and grants would force farmers in his area to pay for the less fortunate. I am quite ready to concede his point, the possibility that inequalities might exist, but I am quite sure that the Hon. Member for Cannington would be the last to suggest that refusing grants would iron out all the inequalities amongst farmers in Saskatchewan. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is just quite possible that such outright grants might help to even up a lot of glaring inequalities presently existing between farming areas of the province. If much of this wheat is lost, not only to the farmers but to the economy of the Province, the farmers of the hon. member's constituency will share in the general provincial economy going down, not up. May I just point out that many farmers are a long, long way from delivering just one bushel per seeded acre.

I am going to use the figures from my own farm because I am well acquainted with them but I am only one in thousands. I rented the farm. To date I have had \$252.51 of my share of crop sold on the 1968 crop of about 460 acres. But I have had to pay taxes between \$700 and \$800 at the present time. Oh no, I forgot, I got the \$50 homeowner grant. But the first year my taxes had gone up \$55, the next year they went up \$35. In 1968 they went up to the point where I am now \$100 behind



the game. On top of all this are all the other taxes that the Government levied. It took these taxes out of the pocket that I might be able to get \$50 out of the other pocket. It reminds me very much of the chap who bought hammers at \$1.50 and sold them at \$1.25 and claimed he made it on the turnover. It's a really wonderful scheme for the Government. Talking about turnovers, I have here a Liberal election leaflet. At the top it says, "To stop the constant increase in taxes on your farm, vote Liberal." And then it says, "Please turn over", and on the other side it says, "Reduce your property taxes, vote Liberal." And again at the bottom it says, "Turn over." I don't know just exactly what it means but probable there is a side I haven't seen yet, I don't know.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — They didn't put the year on it, Mr. Speaker, so that they could apply it to any situation that arose. However, we did, Mr. Speaker, get a turnover. We got the taxes raised on one side and the services reduced on the other. The Liberal party put property taxes up one third and a lot of other new taxes and fees applied just for good measure, so that this pamphlet really tells the truth except this reduce idea. I think they really made a mistake on that one.

The Hon. Member for City Park-University, Saskatoon (Mr. Charlebois) endeavored to belittle, and I am sorry he is not in his seat. I wanted the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Minister who just took his seat (Mr. Guy) to be here for this one. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) endeavored to belittle Socialism by using his own interpretation of Socialism. Strange but true, little Socialist Sweden took away from Canada this coveted place of second spot in the world so far as standard of living is concerned. These gentlemen are not up-to-date at all. Sweden took it away from us a year ago. I was over there this summer and sometime later during the course of the house I may give you some benefit of things that I saw.

Agriculture was given little or no early leadership to meet the kind of situation farmers faced in the fall of 1968. As the Hon. Member who spoke on agriculture a moment ago said, before the tough and damp wheat that they had already been taken off had been marketed or dried there was another three bushel quota for damp wheat opened up. This led thousands of farmers to believe that this wheat could be moved and reach the terminals and the dryers. The result was that millions of bushels of damp wheat were harvested the last week or 10 days of the combining season. Following this there was little or no leadership given regarding drying experience or the purchase of drying equipment at cost price. Farmers in many cases were frightened by reports and experiences of wheat and other grains ruined by inexperience or the overcrowding of dryers in order to make the business pay a profit in this lauded free enterprise system. Thus all the

Better weather of the late fall and the early winter was lost so far as grain drying was concerned. Finally, Mr. Speaker, as the terminals became plugged and the railway yards at the Lakehead were congested with loaded grain care, which incidentally didn't come out of the north of the province. Had they done so the farmers there would have been in a much better position to pay their way and be to some extent solvent as well as paying their harvesting expenses. Only after all this did the powers-that-be begin to realize there was a real damp wheat and drying problem in the Prairie Provinces. Even at this late date the leadership was only halfhearted. It seemed as though the Liberal Governments considered the farmers had only to step outside their homes to buy dryers or to rent them, that money, which they seemed to be so conscious of, did not enter into the picture, that dryers at \$10,00 could easily be procured, that \$30 per hour rent for a dryer was a mere cinch. Finally about the time the Government was ready to sit down to Christmas dinner, drying schools were in operation. Let me tell you, to the disgust of a lot of farmers many of these schools became glorified sales projects for the producers of grain drying equipment. One other thing for good measure, there was no AMA left in the province to give farmers any guidance in buying equipment that they knew nothing about.

