

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**30th Day**

**Monday, March 17, 1969**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank** (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker. it is a pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the Assembly, a group of students from Westmount school in Saskatoon Mayfair constituency. Thirty-five to 37 students are in the group and are situated in the east gallery. Some of us in this Chamber have had the opportunity of going to Westmount school - I think that answers the question who went to Westmount school - and I have a child of my own going to Westmount school. I hope the students have an interesting day in the Chamber and I hope that they have a safe journey back to Saskatoon Mayfair.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**ADJOURNED DEBATE**

**Emergency Adjournment**

**Statement by Mr. Speaker**

On Friday, March 14, before the Orders of the Day were entered into, the Leader of the Opposition rose and asked leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the Assembly under Standing Order 20, in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance and gave a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Chair, which is as follows:

Today's announcement by the Hon. Mr. Pepin that substantial sales of grain are being made by signatory nations to the International Grains Arrangement and that Canada is considering a policy of selling grain at prices lower than the minimum prices provided in the Arrangement; that such a move by Canada would almost certainly result in lower returns, and possibly substantially lower returns, for grain producers in Saskatchewan; that these facts disclose urgent need that the Government of Canada firstly, take all possible steps to ensure the effective operation of the International Grains Arrangement, and secondly, institute support prices for grain sold under the Arrangement, and that all of the foregoing raises the urgent necessity of this Assembly forthwith making a recommendation to the Government of Canada in respect thereto.

Having read the statement aforesaid to the House, I referred the House to the Speakers responsibilities under Standing Order 20 (3) and to certain general restrictions on the motion for the adjournment of the House under this Standing Order as cited in May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, beginning at page 362, namely: That the matter proposed to be debated must not anticipate a Notice of Motion or an Order of the Day; that

it should not include matters for which the Government has no administrative responsibility; that it should be a matter requiring urgency of debate and that it should not be offered when the facts are in dispute or before they are available.

I did then, with the consent of the House, defer my ruling until such time as the relevant facts were fully available, and referred the House to May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, wherein it is stated on page 365 that "a motion has been allowed to be postponed without prejudice to its claim to raise a matter of urgency." Let me express my appreciation to all Hon. Members for their courtesy in allowing me to defer this ruling until such time as I was in complete possession of all of the facts upon a subject so important.

Shortly thereafter I left the Chair and telephoned the office of the Minister of Trade and Commerce requesting a verbatim copy of his statement by wire at the earliest possible opportunity. I was informed that the statement was made in the House of Commons at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time and I did at 5:00 p.m. Central Standard Time receive the requested copy of the statement, copies of which, for the better information of the House, I have placed on the desks of all Members.

I have considered the Minister's statement, its implications to our province and other pertinent facts relative thereto, and have arrived at the following conclusions:

While the actual administration of the sale of wheat is the responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board, the final responsibility for the Board rests with the Federal Government and it is very definitely the administrative responsibility of this Provincial Government to offer advice to the Federal Government on a matter so seriously affecting the welfare of all the people of our province.

This is supported by very well-defined precedents of this House and I refer all Hon. Members to the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan of February 28, 1941, page 28:

The Hon. Mr. Patterson asked leave to move the adjournment of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance and stated the subject to be 'a fixed price for wheat with respect to the 1941 crop and its delivery by quota, and the necessity for this Assembly forthwith making a recommendation in respect thereto.'

The House accepted the motion and the debate proceeded.

A similar situation, as recorded in the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, February 5, 1965, page 19, occurred when the Member for Kelsey requested and secured the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a similar matter in circumstances somewhat analogous to those presently existing.

It could very well be argued that the statement of the Leader of the Opposition seeking a support price for wheat sold under the International Grains Arrangement is out of order because it anticipates motion No. 8 standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Member for Kelsey, which asks the Government

**March 17, 1969**

of Canada to institute a guaranteed price for both export wheat and that used for domestic purposes. In this connection I would draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the difference between a guaranteed price based on production costs related to the standard of living and a support price based upon fluctuating market levels for a commodity. A guaranteed price would mean a sum certain at all times and under all conditions while a support price for a commodity is contingent upon the market price of the commodity over a given period and would only be effective if the commodity price fell below an agreed level.

The urgency for debating this matter is occasioned by the meeting of The International Grains Arrangement Price Review Committee being held in London, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, and no ordinary parliamentary opportunity for debate could occur in time to have an effect on this meeting.

The statement by the Minister of Trade and Commerce indicates a very serious erosion of that international trust which is imperative for the success of bilateral commodity agreements which, if not speedily remedied, will create conditions for grave instability in all commodity markets with most serious implications to all of the people of our province.

I therefore rule the motion to be in order. I ask the House: does the Hon. Member have leave to proceed? Is leave granted?

**Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — First of all, Mr. Speaker, I express the appreciation I am sure of all Members of the House with respect to the decision which you have just handed down, that you have indicated that the motion is one of both importance and urgency. I should to begin with draw attention to an error in fact in the statement which I handed to you on Friday, Sir, in which the words, “Grains Agreement” were used instead of “Grains Arrangement” to be perfectly consistent with the full record.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion, you will recall that I had on Friday made reference to the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce which you have as of today placed on our desks. The statement indicates that Canada already has taken a decision which would lead to selling some wheat below the minimum price set out in the International Grains Agreement.

Some Members will recall that last week in Regina we were able to see the production called “Bad News” of the Regina Press Club. This was highly enjoyable and highly entertaining. But the real bad news of the week was the statement which came on the press wires on Friday. This was neither enjoyable nor entertaining. As a matter of fact all of Saskatchewan must recognize the fact that this news can indeed be disastrous. It can be disastrous not just for Saskatchewan farmers, but for the total Saskatchewan economy. There are indeed very few people and very few businesses which will escape the impact of a drop in the price of wheat paid to the farmers.

Just to illustrate some of the business effects of what already has been and I suspect a bit of the future effect, we should note that in 1968, before this news obviously, purchases

of farm machinery in Saskatchewan were down about 23 per cent. They were down in total some \$28.5 million. We should note that there was a decrease in rural retail sales in Saskatchewan of something like \$26 million over the year before. Friday's announcement, and what it portends, means that the snowball of economic facts which has already caught up some farmers will most certainly encompass a great many others. The end of orderly marketing of wheat in the international market can mean an end to much farm opportunity, farm occupation, and farm life as we have known it and cherished it in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In the statement on Friday, the Minister of Trade and Commerce noted the recent deterioration in prices on the European market. He pointed out that there had already been significant wheat sales by our competitors at prices below those set out in the International Grains Arrangement. There is some information to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that wheat has been selling at 17 cents a bushel below the minimum set out in the Arrangement. The Hon. Mr. Pepin indicated that he had gone to Washington to speak with United States officials with respect to this problem on March 11. He was attempting to get co-operation from them with respect to this crisis situation for Canada. While he indicated there might be some possibility in the long run, he concluded that in the present immediate situation the maintenance of price levels was not likely. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in plain English, he was told "Canuck go home."

He added a fact which I think we must all recognize, that, if the situation continues, then the Canadian Wheat Board must meet competition in the markets of the world. He added that the Canadian Wheat Board has decided to sell wheat at prices below the minimum set by the International Grains Arrangement. Again there is some information to suggest - and I have not seen this verified, I must emphasize - that the Wheat Board is selling or has sold at something like 10 cents below the minimum in the Agreement.

As you have pointed out in your statement, Sir, there is a meeting of the Council some time this week, now currently underway I believe. Undoubtedly there will be other meetings of exporting nations in an attempt to salvage something of the Arrangement.

It is imperative it seems to me that we in this Legislature indicate our unanimous and our emphatic support to at least two items. We must indicate our unanimous and emphatic support of the principle of orderly marketing at adequate prices. This Legislature after all represents the largest single section of Canadian wheat producers. Our farm sector in our province is still the largest single influence determining the level of Saskatchewan economics and indeed Saskatchewan opportunity. So it is imperative we indicate our support of the principle of orderly marketing.

It is also imperative for us to indicate that any price received by farmers below the present minimum will be disastrous. I think we have to bear in mind that the realism of these needs has certainly not been understood or appreciated by Governments of Canada, and this is all the more reason for us to speak emphatically and unanimously in these parts.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**March 17, 1969**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Lets look just for a few minutes at the ultimate seriousness of this move. First of all, we may be witnessing indeed, the death of the principle of orderly marketing on an international scale. Secondly, we are all aware of the fact that farmers and farm people are saddled with the staggering totality of economic impact of a pyramid of situations. Members will all have received, since the House of the Legislature convened, some correspondence from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, under date of February 6. One paragraph in that correspondence reads as follows:

The index of the cost of goods and services used by farmers increased by 76 per cent between 1949 and 1967. The price of wheat rose 29 cents or about 16 per cent in the same period. The price of wheat is clearly lagging far behind other Canadian price levels as reflected in the cost index.

Just to summarize, Mr. Speakers the Pool pointed out that the 1949-67 cost increased by 76 per cent but the price of wheat increased in that period by only 16 per cent. In other words, in that period of 18 years, the gap between farm costs and wheat prices widened by 60 percentage points.

This takes us up to 1967, two years ago. In 1967 the Canadian Federation of Agriculture was urging a minimum of \$2.13 for wheat. Obviously, the minimum to give the farmer comparable standards of opportunity today and return now for his work and that of his family, is higher than it was in 1967.

Let's note for example some of the 1968 happenings which composed part of that pyramid which I mentioned a while ago. Adding to the totality of the economic impact up to 1947, adding to the snowball, which has overcome some farmers and threatens more, has been these events of 1968. The farmer is at a disadvantage because of the cost of drying damp grain in considerable quantities (in some cases I am told, up to 20 cents a bushel). He is at a disadvantage because of the loss of some grain, some already and more later because of excess moisture. He is at a disadvantage because quotas are slower and lower than they have been for several years. He is at a disadvantage because of the added cost of storage and carrying the inventory of grain. Certainly he is at a disadvantage because of the highest interest rates in the century paid on larger borrowings for operating costs and capital costs alike.

Add to the totality of this impact, the impact of lower prices for some grains which are now, as of last week, fact and not just fear. I refer to the fact that last week we were told the final price in the 1967-68 crop year for oats and barley, the total price for barley as announced last week was almost 20 cents below the total price a year ago. The total price for oats not as badly below, but still some 6 cents below. This in itself represents a very serious loss of income to many Saskatchewan farmers. Recognition of all of the staggering totality up to 1967 and 1968 on top of it, was given in a statement at the annual meeting of the Wheat Pool in November, 1968. Again, may I read just one part of one paragraph on page 4. The Wheat Pool there said this:

A number of Saskatchewan farmers this year will not net sufficient revenue to maintain their homes and families

in an acceptable living standard.

The words that need underlining and emphasizing and re-emphasizing here are the words, “net sufficient revenue,” which will not be enough in the words of the Wheat Pool to maintain an “acceptable living standard.”

Note further. Mr. Speaker, a statement which can be found in the morning edition of the Leader Post for March 13, 1969. It reports on an address by Dr. Glen Purnell speaking in Edmonton. Dr. Purnell is the Director General of the Economics Branch of the Federal Agriculture Department. The statement is headlined, “Half farm population expected to be in other jobs by 1980.” That is 10 years from now. In other words he expects a 50 per cent liquidation of farmers in 10 years’ time. This might indicate some kind of deficiency, I don’t know. Certainly, it doesn’t indicate affluence, certainly it doesn’t indicate efficiency in terms of what happens to people.

The content of the article goes on to say, “Small rural communities will wither and die.” It says further, “The political voice of rural Canada will grow dim.”

The situation was already impossible for many, even if the International Grains Arrangement prices had been maintained. We must be painfully aware of this fact, Mr. Speaker: every cent that comes off the present price of wheat rings the death knell for more Saskatchewan farmers.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — If 10 cents comes off, then the death knell for more, for a great many farmers.

But again let us be reminded and let us remind Saskatchewan people that it is not just farmers who are going to reap the consequences of this situation. It is the dealers in farm machinery and in farm fuel. It is the sellers of trucks and automobiles. It is the corner store and the supermarket. It is the restaurant and the theatres. You name the place of business and you almost automatically have one that is going to be severely affected. The effects of any drop in the price of wheat will spread to every crack and corner of Saskatchewan.

Let’s be reminded and let’s remind Saskatchewan people and Canadian people that the effect will not be and cannot be confined to Saskatchewan. The effects of a drop in the price of wheat will back up along the railway lines and truck lines into factories and foundries and forests in every part of Canada. It is imperative again I say that the Legislature of this greatest wheat-producing province be unanimous and emphatic in the support of action.

May I just suggest two lines of action. First of all, every Canadian political and economic muscle must be strained in every conceivable effort to maintain the principle of orderly international marketing of wheat through a public agency.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Let’s do all that can be done to keep at least this

**March 17, 1969**

much of the product of Canadian enterprise out of the hands of those who would speculate and gamble with the world food supply. Only by doing this can there be some certainty of tomorrow for Saskatchewan's farm people.

Secondly, if these efforts fail because of the decision of other nations, then let us in this Legislature be just as emphatic and just as unanimous as to another course of essential action. The Canadian wheat farmer must not be forced to carry alone the cost of lower prices for wheat.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — This is a cost which most appropriately and economically must be carried by the economy of the total Canadian nation. This means a guaranteed return at granary bins or combine spouts. This return must be at least comparable to that now guaranteed by the International Grains Arrangement. In other words, it must be comparable to the price of \$1.95½ a bushel which appears there.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Even this minimum price, as I hope I have demonstrated, is inadequate. I am restricted from discussing some of the additional measures necessary because of the other Resolution on the Order Paper with respect to a two-price system and so on.

The consequences of failure to act to restore confidence right now, Mr. Speaker, to provide such minimum guarantees, should be evident to everybody. One of the consequences must be a desperate increase in regional disparity within Canada. The second consequence which we cannot avoid would be a desperate decline in the hurtling downward thrust of individual opportunity in Canada's Prairie Provinces. If we are to have in Canada, in the face of world supply and production, some adjustment out of wheat and into other production, for heaven's sake, let's not do it with an economic shotgun. Let's do it with some adequate consideration for the human and social consequences to producer and consumer alike. Let's do it, Mr. Speaker, with proper respect for farm people who have already . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . who have already put more into the Canadian economy than they have had back.

In saying this, I am not sure that we have enough evidence as yet that such a production shift should be made. In the past at least, nature has had a way over every 10-year period or so of taking care of alleged surpluses of world food supplies, but that's the question of later this spring and not really a part of this particular argument.

I want to look for a moment further at the importance of orderly international marketing. Canada has to export wheat to live. That I submit is a monumental factor in the equation of Canadian economics. Decade in and decade out, wheat has been one of the mainstays in the game of getting foreign dollars into Canada. In turn these dollars in and out of the pockets of

Canadian farmers have been a tremendous foundation for and a stimulus to business and commerce and employment in all of Canada. If the equation of Canadian economics is to be effective then added investment in the agricultural industry, income insurance, if you like, is completely and absolutely essential. Moreover and of most importance here in this province is the fact that many Canadians - particularly Prairie Canadians, especially Saskatchewan Canadians - have to raise wheat in order to live. That's another monumental factor in the equation of Canadian life.

