

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature
19th Day

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

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

On the Orders of the Day:

Hospital Care Insurance Plan

Moved by Mrs. Cooper (Regina City), seconded by Mr. Erb (Milestone):

“That, in view of the Federal Government’s announced intention to exclude mental hospitals and tuberculosis sanatoria from its proposed Federal-Provincial Hospital Care Insurance Plan, and of the fact that such exclusion appears discriminatory against the sick requiring care and treatment in such institutions,

“this Assembly is of the opinion that the contributions of the Government of Canada to the hospitalization of the mentally ill and of those undergoing treatment in tuberculosis sanatoria, should be on the same basis as for those hospitalized from any other cause.”

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): - Mr. Speaker, for many years it has taken a great deal of hard work and pressure on the part of a great many organizations – political groups, church organizations, labour organizations, farm organizations, municipalities – to bring the Federal Government to the place where it appears now ready to institute the first stages of a comprehensive hospitalization plan for Canada. That is, of course, provided that six provinces will sign the agreement and that those six provinces contain the majority of the population of Canada.

The Federal Government is to be commended on the fact that at long last they have arrived at the place where they are approaching the provinces with a very definite proposition, and it is my earnest hope that the provinces and the Federal Government will move on this matter with the greatest of speed. Certainly, as far as Saskatchewan is concerned, we are ready right now to start in with the plan – not only the hospital part of it, but we are prepared to start in with a comprehensive full-scale health insurance plan for Canada, and there will be no delay as far as Saskatchewan is concerned.

But when, and if, there is a comprehensive health insurance plan in Canada, certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think the C.C.F. Party can claim the lion’s share of the credit. Year in and year out, for over 40 years now, men like Mr. J.S. Woodsworth, Mr. M.J. Coldwell, and C.C.F. members in parliament and out of parliament, everywhere they could, have kept the matter of a national

March 6, 1956

health insurance plan before the people of Canada. Every year they have brought resolutions in to the Federal House; the matter has been discussed in the Saskatchewan Legislature, and we in the C.C.F. welcome any action on the part of the Federal Government that is a step towards a health insurance plan and we will keep on pressing for improvements until Canada has finally achieved a fully comprehensive national health insurance plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched the reports of the deliberations of the conference at Ottawa on Federal Health Insurance that was held in January, with the keenest of interest, and when the word first came out that the Federal Government was prepared to pay approximately 50 per cent of the cost of a national health insurance plan, I was certainly very pleased. But, a few days later, much to my dismay – and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, much to the dismay of a lot of people in Canada – I discovered that the Federal Government was planning to exclude patients in mental hospitals and in T.B. Sanatoria from the plan. Now, half of the hospital beds in Canada are filled with people who are mentally ill, and also we have a great many patients in our tuberculosis sanatoria, and surely any comprehensive health insurance plan should be all-inclusive and it should not discriminate against any one group, or pick out certain illnesses and exclude them from the plan. Whether a person is ill from a mental disease or a physical disease, or tuberculosis, they are all sick people, they all occupy hospital beds and they all need medical care, and I can see no reason for discrimination. You cannot possibly call a hospitalization plan that covers less than half the people who occupy hospital beds in Canada – you cannot possibly call it a national hospitalization plan.

Speaking first of the T.B. sanatoria, I can again see no valid reason to discriminate or distinguish in the need and in the care of patients who suffer from tuberculosis and are hospitalized in sanatoria and those who are hospitalized in general hospitals. If the Federal Government is going to pay 50 per cent of the care of people who are hospitalized in general hospitals, I can see no reason why the T.B. Sanatoria should not come in under the same class. Patients in tuberculosis wards, for the most part, are there for long periods of time. At present the sanatoria are financed by a provincial grant which amounted last year to about \$600,000. The Federal Government merely looked after its own patients, that is D.V.A. patients and patients of the Department of Indian Affairs. The municipalities contribute the rest, which amounted, last year, to \$889,000 or 60 per cent of the cost. So, on this basis, if the Federal Government would pay their 50 per cent of the total, which is about \$1,500,000 and if the province would continue to pay its 40 per cent share, or nearly \$600,000, then the municipalities would be left with only 10 per cent of the cost; in other words, the municipalities could be relieved of a sum amounting to about \$750,000 and I can see no reason at all why the sanatoria should not be included.

Coming to the question of the mentally ill, it has taken centuries of struggle in an effort to try to overcome discrimination against the mentally ill. It has been a long and bitter struggle, and it has been very discouraged to many devoted people who, over the years, have pioneered this cause. The time was when people who were mentally ill were burned at the stake, and later, people who were mentally ill were put in prison and often received very brutal treatment. But, in the 19th century, a very wonderful woman by the name

of Miss Dorothy Lynn Dyck, after a good deal of research and pressure, persuaded legislatures to build asylums for the mentally ill as a place of refuge. This was the first major step in the right direction, but unfortunately, after the mentally ill were shut away in these asylums, the public forgot them and progress in the care and treatment of the mentally ill has been very slow. But recently there has been a great resurgence of interest in the care and the treatment of the mentally ill. One reason for this stepped-up interest was that the number of patients who are becoming hospitalized for mental illness has risen at a very alarming rate, until, as I said before, we find that half of all the hospital beds in Canada are filled with people who are mentally ill.

This is partially due to the fact that there are an increasing number of people becoming afflicted with mental illness, but it is also partially due to a slowly changing attitude of the public towards people who are mentally ill. Because this attitude has been changing more people are ready to enter mental hospitals at an early stage in their disease and certainly, I am sure you will all agree that that is an excellent thing. But, Mr. Speaker, it has taken a tremendous amount of patience and determined effort on the part of the Canadian Mental Health Association and other interested groups to produce anything like a change in attitude and to persuade people and relatives of people who have to be hospitalized that there is no stigma attached to mental illness; that mental illness is an illness just like heart disease, or tuberculosis, or pneumonia or cancer, or any other illness. In spite of this wonderful educational campaign that has gone on, I find that there is need for a great deal more education, because apparently the Federal Government certainly appears to have completely missed this point in its proposals to the provinces when it suggests that they are going to exclude mental hospitals. We have been trying, Mr. Speaker, to get the standard of care in mental hospitals to more nearly approach the standard of care that we find in general hospitals and we have been making progress and a good deal of progress, but in spite of that, mental hospitals all across the Dominion of Canada are still over-crowded and are still understaffed and there remains a great deal to be done.

The care of the mentally ill is a very expensive business. Most patients, of course, have long-term stays – some of them are there for years, but with the recent advances in medical science and the many new treatments that have been discovered, and the wonderful new drugs they now have, there is a high percentage of patients being cured. The number of patients entering the mental hospitals in Saskatchewan has more than doubled in the last ten years, but the discharges in Saskatchewan have risen at an even greater rate. In 1944, discharges in Saskatchewan from the mental hospitals were 63 per cent of admissions. In 1955, the discharge rate was 88 per cent of admissions, or an increase of 15 per cent, and the absolute discharge figures show even a much greater difference. In 1944, 455 patients were discharged and in 1954, 969 patients were discharged as cured – more than double the number. And so the Federal Government cannot argue that mental hospitals, or mental institutions, are not really hospitals, that they are not treatment centres, and that they are purely custodial institutions, because certainly that is not the case – mental hospital patients are being treated and are being cured. Certainly a great deal higher percentage of them would be cured and could be removed from

March 6, 1956

mental hospitals if it were possible to have more staff and more individual attention to patients and to reduce over-crowding and give the patients a little more privacy.

The total cost of mental hospitals in Saskatchewan last year – that is, including psychiatric wards and mental health clinics, was about \$8 million. Now, if Ottawa would come into this plan and pay half the cost of mental care, just as they are doing for other hospitals, we could provide more qualified staff and more badly-needed psychiatric social workers and funds would be available to improve the physical facilities of the hospitals and to relieve over-crowding. And this, Mr. Speaker, is that the people all across Canada have been looking for when the Federal Government came into a national health insurance plan. This is the very thing they have been trying to achieve and it is a great disappointment to find that mental hospitals are left out, and if the Federal Government persists in its present plan to exclude mental hospitals from a national hospitalization plan, it will permanently draw a line between the physically ill and the mentally ill. As far as the mental hospitals are concerned, progress will be set back for many years to come, because, Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government are going to provide 50 per cent of the hospitalization of the physically ill, and only small grants from the mentally ill, there is no doubt in my mind that in most provinces in Canada the general hospitals will get the cream and the mental hospitals will have to take what is left and they will suffer very, very greatly.

I had a letter in the mail yesterday from Dr. Chalmers of St. Andrew's College and I am going to read you just a little bit of this letter. He says:

“Dear Mrs. Cooper:

I noted in today's 'Star-Phoenix' that you will introduce a motion in the Legislature next Tuesday re the Federal National Health Insurance Proposal. I thought that in this connection you would be interested in the enclosed resolution. I was in attendance at the meeting of the board representing the Conference of the United Church. The Board membership is make up of both ministers and laymen and women. It may be of interest to you that this Board of our Church has been steadily campaigning for health insurance for more than a dozen years. Miss Ethel Chapman, formerly assistant editor of the Farmer's Magazine, has been one of the Board's authorities in the field. . .”

and he enclosed the resolution,, which I would like to read to you. This is a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Evangelism and Social Service of the United Church of Canada at its annual meeting on February 24th, 1956 and at which representatives from all Canadian provinces were present:

“Whereas we view with satisfaction the prospect that a plan of national health insurance will soon be established in Canada, therefore be it resolved that this Board commend the action of the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments

that have supported health insurance, in initiating the plan for national health insurance and urges other provincial governments to support and co-operate in this plan and points out that such a plan of national health insurance should include all Canadians and stresses that in plans for hospitalization that while provisions would be made for the care of all forms of illness, and especially long-term illnesses, nevertheless the plan for mental hospital health treatment should be included immediately and strongly suggests that while a national health insurance plan may logically begin with a partial service, such as diagnosis of sickness and hospitalization, it should be extended as rapidly as possible to give complete hospital, medical and dental services, and recommends that church organizations should include in their programme a study of the whole question of national health insurance and urges our people to make use of the privileges of a national health insurance plan in a responsible manner.”

I thought you would like to have the feeling and the statements of the Church on that.

Then I also have here a brief that was presented to the Hon. Paul Martin by the Saskatchewan Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association and I would like to read just a part of this brief to the Legislature. This is what they say:

“More and more it is becoming apparent that illnesses of the body and illnesses of the mind are inseparable. This modern conception of viewing the patient as a whole, not as a mind and a body, has been implemented in such hospital insurance plans as the one in operation in Great Britain and in other countries. The Canadian Hospital Insurance Plan, as reported, excludes mental hospitals, and possible mental patients in general hospitals. This is to be regretted. It is the considered opinion of this Division that if this plan was put into effect, progress would be seriously checked and possibly actual regression would be observed. The following specific results would be observed:

1. That hospital care would be provided for only about half of all the patients receiving treatment in hospitals.

(this refers, of course, to all hospitals)

2. That when a national health plan is devised it should be on the basis of the most modern, approved thought, namely, that no distinction should be made between patients suffering from the various kinds of illness, otherwise unfairness will result.