The drying loan by the Federal Government was so long in materializing that we got into the depth of winter and much of the value of this legislation is to be lost. Farmers have had to take out cash advances to meet living costs and harvesting expenses. It is now evident that these advances are going to carry over into the next crop year when interest will have to be paid. BY the time cash advances and drying loans are cleared away I wonder just how the great many farmers are going to put in their 1969 crop. Where was the so-called charismatic Prime Minister in all this? Finally he got west as far as Winnipeg. He shrugged his shoulders, rolled his head and asked that charming question that we just heard, "Why should I try to sell wheat? That is the farmer's problem." He didn't take the time to shrug his shoulders when it was a case of interest rates going up to nine per cent, or again when the cost of living figures revealed that in 1968 these costs were up over 1967 by 4½ points. It evidently doesn't matter to our free swinging, girl-kissing Prime Minister how difficult times are for the farmers or for the one-fifth of Canada's population in the very low income bracket.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, to me there is a much more alarming undertone in the Prime minister's Winnipeg statement than meets the eye. Is this a veiled suggestion that he wants to be out of the Wheat Board and out of the quota system, and out of orderly marketing? In fact, Mr. Speaker, out of everything pertaining to agriculture except taxes and the protection of the privileged one-fifth of Canada's people at the top who make it out of agriculture. Is this the real reason for setting up a so-called independent Grain Council? Independent of who, I would like to know? One wonders too if the Liberal party is hoping to rid itself of some of the wheat surplus by letting it go up in smoke

in the spring. I well remember a former Federal Minister of Agriculture's remark during a period of wheat surplus and a summer drought. "Well it will help to relieve the wheat situation anyway." What happens to farmers during such crises doesn't seem to matter very much.

Mr. Speaker, for too many years in what too many people considered buoyant years for agriculture, farmers were operating on a very, very fine margin, as a matter of fact too fine a margin to be in a position to absorb a situation of the magnitude of the 1968 disaster. I heartily agree with the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) that the cry of farmer efficiency is a wornout cliché, that the time is long, long overdue for a cost plus price structure. I am very happy that he is to be found in this field of endeavour. Some of us have been saying these things for a long, long time without any help from the gentlemen opposite. However, I cannot follow him when he tries to blame labor for our difficulty. Labor is one of the farmer's best customers. Then in the next breath he tried to absolve the machine companies whose profits have been astronomical, pyramiding year after year.

Just speaking of labor, seeing that so many downgrading things have been said from the gentlemen opposite and for the benefit of the Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan), I want to put in the records of the House a clipping from the Leader Post. It should be acceptable, September 9<sup>th</sup>, 1968: "Olson blames elevator firms." This is the Liberal Federal Minister of Agriculture from Ottawa.

Agriculture Minister Olsen Saturday laid more than 50 per cent of the blame for the month-and-a-half long grain handlers strike at the Lakehead on the shoulders of the company. Speaking at a press conference at Regina airport following a four-hour talk to Saskatchewan agriculture officials, Mr. Olsen repeated and enlarged on statements previously made on his stopover at Winnipeg. Mr. Olsen said, 'His chief concern was that he wanted to dispel the idea that 100 per cent of the blame for the strike lay with the labour union, 50 per cent or more lies on the other side of the table. I think it is erroneous for farmers and the general public to think that labour union is the devil in this case In my opinion it is not.'

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — There are a lot of Socialists in his office, that explains it.

**Mr. Wooff:** — He evidently was quite sure there was a devil in it though. Unless there is better co-ordination, Mr. Speaker, of transportation, shipping orders, drying facilities, quotas and

terminal management plus a vigorous sales policy, western agriculture as we know it, it doomed or at least it will take a long time to recover from 1968's staggering blow. Some farmers, Mr. Speaker, will never recover. There will be hundreds of farm casualties in 1969, farmers who simply cannot put in another crop. One is forced to ask: will the Prime Minister and this Government shrug their shoulders again and say it is no affair of ours, when what they really mean is this will give the corporation land sharks the chance they have been waiting for to pick up land at bargain values?