Orderly marketing on an international scale is crucial to keep that equation in balance or even in near balance. It is well known by Members in this province, Mr. Speaker, that the achievement of orderly marketing has been at the apex of the farmers' struggle for many, many years. In reaching for orderly marketing with built-in prices, Canadian farmers at one time even accepted a ceiling price on wheat. You will recall the situation during the war years in particular. Canadian farmers did this in consideration of the long-term welfare of the industry. They did it in consideration of that day's tomorrow's people in the farm industry of Canada.

Probably, I think one could say without a doubt, no single item has exceeded that of orderly marketing with adequate prices and proper guarantees in the whole spectrum of farm needs and farm objectives. Let's not overlook that there hasn't always been and there isn't today entire agreement on this. There are and there have been some powerful voices and influence raised against the International Grains Arrangement. There are and there have been some powerful voices raised against the principle of orderly marketing by a public agency. Every gambling food exchange and their allies can be counted as those who would oppose orderly marketing by a public agency. The effect of this steady pressure, tremendous I am sure, and its eroding influence have been apparent in the United States for some time. It will be recalled that the International Wheat Agreement, after a year's extension, expired in July of 1967. There was approximately a period of one year before the International Grains Arrangement came into effect in July, 1968. For a period of about a year there was no signed agreement. There was, I understand, some kind of gentleman's agreement given by somebody in the United States to the Hon. Mr. Winters, who was then Minister of Trade and Commerce. That gentleman's agreement was that there would be some observance of the minimum price for United States sales, the minimum price which would come into effect with the signing of the new agreement. But in spite of this, the United States during that period constantly sold wheat below the price to be brought into effect with the International Grains Arrangement in July, 1968. I'm afraid that we have even more reason to be concerned that the present United States Government will succumb even more to the wiles and rewards of corporate enterprise, and we have to attempt to operate a counter pressure to that sort of thing.

Certainly the Government of Canada cannot have been without pressure from Canadian forces of the same kind. Indeed I could be convinced that the pressures on the Government of Canada of this kind don't necessarily all reside in Canada. The tentacles of corporate power don't really respect national boundaries. That's another reason why it is important for this Legislature to speak with one voice, emphatically, on this Resolution which I'm going to propose. We need to do all that we can, using the



**March 17, 1969**

voice of Saskatchewan people to counteract the pressure which would gladly see the International Grains Arrangement floating on an iceberg some place in the middle of the ocean.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Nor may I submit has the Canadian Government been entirely without guilt. I have mentioned that the old IWA expired before July, 1967, after having been extended one year. During a 12-month period we were without a world agreement as to prices of wheat. During that time, at some point, the Government of Canada did establish a guaranteed price to producers regardless of the world price. So we have here some precedent for what the Resolution which I am going to move will ask. It was a welcome effort on the part of the Government of Canada at that time. I think had they not delayed so long in establishing this guaranteed farm price the hands of the Canadian Wheat Board could have been strengthened in making sales. We might have had some additional markets pinned down, had they had the guarantee of the Government of Canada to the producers of wheat behind them at that point. As it was the total cost to the Federal Treasury wasn't all that great. I haven't been able to find out the exact amounts. I hear \$7 million from one source and \$15 million from another. Regardless of all that, Mr. Speaker, there is too much evidence for comfort that the Government of Canada is not enough convinced about the problems of Canadian agriculture. There is too much evidence for comfort that the Government of Canada is not enough concerned with the problems of farm people. There is too much evidence that they are not convinced that more public action and investment are necessary to rescue a perishing agricultural industry.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — This is, I submit, an additional reason for unanimous and emphatic support of this type of request.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, report the essentials as I see them. First, and again, every Canadian political and economic muscle must be strained to maintain the principle of orderly international marketing through a public agency. In other words, we must do everything we can to protect and to preserve the International Grains Arrangement, and we wish the Government of Canada well in its attempts to do just that.

Secondly, if efforts to maintain international price arrangements are not successful, then the fiasco of competing only by rules such as apply in the market place of the world is upon us. Until such a mess is straightened out, the farmer must not be forced to absorb the cost of wheat price decreases. As a result, guarantees by the Government of Canada will be imperative. These guarantees must provide, as a minimum, a level of farm return equal to those which are provided by the International Grains Arrangement.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by the Hon. Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer):

That this Assembly urgently requests the Government of Canada:

(1) to use all steps available to it to ensure the effective observance and operation of the International Grains Arrangement as part of a system of orderly international marketing of grain;

(2) to establish immediately a floor price for all grains not less than the minimum prices provided for in the International Grains Arrangement.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well I have the motion in my hand, moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), seconded by the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and I draw the attention of the House to the fact that we are already debating the motion of the Leader of the Opposition: That this House do now adjourn. Therefore this motion is out of order. The debate continues on the motion that this House do now adjourn.

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the announcement which was made last week, that Canada will sell wheat below minimum prices set by the International Grains Arrangement, of course, comes as a shock to all Western Canadians. Coming as it does, on top of all the other difficulties of the wheat farmer, this news is unfortunate indeed. The Minister of Trade and Commerce made no announcement as to how much the price drop might be. From what I can learn, responsible people in Ottawa fear a reduction of about one to ten cents a bushel. That of course is only a guess. I think everyone will deeply regret the price cut in wheat. In this instance, however, I think the Federal Government has taken the only step which was available to it, because for months export sales have been declining throughout the world. For months surpluses have been building up. It is a well-known fact that the United States has been selling wheat below the International Grains Agreement minimum. And it is also clear that most of the other exporting countries other than Canada have been doing the same thing. Russia has been selling wheat below the minimum prices in the Arrangement and of course she is not a participant and is free to do this. But a huge Russian sale to Great Britain a few weeks ago at bargain prices certainly was a factor in the current situation. I think Members on both sides of the House would agree that Canada has to meet competition. The failure on the part of Canada to meet competition would simply mean the loss of many long-time or future potential markets. I remind this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Wheat Board is responsible for selling our farmer's wheat. I think most farmers in Saskatchewan still have the utmost confidence in the Canadian Wheat Board. Certainly this Government has.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Hon. Members know that on the Advisory Committee of the Canadian Wheat Board, are such organizations as the three Prairie wheat pools. Roy Atkinson, president of the National Farm Union and other leaders, and without exception I ask you to note that those farm leaders have come out in support of the policy recommended by the Wheat Board and adopted by the Government a few days ago.

**March 17, 1969**

Now for almost 20 months the Wheat Board has watched our wheat prices gradually get out of line on world markets. Thus, a short time ago, the Board advised the Federal Government that the present action must be taken. Failure on their part, that is, on the part of the Federal Government, could have meant the collapse of our whole sales policy. In other words, I emphasize today that the Wheat Board and the Federal Government had no alternative but to meet the kind of price cutting that has been recently developed. And as I say almost unanimously agricultural leaders on the Prairies have agreed.

Now does this latest action mean the end of the International Grains Arrangement? Certainly not immediately. Most of us hope, not ever, though obviously as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said there are dangers. An end of the Arrangement could mean a return to the days of cut-throat competition and bargain-basement wheat prices. Let us hope that those countries which are signatories to the International Grains Arrangement will recognize the irresponsibility of their actions in recent weeks in engaging in this price-cut. I suggest that the fact that Canada has forcibly indicated that she will no longer stand idly by while her export markets are taken over, may have a salutary effect. Because last Friday in essence, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has served notice that Canada is going to fight for her share of export markets. And if all governments realized that price-cutting is not going to increase the overall world export volume, they may yet be willing to listen to reason. Price-cutting is not in the long-term interests of either exporters or importers.

My understanding is that all the signatory nations will be together in the immediate future. Mr. Speaker has suggested that they are meeting today and tomorrow and the next day. Well, I know that our own Federal Government will do everything in its power to assure that the structure of the International Grains Arrangement is maintained.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Now what further action should be taken? There really is not too much of a specific nature that this Legislature can do but we can make suggestions. I suggest that there is some action that the farmer himself can take to help in this critical period. Whether we are successful in maintaining the International Grains Arrangement or not, it is obvious that it is more necessary than ever for farmers to diversify. Surely every conceivable effort should be made by our farmers to feed more grain through livestock, hogs, to sheep, to poultry and so on. Not only that, but as farmers prepare for spring seeding, which is now only a few weeks away, consideration should be given to planting a larger acreage of coarse grains, forage crops, flax, mustard and so on. But assuredly in this crisis, there is action which Ottawa should implement. Steps must be taken quickly to protect the grain farmers from bearing the entire brunt of competitive wheat sales and price-cutting. Therefore, our Government asks Ottawa for legislation, at least on a temporary basis, which would give the farmer a minimum floor price for export wheat. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has mentioned, there is a precedent. Such a measure was taken only a year ago between two different International Wheat Agreements. The floor price on No. 1 Northern wheat was set, if I recall, at \$1.95½ a bushel. Now because farm costs have risen

since that time, the new floor should be no lower than that amount. With a new growing season fast approaching, if any degree of stability is to be returned to Prairie agriculture, such action is called for immediately.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We should today ask the Federal Government to give us that guarantee.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the present crisis emphasizes again the urgency of our Federal Parliament to adopt the two-price system for Canadian Wheat. We may have difficulty. Indeed we may never persuade the rest of Canada that over a long period wheat exports should be subsidized. But the case for a fair and reasonable price for wheat sold on the domestic market cannot be refuted.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, since the end of the war, annually throughout Canada, there has been a consistent upward trend in prices, in wages and in incomes. Year after year, sharp wage increases have been demanded and given to virtually every trade union handling the farmer's grain - the longshoremen, the railroaders, the Maritime unions, the dock workers, the elevator operators and so on. I recall, as you do, Sir, one settlement a few years ago which gave 30 per cent in one contract, to the longshoremen and they have had substantially more since that time. Now many of these wage increases that I have mentioned were given after direct intervention, persuasion and pressure by the Federal Government. In almost every case, the farmer has been obliged to absorb a substantial portion of these very huge wage increases. Now I understand that since 1949 in Saskatchewan average wages and salaries have increased 146 per cent. The cost of machinery in that same time has doubled. The price of land since 1949 in some cases has tripled. While all of this has been happening, the farmer's selling price for wheat for the most part has remained static. It has gone up a few cents in 16 years. In other words at a time when inflation and escalating costs have never been so serious, the wheat farm has had virtually no increased returns. The result of course has been that thousands of our farmers have been obliged to stop farming. Thousands of others are caught in a cost-price squeeze that daily becomes more desperate.

Mr. Speaker, I know we all agree that the very basis of the prairie economy is agriculture. I say categorically, the Premier of Saskatchewan, that we do not believe that the nation is treating the wheat farmer fairly. On the contrary, the present pricing system for wheat is rank economic discrimination against him. All the Prairies must take exception to this situation. Today labour is protected by minimum wages and powerful bargaining unions. And that's as it should be. In the Maritimes the fishermen are being helped by subsidies. There is hardly a manufacturer in Canada who isn't protected by tariffs. The wheat farmer on the other hand enjoys no subsidy and no protection. It can be rightly said that he is in a class by himself in this regard. Now it has been said countless times, Mr. Speaker, but it is worth repeating again this afternoon. The farmer must meet the unrestricted competition of the world

**March 17, 1969**

market when he is a seller. When he is a buyer he must buy in a protected market. Other governments provide vast and complex systems of holding up the price which the farmer receives. In the United States they actually pay the farmer some kind of a subsidy for not growing grain. In France the best wheat today sells for \$2.42 a bushel; in the Netherlands the price is \$4.04; West Germany it is \$3.01; in Japan the farmer gets \$3.56 a bushel; in India, \$2.83. The farmers of Saskatchewan are looking for no handout. But they do want a fair return on their investment and on their labour.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Now for years, Mr. Speaker, Canadian consumers have enjoyed what is - whether some admit it or not - relatively cheap bread at the expense of the farmer. The time has come when we on this side of the House suggest that action must be taken to guarantee the farmer a more adequate return. In an average year about 490 million bushels of Canadian wheat is exported. Of that, 60 million bushels is consumed at home. Now obviously the export price, while subject to negotiations, is set by the law of supply and demand around the world. The Canadian Government has relatively little to say as to what that level of price will be. But on the domestic market the Canadian Government can control the price of wheat. And I suggest today that there is no reason whatever why the farmer should not be paid a price which has some relation to his costs of production.

In other words, I suggest this afternoon again that the time has come to establish a full-fledged two-price system for wheat. Personally, I think the best solution so far has probably been advocated by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, which a short time ago passed the following Resolution:

That the price of wheat used for domestic human consumption be increased to a level of \$1.00 per bushel above export price, to be charged to the consumer by increasing the price to the flour mills on that portion of their wheat purchases.

And that principle, Mr. Speaker, a short time later was endorsed by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Now I suggest that adoption of this policy by the Government of Canada would work no undue hardship on the general public. The Government and the farm organizations do not believe that any such system should be paid for by the consumer. Introduction of the two-price system need not cost the Federal Treasury one copper. Rather the consumer would pay a very modest sum, just as he pays for wage increases in every other segment of our economy, and for other increases due to subsidies and tariffs. Now it is estimated by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Mr. Chairman, that if that two-price system were adopted in Canada, the consumer might have to pay another 1½ or 2 cents a bushel. That surely is a small price indeed for what would be a major step toward a fair deal in the market place for our farmers. Now the \$1 differential advocated seems to me to be fair and reasonable. It won't solve all the farmer's problems by any means. But it would be of major assistance. There may be some grounds for debate, Mr. Chairman, on precisely what the difference should be between the export and domestic price. But we do believe that the principle should be recognized.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about nine months ago the Federal Liberal party had a leadership convention. Before that last leadership convention, at the request of the Saskatchewan Liberal party, I approached most of the candidates suggesting a two-price system with a minimum 50-cent differential. Five of those candidates, including the present Prime Minister, gave me a commitment that they would at least give their very serious consideration to such a proposition I regret that nothing specific has yet been done by the new Federal Government. But I can tell you that the Saskatchewan Government intends to vigorously pursue this proposal.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — And we will do all in our power to persuade Ottawa to take such long overdue action. If it is interested in the well-being of the Prairies, it cannot indefinitely turn a deaf ear. At the next meeting of the Prairie Economic Council, which will likely be in the latter part of June, we shall ask Alberta and Manitoba to join us in our representations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I expect that in this debate there will be a reasonable amount of unanimity on both sides of the House, because I know that, regardless of politics, every Member is anxious to take whatever action is possible to help the wheat industry in the present trying circumstances. We know that any overall solution must, for the most part, come from the Federal Government. Therefore, may I suggest that when this debate has concluded - presumably later this day - we endeavour on a non-political basis to frame a Resolution which can be unanimously passed by our Legislature. As I see it - and I'm not sure if my hon. friends opposite will agree or not - but I believe that that Resolution should be moved by myself as head of the Government, hopefully seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd).