March 6, 1956

“The mentally ill are at present often looked on with suspicion and actual hostility. To underline any supposed difference might well be construed a distinct regression of our Canadian cultural pattern. Hospital insurance plans already operating with some advantageous features for the mentally ill would no doubt make no further effort to insure increasing care for the mentally ill. The general hospitals (and I think this is a very important point) would have a difficult time to determine which patients were mentally ill and which were physically ill. Often a physical illness is aggravated by anxiety and a mental illness by acute physical illness. Patients would likely be indexed by their physical illness, rather than their mental illness. The, if mental illnesses are not considered of sufficient severity to come under the plan, and more and more hospitals would refuse to take patients suffering from mental illness in its incipient stage, thus delaying treatment and delaying the chance of recovery. The only recourse for the patient then would be to go to mental hospital where, due to over-crowding and poor facilities, his active treatment would be limited. A sad picture after many years of struggle to bring the care and treatment of the mentally ill into a position where the public might be assured that their friends and loved ones are receiving the best possible treatment. In the opinion of the Saskatchewan Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association, if the health plan goes forth as proposed, one of the cruellest and most thoughtless actions of our time will have been taken, and that this renewal, in a public way, if discrimination against the mentally ill must be removed if the Canadian people are to hold their heads up. An adequate plan worked out by both Federal and Provincial governments must make sure that every sick person receives complete hospital care; and facilities for diagnosis by an adequate hospital staff much be given.”

This, Mr. Speaker, I believe is an excellent summary of what actually would happen if the Federal Government goes through with its plan of excluding mental hospitals; and so I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Erb, the motion which I read at the beginning of my address and which is before you on your Order Paper.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): - I take great pleasure in seconding the motion under discussion by the hon. member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) and upon which she so ably spoke.

What I shall say in the course of the next few minutes will not, I trust, be considered redundant, but rather, expressing the great importance of, and indeed, the great need for, the inclusion of mental hospitals and T.B. sanatoriums in the proposed Federal-Provincial Hospital Care Insurance Plan.

The history of the civilized world's attitude towards mental illness has been one of apathy, disregard and discrimination; and the evidence of this is found in the treatment and care that the mentally ill generally have,

hitherto received. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's announced intention of excluding mental hospitals and sanatoria will perpetuate the indifference toward, and the discrimination against, the mentally ill; and I further believe that it constitutes a regressive step within a plan that otherwise is designed to make hospital care available to a greater number of Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an age wherein we have witnessed fantastic developments in the field of applied science, an age wherein a premium is placed upon brains, personality and ingenuity. We have succeeded, by methods of intricate analysis, to learn the nature and the whereof of things around and about us, and as a result, we have raised immeasurably the standards of our society. We have taken into account the welfare of the Canadian people in respect to education and better working conditions in industry to ensure maximum production. We have provided hospitals and research centres to combat the physical abnormalities that occur in our people; there is a continuing effort on the part of the medical profession and hospitals in general to develop new techniques whereby the convalescent period of a patient is shortened so that he or she may, at the earliest possible moment, resume the responsibilities in whatever capacity they may serve.

Through numerous newspaper columns and magazine articles people are advised to visit their physicians regularly; they are told what abnormalities to observe as frequently possible signs of serious disease. They are cautioned against excesses in their eating, living, drinking, working and playing habits. In short, Mr. Speaker, the accent has been on achieving and maintaining the best possible standard of physical health.

Mental health, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, is too often regarded as a by-product, as it were, in the process of achieving and maintaining physical health and wellbeing, and is of importance only so long as it remains normal. Whenever mental illness strikes, unlike physical illness, it is looked upon with a medieval attitude by an otherwise sympathetic and understanding public; and herein, I submit, lies the tragedy. The mentally ill, unlike the physically ill, are not able to speak for themselves, to demand the treatment and care commensurate with that received by the physically sick. No, Mr. Speaker, their fate rests in the compassion of those doctors, nurses, psychiatrists and people who have dedicated their lives to their welfare, people who have long recognized that mental illness cannot, and should not, be disassociated from physical illness in the sense of meriting equal attention with respect to treatment and care. I believe the Canadian Mental Health Association is to be commended upon the great contribution it has made, and is making, in creating a public consciousness of mental health, with the proper perspective to mental illness.

It is, therefore, that we view with regret the proposed action of the Federal Government to exclude mental hospitals from the Federal-Provincial Hospital Care Plan. The Saskatchewan Government's Mental Hygiene programme has, as everyone knows, become internationally famous; as a result of new methods of treatment and care, together with a sympathetic and understanding public, particularly in this province, six new patients out of seven are being returned to their homes and to their jobs in many cases. In many instances, Mr. Speaker, they are in improved health and wellbeing. Forty years ago the picture was much

March 6, 1956

different; only five new patients out of every ten admitted were returned to their homes and jobs. The cost of our mental hospitals, as noted by the mover of this motion, runs into excess of \$8 million, and incidentally, these costs are increasing by about 10 per cent per year. One can readily see the great benefit that would accrue to mental hospitals with the Federal Government contributing to them on the same basis as it proposes with respect to the general hospitals. It would mean, under the 50 per cent sharing of costs, that we would receive in excess of \$4 million toward the treatment and care of our mentally ill. It would follow then, Mr. Speaker, that this sum of money would greatly assist this Government in creating even better facilities and treatment and care for our mentally ill; in providing more personnel to look after them, and the undertaking of a new building programme, with the result that even more patients would be returned to a productive place in society. Surely, Mr. Speaker, when this Government, with its limited financial resources and humanitarian approach, has kindled a new hope for the mentally ill, it is not expecting too much of the Government of Canada in asking for their participation in the cost of the treatment and care for our mentally ill.

The resolution also asks that the contribution to sanatoriums be on the same basis as that of the general hospitals. Here again, Saskatchewan has an enviable record in respect to the treatment and care of tuberculosis patients, but, nevertheless by a 50 per cent of sharing of costs by the Federal Government, the municipalities of Saskatchewan would be very considerably helped with their financial burdens.

Returning again to the argument of mental health, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the day is not too far off when an all-out effort will be made to combat mental illness and the predisposition thereto. Indeed, there must be, for the kind of society in which we live, notwithstanding the high standards of living that we have achieved, has, within itself, the every elements of strain and stress that contribute to the growing incidence of mental illness. The history of medical science is replete with victories over diseases that have baffled and plagued civilization for centuries – diseases that for hundreds of years have decimated the populations of Europe and Asia – typhoid fever, bubonic plague, smallpox, diphtheria, yellow fever, malaria and so on. And a complete victory over poliomyelitis is now within our grasp; surgical techniques of astounding brilliance and skill are saving countless thousands of lives that less than a hundred years ago would have been doomed to suffering, and finally, death.

Finally, with the discovery of recent drugs – sulpha drugs and the antibiotics, such as penicillin, aureomycin, streptomycin, and so on; and together with the accumulation of all the scientific skill and knowledge and resources, medical science has now in its armamentarium a formidable force to combat sickness and disease. But as I suggested earlier, the accent has been mainly on combating the manifestations of physical disease. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is expedient that we now make as much of a total assault on mental illness as we have made hitherto on a physical illness. I submit, too, Mr. Speaker, that from the straight economic point of view it would be an eminently sound undertaking. As I pointed out before, there is a growing incidence of mental illness and the costs of the operation of mental hospitals are increasing. There is every indication that, unless this terribly important problem is met realistically and resolutely faced, the costs will become, if not already so, an onerous burden.

It will require a great deal of money, more personal, more facilities and more research. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we believe the Federal government ought to at least share in half the costs of the treatment and care of our mentally ill. Any additional amount of money spent will be an investment that will pay dividends by reversing the incidence of mental illness, thereby enabling a maximum number of people who now are, or will otherwise become, afflicted, to live normal and useful and happy lives.

I believe, too, Mr. Speaker, that society ought also to be motivated by the humanitarian impulse, to do all it can, nationally and otherwise, to overcome this unfortunate handicap of our civilization.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that society ought, also to be motivated by the humanitarian impulse, to do all it can, nationally and otherwise, to overcome this unfortunate handicap of our civilization.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the words of the Master, spoken 2,000 years ago, are just as applicable today, wherein he says:

“I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me; for inasmuch as Ye have done it unto the least of these, my brethren, Ye have done it unto me.”

As indicated at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. S.H. Carr (Rosthern): - Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this resolution, but after listening to the hon. member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) I felt that some clarification must be offered in this House; I thought perhaps the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) might clarify the remarks made by the member from Regina when he said he hoped that his remarks would not be redundant. Well, if redundant means not adding anything to it, then his remarks were certainly redundant.

I was amazed at the lack of understanding displayed by the member from Regina of this Federal-Provincial scheme. Everyone knows that health is the responsibility of the provinces and the municipalities. It is not the responsibility of the Federal Government. Under this plan, the Federal Government does not intend to change that responsibility, but merely offers to pay a portion of the cost of certain health services to any province that is prepared to undertake this plan. Now, briefly, the plan is that the Federal Government will pay approximately 50 per cent of the general ward care and diagnostic services, based on 25 per cent of the actual cost in the province, plus 25 per cent of the average cost in the other provinces of Canada. That, briefly, is the plan.

The hon. member for Regina seemed to indicate – at least that was the impression I got – that if this plan went through as it is now, there would be serious discrimination against the mentally ill; that they would suffer

March 6, 1956

under this plan. She went so far as to say that the cost of mental care, in this province is about \$8 million, and that if the Federal Government paid half of that cost there would be so much more money available to care for the mentally ill. Well now, if they take care of half of the cost of ward care and diagnostic services, there will be approximately \$9 million more available to the province of Saskatchewan, without any increase in taxation or any increase in hospitalization fees; so that, right away, when this plan comes into effect, the province of Saskatchewan will have \$9 million more to care for the mentally ill. Now I mentioned at first that the responsibility belongs to the province, so that if there is any suffering – if the mentally ill should suffer in any way – the responsibility lies with the Minister of Health of this province. Why should there be any discrimination? Why, because he doesn't get 50 per cent, should the Minister of Health discriminate against the mentally ill in this province? And if there is any discrimination against them it can only come from the Department of Public Health in this province – and nowhere else.