Mr. Speaker, because of the crop situation the fall of 1968 saw an unprecedented number of cattle go back from our stockyards to the feed lots on farms all over the province in an endeavor to salvage a lot of our out-of-condition grain. This meant that there would be a terrific increase in the amount of beef by spring, not numerically but just sheer tonnage. These cattlemen had barely got their winter's operation under way before buyers were speculating on a drop in the price of beef by spring, not to the consumer but to the producer. These rumors proved to be all too true. In fact this was the method chosen of announcing what was already a planned certainty in the mind of the packing house operators. Before I left home, Mr. Speaker, I was at a gathering where some of these cattlemen were furious because already the price had dropped to the point where they were going to work all winter for nothing. They had worked all summer for nothing to produce an unmarketable grain crop and now they were going to work all winter for the packing houses. Yes, Hon. Sir from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), I agree it is no longer a case of efficiency, it is just a plain case of price. I will go one further and suggest if you really believe what you said the other day you will never stay where you care with the Liberal party.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — They have never given the farmer more than would keep body and soul together and the patches on his pants.

I almost heard a sob the other day when the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) said, "Everybody suffered with the farmer." Was this paramount, Mr. Speaker, to saying that when the farmer is alright, when the farmer is okay, you don't need to worry about the rest of the province? That I agree with, but just try to get the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) or the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacFarlane) or the whole row of yes men in the Government to implement the needed legislation to keep agriculture strong and solvent. You will soon find out where their real sympathies lie. I make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for asking outright drying grants which would benefit not just the farmers but the whole economy of the province. If it had been the CPR Company or the private pulp mill, governments would have been falling over themselves to help these people and the public would have been footing the

bill.

For over a year now the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacFarlane) and the Premier have been shouting diversification, diversification. I am all for diversification. I have lived and operated a mixed farm all my life. But the Hon. Minister knows – at least if he doesn't he shouldn't be where he is – that unless he and others do more about a planned and controlled price for a marketing system for livestock, diversification is a pure, plain deception. I'm sure he must have seen that television program which showed a successful cattle-feeding operation. The interviewer asks the owner, "Do you consider this to be an operation that a lot more farmers should undertake?" The answer is, "No, if many were to start an operation of this kind, the market would break." Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what I told the Minister in this house one year ago. And here we are a full circle on the merry-go-round in one year. It's not only the grain and the livestock producers who are in trouble. The honey producers are finding themselves in as difficult position as the grain growers. Honey processing plants are taking only 60 per cent of the 1967 delivery. The carry over as of July 1, 1968, is more than double normal. Britain is buying only 50 per cent of her 1967 purchase from Canada. United States imports have gone up very little. But here we have done nothing to explore or develop the American honey market. If the Premier would attend to some of these problems on his over-the-border excursions instead of vilifying his own province, he might be of great service to Saskatchewan producers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — Perhaps the worst of all there has been absolutely nothing done to develop an Asian market for Saskatchewan honey which some believe has considerable potential. Surely honey the quality of Saskatchewan's could find an Eastern market of considerable proportions.

Before I came down to the Legislature this session, I was discussing deterrent fees with a member of a doctor's clinic. Not a community clinic – I just wanted you to get that. I asked the doctor how much deterrent fees had cut down their practice. The doctor's immediate reply was that the books say 10 per cent. However he warned, "80 per cent of that 10 percent is from the low-come group who have not the \$1.50 each time a call is necessary of the \$25 to get into hospital if that is my decision." This is the situation. Mr. Speaker, some surveys already made prove that if there was abuse which this Government never tried to prove, it was not the low-income group who were to blame. This group, Mr. Speaker, is one group that a family ceiling on deterrent fees will not help, but, as the doctor pointed out, this is the group that are being deterred by deterrent fees. This brings us back to the archaic position where preventative medicine is not being practised on behalf of the low-income group or the province as a whole for that matter. Medicare costs

could be cut by unified administration right across the board, which would be a much more Christian and much more human approach than taxing the people who are already sick and down on their backs. Mr. Speaker, as I view the present economic situation in Canada, the country is burdened with three great handicaps at the present time. A large sector of the private insurance business, number one. Number two, our lavish television advertising, and number three, the Liberal party.

We'll take the first. Four-fifths of private insurance written in Canada is owned outside the country and much of the money goes out of Canada. Besides costing the public far too much for the protection given.