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — In essence it would: (1) Express confidence in the Canadian Wheat Board as our marketing agents; (2) Call for at least a temporary floor on export wheat; (3) Request the immediate institution of a two-price system for wheat. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Legislature, that such a joint motion, passed unanimously by both sides of the Legislature, might be listened to in Ottawa. If the Leader of the Opposition agrees, I invite him at an appropriate time to withdraw the motion which is now before us, join with us and proceed as I have suggested.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I can't help recognizing that it would be customary on this day to be wearing a green tie. However, the news that the Minister of Trade and Commerce delivered to us last Friday, which well could be termed Black Friday, I think would be more appropriate for the farmers of Saskatchewan to be wearing a black tie today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

March 17, 1969

**Mr. Messer:** — This statement that Canada is going to undertake the policy of selling grain below the prices that were outlined in the International Grains Arrangement is a very serious blow to the farmer in Western Canada and particularly to the farmer in Saskatchewan. This ultimately in the end will affect the total and whole economy of Canada, especially under the circumstances where we now find the farmer in Saskatchewan. This is going to be a very severe blow to him. I couldn't help at this time mentioning an article that appeared in The Leader Post only last week in regard to just how serious it is for some of the farmers in Saskatchewan now in regard to the need for direct financial assistance, in a large percentage of the area in my constituency where the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union acting on their behalf, namely the farmers of the Rural Municipalities of Porcupine and Bjorkdale and Local Improvement District 944, all in Northeastern Saskatchewan, has asked the Government to designate the district as a disaster area. It is indeed very unfortunate because there are other areas in the province that are no doubt in the same situation. Unfortunately the news that came down last Friday could very well put all farmers in Western Canada in a disaster situation. This as has been said before could very well be one of the greatest threats towards the orderly selling of wheat. It could be the end of the orderly selling policy that we have had. In the last three years the wheat producing areas of the world have consecutively been able to produce more than 3 billion bushels per year without any great problems. Countries such as France, Australia and particularly the United States have been actively seeking markets for those grains that they have.

By doing this they have initiated what we see before us now, the coming of what could very well be a price war. There are 17 countries that are participating in the International Grains Arrangement. If we follow suit - and it appears we are - it also appears that we are the first country to make the announcement publicly that we are going to sell grain below that International Grains Arrangement. This means that we could very well bring in all other 17 countries participating into a price war, which would be of little value or little good to any one of those countries with a single exception of the United States. I say this because the United States is able to cut the price of their grains. Because they are now subsidizing their farmers in a great many ways both in the price of wheat and in the fact that they established soil banks and persuaded farmers not to grow, they are within the range with the greatest of ease, of being able to cut prices very drastically and far more than the one to ten cents that the Premier has suggested to us today.

The announcement that Mr. Pepin made last Friday that we would participate in sales below the minimum floor price outlined in the International Grains Arrangement, and then say on the other hand that Canada is still a party to the International Grains Arrangement, cannot entirely be a correct one. After all when we make it public that we are going to sell grains below the minimum floor price, we can no longer be considered a party to the International Grains Arrangement, as we have in effect thrown out the most basic policy in that arrangement. And that is to maintain a floor price. He also hoped that the International Grains Arrangement would be able to be maintained. I suggest to him and the Government that it is going to be much, much more difficult to maintain the Arrangement, when we have come out and publicly stated that we will be selling grain for

less than what the minimum outlined. Any negotiations that follow after that are going to be much more difficult, because we have identified ourselves as being in favour of selling under price-slashing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, it's truly regrettable that the Government was not taking steps in regard to avoiding this situation prior to this late date. It's not news to us that United States in 1968 sold 750 million bushels of wheat on the world market. They also said that they were going to reach that objective again in the next year, and if possible surpass that 750 million bushel goal. This should have certainly given us indications that they would be prepared to sell under the minimum price level.

The general consensus by all in the world wheat trading business is that the United States has consistently for some time now been trading and selling grain below the minimum price outlined in the International Grains Arrangement. It did not maintain its obligations under the old International Wheat Agreement. It broke the agreement with Mr. Winters during the last crisis that we had in regard to selling grain. It consistently sold wheat for 18 cents a bushel below the old International Wheat Agreement during an 11-month period between the International Wheat Agreement and the International Grains Arrangement. It got a taste, in effect, Mr. Speaker, of moving large quantities of grain at lower prices during these periods. One of the major examples of where it was able to get its foot in the door was the country of Japan and has been selling large quantities of grain to them ever since. Other indications that they were thinking along the lines of dealing themselves out of the International Grains Arrangement was when they actively took part during the negotiations for the exclusion of soft wheats from that Arrangement, meaning that they would like to be able to sell grains at whichever prices they desired and not those outlined in the International Grains Arrangement. France also, by selling 6,000 tons of soft wheat to Japan at 18 cents a bushel below the International Grains Arrangement, gave us an indication that here was another country that was going to be dealing itself out of the Arrangement in the very near future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where was our Government both Provincially and Federally when these actions were taking place? They didn't just show themselves in the last week or the last several days. They have been there for some years now and they've been becoming more prominent on a daily basis. The fact that Mr. Pepin did not go down, as the papers stated, to visit the United States until March 11, certainly shows an element of ignorance in regard to the situation or a hesitancy on behalf of the Canadian Government to take action when action should have been taken. It certainly shows that there should be far more participation between the Provincial Governments in regard to the sales of grain, far more participation with the Wheat Board and the Federal Government, especially in the Province of Saskatchewan because this Province is the major producer of wheat in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — I can't help but make note that we never get very much recognition as far as Canadian agriculture or Saskatchewan agriculture is concerned. We never get any great amount of recognition in regard to a two-price system or higher prices for wheat from the Federal Government, until we reach a crisis period.



**March 17, 1969**

And that is exactly what we are in now. Although I am happy to hear the Premier state that he is for a two-price system, and for a temporary guaranteed minimum price of wheat, it's rather an old story that he should just bring this matter up during a critical period for the farmer.

I say again that, if a minimum is not established for the farmers of Western Canada, it's going to cripple and destroy a great many farms in this province and its adjoining provinces of Alberta and Manitoba. The farmers' returns last year in 1968 dropped 10 per cent. It was pointed out that the amount of machinery that he purchased during the year 1968 dropped nearly 25 per cent or a total of nearly \$30 million. It's also a fact that Canada only produces 10 per cent of the world wheat. Now, under these conditions I cannot see how the farmer of Western Canada or how the Canadian Government can maintain a share or control of the prices or set the prices in the international world trading business, when we have so little an amount of grain to sell on that large scale.

The Premier says that the Government would fight to have her share of the export markets of the world. He also went on to say that, through diversification and the planning of feed grains and cash crops, the farmer could be expected to be alleviated of some of the hardships that are no doubt in the future for him. Well, I'd like to bring to his attention the feed grains that are being sold in the province now at prices of 40 and 50 cents a bushel, certainly not at prices that are showing a profit to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — I would like to also bring to his attention the field of cash crops, the drastic fall in the prices of rapeseed in the past week, a reduction of some 20 cents over a period of eight or nine days. If this is the way that the farmer is going to maintain his enterprise, it is no longer going to be very stable under these conditions either.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's truly regrettable that Canada had to be forced into a position of selling grain below the minimum outlined in the International Grains Arrangement. However, I do see and I do admit that Canada does have to sell grain and under the present circumstances the only way and means for it selling its grain will be at reduced prices. However, we should have in the past and we should be working very strenuously towards establishing the obligations of other countries that are outlined in the International Grains Arrangement at the present time and of the 17 countries that ratified that Arrangement. We should have been negotiating with them in the distant past, so that we could have been somewhat assured that we would not all over a period of night, so to put it, be faced with the slashing of prices in regard to world selling of wheat. However, it appears that the Wheat Board will be selling grain below the minimum price. I suggest it's going to be more than the one to ten cents per bushel as outlined by the Premier, as it has been suggested that United States is now selling their grain at 17 cents below the minimum price. If we are going to truly compete, it means that we will have to compete at a ratio somewhat equivalent to theirs, which means the price could very well drop 17 cents, 20 cents, or 25 cents. Once this slashing starts, it's hard to say where it may end up. However, it is of absolute

necessity, not only to the Western farmer but to the economy of Canada that we have a minimum price maintained, as was stated, of \$1.95½ which was outlined in the International Grains Arrangement. I must say here that this is not the realistic price in regard to the cost of farming that is facing the farmers of Western Canada today, but this would have to be the very minimum that we should be able to assure the farmer of Western Canada. The farmer will not be able to carry the burden of selling grains at reduced prices. It will have to be the entire economy of Canada that carries that load in order to be able to maintain the marketing of grain that we have to have, if this economy is going to survive.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** —I think it of utmost importance that every Member in this House in unanimity and unanimously support the motion that was brought forward by the Leader and seconded by myself, setting forth the seriousness of this problem to the Province of Saskatchewan to the Federal Government of Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed in an atmosphere of apprehension and concern that we discuss today a matter of such vital importance to Saskatchewan as wheat prices and wheat markets. The Members will recall that it was with a feeling of anxiety that we gradually perceived last spring that all was not well in the wheat export field, a feeling confirmed by the announcement of the final export sales figure of some 336 million bushels, a return unfortunately to the level of some five years ago. The movement of grain during the current crop year has done nothing, I suggest, to relieve our anxiety. But to say that no preparation has been made in the past I think can be refuted because the Federal Minister of Agriculture in the Pearson Government did set up the Task Force and the Task Force will be presenting its report to all provinces in Canada next week as well as to all agricultural organizations in Canada next week. Certainly I would suggest at this time that, whereas the Province of Saskatchewan may not be able to give full agreement to all its suggestions, still there are many suggestions that, if adopted by the Federal Government, could go a long way to alleviating at least part of the crisis we're in today.

The announcement on Friday of last week has confirmed these fears that I have mentioned and indeed it has aroused tremendous concern throughout Western Canada, concern as to what markets may already have been lost, concern as to how low the price of wheat may have to go to meet competition, but perhaps most acute of all is the concern as to what the result will be if order in the international market cannot be maintained.

To fully understand all the present situation I would like briefly to review some of the implications and Canada's position in world wheat trade. Some Members will recall the situation during the thirties when with surplus stocks of exportable wheat, cut-throat competitions for sales reduced the price to the Saskatchewan farmer to around 30 cents a bushel. Mr. Speaker, the drop in price did not increase sales or wheat consumption. In fact as the price dropped, importing countries simply raised

**March 17, 1969**

their tariff to protect their own farmers from this unacceptable competition. I suggest that this concept still prevails today. Less than two weeks ago the price of Canadian barley was reduced hopefully to increase exports. When this was done, Great Britain simply imposed a duty to protect their own barley producers which resulted in no decrease in price to the British barley users. The European Economic Community establishes target prices for their growers. Imported wheat is assessed a duty to bring it up to this target price. The beneficiary of a lower price is of course, the treasury of the importing country. Wheat is a commodity for which the demand is inelastic. People do not eat more wheat or wheat products when the price is \$1.75 per bushel than when it is \$2.25 per bushel. It's not like oranges or TV sets. Price reductions do not result in more wheat being sold. The International Wheat Agreement first completed just 20 years ago was the culmination of prolonged efforts of producers and various countries that started back in 1933 to bring some order and stability into the international wheat market.

Periodically over the years the price level that should be in the Agreement has been the subject of some disagreement particularly among exporters. Periodically again over the years some countries have attempted to gain a temporary advantage by small concessions in price. Generally speaking, however, the International Wheat Agreement was satisfactory to most member countries. It has been successful in preventing violent fluctuations in price, avoiding both unduly high incentives to extreme overproduction on the one hand and economic disaster to producers from extremely low prices on the other hand. And I suggest that to fully appreciate the present situation we must briefly recall the circumstances surrounding the signing of the present International Grains Arrangement.

Discussions toward a renewal or modified agreement were for the first time included under the auspices of GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in what was termed the Kennedy Round starting in 1963. The discussions were slow and the 1962 IWA was extended for a year in 1965 and again in 1966. You will recall that at that time world demand for wheat was high. International trade in wheat was at an all-time high and there was at that time a keen demand for Canadian wheat. With the background of rising costs of production at home, Canadian delegates pressed strongly for an increase in both the minimum and the maximum prices, and they were strongly supported by Australia but not by the United States. They were successful and a new wheat trade convention finally agreed to at a special conference in mid-August of 1967, included price increases of about 21 cents per bushel. It was accepted at that time in Canada as a minimum increase required by our producers. The completion of the Agreement was followed by a period in which there was no formal agreement until July 31, 1968. Also member countries had unofficially agreed to respect it and this situation followed two record-breaking wheat crops. The first in 1966-67 exceeded 11 billion bushels. It was immediately followed by a second high of over 10 billion bushels in 1967-68. World wheat trade in 65-66 reached record levels exceeding the previous record established the year before by some 24 per cent. The next year 1966-67 saw a decline but was still the second highest wheat-trading year in our history. But the next year, 1967-68 world wheat trade fell by over 300 million bushels or over 15 per cent and Canada unfortunately carried more than her share of this decline.

Where we had held roughly 23 to 24 per cent of world wheat trade during the 1960s and a larger percentage during the 1950s and captured over 26 per cent of world trade in 66-67, the next year, last year, our share of the export market dropped to just over 19 per cent. Thus it was that the final stages of the new wheat convention the ratification by member countries was accomplished during the last mid-summer in an atmosphere that had radically changed from the optimism that prevailed through most of the negotiations. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that there was a certain amount of apprehension in Canada that the United States would not sign the Agreement. And then as you know last spring and summer the minimum prices were broken primarily by the United States. And so the Canadian Wheat Board had no choice but to follow suit and the Canadian Government met the situation by guaranteeing the producer the minimum IGA price until the Agreement became formally effective at the first of the current crop year. Now we find the same situation again with the Agreement being broken and wheat sold below the agreed minimum price.

It is significant to note that the Arrangement contains no provisions for enforcement. It is a gentleman's agreement and we can only deplore the breach, deplore the fact that some countries are behaving in an ungentlemanly fashion. Again it appears that we must follow suit.

What is the present situation? First the International Wheat Council estimates that 57.6 million tons will be carried over into a new crop year by major world exporters higher than at any time since 1960-61. Secondly, whereas in 1960-61 the carryover was held mainly by the United States and Canada, the current surplus appears in Canada, United States, Argentina, Australia, France and several smaller producers. Thirdly, and this is significant, Russia, which is not a signatory of the Wheat Trade Convention, has harvested three consecutive bumper crops and now appears a significant exporter. When we recall that Russia produces more wheat than United States, Canada, Australia and Argentina combined, and realize that a 15 per cent increase in a normal crop in Russia is equal to our total export, we can appreciate the significance of this change in the world wheat situation. Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, our own carryover of wheat at the end of this crop year will approach record levels. So we have now a situation where several countries are under pressure to sell, some of these countries that have storage problems. They do not have adequate facilities to store large amounts of grain. Then, as was mentioned earlier, we have a situation where Russia has sold wheat guaranteed minimum protein of not less than 14 per cent to Britain, a traditional customer of Canada below the equivalent of \$1.95½ per bushel. We have a situation where several countries are selling below the IGA minimum. Canada, I suggest, must sell wheat and we do not have any alternatives. So while we are convinced that no lasting gains will follow we must concur in the decision of the Canadian Government and the Canadian Wheat Board that we have to meet this competition and that we too must sell below the minimum established in the 1967 Arrangement. In the meantime we have been told that negotiations are going forward and meetings arranged in the hope that order can once again be established. I am sure that it is evident to all of us that this will be a difficult task in the present situation. We hope that order can be brought to the market and that progress in international agreements over the last 20 years will not be lost to our Canadian producers. Therefore we support the Canadian delegation to

**March 17, 1969**

the forthcoming International Wheat Council meeting in their efforts to bring other major exporting countries to the negotiating table where differences can be solved.