Now, the hon. member said that there would be a set-back to mental health services in Saskatchewan. How could there be a set-back? We know that we have probably the finest mental health services in Canada; I think that every citizen of this province is proud of that. I cannot see how there can be anything other than a great improvement in mental health services in this province if the Federal Government pay us \$9 million a year more for health services. If there isn't there is something wrong with the government that will be in power.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, while I would be very pleased to see the Federal Government pay another \$4 million, because it would help us in many other fields – by another \$4 million I mean to pay half of the costs of the mental care, but I could not let the hon. member from Regina, or the Mental Health Association, get away with the idea that there will be discrimination against the mentally ill in this province if this plan goes through. That is wrong. It might apply in other provinces, but it won't apply in Saskatchewan.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am torn between two desires. I do not like to vote for this resolution with the discrimination thought in it, because I cannot see that there will be any. I know that if Saskatchewan gets – or I feel sure that if Saskatchewan gets \$9 million more that our good friend, the Minister of Public Health will see that there is better care in the mental hospitals. I would like to see the Federal Government pay that extra money, so with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Hon. T. J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): - Mr. Speaker, I think maybe I should make a comment or two on this debate. Naturally I agree most heartily with the statements made by the mover and the seconder of the motion from this side of the House, and I want to say that I appreciate very much the attitude taken by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr). I think, however, that I should point out to the member that the discrimination mentioned in the resolution and the discrimination that will be thought of in the minds of those who are interested in the welfare of mentally ill people, and those afflicted with tuberculosis, is the discrimination that has already taken place in the proposals of the Federal Government for sharing some of the health services.

I appreciate, also, his comment that this Government, through myself, would propose to improve to the fullest extent of its ability the facilities for the care and treatment of these two groups that have been left out, so far, of the proposals of the Federal Government. The fact that they have been left out indicates that, in the opinion of the Federal Government authorities, they are not as important or that it is not, for some reason or other, as expedient to extend assistance for the care and treatment of these people as it is for the other purposes for which the proposal is made. The reason why we feel badly about it here is because of the improved treatment we have learned how to provide for mentally ill people, and because of the long experience we have had in the caring and curing of people afflicted with tuberculosis. We are now convinced that it is improper for society to any longer try to discriminate between any of the illnesses that can afflict humanity. Each and every one of those can have an affect on some other part of a person; a person that is seriously physically ill and deprived of the ability, for the time being, to earn the necessary food for his family, if it is a man, or to give the necessary care to her family, if it is a mother; can have a serious effect on the mentality and the nervous system of the person so afflicted with this serious, physical ailment, and, inversely, the position is the same – a person who may become very ill mentally may respond, not only to the psychiatric treatment that could be applied, but might respond to physical treatment, which may have a very definite affect on the mental illness of the person's concerned.

For that reason we believe that it is necessary that all these types of illnesses should be included in a total over-all nation-wide health insurance programme, and that, of course, and I believe it would be in Saskatchewan – the C.C.F. – which I represent, and I believe it would be the objective of every member of this House, Mr. Speaker. I think the bulk of our citizens, regardless of their political affiliation would favour and look for a great deal of relief on a proposal that would encompass the whole field of health care right from preventative services into the curative services and right on through the rehabilitative, or restoration services, that are required in the whole field of health.

My friend from Rosthern was very gracious in some of his comments, but some of his comments, again, leave me a bit disturbed. I am always disturbed when I see the alacrity with which our friends across the way will run to the assistance of the Federal Government. You know they do not need your help in this field; they can think of all the excuses for not doing things themselves; and I do not believe that they require the support of the Liberal party of Saskatchewan to assist them in defending any position they take. As a matter of fact, they do not need to defend it, they only need to do as they have the power to do, and say, "There is the proposition; take it or leave it." They do not need any defence for that; they can defend themselves, because they are in an invulnerable position as long as they are in power.

But I do want to mention this – that there is a tendency always on the part of a lot of people to try and divide the responsibilities of the different levels of government in Canada on the basis of the British North America Act, or what is regarded as the Canadian constitution. I know what those are as well as anybody else does, and I realize that the Fathers of Confederation found it necessary to make certain divisions in the responsibilities in the different levels of jurisdiction. But, Mr. Speaker, since the time of Confederation,

March 6, 1956

this country has gone through two major wars, and through those wars we have learned that there is a tremendous amount of interlocking interest, and a failure on the part of any section or region of Canada to keep abreast of the best that is in Canada in some other region weakens the whole chain, because of that weaker link. And, during those wars, in recruiting activity, it has been discovered, and particularly pinpointed during the recruiting days of World War II that there is a tremendous amount of ill health among the young people of our country. I am as anxious as anyone to see that Canada is able, at all times, to defend herself against any aggressor of any kind. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a good healthy body of young people, a good healthy body of all citizens in the country, is one of the best measures of defence that people can have. When you have good healthy people you have people who can be picked out and trained to man any of the machines of war or the ancillaries that are required to carry on that conflict, if it is forced upon us. So in the field of defence I would say that it is necessary that there be no weak links in the chain across Canada.

And so I am not too much impressed when I hear people say that health or some other thing is strictly a provincial responsibility. Under the constitution, I agree that health is. I would like to see the constitution changed if it were possible, but as you all know – you have heard the Attorney General speak on it on more than one occasion, as well as the Premier – it is difficult to change a constitution; but it is not difficult for the Federal Government to overcome some of the obstacles that appear to be in the constitution, but making grants in aid for what are regarded as worthwhile purposes. I agree with the hon. member for Rosthern – I believe he said “they have done do.” That is true. They made certain statements of policy back 37 years ago. They made certain attempts to introduce some of those policies 11 years ago. They made certain attempts, or rather a contribution to implement those policies eight years ago; and now they have gone another step further. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that they have been too slow in implementing the policies that they declared useful and necessary 37 years ago, and now at this stage of development of medical sciences, where the psychiatric services have become known well enough to large groups of people because of the activities of the professional people engaged in treating people for psychiatric disturbances; now that they have become known through the activities of the American Psychiatric Association and the Canadian Mental Health Association, they have disclosed certain very important facts to the people of Canada and to the people of the North American continent, for that matter. Having done that, and having based their representations to the various governments on the facts disclosed that I have just mentioned, they have said (and I agree with them) that it is time we treated this as a national thing, not as a sectional thing. If it is impossible to have this done, undoubtedly this Government, when it returns after the next election and when the proposals of the Federal Government finally become operative, when enough provinces undertake to come into the proposal, serious consideration will be given by this Government to extend or improve the psychiatric services

But I would like to point out to our friend now that we are quite a bit ahead of the other provinces, and the Party I represent and speak for, today, has always stated, and still states, as one of its policies, what we would like to do for ourselves we would like also to have done for the people of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, and

all the other provinces of the Dominion. It is Canada we are interested in; we are more interested in the welfare of Canada than any other material thing that could be mentioned, and having had a good deal of experience, and having led the way in the care and treatment of the people who are afflicted with mental illness and in the field of tuberculosis, we would like to see that extended.

We see no reason why it cannot be done economically. The figure mentioned by my friend from Milestone (Mr. Erb) was in the neighbourhood, and received half of the cost of our care which is approximately \$8 million a year, and is getting to be more every year, but taking it on a \$4 million basis, that is not an impossible load for the Federal Government to carry. Their taxing powers are infinitely greater than the provincial governments' taxing powers. In this province we only have about three areas of taxation which are applied at the present time. The Treasurer would, I think, agree with that statement – I think it is only about three areas which we have. The Federal Government has more. Now them, getting down to the actual economics – the financing of it - \$4 million to Saskatchewan to pay half the cost of their mental services, and another \$1 million to take care of half the cost of the T.B. services – it wouldn't take that much, as a matter of fact, but we will take the whole \$2 million because that includes D.V.A. and Indians and so on, it would mean a total of \$5 million for these two purposes in this province. Now that, applied to the population of Canada would result in approximately \$75 million a year to cover all Canada on that basis. I think my arithmetic is reasonably correct there – I have done it in my head – but I think it will come out on paper not too far from those figures. This is not a large amount for the Federal Government to raise; they are able to raise terrific sums when they are necessary, and I won't argue about those things now, but I am point out that they have the power to do it, and by doing this they would create a condition which would improve immeasurably the health services of not only the people of Saskatchewan, but the people of all Canada; and I would like to see everybody in the House give very careful thought to supporting this, not only as a vote in the House here, but in their discussions out in the country and with people who have influence with the present administration at Ottawa.

If that could be done and the authorities at Ottawa can be impressed with the absolute necessity, in fact the desirability, then I believe it would result in some improvement and modifications of the present proposal.

I will not take any more of the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that this vote should be carried unanimously by this House to show our desire that mental illness and T.B. be given the same consideration as is given the other types of illness in the proposals from the Federal Government.

Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): - Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to take part in this debate either, but in view of some of the remarks made by the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley), I feel there are a few things that I have to say.

March 6, 1956

I am in complete agreement with the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) when he said that if there was any discrimination in regard to those people who suffer from mental illness or tuberculosis in Saskatchewan, then that discrimination will be brought about by this Government and by the Minister of Public Health in this province, and nobody else.

Under this Plan, the Federal Government will, in the province of Saskatchewan, be giving us approximately \$9 million a year. That will mean that we can either increase our services, or we could take part of the \$9 million that we are now using out of provincial revenues to increase our services to those people who are suffering from mental illness or tuberculosis, and I want to repeat again that if there is any discrimination, that that discrimination will be brought about by this provincial government.

The Minister mentioned, a moment ago, that since Confederation we have taken a second look at a lot of the different responsibilities that had been allocated to the provinces across Canada; and we have also taken a second look at the division of the tax dollars to pay for the responsibilities of the provincial governments. We have found that, today, the Federal Government are paying grants to provinces to carry out certain responsibilities that are the responsibilities of provincial governments, and I can refer to, for instance, the payments for social services. As I understand the Constitution of Canada, social services are the responsibility of provincial governments; but we find that, in the province of Saskatchewan, for instance, in the last fiscal year, the Federal Government spent approximately \$20 ½ million on pensions, in the province of Saskatchewan. This is not a federal responsibility, by the people of Canada have recognized that it is beyond the ability of many provinces to pay adequate pensions in the provinces such as Saskatchewan, so the Federal Government, again by agreeing – not by changing the Constitution – but by agreement, have said that they will accept these responsibilities.

The Federal Government is also paying considerable sums of money into such provinces as Saskatchewan in hospital and health grants, and here again, in this plan, as far as hospitalization is concerned, they now say that they are prepared to pay about 50 per cent of the hospitalization scheme in the province of Saskatchewan; and I am in complete agreement with that. I sincerely hope that some day in the not too distant future it will be possible for us to have a complete health service plan across Canada. Some mention was made here, a moment ago, in regard to some promises that apparently were made back about the year that I was born. Well I want to refresh some of those people's memory who sit opposite me as to what this Government was going to do as far as health was concerned, not away back in the year that I was born, but here just a few years ago, when they promised the people of this province that, upon election, they were going to provide health services to the people of Saskatchewan without money and without price. I don't like bringing this matter up, but when we have a Government sitting here that has been in power in Saskatchewan for twelve years, and have not fulfilled the promises they made to the people of this province, and they are referring to certain statements of policy that were made by the Leader of the Liberal party in Ottawa many years ago – something that he hoped would be done in the future – then I feel that I must draw the attention of the members of this House to the statements that were made by this present provincial government.