Secondly, millions if not billions of dollars of television advertising is paid for with money that should be flowing into the public treasury instead of fouling up every program from morning until night. If this money was going where it lawfully should, public taxes could be reduced considerably.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the greatest liability that Canada has today is the Liberal party which aids and abets every sellout of Canada and Canadian resources to the highest bidder that they can find. Mr. Speaker, this Government can find money for dress balls, money for liquor, for receptions and opening which it refuses to disclose the cost figure for. Money for a \$90,000 executive plane to fly to these cork-opening ceremonies and get this on e—money for subsidies for the free enterprise pulp mill to the tune of \$6 per cord for every cord of pulp wood delivered. And don't forget this Government committed the people of Saskatchewan to this free enterprise scheme to the tune of \$55 million if it doesn't work. And last fall the Premier admitted, of all things, it was strikes in other pulp mills that gave them a badly needed market; and I would just like everybody to think that one out to the conclusion. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this grey head of mine may yet see the day when the people of Saskatchewan have to make good that \$55 million Liberal commitment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — Is there any wonder people are leaving the province? Is there any wonder Government speakers shout like mad to cover up this economic suicide?

**Mr. Heald:** — Never learn.

**Mr. Wooff:** — But there is no money for agriculture on its back. It was an unprecedented situation in 1968. No money to make good a drug program that they promised in 1964. I did have a clipping here that I lost.

**An Hon. Member:** — Read The Carillon!

**Mr. Wooff:** — A Toronto woman with a particular heart condition . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — What are you quoting from?

**Mr. Wooff:** — I'm quoting from the House of Parliament in Ottawa. A Toronto woman with a particular heart condition wrote Grace MacInnis in March, 1966 about the quinine-type pills . . .

**Mr. T.W. Weatherald (Cunnington):** —On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that's rather a secondhand source if it if the house of Commons parliamentary records that he is quoting from.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Wooff:** — Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to table it when I'm finished.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the Member is quoting from a newspaper he does not have to table it, but he must state the name of the paper and date of issue.

**Mr. Wooff:** — Oh well, I'm proud to tell them what it is. I am quoting Grace MacInnis from the Commonwealth.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now give us the date of the issue.

**Mr. Wooff:** — I like to bait them a little.

**An Hon. Member:** — Date?

**Mr. Wooff:** — Oh, you want the date too. Very good. February 5, 1969. May I continue?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — May I continue? I've had my fun anyway. I like to set you up a little before I start.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — A Toronto woman with a particular heart condition wrote Grace MacInnis in March, 1966. But the quinine-type pills

she uses had already gone up in price from \$12 to \$65.25 for 500. the explanation given the woman was the war in Vietnam. Grace MacInnis said the food and drug director had advised her of a number of complaints and cited a report that the United State Government had purchased large quantities of quinine, resulting in increased prices of the drug derivatives. The Toronto woman discovered – and I would just like the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) to listen to this one after all that he said about Britain the other day – the Toronto woman discovered that her pills were sold in Great Britain at \$7.50 for 500. This was \$4.50 less than the original price this lady was paying in Toronto. Grace MacInnis again wrote the Government. New information had come to light. United States investigation disclosed an international cartel purchase of a large stockpile of quinine which had been held in reserve by the Government. The United States Government kept a sufficient supply of this to take care of its military needs for an estimated 1,142 years. Having obtained control of most of the quinine supply, the cartel increased its prices by 500 per cent. There's lots of room for this Government to implement its commitment to the people of the province on a prepaid drug policy. No money for drugs, no money for health services for the low-income group. Only deterrent fees.

Speaking of taxes I went into my credit union not long ago when they were making up the annual returns for each member. They used to have to make up every member's account for income tax if he had more than \$100 of interest for the year. But Mr. Benson's fine tooth comb says that they've got to make up an account for everybody that made \$10 in interest in 1968. Just imagine the amount of work these people are doing for what Mr. Benson gets out of it. But those are their orders.