In the meantime, I think it's appropriate to say that we fully support the Wheat Board and recognize the multifaceted job that they have been asked to do in selling Canadian wheat in ensuring equal opportunity of delivery in cash advances and in organizing transportation. I suggest too, Mr. Speaker, that we do appreciate the job that they have done. While we appreciate these things and their efforts it appears that more effort has to be put into our selling job. May I once again repeat that we have to sell. Without going into detail now I would suggest that market research must be stepped up so that sales efforts can be geared to customer needs, to customer habits and to customer prejudices. Similarly credit terms must be geared to the needs of customers and to the needs of potential customers. Somehow additional flexibility must be put into our pricing system, so that when prices fall to the minimum specified, our price is not set out wide open to the last 1/8 of a cent per bushel for every competitor in the world to shoot at.

Now what of the farmer? It is perhaps too easy for us to become lost in a welter of statistics, disputes over international agreements and competition among wheat traders and forget the immediate and direct effect on the farmers of this province. After all we are talking about his salary, his labour return and his level of living. I am sure that farmers of this province will almost unanimously concur with the decision of the Wheat Board as being the only logical thing that could be done. Some may feel that the step was too long delayed, but at the same time every farmer will be watching with apprehension how much the price will have to drop for how long and how much more wheat it will move. After the lapse of the old International Wheat Agreement last June the Canadian Government guaranteed wheat prices to the farmer at the level provided in the new Arrangement, namely, \$1.95½ per bushel in store at the Lakehead. Farm organizations are now requesting that the same action be taken and we could not agree at less than their request. We support and we endorse this request and call upon the Federal Government for an early announcement to this effect. In addition we suggest that now is an appropriate time to introduce a two-price system and the price of wheat sold for domestic human consumption in Canada to be raised by not less than \$1 per bushel. It would only mean an added two cents on the cost of a loaf of bread. It would mean about 10 cents per bushel to the farmer and would demonstrate to him the support of the Canadian people in these difficult times. So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I re-emphasize firstly that we are in a difficult period with large stocks of wheat above the immediate market requirements held by several countries in the world; secondly, that we deplore the actions of countries which had signed and ratified the Wheat Trade Convention of the International Grains Arrangement in breaking the terms of the Convention that they had agreed to; thirdly, that we concur in the present action of the Canadian Wheat Board as being the only realistic reaction to the situation that has developed; fourthly, that we support our delegation to the forthcoming International Wheat Council in its efforts to try and re-establish order in the international wheat market; fifthly, that we consider additional effort in terms of market research and promotion and credit availability and that great flexibility will be necessary if Canada is to maintain her position in the world wheat trade; sixth, that we strongly recommend to the

Federal Government as a necessary measure of income support early announcement that the minimum price of \$1.95½ based on No. 1 Northern stored at the Lakehead, be a guaranteed minimum price; seventh, introduction of a domestic price on wheat that would add \$1 per bushel to the price of hard spring wheat milled for human consumption in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes** (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take too much time of the House. In fact I really had not intended to speak in this debate until the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture spoke. I certainly think that we will all agree that last Friday was one of the worst days in the history of Saskatchewan farmers for a good many years, possibly since the 1930s.

I just want to say that I am pleased that the Government Members are at last converted. One year ago I moved a Resolution in this House asking for a two-price system, and it was the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) who amended that motion and watered it down to a point where it did not mean too much. I noticed that he also admitted that as far back as last spring that he was fearful, and I think we all were fearful.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) both did a good job and so did the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) of explaining the farmers' position. I am not going to repeat the statistics that have been given to the House, but I just want to emphasize the position in particular of the small farmer. I said before in this House that many of the farmers are going to have trouble sowing a crop this spring, and certainly this is not going to help it. I do want to remark on the words of the Premier when he suggested that we grow more coarse grain. I want to suggest that this may be right but we certainly need more stability in the meat industry if we are going to do this. It is traditional that every time a farmer goes into pigs, the price goes down. I want to suggest that there is a real need for a meat board the same as we have a wheat board, so that the farmer can invest in equipment and land and stock with some assurance that he is going to make something out of it.

As far as the growing of coarse grains, the Minister of Agriculture just mentioned that the price of barley has been dropping in the last few days. To go into coarse grains and lose money on it isn't much different than losing money on wheat. I think the big thing is that we are in trouble and must act now. As the Premier has said we have had sharp increases in the cost of production to the farmer. Prices and wages have gone up. He didn't mention that also profits have gone up in the machine industry by terrific amounts, far greater than even wages. Actually the figures show by the Bureau of Statistics in Canada that productivity in the machine industry has increased so that per man they have produced a lot more than they did 25 years ago. Machinery has gone up. He referred to wages as going up 140 per cent, but I want to say that machinery has gone up 300 or 400 per cent, when I think of the combine that I purchased in 1948 which cost about \$4,500 and a machine of its size and its capacity is now going to cost \$8,000.

In closing I want to say that I think that we must, in this House, support this motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition

**March 17, 1969**

and speak in one voice because I am sure that it affects everyone in all parts of Saskatchewan, whether you be a businessman in the centre of this city, or whether you be a small businessman in the small village or hamlet out in the country.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Larochelle** (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I will not do like the last Member that just sat down and say that he wasn't going to take part in this debate. I certainly had intentions as a farmer to take part in this debate, because I think that it is important to the people of this province what we are debating here today.

Mr. Speaker, I think the first thing that we must look at at the present is the problem of marketing wheat in Canada during the last few years. I think that we should all take a look at it because I think that we all have a stake in it. Mr. Speaker, our first thought is to blame the Wheat Board for not selling our wheat. We are all prone to say that the Wheat Board should have done this and the Wheat Board should have done that. It is always a lot easier to criticize than to be constructive. I believe that this is one agency that is doing a good job, and I would certainly not want to see it disappear for fear of what may happen, if we did not have such capable men doing this job.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should take a good look at the problems that this agency has had on our world markets and the position that other wheat exporters have placed the Wheat Board in. Over the years we have had many world wheat marketing agreements. In 1930-31, against a background of wide-spread depression, mounting wheat surpluses and collapse of the wheat prices to rock bottom levels, international discussions were held with a view to bringing some stability to world wheat prices. In 1933 an agreement was reached between nine exporting and 13 importing countries under which a world quota of 560 million bushels were distributed among the nine participating countries. This agreement never actually functioned since world-wide prices fell during 1933 and 1934. This agreement was changed in various ways to try to make it more workable, but was formally terminated in 1935, largely because all the major exporters failed to co-operate fully in adhering to the agreed export quotas. Argentina was the largest offender in this case. During the period of World War II export prices were very low and once again large stocks built up in exporting countries, because exports to Europe were greatly reduced. In 1942 Argentina, Australia, Canada and the United States adopted a memorandum of agreement. These countries agreed to control production and to avoid burdensome surpluses.

After the war we entered into a sellers market due to shortage of wheat in Europe. In 1945 discussions again got going and continued in 1946 and 1947. In 1948 the International Wheat Council met in Washington and a tentative agreement was reached based on a price of No. 1 Manitoba Northern at \$2 per bushel at Fort William. This agreement fell through as the United States refused to sign. In 1949 this same council met and an agreement based on a price of \$1.80 was reached and this time the United States agreed. This agreement was renewed in 1953, 1956, 1959 and 1962. As time passed and wheat became more plentiful, some countries again came to regard guaranteed quantities too restrictive and again we were in trouble with countries not respecting the agreement.

In 1962 the last International Wheat Agreement went into effect and this time with a very more complex pricing system. We now had new varieties of soft wheats which created problems of pricing. Manitoba No. 1 was priced at a high of \$2.35 and a low of \$1.95½; Manitoba No. 3 at a high of \$2.30 and a low of \$1.90 and so on down the line until we reached the lowest which was Mexico with a high of \$1.95 and a low of \$1.55. These prices have fluctuated up and down by agreement since then, but wheat has been sold mostly at the minimum on the export market.

Mr. Speaker, the high carryover that we now have is due to many factors. One of the reasons is the decline in export sales. Wheat exports in 1967-68 were more than they have been in recent years. Wheat exports from the four principal exporting countries, Canada, Argentina, Australia and the United States, totalled only 1.4 billion bushels in 1967-68 compared with 1.6 billion in 1966-67 and a high of 1.9 billion in 1965-66. Canada wheat exports in 1967-68 were the lowest they have been since the 1962-63 crop. Mr. Speaker, this is due to many reasons, such as countries, which were importing wheat a few years ago, now due to changes in agriculture are now exporting wheat. Today nearly three quarters of world wheat production originates in countries other than the four principal wheat exporters, Canada, United States, Argentina and Australia.

In 1968, for example, world wheat production totalled something like 10.8 billion bushels while total production in the four above-named exporter countries totalled 3.6 billion, leaving 7.2 billion produced in other countries such as Russia and other wheat-producing countries. Russia at one time was a large importer of wheat. Today Russia produces 2.5 billion bushels of wheat herself.

Mr. Speaker, one other reason for declining Canadian exports is that the high quality wheat, which we produce and have been selling at a higher price on the wheat market, is not as much in demand today due to the changing technology in the milling and baking industries. In Britain, for example, 65 per cent of the milling and baking industry has converted to a new baking process which requires only about 30 per cent of our hard wheat in their grist compared with 50 per cent of our wheat under the old baking process.

Mr. Speaker, these are hard facts we learned about yesterday which must be taken into account in considering what we do today. They raise for us the blunt question: what can we do about it today for tomorrow? Mr. Speaker, I do believe the Wheat Board is doing a good job in trying to sell our wheat, and if they saw fit to reduce the export price from one to ten cents per bushel, depending on grades, they should not stand to be criticized, for whatever is the best course of action to follow is the course the Wheat Board must pursue, because unless our export market is strengthened, the position of wheat farmers will become untenable.

The low export volume of last year has not generated enough income from wheat to keep the farmer in business, let alone provide incentive for him to improve his production. If the export markets are improved and result in larger delivery quotas, I do not believe that the farmer would resent the probable five cents per bushel average decrease, providing he can sell a larger amount of his production.



**March 17, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the Federal Government will see fit to reinstate the floor price of \$1.95½, which was in effect in the year 1967 during the time that the International Wheat Agreement had lapsed. While this price is not too satisfactory it will introduce a certain amount of protection to the farmers. I understand that the International Grains Arrangement Price Review Committee is meeting in London today, March 17, 18, and 19 and it is to be hoped that they will come up with a solution that will not be detrimental to the farmers of Western Canada. A special meeting of the exporters group is scheduled for the first week of April, at which time prices will be reviewed and the present situation of world grain markets will be discussed.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been a marked decrease in prices offered for high quality wheat in the markets of the world. In some cases for certain grades, these prices offered were substantially below the set minimum prices of the International Grains Arrangement. In recent weeks quite a volume of sales have been done by our competitors to the detriment of Canada. In one instance Canada lost the sale of an extensive amount of bushels to Russia by a margin of about 10 cents per bushel. Russia is not a member of The International Grains Arrangement. Russia at one time was a large importer of our Canadian wheat and today, due to changes in agriculture in that country, Russia is now an exporter of wheat on the world markets.

Mr. Speaker, if our Canadian Western grain farmers are to survive in the wheat growing industry it is high time we take a good look at a two-price system. Farmers cost has changed an awful lot in the last 10 years. Price of machinery has gotten to an exorbitant price. Wages have almost doubled and this has left the farmer in a very bad cost-price squeeze. I would recommend very strongly that the Federal Government institute a two-price system with the price to the producer of \$1 per bushel above the current export price for wheat milled for domestic consumption.

**Mr. E. Kramer** (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I thought that you had ruled earlier. It has been several times since this debate has started that other people before the Member that is now speaking in all due respect have been speaking on a Resolution that is on the Order Paper. I wonder and I would like to hear from you - there are other people that wish to speak in this debate - and I wonder what your thinking and ruling is on this, Sir. You referred to it yourself when you brought down your ruling. I don't know how much latitude that you intend to give but I would like you now to tell us whether or not the Member is in order and if others were, including the Premier, earlier in the debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The differentiation which I made in the ruling, and incidentally which was the differentiation which allowed the motion to come before the House - otherwise it would have been out of order - was the difference between my interpretation of a support price, or I should say the strict dictionary interpretation of a support price, and an interpretation of guaranteed prices. Now if you are going to talk about guaranteed prices you are out of order. If you are going to talk about support prices you are in order. You produce what arguments . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask another question, Sir. What about the two-price system which is on the Order Paper?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, this all depends on whether you consider a two-price system to be a guaranteed price for wheat or whether you consider the two-price system to be a support price for wheat.

**Mr. Larochelle:** — Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be a support price, but if it hurts the Member I will drop it. But I would like to remind the Members across, Mr. Speaker, that we are here today discussing what I think is a very important matter in regard to our Saskatchewan farmers. Right?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Larochelle:** — It must be important because this Legislature has seen fit to set aside all other business today to discuss this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, what really amazes me though is that, while we have this serious problem, I see here in this Legislature this afternoon two Federal NDP Members. I would certainly have thought that these two gentlemen would have made better use of their time in the House of Commons this afternoon to defend the farmers of Western Canada instead of being here supporting this issue.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Larochelle:** — Mr. Speaker, if this Resolution ever comes up, I will certainly support it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.I. Wood** (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to take part in this debate. There has been much said on both sides of the House and very good information has been brought out in this debate today. I do not wish to repeat more than necessary what has already been said, but I think, possibly, Sir, that I do have some thoughts that have not been brought forward.

I think that the present position of the Prairie wheat farmer has been well established, not only in this debate today, but in the facts that have been put before us from time to time in the press and other ways. I think the fact is that it has been well established that the farmer is not well established. I think that the fact, that has been pointed out here today that costs of farming have gone up by some 76 per cent since 1949, while the price of the goods that the farmer has to sell has only gone up by some 16 per cent, shows that there must be a very serious situation building up throughout the Prairie Provinces and especially in Saskatchewan, which is the most outstandingly rural and farming province in Canada.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that adjustments have been made by the farming industry to confront the situation by which they have been faced. Otherwise on the very face of the thing when

**March 17, 1969**

we have this some 60 per cent cut in the income of the farmers, the farming industry would have folded up long ago, if they had not faced up to the situation and put up a very good battle to confront it. The efficiency of the farming unit has been greatly increased. In fact I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that, if some of the other industries in our fair Dominion were prepared to increase their efficiency the way the farming industry has, they would not be needing to call upon the Government for the tariffs and such supports as they have had from time to time. I believe that the farming industry has more investment in equipment and such per person employed than practically any other industry in Canada. I think that this shows that Saskatchewan and Prairie farmers are prepared to do what they can, and with what lies within them, to do what they can to combat the situation which they are confronted with. Machinery co-ops have been set up in order to make the very best use that they can of the high-priced equipment which they are forced to buy. Many farmers have left the farm. They have been forced off by the situation which has confronted them. This has led to a realignment and a further consolidation of the farmers' position in the Prairies by those that are remaining and endeavouring to still fight this battle of the family farm. It is apparent by under the present situation a losing battle. The statement by such people, as has been quoted by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, that by 1980 half of our farmers will have left the farm, does I contend show that it is a losing battle. Under the present situation at the prices that we now have in the farming industry we are confronted with a very serious situation and the farmer is being forced into very serious straits, if we are to continue in this way. Added to this, in the last few days we have had the prospect of lower prices for farm commodities - wheat in particular - and also a serious cut in the price of barley and oats. I think that this is going to add greatly to the troubles with which the farmers are confronted.