I want to refer to two or three of those statements. The first one that I want to refer to is one that was made by the Premier himself, and he said:

“The time has come when we must make all the benefits of medical science available to all, without money and without price. By supporting the C.C.F. you can make this right of health and happiness the lot of every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.”

Now I agree with that statement. It was a good statement, and I agree with the statement that the Minister of Public Health made, a moment ago, when he said that Saskatchewan has led the way as far as public health is concerned, for many, many years. I could refer to the statement that was made by Dr. Sigerist, when this provincial government came into power, when he was asked to write a report into the possibilities of setting up a province-wide health scheme here in Saskatchewan. I would just like to refer, at this time, to something that he said. He said we were very advanced in the field of services as far as public health was concerned, in Saskatchewan; and it was only a matter of extending these services out on to a provincial basis from a municipal basis. And I, too, want to compliment the people of Saskatchewan for having led the way for many, many years in the field of public health.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish I had had time to prepare more on this, because there is a good deal that ought to be said; but again I want to say that as far as I am concerned, I hope that, eventually, it will be possible for those people, no matter what part of Canada they live in – whether they are in Saskatchewan, in the Maritimes, eastern province, or in the provinces to the west of us – that they will be given the benefit of complete health services. I believe that the economy of Canada, today, is fast approaching the time when we can support full health measures for all the people of Canada.

Some people have advocated, in the past, that we ought to be taking some of the money that has been spent on national defence and use it for such services as public health. Well I, for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that we probably get more value for the dollar expended for the protection of this country than we do from any other dollar, and I agree with the Minister of Public Health when he said that it is very, very necessary to have a healthy nation in order to protect ourselves from whatever enemy may approach the Dominion of Canada, but I also believe that we must continue to spend money on the defence of the nation in the amount that is necessary to defend this nation now and in the future.

He also mentioned that the Federal Government had wider fields, or greater taxing powers than have provincial governments. That is very true, but he intimated that in order for us to have complete national health services, or even in order for us to be able to pay half of that cost of taking care of the mentally ill and those suffering from tuberculosis, that we would have to increase taxes. Well, I don't think it matters too much just where you are going to get these taxes from – whether you are going to collect them federally, provincially, or municipally. After all, we, as citizens of Canada, have to pay those taxes. Naturally, if they are going to be collected on a municipal basis, then they must come from property; and I have said before, and I am going to say again now, that in my opinion property taxation has hit a peak and we dare not go beyond the present level. As far as provincial revenue are concerned, I believe that there are fields there where we could increase the revenues of

March 6, 1956

this province and the other provinces of Canada, just the same as the Federal Government could derive this additional revenue from increasing their taxes. It is very unpopular for any government, no matter whether they are provincial or federal, to increase taxation and I think the argument is very weak when we ask Ottawa to do something that we are afraid of doing ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion and I sincerely hope that this Government will not discriminate against those people who are suffering from either T.B. or mental illness.

Premier Douglas: - Mr. Speaker, the Opposition members who have taken part in this discussion seemed to have great difficulty in making up their minds as to whether they are for the resolution or whether they are against it. Apparently their technique is to speak against it and then vote for it.

Mr. McDonald: - I didn't speak against it.

Premier Douglas: - The Leader of the Opposition began his remarks by suggesting that, primarily, health is the responsibility of the provincial governments and municipalities, and therefore it wasn't too wise for the mover and seconder to suggest that the Federal Government, in its proposed hospital plan, should cover those occupying hospital beds in mental hospitals and T.B. sanatoriums. I am going to remind the House, however, that in 1945 at the Reconstruction conference, when this matter first came to the attention of the provinces, the Federal Government was going to pay 60 per cent of the cost of all health services – that was to cover people in mental hospitals, T.B. sanatoriums, general hospitals; it covers diagnostic services, medical care, surgical care, dental care and optometric care. There was no question then about any division of jurisdiction. The Federal Government at that time was prepared – leaving the constitutional power in the hands of the provinces – to make a 60 per cent contribution up to a certain maximum per capita. The 5 per cent which is being asked here is considerably less than they had already agreed to, in principle, more than ten years ago.

The Leader of the Opposition – I don't know why we brought it in – but he mentioned the amount of social welfare which the Federal Government pays, although he said it wasn't their constitutional responsibility, and he quoted a figure of some \$20 million, which I presume refers to the amount they pay for old age security. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend ought to know that in 1951, the Federal Government asked the provinces to agree to a constitutional amendment giving them the constitutional authority to look after those 70 years of age and over, and moreover, to help them meet that responsibility which they were assuming, levied a two per cent surcharge on income tax, a two per cent surcharge on corporation tax, and earmarked an additional two per cent on the Federal sales tax to be set aside for the purpose of paying a universal pension to all persons 70 years of age and over.

Now what the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Rosthern have said is that if there is any discrimination at all in the future against persons in mental hospitals, it will be because of the provincial government; that if we want to, we can take the money which the Federal Government will pay in this hospital services plan and use it for the mental hospitals. I want to remind the members opposite that the people of this province are paying a per

capita tax for their hospital care. In addition they are paying a one per cent sales tax for their hospital care. Surely it is not suggested that we take money which we levy from the people for a general hospital care programme and apply it to mental hospital care. You surely are not suggesting that.

If there are considerable savings to be made from the general treasury, then some of those ought to be earmarked either to reduce the per capita charge on the people of the province or to expand the health services into diagnostic services, and eventually into medical care and surgical care.

The Leader of the Opposition, in trying to cover up the fact that the Liberal party has been on record since 1919 as being in favour of a comprehensive system of national health insurance, talks about the promises which were made by the C.C.F. party prior to taking office with reference to giving health services to our people. . .

Mr. Danielson: - That is just one of them.

Premier Douglas: - And if there is any pledge which I am prepared to make to the people of this province and say that we have carried it out beyond our fondest hopes or expectations, it is what we have done in terms of health services for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McDonald: - You said it only cost. . .

Premier Douglas: - We hear the hon. gentlemen talking about giving people health services, without money and without price, which was a phrase, I believe, I used in a radio broadcast. . .

Mr. Danielson: - Nobody believed you, anyway.

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Premier Douglas: - I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite about a lot of people who are getting health services without money and without price. There are hundreds of people who enter our mental hospitals every year, who are getting the very best psychiatric care and the very best psychiatric nursing without money and without price.

Mr. McDonald: - That's not what you said then.

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Premier Douglas: - The thousands of people who are being treated in our cancer clinics, who are getting not only diagnosis but surgery and deep X-ray therapy and treatment, are getting that treatment without money and without price.

Mr. McDonald: - They always have.

Premier Douglas: - The patients who suffer from tuberculosis, the patients who suffer from polio, who get not only treatment but get a long programme of physiotherapy and a programme of rehabilitation, are getting it without money and without price.

March 6, 1956

This Government is spending \$1 ½ million a year, roughly, to give to certain old-age pensioner groups, and mothers' allowance groups, and every one of them with a health services card – we didn't wait even for the election to give it to them – they got it on January 1, 1945, within six months of the C.C.F. Government taking power. Every person with that health services card has health services without money and without price.

Mr. McDonald: - That wasn't our promise, though.

Premier Douglas: - Now, Mr. Speaker, what the mover and the seconder are striving to bring to the attention of this House is the element of discrimination, not just with reference to Saskatchewan but with reference to the whole approach to health services and particularly with reference to hospitalization. Now it is true that in Saskatchewan the person who is mentally ill will get this treatment and this care in a mental hospital without charge; and the person who goes to a T.B. sanatorium will be able to get that kind of care. They have been able to get it for a long time. That is not true, though, all across Canada. In the majority of the provinces of Canada the people pay for treatment in those types of institutions. Now that means that in one of those provinces an individual will pay his or her hospital insurance tax – it may be a per capita tax, or however the government decides to levy it – and when he has paid his per capita hospital tax for himself and his family, if he contracts some physical illness and has to go to a generally hospital the payment of that tax will entitle him to free hospital care. But if he contracts a mental illness he will have to pay it out of his own pocket. Or if he contracts tuberculosis he will have to pay it out of his own pocket. If he happens to reside in a province that doesn't provide those two services on a free basis, then he will have to pay his own expenses.

Now, the average person, paying a per capita tax to provide himself and his family with hospital care needs to be insured against the bills from mental illness and tuberculosis treatment even more than he does against general hospital care. If he goes to a general hospital for a normal illness, I think the average stay is somewhere around ten days. Of course for many people it does run into months, or even into a year. But persons going to a tuberculosis sanatorium and person who, unfortunately, have to go to a mental hospital, are faced with the distinct possibility of having treatment over a period of months and, in some cases, years. The average length of stay is much longer, and therefore what we are trying to establish here is not just the situation as it affects Saskatchewan but as it affects the citizens of Canada. The people of Canada at the present time are facing up to the whole question of national hospital insurance. If we are going to have national hospital insurance in Canada it ought to be hospital insurance which covers every form of hospitalization.

There isn't any use of the gentlemen opposite trying to move that aside, because the Federal Government recognized that principle in 1945 when they made the Green Book proposals at the Reconstruction Conference. We are approaching this as a national problem, not just as it affects Saskatchewan, but as it affects the people of Canada as a whole. The people of Saskatchewan will still get care in the mental hospitals and in the T.B.

sanatoriums. There ought to be any differentiation between a man or a woman or a child going to a mental hospital, a T.B. sanatorium, or to a general hospital. When they pay their per capita tax for their hospital cards that should entitle them to go to any hospital, to deal with any type of illness which they are unfortunate enough to contract.

There is one other thing I would like to say in regard to this hospitalization thing and that is that I join with those who said we are pleased that the Federal Government has now made some submission about sharing with the provinces on a hospital insurance plan. And I want to say this: My understanding is that at the Conference in January the Minister of National Health and Welfare himself, said that the main reason why they were going into this plan was because of the demonstration which had gone on in Saskatchewan and which created the demand for hospital insurance.

The people of this province can take a good deal of credit to themselves for the fact that they have pioneered the field, that they have set up a successful hospital insurance programme that has been operating now for some ten years – we are now in our tenth year – and it has been done so well and so successfully that other parts of Canada have become enamoured of that programme and have asked for a similar programme to be adopted across the rest of Canada. I think it is only unfortunate that the conditions which the Federal Government have attached to their proposals makes it unlikely that we will get any benefit in 1956, or perhaps even in 1957 because, as all hon. members know, not only must six provinces, representing a majority of the people of Canada, agree to enter this plan, but six provinces must have a plan set up and operating so that even if, in 1957, five provinces get this plan under way – until the sixth province not only gives assent, but actually has the plan in operation, then we will not be able to get any assistance from the Federal Government.