History, Mr. Speaker, repeats itself. Elect Liberal Governments in Saskatchewan and Ottawa and you have political trickery, high taxation, agricultural chaos, exodus from the province, unemployment. Just think what unemployment would have been if thousands of people hadn't left Saskatchewan in the last four years. As a farmer, Mr. Speaker, I cannot and will not support the motion but will support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Mr. Speaker, would the Member permit one question? Mr. Speaker, if I understand what the Member said, he said that livestock prices were depressed because farmers in Saskatchewan were feeding their livestock poor condition grain, therefore increasing the tonnage and that was of course in the price. I believe that is what he said. Now the question. The question is this, Mr. Speaker. I would like the Member to tell me if those livestock were not fattened in Saskatchewan, would they not have been fattened in Ontario on corn or barley or in the United States and the tonnage would therefore be identical to what it is now.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — Oh, but, Mr. Speaker, what a question, what a question! Now I don't believe you will leave the Liberal party].

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — This isn't the point at all. The point is that this Government is giving no protection whatever to these farmers, that they are at the mercy of the packing houses. They started a program of prophesying lower prices for spring. This is the point.

**Mr. Heald:** — Rubbish!

**Mr. Wooff:** — There is no rubbish to it. This is exactly what I told you last year and it is happening all over Saskatchewan today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — And you have done nothing about it and you don't intend to.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose):** —Mr. Speaker, we've been getting a lot of woofling from the other side for the last half hour.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leith:** — The Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) made a suggestion that perhaps the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) might find a better home on that side of the House. I want to tell the Member for Turtleford that perhaps if the Member for Cannington did go over there it would certainly brighten things up a little bit. There would be a sudden and dramatic increase in the knowledgeability and the actuality of their economic pronouncements. I think he might even sit in your front ranks.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leith:** — I don't think there is anybody over there that can sit in the same row with him.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot about the farm situation — I don't intend to devote much time to it — but I did pick up something that the Member for Turtleford said about the

northern farmers. He said that as a landlord he has collected only \$242.15 since the first of August. I want to tell him that the difficulty and the hardship is not limited to the north part of Saskatchewan. Luck Lake which is in the Elrose constituency has not yet had a quota. The elevators are full of damp grain and some durum. Some of those farmers have not yet been able to deliver initial quota. I know of one man that has not had a nickel of income from his farm since June 15, 1968. There is a problem and I am aware of it. Those people of Luck Lake are aware of it too. You people are very late in recognizing some of the difficulties. I believe that if the Canadian Wheat Board had not opened the 10-bushel durum quota and had restricted it to five, had not opened the three-bushel quota on damp grain so quickly, then perhaps we wouldn't be in the situation we are now, waiting in Vancouver for dry No. 2 grain. Believe me our part of the country, the southwestern part of Saskatchewan can supply all the No. 2 dry grain that Japan and China want. If we have the chance to get it out there we will be moving it.

I think that the Canadian Wheat Board made an error and I am not afraid to tell them. I have already mentioned in a letter to the Board of Commissioners that I thought they made a mistake. I have had a letter back. I am not prepared to table this correspondence but I do want to tell you that there is a lack of uniformity in quotes which is distressing. Some parts of our area are now on three-bushel quotas. Other points which are less than 30 or 40 miles away have no quota at all, as I have mentioned, and no room for delivery.

We have heard a lot about agriculture in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. In my opinion, the best speech, the most thoughtful and the most thought-provoking came from the Member from Cannington. I am not prepared to analyze any of the other speeches on agriculture. I think that every Member in this House knows that there is a problem. Every member is anxious that these problems be solved quickly.

I want to say a few words too today about other problems, problems that are acute, problems that I think are being solved, but that need our attention as Members of the Legislature. I refer to the problem of the retarded children in our province. My information is that there are 1,151 educable retardates (and these are people with I.Q.s of from 60-80) in some kind of school in the province. I believe that there are just under 600 trainable retardates and some of these are not receiving any services at all. I am not sure that anyone really knows exactly how many there are in the province altogether. The Kinsmen Club of Saskatoon is to be congratulated for their initiative in beginning the construction of Elmwood residence for the residential care of mentally retarded. The Welfare Minister (Mr. MacDonald) took part in the sod-turning on October 3 along with Mayor Buckwold, Mr. Derek Arnold, President of the Saskatoon Kinsmen Club and Mr. G.N. Sneyd local manager of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Over the years, a new philosophy regarding the care, treatment and training of mentally handicapped children and adults has developed. Rapidly developing community-based rehabilitation, sheltered workshop and recreation programs are contributing to the new way to life for many mentally handicapped young people and give ample evidence of the broad acceptance of the changing philosophy.