I would like to say here, Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out earlier today, but I want to stress this point that this certainly does not confront the farmer alone. If the farmer is forced to the wall in an economy such as ours, it has very serious repercussions indeed upon the rest of our community, upon the rest of our economy. The other implement dealers and all the other dealers with whom the farmer has to work will feel his lack of cash, his lack of funds immediately, and this could react in a very serious way in a chain reaction throughout our economy.

Mr. Speaker, since the great depression we have in our economy worked in many safeguards against the return of such a situation. The Keynes theory of financing has been accepted by many governments that they endeavour to take money out of circulation at such times that are buoyant and endeavour in hard times to prime the pump and put money in circulation in such a way to bolster the economy. We have such things built into our economy as old age security funds that are continually given out to the older people. This money is put into circulation and acts as a safeguard against the return of hard times. We have such funds as our family allowances and our Canada Pension Plan and Welfare plans which in themselves have a strong tendency to keep us from getting into the return of the times which we had back in the 1900s.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion that one of the most important bulwarks which we have against a return of

such times, is the International Grains Arrangement. If Members will recall that this was one of the things which possibly, not actually preceded, I mean which came before, the hard times that we had in the '30s, but was one of the very first things when that the international price for wheat collapsed. There were sales made, just as we have talked about today, by certain countries and I believe Russia in particular, that put large quantities of wheat upon the international market at prices below those which were in effect at that time. This had a very large effect on bringing about the 1929 collapse and the following hard times during the '30s which we know as the Dirty Thirties. I do maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the failure to take some action and to allow the price of wheat to deteriorate seriously would have a very serious effect on the economy.

In such countries, as the United States, where they have had government support for agricultural products for many years and such a thing is taken as a part of their economy, I do not think that the failure of the International Grains Arrangement might have such serious effects as it might otherwise. But in Canada we do not have a history of this kind. As has been stated here today, I believe that agriculture is just about the only industry that does not have support of tariffs of some kind in our Canadian set-up. If we do not have supports I feel that the deterioration of the price of wheat in Canada could be a very serious thing indeed. I think that it is very important at this time that we urge our Canadian Government to do everything that it can to maintain the International Grains Arrangement. As the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) has pointed out a statement on behalf of the Wheat Board that we are prepared to sell wheat under the minimum prices at this time may not have the desired effect. I think that we should be careful that we do not get ourselves into the position of accepting the selling of wheat under the International Grains Arrangement price. I think that we should urge, this Legislature should urge our Federal Government to do everything it can to maintain and to retain the International Grains Arrangement. But, Mr. Speaker, if lower prices do come into effect, I believe that it is imperative, not only for our farmers, but for all of our economy that support be given to the Canadian wheat price. It is very important that we have a guaranteed price whether it is by a two-price system or by direct support. I am glad to hear the words that have been coming from across the floor this afternoon concerning their desire for these things and how much they are behind them. I only hope that it is not coming too late. It is coming too late for a good many of our farmers who have already been forced to leave the farm. I think that the Government has had five years in office in here in which to impress upon the Federal Government the necessity of taking some action along this line.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — We have had Liberal Governments in office since 1963 and we still have nothing along this line. We did have a temporary support of \$1.95 per bushel back in 1967 for which I think that we are very pleased and I'm glad that we did have this. I'm sure the situation today would have been much worse if we hadn't had that. Although possibly I think that this \$1.95 support price tended more to detract from the sale of grain than what it did to really help the farmer on the farm. But at any rate the Government did make a motion along that line and did establish a precedent. I think it is very necessary that this

**March 17, 1969**

Government across the way and the Government in Ottawa get off their horses and take some definite action in regard to doing something about the farmers' predicament in regard to a price of grain, that will be such that they will have a suitable and an equitable standard of living. I think that we in this Legislature, I believe it is our duty to use every means at our disposal to bring this fact before the Government of Canada and the people of Canada. I think that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) deserves a good deal of commendation by the fact that he moved the adjournment in this debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — It was he that brought this matter before this Legislature. I think that we must act along these lines and publicize this fact that the industry of agricultural farming in Saskatchewan is confronted by a very serious situation at this time. I think that we should not only move the adjournment, as we have of the Legislature to discuss these matters, we should proceed to have resolutions addressed to the Federal Government, as I said earlier, that it endeavour to retain the Grains Arrangement. If it cannot do that, it should be prepared to take whatever means it can to see that the price received by the Saskatchewan farmer is not reduced below the minimum level which will ensure to him an adequate living.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.F. Gardner** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, over the years, no subject has received as much attention in this House, I believe, as the subject of wheat. I am sure that almost every sitting day since I have become a Member, wheat has been mentioned sometime in the debates. I'm sure many of you here were familiar with the annual ritual of the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) getting up, blowing the dust off the same old speech and giving his annual 90-minute shot on the cost-price squeeze. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the present Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) has not inherited this speech, although there seems to be a certain amount of evidence to the contrary. However, I do not suggest that we shouldn't talk about wheat in this House because there is no subject of more vital concern to Saskatchewan. But after discussing the problems of wheat year after year in this Legislature - and I think we will agree with very little results - I think we should all begin to get the message and the message is simply this: that we are all familiar with the problems involved; we would all like to find a solution and the fact that we have not solved the problems is not due to the inefficiency of this or the previous Government or to the inadequacy of the Members, but simply to the fact that the wheat problems we face are largely beyond the control of a Provincial Government.

However, the question before us today is certainly of prime importance to Saskatchewan people. The Canadian Wheat Board has already been held in high esteem by the Saskatchewan farmer. Farmers in my area at least generally feel that the Wheat Board has done its best for them at all times. The actions of the Wheat Board and the Federal Government in deciding to reduce our export price to meet competition are regretted in rural areas but most agree that under the circumstances they had no alternatives. This change should give flexibility and allow them to sell more of our wheat. This is certainly not a time to criticize

the Wheat Board but I think we should assure them of our support in these difficult times. I suggested at the beginning that the problems of the wheat farmer today are largely beyond the control of any Provincial Government. However, I do think there is one area where we could be of assistance and it is an area that has been largely neglected. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the average Canadian has little conception of the importance of wheat exports to the Canadian economy. He perhaps does not fully realize that the business and prosperity generated by wheat sales reverberate through our economy at all levels. It benefits first those directly involved in the handling of the wheat from the farmer to the elevator people, the railroad people, grain handlers, dock workers and so on. Just as important in a secondary wave of activity, it benefits all of those who supply these people with goods and services and thus provides an impetus that contributes to the prosperity of all Canadians. Agricultural economists have spent very little time researching these factors and the work they have done has certainly received little publicity. As a primary producer the farmer consumes other products at a fantastic rate. The fertilizer, fuel, chemical, machinery, etc., he uses mostly come from outside Saskatchewan and stimulate the entire Canadian economy. It is most important to note, Mr. Speaker, that all of these substantial benefits accrue to our economy and to everyone who handles our wheat regardless of a drop in export prices. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this announced drop in export price means an increase in income to everyone who handles our wheat because more wheat will be moving. The irony of the situation, Mr. Speaker, is that this drop in wheat price to the farmer will be welcomed by the Quebec grain handler, dock worker, railroader and so on because it will increase their income. The average Canadian will welcome it because it will stimulate our economy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Canadians are generally pretty reasonable people when they are presented with all of the facts. Perhaps it is our duty as a Provincial Legislature to see that he is supplied with these facts. When he fully realizes the importance of our wheat farmer and wheat exports to the country, he will be willing to share this prosperity with the Saskatchewan farmer who produced the wheat in the first place. He will not want to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. When the average Canadian becomes fully informed, he will not only agree, but he will insist that the Government of Canada provide the wheat farmer with a minimum price for his product so that he can stay in business. He will agree to pay a small amount more for his loaf of bread so that the wheat farmer can stay in business. Mr. Speaker, it is our urgent duty to begin a campaign that will ensure that all Canadians are presented with the necessary information and to insist that the Government of Canada take these very necessary steps for the benefit of not only the farmers but of all Canadians. I hope that all Members will support the motion proposed by the Premier.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kramer** (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in what I think is the motion, whether or not we should adjourn and back to last Friday when we first heard this motion. I want to say that I was a bit shocked to find, out that the Government opposite was completely unaware of what the situation really was. One thing I want to suggest that the Hon. Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle) has possibly not contributed to the unanimity that the

**March 17, 1969**

Premier asked for by dragging politics in by their heels when he rose to speak. If the other side of the House wishes to have unanimity they are behaving rather oddly. Getting back to what I wasn't going to mention in this debate was my initial shock at finding that the Government, a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan, was completely unaware of what a Liberal Government in Ottawa was doing. One thing, Mr. Speaker, this particular motion has done, it brought the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) once more out of hibernation. It brought the Premier into the building for the first time in a few days and, Mr. Speaker, it interrupted the Provincial Treasurer from his contemplation of the bare bones of the Saskatchewan taxpayers.

**Mr. J.J. Charlebois** (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Where were you the first three days of the session?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say here that it is a rather strange thing to hear the kind of words that we are hearing now from Members opposite about the farmers' plight. You know when I was sitting here I almost for a moment thought that there was a Federal election on, because the only time that I ever hear Liberals talk about a two-price system or anything concerning the farmers is before an election.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — The only time we ever hear any thing from them is at election time, so this is another thing possibly that this resolution may have done. It may have wakened this Government up that is sitting somnolently on the other side of the House, contemplating God knows what, anything but the farmers' situation. They now actually want us to be unanimous on considering something that we have always believed. There has been no question on this side of the House at least about the value of the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — I don't think that we can say the same for the other side of the House, who do everything possible here and there as well as a good many people of their party outside the House to undermine anything that has to do with Government supervision of anything, anything that the Government runs is supposed to be bad and it shouldn't be forgotten. It shouldn't be forgotten that other parties, not ours, think the same way. We probably wouldn't be in this situation today, Mr. Speaker, if it had not been for the actions of a Conservative Government that took coarse grains and feed grains out of the purview of the Canadian Wheat Board. That has resulted in putting farmers, the producers of grain into completely unhealthy competition with one another, the same as they were years ago, and putting them at the mercy of those people that want their pound of flesh in a year when things are pretty rough. We have seen the situation deteriorating. We've seen good wheat, No. 2 wheat, going to feeders in north-western Saskatchewan and certainly in the Saskatoon area for 60 cents a bushel. We have seen implement dealers embark all of a sudden in the feeder business in order to collect their bills. I am not blaming the implement dealers, but this is what is happening and once again picking up their debts and picking up

wheat on the basis of one cent per pound. Who is to blame for this? I suggest people that think like the people opposite do, who first of all weakened the Canadian Wheat Board by taking coarse grains out of the Canadian Wheat Board, which allowed feed grains, including wheat to be peddled to the highest bidder. And the highest bidder is not bidding very high when farmers are faced with creditors, as they are this year. They have no choice! They have no choice but either to give up the machinery that they need for next years operations or to sell their grain at less than half of what it is worth. I haven't heard a thing until now until this Government across the way came out of hibernation last Friday - it was you, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate you - who did the job for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) in telegraphing and phoning the Federal Government. You did the job for that gentleman over there, who has probably gone back into hibernation.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member for The Battlefords is strictly out of order. I did it for the edification and benefit of this House, trying somehow or another to get your confounded motion in order.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, if I did anything that jeopardizes your position, Sir, I am sorry. But I'm still saying that the Government opposite should have known. Certainly we on this side of the House knew what was going on. It seems strange, it seems very strange with all the high-paid help that these people have here and in Ottawa that in an agricultural province they didn't know, that they didn't know what was going on. They have holes in their head. They didn't know whether they were drilled, punched or eaten out by ants.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now I'm going to ask the Member to withdraw one of the most derogatory and dirty remarks I have ever heard in this House. Apologize for that.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — And it won't benefit the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) to sit there and snicker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Surely the matter we are discussing is more important than this.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I want to say, Sir, on this particular resolution, it is certainly high time that the people across the way woke up to the fact that there was something wrong in agriculture.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — If, Sir, I express myself rather strongly in farmer's language, I apologize to the House. I certainly do, I don't want to offend the Chair at all. But I cannot express myself



**March 17, 1969**

in anything but the strongest terms when I see people over there, not aware of what is going on. Therefore, I certainly do, Sir, support this motion that this House do adjourn. It is a sorry and a sad situation when I find people in my constituency who I know are not going to be able to buy fertilizer, who I know already have last year's gasoline, in many cases, still to be paid for, who have grocery bills to be paid for, who have their children's clothing to be paid for, who have back taxes. A good many of these debts are facing these people and certainly the wheat payment that is going to be brought forward, we don't know what the amount is going to be, but it is going to be much less than last year. The whole situation is in a downhill slide. It is high time that this Liberal Government in Saskatchewan and Canada woke up to the fact that the farmer can no longer subsidize cheap bread in Canada any more than it can subsidize all the rest of the commodities that farmers contribute to in the purchase of their day-to-day living and their day-to-day operations. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to adjourn.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. Heggie** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised to hear the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) deliver the speech that he did after he took time out to chastise the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle) for mentioning the presence of two Federal members in this House. I thought that, when he did that, it only was a passing remark and that was to be the end of the partisan debate. But certainly he carried on the partisan debate in the most vitriolic manner that any Member has ever carried it on since I've been here. When he was checked by Mr. Speaker, he certainly deserved it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to take part in this very important debate on wheat. No matter how much diversification of industry there is in Canada, (and might I say the Government and the people generally welcome it), wheat and agriculture will remain for a long time the West's most important industry. Therefore, when the price of wheat goes down all farmers in the West are affected and all people in the West regardless of occupation are affected to some degree. The Province of Saskatchewan bears the brunt because this province is Canada's banner wheat province. This province is the weathervane of the wheat and grain industry and we point the way; hence this emergency debate in this Legislature. Now what are the facts? For a number of years the International Wheat Agreement maintained the price of wheat at over \$2 per bushel. I believe it went as high as \$2.12 or \$2.14 a bushel. From 1963 to 1967, there was a series of good crops in Saskatchewan and farmers turned more and more acreage to wheat production. Better grains, better dry land farming practices, and especially the increased use of fertilizer pushed our production up and up until in 1966, Western Canada, especially Saskatchewan, had the biggest wheat crop on record and all of high quality grain. Meanwhile we had developed new markets in Russia, China, Eastern Europe and Japan. But the factors that helped produce big crops in Western Canada produced big crops elsewhere. France became an exporter of wheat and other grains instead of an importer. New varieties of heavy-yielding wheat from Mexico caught on in places like India, Pakistan and China. Australia overhauled its whole wheat-producing economy and began to bring more acres of the Australian outback into wheat production, and adopted the use of modern tillage and harvest equipment on the North American model. Except

for the odd year of drought Australia has had large and bountiful crops and is growing more bushels of grain every year. Its production is reaching for 500 million bushels which is a good average crop for Western Canada and mark you, Australia stands on the front step of the huge Japanese and Asian markets. Russia too has put more acres of the Siberian steppes into production, and modernized its agricultural plant as well. China is trying to become self-sufficient in grain and rice. India and Pakistan are grasping for self-sufficiency in grain production. The United States has always been the big producer of wheat and, although its domestic market of 200 million people absorbs a lot of it, it still has surpluses to sell in the world markets. The result is, Mr. Speaker, that competition has become keener in the market place. The first crack came in 1967 when wheat went down almost 20 cents per bushel and our Federal Government pegged the price at \$1.95½. With all the wheat to sell in the world market, further strains were inevitable. Now the news last Friday was that the United States, France and Australia were prepared to cut the price per bushel in order to sell wheat. In other words, the competition had reached a boiling point. What was Canada to do? We have had four above-average crops in the last four years and our carryover is big - 660 million bushels. We can't keep this wheat unsold at an unrealistic price and let other wheat exporters steal our seat in the market place. We have to meet competition. Consequently the Wheat Board sought permission to drop the price from one to ten cents per bushel and received this permission from the Canadian Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who feel that this was the proper thing to do. Most farmers I have talked to over the weekend feel this ought to have been done before. If our wheat is competitive it will sell and our markets retained, especially in a year of damp wheat which even though dried may be somewhat inferior. We must move this crop, clean out the bins and get ready for a new crop in 1969. Let's sell the wheat and look forward, not backward. Already I have detected a trend towards diversification in farming in this province brought on by the wheat situation. Farmers are already planning to reduce hard spring wheat acreage and plant durum wheat, flax and oil seeds in its place. Many are quickly converting to cattle production as meat seems to be a commodity with a ready market. Let us clear out this crop and other surpluses and then turn our attention to increased production at a price at which we can meet competition. I'm sure all of us here reaffirm our faith in the Canadian Wheat Board. I do not think there is one farmer in Western Canada who would find fault with what the Wheat Board is doing. I want to ask this House to show its complete confidence in the Wheat Board to meet competition as it confronts it and move toward stabilizing the price of wheat in the world market.