But at least we are making progress and it is now within the distinct realm of possibility that, within 12 or 18 months or two years, we will have in six provinces of Canada a hospital insurance plan. I do hope that when this matter is being discussed between the Federal and Provincial Governments that the Federal Government will reconsider their proposal and accept the recommendation in this resolution, that this hospital plan will cover all forms of hospitals and all forms of illness. I think if we do that we will have won a great victory in Canada, because we will then be saying to the Canadian people, “You will pay an insurance premium; that insurance premium entitles you to hospitalization, whether you are mentally ill or physically ill, or suffering from tuberculosis”; and that would eliminate any differentiation between one kind of illness as compared to another kind illness and we will have paid part of our debt of the long neglect for which all civilized people are responsible, that of overlooking our responsibility to the mentally ill. The sooner we remove that discrimination and treat the mentally and physically ill and people with tuberculosis all on the same basis, the sooner we will have moved toward a sound and humane type of health programme.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

March 6, 1956

Motion For Return

The Assembly resumed the Adjourned Debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Danielson (Arm River), for a Return showing:

“Of the reduction in Public Debt since July 1, 1944, the amounts provided by: (a) Cancellation of relief by Federal Government; (b) collection of seed grain and other advances; (c) repayments by Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board; (d) repayments by Wheat Pool; (e) payments by Saskatchewan Government Telephones including Sinking Fund payments; (f) payments by Saskatchewan Power Commission, including Sinking Fund Payments; (g) repayments by municipalities; (h) Liquor Board profits; (i) repayments, of capital advances of Crown Corporations other than Telephone and Power; (j) other sources other than revenue surpluses; (k) revenue surpluses.

Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): - Mr. Speaker, I asked to have this put over, since I could not understand it. Now, after a few more days and further study, I find it is even more confused. This is an example of why the hon. member can never understand the Public Debt. This is the worst example of muddled thinking this House has ever seen. This motion asks for all sorts of things and I must admit I fail to understand it. For instance, he wants to know the payments by Saskatchewan Government Telephones, including the Sinking Fund payments. He wants to know the payments by the Power Commission, including Sinking Fund Payments.

May I point out that the Power Corporation, in 1944, had virtually no debt. I think, if I remember rightly, it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$12 million to \$15 million. Well I am satisfied that they have paid back practically that amount, since 1944, but what have they paid it back for? Not for the debt that was created prior to 1944, but the Sinking Fund payments, for the most part, have been for the debt that has been created since that date. Today, the Power Corporation debt is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$70 million or \$80 million. Well, three per cent on that a year runs to about \$2 ½ million – in other words, they are paying \$2 ½ million a year chiefly for the debt that has been created since 1944; and yet my hon. friend across the way is trying to mislead the people of this province into believing that all the money that has been paid by the Power Corporation is to be applied on the old Public Debt. There would be no alternative, if we answer. So, Mr. Speaker, I thought that we should try to give the hon. gentleman a proper understanding of this whole thing.

Now I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am under no illusions whatsoever; I am not going to get him to understand it, but it might help other people to understand, so I am moving, seconded by Mr. Brockelbank:

“That all words after ‘showing’ be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(1) The gross debenture, treasury bill and contingent liability indebtedness as at July 1, 1944;”

May I explain, as I go along, that this will give him a ‘jumping off’ point; he will be able to start right in here at July 1st and we will give him a complete picture of the gross debt as it was at that date.

“ (2) The gross debenture, treasury bill and contingent liability indebtedness as at December 31, 1955.”

Now that will show where we have jumped in connection with our indebtedness.

“(3) The total increases in debentures and treasury bills between July 1, 1944 and December 31, 1955, and the purposes for which these debentures and bill were issues.”

I would like him to know just what new indebtedness has been created, from 1944 to 1955. We will set it all out for him in detail so he won’t miss anything.

“(4) The total decreases in debentures and treasury bills between July 1, 1944 and December 31, 1955, and the source of funds for such decreases, including:

(a) Cancellation of treasury bills by Federal Government in respect of relief indebtedness.

(b) (Natural resources settlement.

(c) Repayment of advances by:

- (I) Farm Loan Board
- (II) Saskatchewan Wheat Pool
- (III) Saskatchewan Government Telephones
- (IV) Saskatchewan Power Corporation
- (V) Government Finance Office
- (VI) Other

(d) Liquor Profits.”

That would be the amount of liquor profits we have used for reducing the debt.

“(e) Current revenues (including the payments by farmers and municipalities on seed grain and relief debt).”

We will show what has been collected from the farmers and municipalities out of these total current revenues.

“(f) Other.

(5) The net decrease in contingent liabilities between July 1, 1944 and December 31, 1955.”

March 6, 1956

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that motion, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank. If my hon. friend will be honest now and go out in the country and use this whole statement to show the picture of the Debt, then he will find that the indebtedness of the province, the dead weight debt has gone down by \$107 million since April 30th of 1944. He will find that the Federal Government have provided us with about \$36 million – that we have used about \$8 million we got from the Federal Government to settle up our natural resources; he will find that certain sums have been paid by the Farm Loan Board; he will find that certain sums have been paid by the Wheat Pool; but where he is going to be disappointed is that the Saskatchewan Government Telephones have not paid back nearly as much as what we have paid to them. In other words, the payments they have made have not creased the indebtedness, but rather they have increased the indebtedness; and the same is even more true of the Power Corporation. The amounts we have received from them on their indebtedness have been much less than what they have got from us to increase their indebtedness, with the result that the picture is not going to be quite the way he sees it, but it will give him all the information in the way that I think he should have it, in order that he can properly understand it.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): - Quite a speech!

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Premier Douglas: - Take it as read.

Mr. Speaker: - Will you take it as read?

- Agreed -

The debate continuing on the proposed amendment:

Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): - Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this, because he forgot to say anything about the public finance in his budget speech, yesterday. He made a political harangue for about an hour and forty-five minutes. Now this has given him another opportunity to make this budget speech again.

He has admitted that, during the last few years, I have consistently and consistently tried to get this information; and he has evaded giving that information. There has never, at any time, been a full statement given or submitted to this House with the information that I want to get here. When I spoke a few days ago in this House, Mr. Speaker, you will remember I made certain references to the position of the province and the municipalities at the end of the 'thirties, and the steps that were taken through the Federal Debt Adjustment Board of Review and your own local government Board, and the Debt Adjustment body that was set up by the provincial government, whereby over \$406 million was written off for the people of the province, principally in 157 municipalities. I know there were a certain amount of treasury bills outstanding in Ottawa at the time – I don't know how much, but I am going to make a guess, and I think the Provincial Treasurer will find that I am not very far out. . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: - It's in Public Accounts.

Mr. Danielson: - . . .about \$62 million.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - Oh, no.

Mr. Danielson: - Well now, that was before the cancellation of \$36 million, plus \$8 million took place. I know something about this thing; I lived here; I was a member of the House; and he gets up trying to ridicule me because I have been camping on his tail now for close to five years. It doesn't get him any place! I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, you can go right down and talk with some of these bank men in the town of Davidson, or in the city of Regina, and they will admit that the statements that have come from some of the members on this side of the House in regard to the position of the Public Debt of the province of Saskatchewan are the proper and the correct ones. The statements that we have used are used by the Bank of Montreal – you can go in to the Bank of Montreal and get a pamphlet showing the relative indebtedness of the different provinces in the Dominion and you will find that my statement is correct, Mr. Speaker.

He doesn't need to laugh at anyone; he is trying to conceal and distort this information so that no one can get at the actual facts.

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Mr. Danielson: - He admits the debt. . .

Mr. Speaker: - Order! The hon. member must withdraw that accusation.

Mr. Danielson: - All right, I'll do that, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to tell you what he said himself – that finally now he is going to get the information we have been looking for. You can interpret that whichever way you wish, but that is the situation; and so far as me going out to the country, I am going out, Mr. Speaker, like I have always done. For the truth is truth and so far as I know it, it is going to be placed before the people of this province of Saskatchewan, without any distortion or misrepresentation of any kind, because, after all, the people of the province of Saskatchewan are not all fools, in spite of the fact that some of the members opposite might think so.

I have lived here for fifty years and so have more than two-thirds of the people. I think, perhaps. We have built up this province; we haven't all been jumping up from a certain place, off the street into the position of Provincial Treasurer. We learned something; and you learned something, Mr. Speaker, when you battled with your municipal affairs up in your part of the province, and you have learned the hard way, and you know this too, that there is no person in the world today, or no government in the world today, and no provincial treasurer, that will ever borrow themselves out of debt, except this fellow that sits right here. And when I make that statement I am taking him at his word, not what I think, but what he says. The more he borrows, the less money he owes. He said so, yesterday. He has said so persistently.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Order!

March 6, 1956

Mr. Danielson: - I can give him fair warning now, that if this document which he has expounded on, and at the same time trying to cast reflection on my mentality for a few moments, doesn't include the information that I want, I am going to come right back at him; and he is going to come through with the information that I want, no matter how long it takes, because I will be back here after the next election. He may not be, but I will be back.

The question being put on the proposed amendment, it was agreed to.

The question being put on the motion as amended, it was agreed to, and an Order of the Assembly issued, accordingly, to the proper officer.

Cash Advances on Farm-Stored Grain

The Assembly resumed, from Thursday, March 1, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):

“That this Assembly, recognizing that the Federal Government guaranteed bank loan scheme is inadequate to meet the serious financial crisis now confronting the western grain farmer and the entire prairie economy, deploras the failure of the Federal Government to provide a prepayment on the initial price of grain in the form of a cash advance on farm-stored grain.”

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): - Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that when Mr. Wesson, the President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, made this statement at the convention in Saskatoon last fall, and I quote it:

“Comments were being made about marketing prices, storage and deliveries by people who obviously had little knowledge of what they were talking about.”

Now those were the words of the President of the Saskatchewan Pool. It is quite evident, at that time, that he didn't know of a new 'Moses' of agriculture, who had spring up from the Gravelbourg constituency, supported by the hon. member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), and also the hon. member for Battleford (Mr. Kramer); because, according to this resolution they have brought into this House, they have found a very short way of curing all the ills of our supposed agricultural crisis.

This resolution does not ask for anything; it does not ask for any additional services to take us out of the crisis, so I presume that all we need to do is to vote against the performance of the Federal Government. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this 'Moses' of ours has rather gone out of his way, because, after all, the Federal government just wants every farm organization (I have a list of them here) – every pool management – yes, sir, every grain-handling authority, including the presidents of the three Western Pools, the United Grain Growers and the Wheat Board Advisory Committee, also the three Ministers of Agriculture of the three western provinces, and most of all, the recommendation by the Commission of Agriculture

and Rural Life to support agricultural prices. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Advisory Committee to the Wheat Board are composed of J.H. Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool; W.J. Parker, President of the Manitoba Elevators; D. Plummer, Chairman of the Alberta Wheat Pool; J.E. Brownlee, President of the Unite Grain Growers; Chris Hansen, President of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union; Roy Molnar, President of Alberta Federation of Agriculture. Now this is the Advisory Committee to the Wheat Board. Has anyone ever heard them ask for, or make the suggestion that is made in this resolution? I don't think so; and yet these men think that it is the cure of all our ills.