Elmwood residence is a pilot project that will point up the advantages and disadvantages of this new approach to the needs of the retarded. It is a special-care home providing supervisory and limited personal care for 50 mentally retarded people, 18 years and over. These will be drawn from the city of Saskatoon and surrounding areas. Elmwood residence will provide board, room and laundry services to the guests and assistance with bathing, dressing and grooming when needed. Supervision and guidance in eating habits, social graces, developing work habits, medication programs and special diets will be given. From this residence the guests will be able to take advantage of the special training programs and available work that is offered in the community of Saskatoon. The financing of this new home with \$500,000 was arranged with a Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation loan, a Provincial Government grant of up to \$100,000 which is non-repayable, and local sponsors. The share is largely borne by the Saskatoon Kinsmen Club who approved the amount of \$38,700 for the project. Donations totalling over \$10,000 to the furnishing fund have been received from a large number of interested citizens.

Mr. Speaker, there is a facility in Kinistino called The Haven of Hope. There are 12-18 children in residence and these people are receiving day care for which the parents are charged a small fee. The cost of room and board here is \$150 per month.

Assiniboia has a residence which has been set up and is administered by four school units. This building was formerly a nurses' residence. About 20 children are living there and a day-care centre and a training classroom are provided. There is a small fee for the service provided at Assiniboia. It is felt that the parents should have some financial involvement, but that the fee should not be so high as to discourage a family from enrolling their child. I want to congratulate the four school units who are co-operating in this Assiniboia project and I hope that other areas of the province will follow their lead as quickly as possible.

I hope that the Government will continue to broaden its policy in respect to retarded children. I know that there is an inter-departmental committee and it is actively working on the difficult problems of adequate care, health and education for these people but much remains to be done. Recently the Rosetown School unit is operating an opportunity classroom. Several children from the Eston-Elrose unit are able to attend on a day-to-day basis and the Eston School unit pays their tuition. This has been satisfactory but I believe that more

residential homes are needed. In the first place, some of the retarded children in the province are not at all trainable and can become a tremendous burden to the family. I am not suggesting that any time the parents should shelve any of their responsibility toward these children, but I do say that sometimes the care of a retarded child at home may be the cause of physical or nervous exhaustion of the mother or it may be crippling to the development of other children in the family.

I say that there is real need for homes like the one in Kinistino for the care of the retardate who must be moved out of his home environment. I realize that some of these people are being looked after at the training school at Moose Jaw; but certainly there are many others, who, if residential care were supplied or established close to their homes, would be able to get out on weekends or would be able to get out on special occasions. In short they could be able to maintain their membership in the family unit. I believe that much can be done by private citizens. I believe that the lead had to come from the Inter-Developmental Committee. I believe that this committee can recommend and can make possible the changing of some of the regulations that now prohibit the setting up of these homes. This is something all of us ought to be concerned with and I think that we all ought to take a very real and close interest in it. I don't know if any Member of this Assembly can say for sure how many retarded children are living in the bounds of his constituency. I know that I can't be positive that there are only eight; there may be 10, 12 or 15 as far as I know.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of a distinguished Saskatchewan citizen, Mr. Thomas Edward Myers, who died on January 11, 1969 at the age of 47 years. He was a farmer and he operated a feed lot in the Hughton district since 1948. He was also a man active in community and provincial affairs. He was the first cub master at Hughton. He was reeve and councillor of the Monet municipality for several years. He was chairman of the Rosetown Health Region. He was chairman of the Golden years Lodge at Elrose from 1957 to 1961. He was director of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, vice-president of the Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association. He was a director of the Western Canada Racing Association, a sport which he loved both as a participant and a spectator and he was a member of Alcoholics Anonymous for the last 17 years. Mr. Myers was well known and respected for his public activities. However, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of people knew him for his unselfish and dedicated struggle with the problems of alcoholism. I know that no matter how far away or how late at night or how inconvenient for him personally, he would offer his assistance. He has been a lighthouse for the AA movement in Saskatchewan.