Whether the Government of Canada feels it should stabilize the market by a support price is really another subject altogether. If support prices are feasible, then on what basis I ask? I would say that the Government cannot continue to subsidize the export price of wheat unless it is because wheat is the biggest earner of dollars that Canada has. This would be a justification for it. The Federal Government has to consider many other worthy economic groups who could plead a good case for subsidies. But one thing is clear, Canada cannot continue to support export wheat if it cannot meet competition. If the world does not need our wheat we will have to diversify to products that we can sell in the world markets. Whether the two-

**March 17, 1969**

price system guaranteeing an additional dollar per bushel for wheat consumed on domestic markets is the answer remains to be seen. Certainly it would help. If a farmer could gain a dollar per bushel on, say, the first thousand bushels, it might act as a buffer if the export wheat sold lower in the world markets to meet world competition.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, the problem is markets, a problem that faces the United States, the Argentines, Australia as well as Canada. World wheat markets have always been cyclical. There were good years from 1960-67. We are in a critical time at the moment but we will come out of it and without nationalizing our farms, as advocated by the Young New Democrats.

I say again that wheat markets are a world problem. The Members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition do not need to take my word for it, I give them the word of Charles Gibbings, president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Surely they would not disagree with Mr. Gibbings. Here is what Mr. Gibbings said in his policy statement at the 1968 annual meeting of the Wheat Pool and I quote:

Canadian Wheat exports have been down. One reason is because world wheat production has increased and countries which might have bought more of our wheat have produced more for themselves. In each of the last three years, world wheat production has been over 10 billion bushels. Another reason for declining Canadian exports has to do with the changing technology in the milling and baking industry.

Mr. Gibbings goes on to say what Canada can do about improving our export position in real terms is one of the major questions facing the wheat industry. The low export volume together with the minimum prices of the last year has not generated enough income from wheat to keep the farmer in business, let alone provide incentive for him to improve his production. The latest report of the Saskatchewan Farmer Business Survey, participating farmers in the brown soil zone, the major wheat growing area of Saskatchewan, reported total cost per cultivated acre more than a gross revenue could have been on a six-bushel quota. But Mr. Gibbings speaks out then on the Canadian Wheat Board and I quote:

I must assure you once more and make certain that the outside world understands the Prairie grain farmers do not want the authority and jurisdiction of the Wheat Board reduced in any single way.

Those are the words of Mr. Gibbings.

What we actually want is to extend the jurisdiction of the Board to rye, flax and rapeseed.

Now, I could go on and quote numerous other paragraphs from his speech, but they would not add anything further except to his remarks on the consumption of red meat and he says:

As meat consumption rises per capita there is an increasing opportunity for Western farmers either to increase their livestock output or to increase their coarse grain production.

And I want to say that in summary I could go on and quote

further from his speech which follows the similar line that the matter of markets for Canadian wheat is a world problem and not confined either to this country of Canada or to this Legislature. It is one which will take negotiation on the world level to work it out. He also says:

The Government of Canada should give careful study to the methods used in the various countries to deal with industrial disputes and set up machinery offering an effective means of settling such disputes in instances when private negotiations break down and work stoppage is imminent.

He is obviously referring here to the many strikes of the longshoremen, the grainhandlers and the other people in whose hands the fate of the Western farmer rests.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I might say that A.M. Runciman, president of United Grain Growers, expresses exactly the same thoughts in his speech to the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists at Winnipeg on October 28, 1968; so do all the responsible farm leaders of Western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this House to support the proposed resolution of the Premier which endorses the action of the Wheat Board and suggests reasonable and obtainable alternatives to the Department of Trade and Commerce whose responsibility it is to sell our wheat.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. M. Breker** (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, the crop year of 1968 will go down in history as one of the most difficult as far as the Western farmer is concerned. Just about every hazard and difficulty that can be imagined took place in that year. Depending on the area, there was dry weather, soil drifting, heavy rains, later in the season early frost and wet harvesting conditions, poor exports and finally the possibility of decreased prices and the unthinkable situation of an international price war. Add to these physical conditions the hold-over stocks of wheat and the depressed state of world sales. It adds up to a condition the West hasn't had to face for some years. The sale of low-grade wheat to China and Hungary plus the four million tons to be delivered to Russia - I use the future tense because the agreement hasn't been ratified as yet - doesn't do much to render the picture more pleasing.

Canadian wheat exports have been down. One reason is because world wheat production is up and countries which might have bought more of our wheat have produced more for themselves. In each of the last three years world wheat production has been over 10 billion bushels, and another reason for declining export markets has to do with the changing technology in the milling and the baking industry.

What Canada can do about improving our export business in real terms is one of the major questions facing the wheat industry of today. I support all three of the suggestions in Mr. Premier's intended motion: one, that the minimum floor price be guaranteed by the Federal Government in this crisis, as it did in the 1967-68 crop year when there was no agreement in effect; and two, for reasons given by the Premier, I wholeheartedly

**March 17, 1969**

agree with the two-price system; and thirdly, I must assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House agree with Mr. Gibbings. We believe that the Wheat Boards authority and jurisdiction should not be reduced in any single way. I personally, like Mr. Gibbings, would extend the jurisdiction of the Board to include flax, rye and rapeseed.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that, after the Hon. Member for Morse, the Premier of Saskatchewan, had made his plea for unanimity on this debate, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) would recognize the urgency of the situation and withdraw his motion. The effect of this would have been to shorten the debate. While it is true that Members on this side of the House and on that side of the House would have had to discard their carefully prepared speeches, the total effect would have been to speed up the submission that we hope to make to the Federal Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Breker:** — After all, Mr. Speaker, nothing new has been presented in this debate that will help solve our problems. We do want every effort made by our Federal Government to maintain the international orderly marketing of wheat. I would, therefore, urge again that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) withdraw his motion, that we adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney** (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to add a few words to this debate and I want to deal really with only one aspect of the debate. It seems to me that we have been discussing three or four aspects of the debate. One, whether this House and whether Saskatchewan farmers generally agree with the International Grains Arrangement. And surely the answer to that is Yes, and surely there will be no real debate and real difference of opinion on either side of the House on that question. Surely also, I believe, the Government of Canada and all MPs will agree with the desirability for Canada and for Western farmers of the International Grains Arrangement. Accordingly I don't intend to dwell on that aspect of the issue.

The second issue which has come to the fore in discussion has been the place of the Canadian Wheat Board and I'm not aware of much difference of opinion on that. I believe Members on this side of the House and on that side of the House and generally almost all Members of Parliament, almost all from Western Canada, at least, will agree with the idea of the Canadian Wheat Board. There will be some difference of opinion perhaps as to what particular grains ought to be covered and I for my part agree with the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) and Mr. Gibbings of the Wheat Pool in suggesting that the coverage ought to be extended and not reduced. So, accordingly I don't intend to dwell to any extent on the question of the Canadian Wheat Board and our full support for it.

It seems to me that the gut issue in this debate at this time is the question of support prices.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** —The short question is: will there be minimum support prices in the face of this crisis? Now that's the question. I know that Members on that side of the House agree with the idea of minimum support prices, and I know that we agree with the idea of minimum support prices but when I extend this to ask whether Members of Parliament in Ottawa agree with minimum support prices, I think the unanimity evaporates. In fact, I don't think that there is unanimity or substantial unanimity of view in the House of Commons about minimum support prices, not in the same way that there is with respect to the International Grains Agreement or the Wheat Board. So that really is the issue. How can we persuade the Government at Ottawa to initiate minimum support prices during this crisis?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now I suggest we won't do it by talking about red meat or we won't do it by hearing talk about the history of the Grains Arrangement which the Minister of Agriculture treated us to during the course of his remarks. Nor I think will we do it in the manner which the Premier suggested. He was very, very vigorous in saying what he was going to do, indeed he was. He was going to vigorously pursue this, and he indeed was going to ask the Premier of Alberta to help him and the Premier of Manitoba to help him. But where has he been? Furthermore he told us that in any case there was no particular problem because he had a commitment. He had a Liberal commitment. He had a commitment from Mr. Trudeau.

**An Hon. Member:** — Pretty shaky.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, I want to ask him and other Members of this House whether they feel that the Federal Liberal Cabinet at Ottawa understands this problem, whether they feel that the Hon. Edgar Benson who has to put up the money is familiar with this problem; whether they feel that the Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau is familiar with this problem. It seems to me that any Prime Minister who makes his agricultural policy in the airport in Winnipeg while going from Montreal to Vancouver is not very familiar with Western agricultural problems.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Premier tells us that he's got confidence that the Federal Liberal Government will honour its commitments. But some of us remember some other Liberal commitments. Some of us remember \$2 wheat. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time when the Government at Ottawa should honour a commitment or two on wheat, it's right about now.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We're told that what the solution to this problem is, is the two-price system. Well, the two-price system is hardly a new idea. In fact it was promised election after election. It was promised in 1963 and I want to remind this House, Mr. Speaker,

**March 17, 1969**

that 1963 is six years ago. For six years the Federal Liberal Government has been hide-bound with inertia. It has been in a state of total immobility on this question.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I want to remind Hon. Members that five years ago the Member for Morse, the Premier, became Premier of this Province and for five years on this issue he has been hide-bound with inertia. He has been totally immobile on this issue. I think the time has come for us to stop making speeches on this issue and I think the time has come for us to start acting on this issue.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I have a few suggestions on how to act on this issue.

**An Hon. Member:** — Tell us what the NDP did.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, all right. The Members opposite will know that we're having a little debate on NATO in Canada. It's called involvement. It's called participation and dialogue. And in the course of this, Cabinet Ministers in one part of Canada are saying one thing and Cabinet Ministers in another part of Canada are saying another thing. Well, I suggest a little bit of dialogue on this matter of support prices. And I suggest that it's time for the Cabinet Minister from Saskatoon-Humboldt, the Hon. Otto Lang, to stand up and tell us where he stands on this issue.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I suggest the time has come for a statement by this long-sought-after Liberal Cabinet Minister so that we will know just where at least Saskatchewan Liberals stand on this issue.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Because it's very easy for Saskatchewan Liberals sitting in this Legislature. Of course they're in favour of support prices because they don't have to live up to it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, you fellows . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — How about the Saskatchewan Liberals who have to deliver the goods? We'll see how the Hon. Otto Lang stands.

**An Hon. Member:** — We've got another . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I am by no means sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Government at Ottawa is getting all of the best advice from the Hon. James Richardson and some other well-known guardians of the Canadian Wheat Board, I think perhaps someone opposite ought to be prodding the Hon. Otto Lang a bit. May I suggest that the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) might well say to Otto Lang, "Either you make a statement or so far as I'm

concerned my organization isn't yours next time round."

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I suggest to the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) that he might make the same statement, "Either you stand up and speak for the farmer or I'll not have my organization working for you next time round." And I say for the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) who has just spoken, how about him telling the Member of Parliament for Saskatoon-Humboldt that that's the situation. Either put up or shut up for the farmers.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — How about the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) what's he going to say?

**Mr. Breker:** — I did already.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — He did already, well, isn't that interesting.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Because I have stood here and listened to this debate for well over two hours. I have heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) stand up. He told us what ought to be done but not a word about what he had done. The Premier told us what ought to be done, what he'd done this morning, but not anything about what he did as late as yesterday

**Hon. D.G. Steuart** (Provincial Treasurer): — Speak up . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Not one Member opposite has told us what they have done constructively in support of this alleged baby of theirs, two-price system or \$2 wheat. They did not, Mr. Speaker, take any action. The Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) was on his feet. If in fact he had done this, if in fact he had made representations to his Member, I am sure he would have told him.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What have you done?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I am perfectly prepared to say and do now say that I made representations to my Member for Parliament and he is going to . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — That's right. Maybe he is sitting there but at least he knows where I stand and I want to know whether the Hon. Otto Lang knows where those people stand.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that Members opposite are



**March 17, 1969**

in support but when the chips are down, when there's something that they could do, when there's some little arm-twisting they could do with respect to their Member of Parliament, they are silent. They have not told us one word about what they have actually done.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Our Member of Parliament . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The facts are this . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) will be able to stand up and tell us what he's told his Member of Parliament as soon as I am through my remarks. All I want to say is this. The Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) was silent. The Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) was silent. The Member for Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) was silent. The Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) was silent.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — These people could have done something and they have done nothing. Mr. Speaker, we can talk about passing resolutions and I hope we do pass this Resolution, but I think we will know whether anyone is sincere by the way they act. The way they can act is to put the squeeze on their Member of Parliament and until they have done that, they have not done anything but waste the time of this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I have done this and I stand up and say so and I note very carefully that Members opposite have not said this. I note that the Member for Bengough (Mr. Mitchell) has been silent, notwithstanding the fact that his Member is supposedly influential at Ottawa.

**Mr. J.J. Charlebois** (Saskatoon City Park-University): — You're picking on . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) as far as I'm aware . .

**An Hon. Member:** — He's not here . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No, he's there. His Member is down at Ottawa.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Charlebois:** — Could I ask the Hon. Member a question.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, of course.