The new agricultural 'Moses' in his speech would have the people of Canada believe that the farmers of Saskatchewan are such poor managers that even with their granaries full of grain, they are helpless on their own resources and have to have at the expense of the people of Canada, which includes pensioners and widows and orphans. This reputation, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is undeserved by our farmers. Our farmers, as a lot, are not 'gimmies' – there are a few C.C.F.'ers, but as a whole, they are quite able to run their own business as long as they are not interfered with by the political advisors, particularly composed of socialist theorists; and in order to substantiate this statement, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read an article that appeared in the Moose Jaw 'Times' on February 25, 1956, and I quote:

“In order to gain their objective, the C.C.F. members of the House of Commons will have to secure the sympathetic support of more than the members of the Progressive Conservative party; they need to win friends and influence members from Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia. It is questionable and debatable whether the tactics of the C.C.F., egged on by the Progressive Conservatives, are accomplishing the desired purpose. Is it good psychology? The question is asked for the reason that this the third year in succession in which the western C.C.F. members have sought to arouse the sympathy of the members of all political parties from other provinces, with prolonged lamentations about the plight of the western grain growers.

“That Quebec members are not being influenced in the desired direction is evident from one exchange that took place in the Commons a few days ago. A western member has lamented and wrung his crying towel, and finally declared that secession was even being proposed in the west. From a member of the House sitting for a Quebec constituency came the remark, 'That's the best news yet.'

“A couple of sessions ago the House was told by the same C.C.F. member that the western farmers had to get millions because they had lost their crop through rust. Then, last year, there was a long lament about the western farmer, and particularly Saskatchewan grain growers, having been flooded out. The House was told that thousands of farmers would not be able to sow grain for the reason that their land was under water. Before the year was out the

March 6, 1956

same C.C.F. ers were again wringing the crying towels that this time it was because the grain growers of Saskatchewan, in spite of the wet spring, had grown so much wheat and other grains for which there has been no market that they had to be provided with more millions from the Federal treasury.

“In the past, one complaint of the west, and particularly of Saskatchewan, has been that it is looked upon as a poor relation in Canada, (and deserved, I would say, Mr. Speaker.) Most certainly this annual lamentation for financial assistance from the other provinces is bound to produce the idea in the minds of others that Saskatchewan is a poor relation that has to be kept by hand-outs.

“This is not the reputation that is desired. It is very poor psychology. Ultimately there is danger that the rest of Canada will come to look upon this province as one which can be counted upon to come either as a suppliant or a demander and they will wonder why it is that they hear that Saskatchewan is ‘forging ahead’ and making tremendous progress, when those who are the mainstay are starving, with the soles of their shoes worn through and wearing shirts made out of gunny-sacks.

“There is danger that the rest of Canada will take the threat of secession seriously and say to Saskatchewan, ‘Go ahead and do it’, feeling that they would be well rid of a poor relation.”

Now that is about the fact of this continuous lamentation of my hon. friends to your right and these crying babies in Ottawa. Yes, they go around and say that people are all in favour of cash advances, in spite of the fact that all these authorities who are entrusted by the farmers to run their business – and I want to say this, that I have every confidence in the heads of our co-operatives, because it is their intention to get the most for our products, but when they are undermined in every way by my hon. friends lamenting about over-surpluses, terrible financial crisis, and give-away policies, you can only find yourselves in the position in which you are today.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that had the Liberal government been in power this fall in Saskatchewan, there would not have been any of this condition to lament about.

Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): - They are in, in Manitoba.

Mr. Lopton: - They would have taken care of it. The farmers would not have been asking – or there wouldn't have been anybody asking – for interest-free loans. And I want to say right here that there isn't 10 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan that want to be spongers on their neighbours. All this noise that these C.C.F.ers are making has been made for political purposes, and I want to say to the people in eastern Canada that the farmers in Saskatchewan

are quite prepared to pay for their accommodation. And the way it has been reported, these people are going around the country, holding meetings, and at every meeting they hold, they have been endorsing resolutions wanting interest-free loans, have been brought about in this way, Mr. Speaker. You know how they are brought about. They had about four Federal members going around this fall, accompanied usually by one of my hon. friends over there, depending upon what constituency they were in. I happened to be at one of those meetings, and they didn't know I was there; and there were about 50 people there, and out of that 50 I would say there were probably about 35 C.C.F.ers. The Chairman, of course, knew what the programme was, and the first thing was that a Mr. Nicholson got up and talked about Ottawa. That was all he talked about – Ottawa. There was a Castleden and he got up and he talking about Ottawa. Then there was Hazen Argue; he also talked about Ottawa. Then there was another one – I have forgotten what his name was – but he also talked about Ottawa; and lo' and behold, Mr. Speaker, the member from the Legislature got up and he also talked about Ottawa. There was never anything else said, and they got up with – oh, my hon. friend, the Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) was there – it was in his constituency. And then they finally wound up by somebody moving a resolution that Ottawa should pay, or advance, interest-free loans, or advances on the grain.

Well who would refuse to take money if they don't have to pay anything for it – even a Liberal would almost say that he would take it.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): - Did you support it?

Mr. Loptson: - I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a nice. . .

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): - Did the member say 'money for nothing', Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Loptson: - Well, of course it is. If I was getting \$90,000 as would be the amount that would be paid to that farmer in Alberta, who has 150,000 bushels on his farm, he would be getting that money without interest, wouldn't he? And he would be re-investing it at about 5 per cent interest, at the expense, either of the poor farmers who would be paying the interest, if it came out of the Pool; or from the rank and file of the people of Canada, if it came from the federal treasury.

That is actually the situation. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we would have done, had we been in office, we would have immediately taken hold of the situation if we found the farmers in difficulty, and handled it in something the way as was done during the 'thirties. We would have gone to the municipalities and said, "Here, we will back up the bank loans, but you distribute it according to need, to the farmers who are hard up." That would have been a very simple way of doing it, and a cheap way of doing it. Now I am not going into the whole rigmarole of what this new set-up would cost the farmers, as is suggested by our friends who want cash advances; it would be quite a sum if you started to figure it out, and having inspectors going all over the country, inspecting granaries and grading grain. . .

Mr. Kramer: - When did you ever start objecting to that?

Mr. Loptson: - That is the suggestion. Well now, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to make my remarks very short.

March 6, 1956

We realize temporary need for cash, and we realize the present accommodation for distributing that cash is not accessible enough to all the people. So, in order to remedy that situation, I propose to move an amendment, and the amendment will read in this way:

“That all the words after the word ‘the’ in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

“Immediate financial needs of prairie farmers urges

- (1) that credit unions, and where credit unions and banks are not conveniently located, that elevator companies be allowed to make loans or advances to farmers on the security of farm stored grain on the same terms and under the same guarantees against loss as are provided for the banks.
- (2) That the initial payment for wheat, basis No. 1 Northern, Fort William, be increased to \$2.00 per bushel up to the first 1,000 bushels delivered, in any crop year, with comparable initial payments for other commercial grains.
- (3) That the Wheat Board regulations be relaxed to allow within the province trading in grain by permitting the purchaser to sell such grain to the Wheat Board on the Grower’s Permit Book.
- (4) That these arrangements continue until commercial storage facilities for grain are available to meet farmers’ delivery requirements.
- (5) that the Government of Saskatchewan take immediate steps to negotiate with the Grain Commercial Channels for additional storage. Failing immediate action, the Government of Saskatchewan immediately take action to provide this additional storage.”

I move that amendment, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson).

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is far more constructive. . .

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): - It’s out of order.

Mr. Lopton: - . . .and I would say, far more helpful to the farmers than the original resolution, which only says that we should condemn the Federal Government for not having done something. I submit in all fairness that outside of ‘Moses’, with his superseding intelligence over the rest of us, you know – us common crowd over on this side – that there is an opportunity to vote for something constructive. Now I am absolutely certain, in the first

place, that if the channels were extended so that people who are living in the outside districts, miles away from towns where there are no banks, where there are no credit unions, that these people should be able to go to the elevator agent and get their loan. I submit that. . .

Premier Douglas: - Would my hon. friend explain. How would the elevator agent give the loan? Against what account? Against the elevator company?

Mr. Loptson: - The elevator company would advance the money on the farm-stored grain.

Premier Douglas: - From whom would they borrow it?

Mr. Loptson: - They would borrow the same as they borrow it when they pay for it at the elevator.

Now for my hon. friend's information, that practice has been used for many, many years. As a matter of fact, I myself have borrowed on my grain before it was threshed, let alone when it was in a granary.

Mr. Wahl: - Pretty small, my friend.

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Premier Douglas: - That would be for a matter of days or weeks, not for a matter of years.

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Mr. Loptson: - Then secondly, I submit that \$2.00 a bushel initial payment on the first 1,000 bushels to the small farmer means a lot as a return on his year's work. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that could be taken out of the Pool, and that all farmers would get that \$2.00 a bushel for the first 1,000 bushels. And I think the big operators – a man for instance, who has 100,000 bushels, can quite well afford to pay a little bonus to the little fellow in order to keep him going.

And I also submit that the Wheat Board regulations be relaxed to allow, within the province, trading in grain, by permitting purchasers to sell such grain to the Wheat Board, on the grower's permit. Now what is happening, today. . .

Premier Douglas: - Would the member read that again. I am not clear on it.

Mr. Loptson: - Yes, I will read it, "That the Wheat Board regulations be relaxed to allow, within the province, trading in grain, by permitting the purchaser to sell such grain to the Wheat Board, on the grower's permit book." What is happening now, under the present regulations, is that you can buy my grain, whether you are a farmer or not; but you have to feed it; you can't sell it for commercial purposes, other than feed it, within the province. What I submit to you is that a merchant can take a farmer's wheat on account, or whatever he wants; and if he puts it in a granary and keeps it there until a

March 6, 1956

quota comes along, then he should be permitted to sell it on the Permit Book and get the cash ticket for himself.

Premier Douglas: - Would you have a provision in there that he would have to pay the initial price?

Mr. Loptson: - Well, of course, I am not going to be concerned about that.

The farmer will look after that himself. Surely you are not going to be everybody's guardian. That is being done now, but it is being done illegally to a large extent.

Then we have (4) "that these arrangements continue until commercial storage facilities for grain are available to meet farmers' delivery requirements." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this Government had been so concerned about the farmers condition that they should have started that a year ago- or two years ago – and I might even say three years ago. My hon. friend, the Premier, brought a resolution into this House, I think, three years ago, advocating farm storage; but we are advocating commercial storage, where he can get his money; and if they were so concerned about the farmers, where he can get his money; and if they were so concerned about the farmers, they should have been out there a year ago to see that the elevator companies would extend their storage facilities, when they say the crop coming off. And if they would not, they should have done it themselves.