Perhaps it is unusual for the House to listen to an obituary like this for a private citizen but I don't make any apology for it. This man's family life and his public life illustrate to us all what can be accomplished by an individual. They also illustrate what we sometimes seem to forget, that some of the most

lasting and the most precious things in our society are not necessarily built by governments with public money or even by organizations of people working together, but are sometimes at least the product of an individual's imagination his dedication to principle, his willingness to sacrifice personal comfort and personal profit for something he believes in. Of course other men will come forward to fill the public posts that have been vacated by his death, but I say to you again, Mr. Speaker, that he has left a mark that will not soon be erased in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South):** —Mr. Speaker, I found their presentations most interesting and most adequate. I had intended to speak on some aspects of the Throne Speech which I find most interesting and commendable, but two news storied in last night's edition of the Regina Leader Post disturbed me so much that I feel I must comment on them, even though the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has already mentioned them.

The first is the report of a speech given to the Regina Campus students by Mr. Len Wallace, international representative for the Retail-Wholesale Department Store Union. To set the tone for his presentation, Mr. Wallace is reported as saying to the students:

If you win the fees fight, you just got back what you had. Changing the whole method of running this place, and changing the kind of people it turns out is a long-term battle and one we will help you with.

I must say that I rather resent a campus of my alma mater being referred to as 'this place.' The reference to the kind of people it turns out is really quite interesting and amusing. Here we have the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the Hon. Members from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) being grouped with the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) and the Hon. Members from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), Elrose (Mr. Leith), Hanley (Mr. Heggie), Humboldt (Mr. Breker) and Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) — that's an interesting group. Perhaps Mr. Wallace is a political neutral in spite of some indications to the contrary.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Referring to The Carillon, the report continues to quote Mr. Wallace as saying:

Give us 25,000 copies and we'll get them in the hands of the affiliates of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor.

I see that he has managed to do this to some extent, because the

Members across the way have been waving them around rather freely all afternoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — He also warns thought that it is not all roses because he says:

We may need you to get up early in the morning and come to some plant gates with us. He said he would help raise union money for a provincial edition of The Carillon.

That is the end of the quote from the newspaper. Obviously the Commonwealth newspaper is in for some stiff competition. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that some of the students present had the temerity to enquire how much union money Mr. Wallace had undertaken to raise for constructive purposes at the University. I know that many of his fellow union members would be much more interested in such an undertaking. It was also rather a revelation to note the apparent lack of communication which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and his seatmate (Mr. Blakeney) have with the union people who are supposed to be their supporters.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Wallace.

**Mr. Forsyth:** — The Leader Post report continues to quote Mr. Wallace as saying:

The only university graduates a union man meets are personnel managers, lawyers against labor union people on negotiating teams, and doctors who oppose medicare and try to cut down compensation.

I wonder if some of the friends of the Opposition who are in the community clinics would quite agree with that description.

**Mr. Heald:** — Of course Roy would.

**Mr. Forsyth:** — The Socialist credibility gap is evidently much greater than we ever had any reason to suspect. Perhaps the Hon. Members for Moose Jaw will get together with the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) and arrange to introduce themselves to their leaders at some opportune time during this session.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Speaking of the Hon. Members for Regina North East, it is interesting, in a rather nauseating way to read the account of his contribution to the recent Regina Campus 'Teach-in.'

According to a report carried in last night's Leader Post, he commended abolition or reform of the University Senate. He being a member of that Senate is in great position to contribute to any worthwhile reforms of that body. I have never heard that he has done anything of the sort. If his contribution to that body's deliberations has been as negative as his remarks which were reported in the paper, I would recommend perhaps that his resignation from the Senate would be a first step in the reform which he suggests. It certainly will be interesting to see how he casts his vote on the Resolution recommending student representation of which my friend the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) has given notice.

Mr. Speaker, I really have no intention of commenting on remarks which bona fide students make regarding issues which they feel exist on the campus of our University. However, I just cannot remain silent when attempts to gain political capital from their activities are made by the party whose members sit opposite. I do have what I hope will be more pleasant remarks to make at a future time and at this moment I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned

### ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FEBRUARY 7 – FEBRUARY 13

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Provincial Secretary):** —I move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac):

That when this House adjourns on Friday, February 7, 1969, it do stand adjourned until Thursday, February 13, 1969.

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** —Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question. On the Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>, if any of the Members are in, will the Chamber be open so that they could work?

**Mr. Heald:** — Yes, I think so. I am sure there is no problem, it will be available to the Members.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:11 o'clock p.m.