**Mr. Charlebois:** — How come you forgot the Hon. Member from Nutana Centre (Mr. Estey)?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, I felt that I was speaking about the influential Members.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I simply want to say this and I want to say it in all seriousness that it is all very well for us to pass the Resolution, I trust we will and I trust it will be passed unanimously. Whether it's the Resolution propounded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) or the Premier is irrelevant. They are very similar in their tone. But I do suggest that, if anyone is serious about trying to get support prices for wheat, there is only one way to do it. That is to attempt to influence the Liberal Cabinet at Ottawa, which notwithstanding what Members opposite say is by no means disposed to give us support prices. And the only way to do that is for Members who have influence with the Hon. Otto Lang and with Mr. Ab Douglas, to use that influence. I urge Hon. Members opposite to do that. And if they can tell this House that they've done it, I'll be very grateful to them.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one word. I agree that everyone should get in touch with their Member of Parliament and my Member of Parliament sitting over, Mr. Burton . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — So do I.

**Mr. Steuart:** — . . and I say, please, Mr. Burton, go back to Ottawa, earn your \$18,000 and get fighting for the farmers of Western Canada.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this Province has not sat hide-bound over the years in not saying anything in favour of the farmers. He has fought and he has done everything in his power to try and get a two-price system in, for example. He will continue to do this. I would suggest, also, at the same time that we are pleading with Members on this side to show some support by using our influence - and I think he is right. The only way that we will get it is for us to use influence with our Members of Parliament, because there is no use using any influence with the Opposition Members of Parliament who represent this area down there, the NDP, because obviously even the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) knows they have no influence, I guess, or they wouldn't be here. I agree that we should use our influence and we should fight and we will fight. This Government has never been found wanting when it is called to fight with anyone, for anyone, for the Western farmers and we will continue to do this.

I would ask the Members opposite to use some influence in an area where they might have some influence and that is to speak to some of their very influential labour Members in Eastern Canada and ask them for a change, to support the proposition of the Western farmers, when it comes forward as it will. If they do this they can use their influence in some area where it might

**March 17, 1969**

do some good, for example, to use a little more discretion, a little more responsibility at times when it would, in fact, help the Western farmers.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky** (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — The only reason that I want to add a few words to this debate is to get some facts on record indicating the situation in my part of the constituency. I know that we may argue here but eventually we'll all join and vote together, because we can do nothing else but speak up for all the people of Saskatchewan. I've said over the years that insofar as the Northern part of Saskatchewan is concerned, and all across the Northern parkland we've had a very distressing situation. I know from personal experience that farmers have been barely holding on to the little bit of land that they call a home though over the years we've made representations in this House. I do not think the Government really did very much about it. I still remember the time when we had a debate similar to this in this House. Later we asked the present Premier what he'd done about it. He told us, "Oh, well, I phoned Ottawa." That's how unimportant he considered the farm situation to be. But, be that as it may, the fact is that we've now come to a position where there's a point of no return. We've come to a point now whether or not the farmers are going to be able to remain on the land. I'm not thinking of the farmers living in the choice areas of Saskatchewan around Regina, Rosetown or maybe at Kamsack-Canora, I'm thinking about all the other areas of Saskatchewan which are not blessed with the best soil in the world. It's no use for anyone to argue here that the law of supply and demand is going to resolve anything. We've been told over the years, farmers have been told, all they have to do when they've got too much wheat is to go into cattle. We heard that today from the Premier. The farmers should diversify he said. In my part of the country the farmers have diversified over the years, and they have had some very sad experiences, because when they stopped growing wheat and went into cattle, for some reason or other the cattle dropped to a price where it became uneconomic to raise cattle. So they were just barely holding on to their farms. And when they went into producing hogs, it was the same story. The price of hogs dropped to a point which was not profitable to raise hogs. We heard the same story and the same request to the farmers as far back, I recall, as the Hon. James G. Gardiner who talked about diversification and that was his answer. I heard the same story 10 or 12 years ago in this House when we had a committee and we discussed the same problem about supply and demand. The free enterprise experts told us then, "The answer is you have too much wheat. Go ahead into cattle." And I remember asking the question: if there is too much cattle what then? "Well, go back to the wheat," we were told.

Now it's not just as simple as that. We know the causes of oversupply today. It was brought up in this House. Every Member knew before you people mentioned it. This was a world situation. But it doesn't matter what the world situation is, my friends. We have a country here and we have an economy here that we must sustain.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — If the farmer goes bankrupt then I agree with the Premier that this would be tragic. This is the first time that I've

heard him say that if the farmers go down then the whole economy will go into bankruptcy. This is a fact. This is true, because agriculture is still the most important industry in our country. Without farmers and without food, we won't have industries, we won't have factories, we won't have anything. So we must try and save this industry.

It's no use blaming the difficulties of the farmer on the dockworkers who were on strike because I can immediately return the argument and ask: well, what did the Government do about it? Couldn't it have sold considerable millions bushels of wheat via Churchill where the port was open? So this is no argument at all. We come back to the same point. How is the farmer going to retain his land so that he can continue to produce for Canada and for the people of Canada? How do you do it? Well, you do it the same way in a private enterprise society as you have been doing it with other industries. When Canada was short of boats, Canada took the farmers' money and it took other people's money and it subsidized the ship-building to the tune of 50 per cent. This is all right for Canada because work was provided. The money went into circulation and so our economy benefited accordingly. Canada today as a country subsidizes coal mines and gold mines and Lord knows what. And nobody says it's wrong but for some reason or other, people in this country, and particularly those who used to believe or still believe in the free enterprise say, Oh, but you can't subsidize the farmers. As a matter of fact the Premier said today that, if there's going to be any subsidy, it has to come out of the consumer's pocket, don't dare ask the Treasury! Canadian taxpayers generally, the millionaires and the middle class and the poor too, all contribute. Get the consumers to pay for it. Mr. Speaker, it isn't just the consumers that subsidize the gold mines. It isn't just the consumers that subsidize the ship-building companies, and it isn't just the consumers in this province that subsidize big industries, Mr. Premier. All of us subsidize them. And it's about time we got that one main point settled, which is, that farmers are in trouble. This is an important industry for Canada, we can't see it go bankrupt completely. It's just about bankrupt. What we must do is ask the Dominion Government to do what's been done in other countries and must be done here as well, and that's to subsidize the agricultural economy, whether it's cattle or wheat or whatever else the farmers produce.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'm all in favour of what has been said in this debate. I cannot say other than what I have said for my people. They are hard up. This is the last straw. If the price of grain, wheat or coarse grain goes down, they're finished farming and will all move to Prince Albert, and will either be working in the pulp mill or will find themselves on social aid. That's what will happen to them. But I hope it never happens. I still have faith in this country and the governments of this country.

I'll just conclude with this. I hope that we never again hear of the benefits of free enterprise, because if at any time we heard anybody in this province stand up and show how free enterprise has failed, it was when the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan got up today, saying we must do something to save the farmers. Why hasn't free enterprise been successful in resolving such problems?

**March 17, 1969**

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I do not intend to prolong the debate. Others will say things that I have not covered.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must draw the attention of the Members to the fact that the mover of the motion was seeking to close the debate and the reply in connection therewith, if there is any question in the minds of any Member, because generally a motion to adjourn is not debatable and therefore the debate couldn't be closed on it. I draw your attention to page 426 of May's Parliamentary Guide, "Reply is only allowed to a Member who has proposed a substandard question to the House, and this privilege is accorded to the mover of the substandard motion for the adjournment of the House."

**Mr. Lloyd:** — This compounded Resolution as it has been called, has created a very considerable amount of gratifying interest on the part of the Members of the Legislature. Certainly as the mover of the motion, I am pleased that a number of the Members have found the topic important enough for them to put their comments on the records of this Legislature. It seems to me that no one has disagreed with the two main proposals which I was making. Those two main proposals were first, that this House ought to speak with a united voice and an emphatic voice in support of the principles of orderly marketing of grain at adequate prices by a public agency. The second of those principles was that, if it was impossible to convince the other nations of the world to carry on with the International Grains Arrangements then the Federal Government must step into the breach. The Federal Government must do that by guaranteeing to the producers of wheat in Canada a price benefit comparable to that which is provided under the International Grains Arrangement. That would be guaranteeing a price of \$1.95 or \$1.97½ a bushel, something like that. There has, I think, been no substantial argument raised against those and most people have in fact specifically indicated approval of those two ideas. And it is those two ideas which I think are most important for us to impress on the Federal Government. It is those two ideas which it is most important for us to impress on the people of Canada. The importance of those ideas must be carved into the minds and as a result be reflected by actions of the Government of Canada. That is why it seems to be wise that our Resolution which we sent should not get over complicated with additional ideas which indeed are valuable. My reference here of course is to the suggestion that we ought to include in our Resolution the idea of the two-price system. As I indicated while I was speaking, Mr. Speakers I felt discussion of the two-price idea was ruled out, because there was a Resolution on the Order Paper initiated by my colleague the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer), calling for a two-price system and so I did not speak on it. Certainly it is a concept with which we agree, but it seems to me at this point we ought to hammer, and hammer as hard as we can on the two points I mentioned, the preservation if at all possible of the principle of orderly marketing with straining, as I said, of every economic and political muscle in Canada to that end. Secondly, if that can't be done, then it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to guarantee price benefits comparable under the agreement to the farmers of Canada. These it seems to me to be the things which we ought to hit and hit hard. If

we extend the argument beyond that then we diffuse the effect of our argument, I think, to some extent.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might call it 5:30 as I have some more to say.

The House recessed at 5:30 to 7:30 o'clock p.m.

### INTRODUCTION OF AIR CADETS

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney** (Regina Centre): — I would like to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all Members of the House, a group of air cadets in the Speakers gallery. They are the No. 703 squadron based upon the Queen building in Regina. There are about 20 in number, 21 maybe now that a couple more have come, led here by their chief instructor, Mr. Trenker. This is part of their training in citizenship. Mr. Trenker is a teacher at Campbell Collegiate and the boys are students at various schools in Regina. I know that all Members of the House would like to join with me in extending to them a cordial welcome to the House and to express the wish that their stay with us will be enjoyable and interesting.

### DEBATE ON EMERGENCY ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Lloyd for an Emergency Adjournment.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, when 5:30 was called I had expressed some gratification at the considerable agreement there seemed to be in the House with respect to the two main points which I suggested. I had proposed that we needed to speak together and speak emphatically with regard to support of the principle of orderly marketing by a public agency, that we had to speak together and with emphasis on the idea that the farmer couldn't carry the loss, in any loss, in price of grain himself, but that this was the responsibility of the total Canadian nation. I had also, as I recall it, Mr. Speaker, suggested that, in my opinion at least, it was preferable to consolidate our argument on those two points. While we have considerable and complete agreement with the two-price system, as indicated by a motion on the Order Paper now, we felt that this one might perhaps be better left until later on.

May I this evening turn to some of the remarks which were made by Members opposite with which I don't find such substantial agreement. For example, I think of the comment made by several Members with respect to the presence in Saskatchewan of two New Democratic Members of Parliament. I believe the first reference came from the Member from Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle). I doubt if it really originated with him. It looked to me like one of these plays sent in from the bench of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), and he simply proceeded to tote the ball. This happens every once in awhile over there. May I say, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question as to what these Members are doing in Saskatchewan, they are for one thing communicating with their constituents and the people of Saskatchewan about some very real problems that face Saskatchewan here.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**March 17, 1969**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Perhaps I may put on the record a statement made earlier today by the Member of Parliament from Regina East Federal constituency. He says:

The Western Canadian economy will be left in shambles if the Federal Government fails to support farmers in the international grain crisis. The one major and critical flaw in Mr. Pepin's statement on Friday was that there was no hint that the Federal Government would stand behind the farmer. Without such support Prairie farmers will have to bear the full cost of an international grain price war. The Federal Government has an economic, moral and possibly a legal obligation to support the price of wheat. Economically a failure to support wheat prices would be catastrophic to Western Canada and would seriously impair the Canadian economy. Morally and legally it was Canada as a nation that signed the International Grains Arrangement. It is Canada as a nation that should fight the price war, not the Prairie farmer alone who is already facing a serious cost-price squeeze. As a start there should be an immediate guarantee of \$1.95½, the equivalent to the minimum price level of the International Grains Arrangement. This should be followed by immediate steps to introduce a guaranteed minimum of \$2.13 per bushel as requested by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

That is the end of the statement which Mr. John Burton, MP for Regina East made on behalf of his constituents and the people of Saskatchewan this afternoon.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to ask Hon. Members to contrast that with the statement reported by the Hon. Mr. Otto Lang reported on television news this evening. Mr. Lang said, "Oh, yes, there are problems in the West, the Federal Government doesn't pay much attention to them." Not once did he say anything of the necessity of a two-price wheat system. Not once did he say anything about the necessity of a guaranteed price of wheat in this emergency situation. Not once did he mention the situation as it is in Saskatchewan at all. Now here was the Liberal representative in the capital of Canada speaking at this time when the Members over there admit there is a great crisis facing Saskatchewan farmers, speaking in the heart of industrial Ontario, and saying nothing whatsoever, while he remained in the East, about these problems.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I suggest to the Members over there that they heed the request of the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) who urged them to get some contact with the Liberal representatives in the Parliament at Ottawa from the Province of Saskatchewan.

I want to say something else about those two Members since they have been drawn into the debate by the Members opposite here. May I suggest to them that they take a few minutes and look back at the records in *Hansard* over the last four, five, six months. Look at the speeches these two Members have made about Saskatchewan agriculture. Look at the proposals these people have offered with respect to the problems of Saskatchewan agriculture. Let them look at the motions these Members have

moved with respect to alleviating the problems of Saskatchewan farmers. They have spoken consistently about the problems of damp grain for example, at a time when my Hon. Members across the way were completely and supinely silent. For months and weeks they had nothing to say. Nor did Mr. Lang. Mr. Douglas, I admit, did have a little bit to say. These Members were talking about the problems of boxcar allocation, its unfairness and its inadequacy in this problem. They were talking about this when the Hon. Cabinet Ministers opposite sat quietly and supinely without a word to say on behalf of this problem. They talked about the problems of shipping and the sudden falling off of sales, while Members opposite for months and months in this province had nothing to say in representing the Saskatchewan farmer to the ears of their fellow Cabinet Ministers, fellow Liberals, in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) during this period had much more to say about his difficulties in collecting the little tax that he put on food last year than he had to say about the problems of farmers selling wheat. And I say to these gentlemen who have attempted to be critical this afternoon, when the Liberal representatives from Canada in the Parliament of Canada, plus the entire Cabinet which sits across here have raised half as much hell in support of the Saskatchewan farmers, as the two Members they mentioned this afternoon, then maybe they will have a right to say something about it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Just take for example, Mr. Speaker, take for example the example of this last weekend. This news was known on Friday at 11 o'clock or so I believe. I am sure that the Premier got calls from the press and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) got calls from the press about the same time I did. They sat quiet and said nothing for the rest of Friday, for all of Saturday, for all of Sunday and not until this morning did they gather up their courage or their wits, and say a single word about this. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this long delay speaks for itself with regard to the readiness of these people to stand on guard on behalf of Saskatchewan agriculture.

There is all this talk in the press about the kind of a hot line to the Prime Minister's office in Ottawa - regional phones all over the place, one for the West here, one for the East here, one for the Maritimes here, people ready to grab them at the drop of a hat. My hon. friends across the way seemingly have lost the number or else nobody was answering these phones on Friday, because they couldn't find out a single, solitary thing about it.