The next number (5) says "that the Government of Saskatchewan take immediate steps to negotiate with the Grain Commercial Channels for additional storage. Failing immediate action, the Government of Saskatchewan immediately take action to provide this additional storage." I submit, Mr. Speaker, if they have \$5,500,000 to put into a cement plant, then they should have a few million dollars to put into storage facilities for the farmers, which is the mainstay of this province.

Premier Douglas: - Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Government has not, at any time, put \$5 ½ million into a cement plant.

Mr. Danielson: - You gave a \$5 ½ million credit.

Mr. Loptson: - It doesn't say in the prospectus that you are guaranteeing it; it just says that you are behind it. That is just a theory, that guarantee business, but what is the difference, anyway.

Now then, having said this, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the House that this is a far better proposition to help the farmer, than by putting the Liberals on the spot here, as voting against the Liberals' action in Ottawa.

Premier Douglas: - May we have a copy of the amendment?

Mr. Danielson: - That's all you get – something negative.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Couldn't you get anybody to second it?

Mr. Loptson: - Yes, it is seconded by my friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson).

Mr. Kramer: - The Gold Dust Twins!

Mr. Danielson: - And the Provincial Treasurer!

Mr. Speaker: - In looking over this amendment, I think the amendment, as it is drafted is exactly the same position as the other motion which the hon. members objected to because it was more or less in the form of an omnibus motion; and if there is anything that was omnibus in that other one which it was agreed we should separate, this amendment is certainly an omnibus amendment. It has exactly the same. . .

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker. . .

Mr. Speaker: - . . .objections which were raised against the motion, the other day, certainly can be raised against voting on this amendment.

Mr. Loptson: - Well, Mr. Speaker, what is this House coming to, if you cannot make an amendment alluding to the subject matter of the original motion.

Mr. Speaker: - I am not objecting to that at all – that is not it. But I say you have now incorporated in this amendment something that has nothing at all to do with the motion, and if it was justified, then by agreement the other day, we separated the motion so that you could indicate your approval or disapproval of the different subject matters in that motion; and this is in a worse condition than that one. And I rule that if it is going to be discussed, it must be separated.

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker, the motion that we were discussing here at the last sitting of the House – the motion moved by Mr. Dewhurst – is also an omnibus motion, and it was not ruled that the motion was not in order, or that it must be broken into three motions; and I would like to refer you to motions that have been brought into this House by the Opposition, and have been amended, from time to time, by Government members in a very similar manner to the amendment which we now have before us. In my opinion, all such motions are out of order, but they have, down through the years, been accepted in this Chamber; and if the present motion is going to be ruled out of order, then I submit that all motions in the future that deal with more than one subject must also be ruled out of order; and that amendments, as well, that are brought in – whether they are brought in by the Government or by the Opposition, that they, too, be ruled out of order.

Mr. Loptson: - Well, Mr. Speaker, may I ask in reply to your ruling – what clauses are objectionable to the Government members, in this amendment?

Mr. Speaker: - Replying to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald,) I agree that many of these motions have been accepted, but they were not in order, and as I said, when I agree that the previous motion should be broken down, that I would not accept, in the future, any omnibus motions. This is really a substitute motion, not an amendment.

Mr. Danielson: - Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to one thing, and that is – I am going to read the original motion:

March 6, 1956

“Recognizing that the Federal Government guaranteed bank loan scheme is inadequate to meet the serious financial crisis now confronting the western grain farmer and the entire prairie economy, deplores the failure of the Federal Government to provide a prepayment on the initial price of grain in the form of a cash advance on farm-stored grain.”

Now that is the original motion. Now this other one, this amendment, deals with the same topic exactly; and it just has a more practical approach to the problem. And it says this:

“That all the words after the word ‘the’ in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

“Immediate financial needs of prairie farmers urges

(1) That credit unions, and where credit unions and banks are not conveniently located, that elevator companies be allowed to make loans or advances to farmers on the security of farm stored grain on the same terms and under the same guarantees against loss as are provided for the banks.”

That is what I consider the most important clause in this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: - But read the next clause.

Mr. Danielson: - Now, just a moment. I will deal with that. It is covered – a vacancy, or a blank space in the original system that has been set up by the Federal Government now, for rendering these advantages. It has been recognized and in many cases the farmers are far, far removed from the banks, and it is extremely difficult for them in winter time to get around to the bank to make a financial agreement with the bank.

Now then, I will admit that the second paragraph deals with something that is not directly in the motion, but I am sure I cannot see how, if it is not concurrent to the spirit or the intent of the motion, it goes further than the motion, but it is concurrent to the spirit of it. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): - It is not even related.

Mr. Danielson: - It is relative to it.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): - It is not.

Mr. Danielson: - It is dealing with the method whereby the farmers might get some money for their grain. And we know they haven't been getting any, and this is very important. The reason the farmers haven't been getting any money is because the storage, with the exception of the number of bushels stored by the elevators, is not large enough to bring in the cash on the initial

plan which is necessary for the farmers' needs.

Now this suggests that the initial payment for the first 1,000 bushels should be increased to \$2.00 per bushel – that would give even the small farmer \$2,000; and I think that practically all the half-section farmers would not be in not too bad shape at all, if they could get that.

Then the next clause is in regard to the Wheat Board regulations being relaxed – well, there is something wrong with this regulation; there is a penalty, I think, Mr. Speaker, because where we ask the Government to draw up regulations and rules for doing business, we always find out we are in a strait-jacket, more or less. We know what happened the other day when a farmer tired to shop some wheat from Saskatchewan or Alberta to British Columbia, where he had a poultry farm, and we know he got in trouble; he was pulled into court and the consequences to him were not very cheerful; so this clause that we have here asks that the regulations be relaxed to allow, within the province, trading in grain by permitting the purchaser to sell such grain to the Wheat Board on the Grower's Permit Book. Now we know that if I took over my friend's crop, I couldn't do that. . .

Mr. Speaker: - Might I remind the hon. member that we have not decided yet – the House has not decided whether we are going to accept this amendment. We still have the original motion before us, if the hon. member wishes to speak on it, there is time to do that yet. Might I say this – that it was on the request of the Opposition, and acceded to by the Government that the previous motion, which was very similar in position, had to be broken down, by agreement.

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it hasn't been agreed to. The question was never put as to whether it should be broken down or not, and when I moved the adjournment of the debate there had been no decision given as to whether the motion would be broken into three parts, two parts, or whether it would be put in its original form.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): - Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I submit that any contention that a motion is out of order, just because it is broken into paragraphs, it just plain silly, as long as the paragraphs are relevant to each other; and to object to this amendment on the grounds that it is sub-divided into headings and numbers interspersed throughout it, is not a ground for objection.

Mr. Speaker: - It is not on that grounds.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): - That is right, and I submit that that is the position which the Leader of the Opposition tried to put to it; that it was objected to on that ground. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the amendment is out of order on the grounds that it is not relevant to the motion. A specific rule of an amendment is that it must be relevant, and this amendment that the price of \$2.00 per bushel be paid on the first 1,000 bushels of wheat simply isn't relevant; if that is relevant, you can work in freight rates, or you can work in customs duties – I have no doubt if the tariffs were properly adjusted the matter would be as greatly affected as is suggested by that clause.

March 6, 1956

You could work in P.F.A.A. benefits, or the whole field of agricultural policy. The thing that is relevant here, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of cash advances to meet this financial crisis, and any clause that is proposed to be added that is not germane to that particular subject is out of order for irrelevancy, and on that ground alone.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I might just point out, also, that on another ground the amendment is out of order, because it is amendatory on the Government spending money, if the motion passes; there is a clause in there that the Government will go ahead with building storage facilities, under certain conditions. Now that can only come into the House by a message of His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Danielson: - It doesn't say that at all.

Mr. McDonald: - It is not asking you to spend money.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Do you think you are going to build that storage with wind?

Mr. McDonald: - If you could build with that, you would have had lots of it. There would be no shortage of storage.

Mr. Danielson: - Everything you were going to do was without price.

Premier Douglas: - How so you propose to take action to provide additional storage, without money? By turning somersaults?

Mr. Lopton: - The Liberals built the Co-op elevators to provide storage.

Mr. Speaker: - I think it would be just as well to adjourn the debate. At the present time I am absolutely sure, in my own mind, that it is out of order, particularly Item 2, and also Item 5, and I would much rather that you adjourned the debate and we can look up the rules.

Premier Douglas: - Mr. Speaker, before the debate is adjourned, while we are still on the point of order, so that we don't get ourselves into a scramble when we come to the next motion, I would point out Mr. Thatcher: - in the 3rd Edition of Beauchesne, under Citation 333, it says:

“A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the House may be taken on each separately.”

But if the resolution is, let us say, advancing a programme, and says there should be one thing done, a second thing done, and a third thing done, the House can ask that it be voted on separately. I am not dealing with this resolution under that point, but that deals with that problem.

Now, coming to this particular amendment, Citation 344 says:

“It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the House the question or amendment as mended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.”

I take it from that – if it is an amendment, when it is read it still deals with the subject matter of the original motion – it may be a qualifying phrase, it may be an expanding phrase, it may be a conditional phrase, but it is a phrase which still deals with the subject matter of the motion. Now strictly speaking, as I see this, this is not an amendment at all; it is a substantive motion and should have been moved “that all the words after ‘that’ be struck out”, and this introduces a substantive motion. I think, as has been pointed out by the member for Hanley, one couldn’t be any stretch of the imagination, think of the various items here, all the way from paying \$2.00 a bushel for a certain quantify of wheat, up to the provincial government providing storage space, as having anything to do with the subject matter of the resolution, which is cash advance on storage.

I think that probably. . .

Mr. Loptson: - It all refers to the financial position of the farmer.

Mr. Speaker: - Order! I am going to declare this amendment out of order.

Premier Douglas: - I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that probably if somebody would adjourn, it might give you a chance to examine the rules.

Mr. Speaker: - No, I am going to declare the motion out of order, and suggest that someone adjourn the debate and bring in another amendment, if they wish. I can agree that the first item would be in order, but the other items are irrelevant, and I declare the amendment out of order on this basis.

Mr. Loptson: - Well, Mr. Speaker. . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - The debate is on the motion, then, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: - The debate will continue on the motion.

Mr. Loptson: - I will appeal against your ruling on that.

The question being put by Mr. Speaker: Shall the ruling of the Chair by sustained? – it was agreed to, on recorded division, 32 to 8.

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): - Mr. Speaker, I. . .

Mr. Danielson: - Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: - I recognize the hon. member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff).