Mr. Speakers let me turn to some of the other comments that have been made this afternoon. With respect, it was to begin with, until some of you characters over there entered into a partisan debate on the matter. And it would have continued that way. If you gentlemen want to be pirates you will find us willing to be pirates and a half, and you can take your choice in the matter.

Now let me turn to the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think there is only one thing to say about that speech of the Minister of Agriculture and that



**March 17, 1969**

is a question. The question is: was that speech really necessary? Now, I can think of nothing more to say about it, except perhaps, listening to it it helped to explain the reason why the Federal Government doesn't listen to what they have to say over there.

There were a couple of general types of comments from some of the Members opposite which I suggest need to give us some concern. There was a suggestion by some of them at least that this whole problem could be taken care of if we were to diversify sufficiently. Nobody is going to disagree with the merits of considerable diversification, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is dangerous to have Members of this Legislature even hinting the suggestion that there would be no problem if we diversified sufficiently. If we are going to have diversification, let me repeat something that I suggested this afternoon. Let's not have it because of the use of an economic shotgun. That's really what is being suggested over there. If you can starve people out of growing wheat then perhaps they will diversify and produce some other products. They say that. If we starve people out of producing wheat into other areas of production which are no better or even less protected, then we are not necessarily doing a good long-time service to farm people and the agriculture industry in Canada. Take for example the people who are forced at the end of this economic shotgun into the production of livestock, or into the production of rape, or into the production of mustard. They have less production, less protection even than the wheat producer has at the moment. I admit the livestock producer at this point in time does seem to have some certainty of market for his goods in the reasonable future. Let me say also to the Premier and some of the others over there that they seem to overlook one of the reasons why there is a better market for the producer of livestock. One of the reasons why there is a better market is because some of the trade unions which they assail so frequently, which they criticize so much, have been able to keep the purchasing power of the worker up somewhat. If it wasn't for many of those actions putting some cash in the worker's pocket then he wouldn't be able to buy nearly as much beef to put some lunch in his basket from the sources such as Saskatchewan farmers.

Secondly, it seems to me in this regard, Mr. Speaker, that what some of the Members over there hint at, is that we can safely leave the decisions of agriculture to be made as the result of economic pressures. All you have to do is to let the economic pressure push hard enough and people get shoved into this slot or that slot. The human decision doesn't matter a bit, just let the economic pressure operate and push people around. That surely is not good enough in a civilized and decent society. Diversification by a shotgun is not the answer to Saskatchewan's agricultural problem. It is not the answer just to force people out of wheat production into the unprotected production in a number of other areas.

Thirdly, I want to mention briefly a point which I thought the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) was trying to make. He seemed to be suggesting that cheap wheat wasn't such a bad thing after all. I hope I am not misinterpreting his remarks. He seemed to be suggesting that cheap wheat would in a sense stimulate the whole economy of Canada. What we have to remember I think that is in the long run cheap wheat doesn't necessarily sell any more wheat than wheat at the price that we are now trying to sell it under the International Grains Arrangement. Let's

remember this, that the other countries which may be selling their wheat cheaper to the consumers of other nations are in fact subsidizing their own producers, so as to make the production of that wheat possible at some kind of adequate level to the producers of that country, and this we should do likewise.

Let me turn to some more of the remarks of the Premier (Mr. Thatcher). For example, Mr. Speaker, he told us of cosy little tête-à-têtes that he had with the contenders for the Liberal leadership before they elected a leader. He suggested to us that he had been able to wrest from them commitments, five, I think he said, out of the group. What was the commitment that he said he got? He got a commitment from them that they were ready to consider the two-price system of wheat, not that they would be in favour but that they would consider it. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that, at that point of time before the leadership choice had been made, most of those gentlemen would have been ready to make a commitment to consider almost anything that was suggested to them. I can't really believe that this can be considered to be binding promise. You know probably somebody agreed to consider to make Judy a judge, I don't know. And probably they considered to make some other people a judge, I don't know. And probably they considered they would send Joey to the Senate or somebody else to the Senate, I don't know, but I can't really believe that the Premier expects us to take that commitment very seriously. I can't really believe that he expects us to take it seriously in view of what has happened before with respect to two-price wheat. What has happened since? Since that time, Mr. Speaker, we had the Federal campaign. I recall no mention whatsoever by any Liberal candidate that he would support a two-price system for wheat. I recall no mention whatsoever. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I recall no mention whatsoever of any Liberal Cabinet Minister in Saskatchewan speaking on the hustings in the Federal campaign that they would support a two-price system of wheat. As a matter of fact the whole thing was dropped, as empty a promise as many of those words that come from the lips of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), as he sits and snaps and snarls in his seat.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back to what had happened before this. In 1962 or 1963 - I have forgotten which - Mr. Pearson who was then Leader of the Opposition spoke in the city of Saskatoon, before the election. As he spoke in the city of Saskatoon he promised that one of the things the Liberal party would do if elected was to implement a two-price system for wheat. All Saskatchewan knows it. Mr. Pearson, as Leader of the Opposition, said, "Elect Liberals and we will have a two-price system for wheat." The country elected the Liberals, and as the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) reminded us this afternoon, that was some six years ago. In the face of that, in the face of what has happened since the choice of the new Leader, the Premier asks us to have faith in the Prime Minister, and in the Federal Liberals, and maybe we will get the two-price system for wheat. I think it is only important to mention this so that the Premier doesn't really believe that he is kidding the people of Saskatchewan on that line anymore. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier suggested a Resolution which he would be happy to move and happy to have passed in this Legislature.

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall** (Souris-Estevan): — Non-partisan.

**March 17, 1969**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Non-partisan as was my Resolution which I proposed. He ventured this Resolution. Speaking to the press, I understand from reading the evening paper, when he met them this morning he proposed that maybe I would be ready to second his motion. I haven't seen it yet. The Premier hasn't been thoughtful enough to let me see what he hopes I might second. That may be a little bit unusual under the circumstances. But, may I point out this, as I heard it when he spoke, it seemed to me to fail in at least one important essential and I may not have heard it well. It seemed to me that it did not speak up as distinctly and emphatically on the principle of maintaining an orderly marketing system through a public agency as we ought to do. It mentioned the two-price system and that is good enough.

As for my Resolution that I had suggested I hoped to move, Mr. Speaker, it contained two essentials on which it seemed well to concentrate - urging and supporting the Federal Government in its attempts to maintain the system of orderly marketing, and second, saying to the Federal Government, if this is not successful then we must save what we have at home. This can only be done if the Federal Government puts the Federal Treasury in a position to provide guarantees to Saskatchewan farmers. These guarantees would have to be at amounts comparable to these in the present International Grains Arrangement. As I understand our particular situation because of this rather odd procedure, Mr. Speaker, it is possible for my Resolution to get before the House only if I can move it with consent. But, before I can move it with consent, I have to have the consent of the House to withdraw the motion which I have now before the Legislature, "That this House do now adjourn." I would hope I would have an opportunity to move the Resolution I suggested earlier, a copy of which you have, Sir, a copy which the Premier has had for some hours now. The Government may wish to support, it may wish to amend it, but I would hope that I would have leave, if I am given leave to withdraw the motion to adjourn, to move that motion. With that hope expressed, Mr. Speaker, I now ask leave to withdraw the motion that this House do now adjourn.

Leave granted and motion withdrawn.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I spoke at some length this afternoon and I see no point in repeating the arguments which I made. But I do suggest that it might be helpful if this Legislature could pass a Resolution which is moved by the Premier as head of the Government, and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). We have listened to speakers on both sides today, and I don't think there is very much difference in the views which have been expressed. I don't know whether the Liberal Government in Ottawa is likely to listen to our Resolution or not, but I suggest that it is more likely to listen to a resolution moved by a Provincial Liberal Government than to one moved by a Socialist Opposition.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I had hoped that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and my hon. friends would be non-political today. This is a matter of such vital importance I don't see why they should play politics. However . .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — What procedure is the Premier . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I am about to move a motion.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I just wondered what it was all about.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He is making a speech and I presume, when he is through making a speech, he is going to submit a motion.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — All right I will move this motion, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the Opposition won't talk it out. Because if they talk it out, I think they will be harming the interest of the farmer in Saskatchewan. I move seconded by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart):

That this Assembly express complete confidence in the Canadian Wheat Board in its efforts to maintain international wheat prices; and further that this Assembly request the Government of Canada to immediately implement support prices for export wheat, equal to the minimum price in the International Grains Arrangement; and further that the Federal Government be urged to make regulations providing that the market price of wheat milled for domestic consumption shall be \$1.00 per bushel above the International Grains Arrangement floor price, such price increased to be charged to the consumers and not to the Federal Treasury.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It appears that we have here a conflict of interest which it is necessary for the Chair by some method or another to resolve. We have two motions offered, neither of which has had official notice given, and both of which or either one would require leave of the House to be proceeded with. Both indicate a desire for a support price for wheat rather than a guaranteed price and in my view therefore don't conflict with the motion on the Order Paper moved by the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer). It is now necessary to decide which one of these motions the Chair is going to put before the House for debate.

I draw your attention to Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, page 399:

Stated generally the rule against anticipation (which applies to other proceedings as well as motions) is that a matter must not be anticipated, if it is contained in a more effective form of proceedings than the proceeding by which it is sought to be anticipated . . . A Bill or other order of the day is more effective than a motion; a substantive motion more effective than the motion for the adjournment of the House.

Therefore, it becomes necessary in my view for the Chair to decide which one of these motions if passed by the House would be the most effective. I cannot but have in mind the seriousness of the matter that we are debating and the problem that has been discussed and its political effect on all of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and particularly the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan of which I am one, my bins are as full

**March 17, 1969**

of wheat as anyone else's. I can come to no other conclusion than that the motion moved by the Premier of the Province, seconded if he wishes to, (as was requested by the Premier), by the Leader of the Opposition, if passed by this House would be more effective and more binding and productive of more concrete results than any other type of motion which could possibly be put before the House at this time.

Before the motion can be proceeded with, it requires the leave of the House. It has been moved by the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher), (and I am still in a quandary as to who is going to second it), seconded by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart).

I draw your attention to the fact that this motion is just as amendable as any other.

Is leave granted?

Agreed.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, as I intimated earlier, I had not seen the Resolution which the Premier was suggesting I might second, if I were a good boy . . . At least that is approximately what he said. As I intimated in some earlier remarks, it seemed to me that it was perhaps somewhat deficient in one way only. If I may comment on that. The Resolution says:

That this Assembly express complete confidence in the Canadian Wheat Board in its efforts to maintain international wheat prices.

With that there is no problem with us whatsoever in agreeing. But, may I suggest, Sir, that this is where the deficiency in the motion comes in. It is not alone the responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board to put forth an effort to maintain international wheat prices. Surely at this point, the Government of Canada enters into it. When the representatives of the exporting nations meet in the near future to attempt to salvage the International Grains Arrangement, it will not be the Wheat Board as the main spokesman for Canada. I should think it would be the Government of Canada. It is negotiating a national agreement. I do hope that the Government would accept a proposal, which I think strengthens the Resolution. My proposal would be to amend the Resolution or propose an amendment seconded by Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre):

That the following words be inserted after the word "prices" in the second line"

"urgently requests the Government of Canada to use all steps available to it to ensure effective observance and operation of the International Grains Arrangement as part of a system of orderly international marketing of grain."

In all sincerity I suggest that inserting these words at that point does strengthen the Resolution. It would then continue to read in the terms which the Premier has proposed. So, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Member from Regina Centre, if we can have just a minute to word it so that it fits in. I so move.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government I would like to say that we would be very happy to accept that amendment. Again I repeat when we pass the motion as amended which I imagine we will do, I still think it would be helpful if the Leader of the Opposition would agree to second that motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now in order to get the debate in order at this junction, if it is desired that the House change the seconder of this motion, it would have to be done by leave. Now the mover of the motion has asked leave to change the seconder from that of . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . agreed, I don't know.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I am going to get around to seeing whether he is or not. The mover of the motion has suggested that the seconder be changed from the Member for Prince Albert West to the Leader of the Opposition. I ask the Leader of the Opposition: is he agreeable?

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Yes. I am probably the most agreeable person in the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I now ask the House: is leave for this change granted? Leave granted.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of something or other, I wonder if the Premier would agree. In the Resolution the words, Grain Agreement are used. I believe the correct terminology is 'Grains Arrangement.' Could we have it for the record.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Yes, that is quite all right.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I think that is a matter of form and I'll change it up here. Now, just a minute, we now . . . Order, order! Order! We now have the seconder of the motion moving the amendment. Is leave granted for that?

Leave granted.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to nemine contradicente.

### ST. PATRICK'S DAY TRIBUTE

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, it is obvious there are too many leprechauns around here today. Enthusiastic Irishmen insist that one day on each year is not enough, that the allocation of March 17 to celebrate St. Patrick's Day and to pay tribute to the good qualities and accomplishments of the Irish is inadequate. These people insist that each Legislature and every elected Assembly should allocate a second day. The first day would provide the time for eulogizing the qualities of the Irish and the second to list their accomplishments.

**March 17, 1969**

Let me begin by reminding this Assembly of intelligent hon. friends and gentlemen who are possessed with the finest judgement and the noblest motives that they know full well that the Irish are exuberant, enthusiastic, patient, polite, good-natured, thoughtful, romantic, kind-hearted, cautious, considerate citizens . . . Mr. Speaker, until we have been allocated a second day, and more time is available, it is not my intention on this St. Patrick's Day to remind this Assembly of learned, gallant and generous Legislators of the many accomplishments of the Irish. It is my intention only, Sir, to ask all Hon. Members to join with me in paying tribute and expressing best wishes to the Irish people of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky** (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Once again, I didn't intend to speak. But you know, the Ukrainian people are very closely related to the Irish people. They tell us that the Celts and the Scythians and Slays at one time all lived to the north of the Black Sea. These Irish Celts were all very fine people, humorous, full of song, and really gentle in character. The difference is this, that the Ukrainians stayed put by the shores of the Black Sea and the Celts or the Irish, couldn't stay put. They just kept on travelling until they ended up in the great land of Eire. Of course, we find some of them here now. I certainly wish to add my few words for the Irish who live in my constituency and those in the Province of Saskatchewan and across Canada. It is wonderful to have a few minutes to enjoy and honour them on an occasion like this.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.G. Steuart** (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, if William O'Berezowsky can say a word for the Irish, I can say something for the Ukrainians . . . I would just like to join in with my seatmate from Prince Albert, to say, if those Ukrainians stayed so well put, how come there are so many of them in Prince Albert East-Cumberland. That's all I want to know. But I would join with the Hon. Member and Members from this side . . . I really expected Gallagher (Yorkton) to say a word, but he has been struck dumb after 5:00 o'clock. Gallagher doesn't say anything unless he gets paid double time - I don't think. But we join with the Member opposite and his wonderful sentiment on the 17th of Ireland.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — While I can't claim any Irish ancestors in my family tree, I was today the recipient of this very fine Irish dudeen. It was given to me by presumably the leprechauns, and though I can't claim family affinity, I now consider that I have a good case to claim a spiritual affinity with that wonderful race of people, the Irish.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 9:58 o'clock p.m.