March 6, 1956

The debate continuing on the motion of Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): - I must say, to begin with, that I found it very, very difficult to follow the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) and some of his reasoning. We found the Liberal provincial treasurer of Manitoba very much alarmed and opposed to the Federal Government's policy of bank loans. We also found that, as difficult as it is for the members opposite to accept, the Wheat Pool delegates certainly did not agree with the position that our friends opposite keep trying to take.

So long, Mr. Speaker, as the marketing of agricultural products is in the hands of the Federal Government I think that we would be idiots indeed if we addressed any other body with regard to the difficulties that agriculture constantly finds itself in. The members opposite, and the Liberal party in general, have tried to fight the idea of cash advances – by raising carious red herrings, and the member for Saltcoats has certainly followed up that line this afternoon. It seems to me that these proposals of bank loans and credit union advances and, finally, freer trading under the Wheat Board, which is certainly the beginning of the end of orderly marketing, is one of the greatest 'mulligan stews' that I have ever listened to, as a policy that was supposed to cure the ills of agriculture.

Western agriculture, since the turn of the century, has been faced, periodically, by wide or wild or both, fluctuations in their overall returns, and especially in the net returns to the producer; partly, I think, because the returns to the tiller of the soil are subject to climatic and weather conditions, not only in Canada, but throughout the world; and partly by the law of supply and demand, and again, within certain limits, the law of supply and demand is subject to climatic conditions. However, there are other factors which enter into the picture, such as peace or war, trade agreements between heavily-importing countries and policies of self sufficiency amongst large importers of wheat, under normal conditions. During two world wars wheat marketings were regulated – not, Mr. Speaker, to see that agriculture had a guaranteed price or a parity price or a price based on the cost of production, plus a good standard of living; but rather to see that wheat and flour prices did not follow the upward swing of the law of supply and demand. In other words, when national regulations were applied to the wheat producer it was to keep his commodities from rising above a certain level; and to some extent these measures may have been justified in the war economy. I am not going to argue that at the present time; but certainly, Mr. Speaker, the consuming public were spared high bread and flour prices during those periods. It must also be remember that it robbed the agriculturist, during those periods of high prices, and it prevented him from receiving compensating returns for the periods when he was producing far below the level of production. There have also been these recessions of short or lengthy periods of time when the farmer found himself in the position of holding and carrying large quantities of grain with no immediate chance of marketing it, and therefore also found himself in the position of being unable to meet his obligations. We have also had the period of several years of high yields which, if carried forward, could meet a period of crop recession, when the yield would not meet the annual demand,

and to quote, Mr. Speaker, "On such a full sea are we now afloat"; and if we don't learn to navigate this sea of abundance, we will once again flounder amongst the pillars of plenty.

It is not because the Federal Government's bank loan policy is useless, or brings no relief, that we on this side of the House are critical, Mr. Speaker. It is, rather, because the measure is, to quote again: "too little and maybe too late." In many instances it is definitely not the ones in the greatest need who qualify for bank loans; and in the second place, for many people the loan is so small that it only affords sufficient to carry on their day-to-day expenses, and at the same time, it is carrying a 5 or 5 ½ per cent rate of interest for a very indefinite period of time. Thirdly, it is no answer at all to those who do not qualify for the loan, but whose families must be fed and clothed nevertheless. I see no valid reason, Mr. Speaker, why cash advances on a certain specified quantity of grain should not become a permanent part of our grain marketing policy, which would automatically go into operation when certain definitely stated conditions prevail. I think it should be, as I stated, a permanent part of our marketing policy.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not, as has been intimated from time to time, a hand-out to the farmers. It is only a legitimate means of changing his wages into a means of exchange for goods he so sorely needs, and it would not only assist the farmer and the small business man but it would be beneficial to our whole economy on provincial, national and local levels. It is not advocated as a sole answer to our agricultural problem at all, nor even as a sole answer to marketing problems, but to bring immediate relief in times of stress to the farmer and to the small business man. It would relieve the difficulty during the periods of large carry-overs, such as we are faced at the present time, and I for one, Mr. Speaker, am going to support the original motion.

Mr. Arnold Feusi (Pelly): - Mr. Speaker, one item here in the book struck me as peculiar. I hope this – that the Federal Conservative party is very much for cash advances, and I am just wondering where our provincial so-called Conservative stands, in this House, and I would just like to point out that the whip has already been cracked. He lines up with the Liberals.

Back again,, Mr. Speaker, to the man who has moved the amendment to this resolution. He made a statement referring to the new 'Moses'. I would like to call attention to the fact that a lot of folks in western Canada have lost a lot of faith in the old 'Moses', and there have been statements made by the Opposition, both in the Federal House and in this House, which give our western farmers ample reason to believe that they are insincere. They spread the story far and wide that our farmers pretty well all drive Cadillacs and they are not in need of assistance. I have a letter here, Mr. Speaker, written by one of the councillors in one of our northeastern municipalities, that is very short and to the point. He deals with tax arrears and the plight that our small business men in our rural communities are in, as well as the situation the municipalities are in, and the farmers. I would just like to read this into the records, and this is from Norquay, Saskatchewan, an area that is a very strong

March 6, 1956

producing area in the northeast:

“Our municipal situation is kind of grim, with a lot of unpaid taxes, but if the farmers could dispose of their grain we would be well off. The Liberal bank loans are not helping the farmer here at all. Not one farmer in the Norquay district qualified for a loan that I know of.” (Signed by the Councillor).

I would like to just advance this in this argument, Mr. Speaker. I shall support the resolution.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): - I would just like to say a few words on this, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to prevent the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) from adjourning the debate, so I am going to be brief.

Mr. Danielson: - Take all the time you like.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - Well, I am not going to take long, but it is rather strange, in this House, that one time they argue the constitutional issue – this afternoon, on one other Bill, that it is a federal measure – and now, this afternoon, under the constitutional marketing and export of wheat and grain it is a federal matter; and then the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) says it is up to the provincial government to build storage.

Mr. Loptson: - Sure it is.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - I say to the gentlemen over there, any time the Federal Government will step aside and hand over the marketing of all the wheat to the western provinces they will do a much better job than is being done in Ottawa at the present time.

Mr. Loptson: - That is what I wanted you to say, boy.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - That is just fine. Last July, Mr. Howe told the farmers that all the grain would be moved off the farms. . .

Mr. Loptson: - You'll sure get it, too.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - You have had your say now; I wish you would let me say a few things that I hope are a little more sensible than what you have said this afternoon.

Mr. Loptson: - I doubt that.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - Mr. Howe told the farmers that this grain would be moved off the farms and they would have storage by the end of the crop year. Now since he failed, he says it is up to the provincial government to build storage. Now the unfairness of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is this – they come along with a bank long for \$1,500; the farmer has to pay 5 per cent on that. . .

Mr. Loptson: - Terrible!

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - It is just as fair to say to the labouring force across Canada – every time we issue a pay cheque we want to deduct 5 per cent. It is just as fair.

Some Hon. Member: - It's the same thing.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - Here is a farmer who has produced the goods; they are marketable commodities; and because the Federal Government has failed they turn around and say to the farmer, "we are going to deduct 5 per cent off the \$1,500." Now, the amazing thing – we heard in the Committee yesterday, that the Credit Unions – and this is by information from our own Credit Unions – have given out all the money they have to loan.

Mr. Speaker: - Order! I do not think you should discuss what has gone on in the Committee. There have been no findings of the Committee yet.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - Well, I will repeat that – the Credit Union in my town, and I asked them before I came down about their loans, and they said "they are all out; if we had more money we would like to loan it to these people." Now the member for Saltcoats gets up in this House and says the Credit Union should loan more money. Where are they going to get the money? Aren't the members of the Credit Union predominantly in the rural areas farmers? And they are the same people who need it. Such nonsense from a member with so many years of experience behind him. All the farmers as for is a fair deal.

Mr. Loptson: - The resolution recommends it.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - Mr. Speaker, as this resolution states, the farmer wants to be treated like other people in Canada, that is all – nothing more or less. He thinks that he should have advances on his stored grain. Now, at the present time, if the grain is hauled to town and put in the bin there that is fine, but in a suitable bin on the farm, the farmer cannot get anything out of it at all. Now that is the situation at the present time. The second thing – since they have failed in their marketing policy, they are going to penalize the farmer further. Before I left my constituency I had three people phone me; they had spent all the money that they got in quotas in building storage; it was no use building further and so they left the grain piled up outside; we had terrific storms with high winds and much of that grain, when they go to move it, will be spoiled. There are two farmers who had 2,800 bushels of barley blow away off a pile, and when the farmers (and I make this prediction for this spring) in these areas look at this grain they are going to get some awful surprises, because some of the grain has been in granaries since 1952 – not 1953, but 1952, and there is a lot of spoiled grain.

Now I say this in support of this motion, why can't they give the farmer the same deal as we give other classes of people in Canada; and, this afternoon, we hear the argument – "Well, the Federal Government failed; why don't you fellows take it over." In answer to that I say put a C.C.F. Government in there and we will market your grain at Ottawa and we won't be

March 6, 1956

offering the farmers a meagre amount of \$1,500 and deducting 5 per cent before they get the \$1,500. That is bank loans – you never get \$1,500. . .

Mr. Loptson: - Highway robbery!

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - And because we stand up in this House and say something on behalf of the farmers they say, “well go out and build storage now”; and previously they argued about the constitutional issues. Why don't they, in turn, stand up and I would challenge the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) – the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) – I will go out and battle the election in the seat of Elrose tomorrow morning on cash advances on stored grain. I make that challenge in this House this afternoon.

Mr. Loptson: - I'll take you up.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - Any time you would like to come I will resign my seat and you can run against me.

Mr. Loptson: - No 'gimmies' there.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - We on this side are prepared, I am sure, and the members on this side of the House will go to the people on this issue any time you people would like to call it. In fact, you aren't come out on it.

Mr. McDonald: - Go out on your own record.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - You will see what record you have, after next summer is over, my friend.

Mr. Danielson: - He's dramatizing!

Mr. Willis (Elrose): - I said I would be brief, and I am supporting this motion.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): - Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

Boxcar Distribution and Allocation

The Assembly resumed, from Friday, March 2, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Dewhurst:

“That this Assembly requests the Government of Canada:

- (1) to make a sufficient number of boxcars available for the movement of grain, so that at all times grain may be moved into available terminal storage space; and

- (2) so to amend the Canada Grain Act that allocation of boxcars among the various elevator companies may be on the basis of the preference indicated by the application in each producer's permit book; and
- (3) to instruct the Transport Controller to make a more equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points, the allocation to be on the basis of need."

Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): - Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that our amendment, or proposed amendment. . .

Mr. Speaker: - I propose to split this motion up.

Mr. McDonald: - Thank you. That is just what I was going to ask you to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if it is agreed that we shall vote on this as three separate motions, I think in view of the fact that it is twenty-five minutes after five, I would like to adjourn the debate until Thursday night.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.