

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
24th Day

Tuesday, March 18, 1958

The House met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING OF FOOD ANIMALS

Moved by Mrs. Cooper, seconded by Mr. Davies:

That this Assembly:

- (1) Endorses and supports the principle of the proposed amendment to the Criminal Code contained in Bill No. 241, respecting the Humane Slaughtering of Food Animals, which Bill was given First Reading in the House of Commons on December 21, 1957, and which has been circulated in draft form for the purpose of obtaining the view, and suggestions thereon of all interested parties, before the proposed legislation is further proceeded with at the next Session of the Parliament of Canada;
- (2) Urges that the proposed amendment to Section 387 of the Criminal Code as set forth in the said Bill No. 241 be made applicable also to poultry slaughtering, and be enacted and have effect at the earliest possible date, and
- (3) Requests the Government of Saskatchewan, to the full extent of its jurisdictional responsibility, to take all necessary steps to ensure that all slaughterhouse practices repugnant to the principle of humane slaughtering be eliminated.

Mrs. J.M. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time this matter of humane slaughter has been brought to the attention of this Legislature, but all over Canada there has been a rising protest about the antiquated, the archaic and inhumane methods of slaughter that are being carried out in this country. This protest has been particularly vocal in the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario, and there has been a very widespread newspaper campaign in those provinces to acquaint the public

March 18, 1958

with the kind of methods being used. This campaign has helped to make people understand what is going on, and to produce a great deal of effort to get these methods changed.

Because of this protest, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Fulton, who has had a great many representatives on this subject, has brought a Bill into the House of Commons, namely Bill No. 241, which would make it a criminal offence under the Criminal Code to slaughter food animals without first rendering them unconscious by humane methods.

This matter was brought to my attention by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and by the Humane Slaughter Association which is a Canada-wide organization. Mr. Peter Stratton of Vancouver is its president, and he acquainted me with what was happening actually in our slaughter houses. Before that time I had no knowledge of it, and naturally I had no concern about it. However, since getting this information I have tried to collect what information I could, in the intervening time, and what I have read has convinced me, without a doubt, that it is time we had a change.

You might be interested to know that Canada is away behind other countries in the matter of the humane slaughter of animals. There has been compulsory legislation for many years in Britain, France, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, and Scandinavian countries. I thought it was quite interesting that compulsory humane slaughter legislation has existed in Switzerland since 1874; in the Netherlands since 1920; in Scotland since 1928; Ireland, 1932; England, 1933; Finland, 1934; Sweden, 1937; Fiji, 1948; New Zealand, 1951 and Denmark, 1956. Also I would like to say that resolutions have come in to the Government from the Farmers' Union on this matter.

I have talked with the President of the Women's Section on this matter; she is most anxious that legislation should be enacted. A resolution was passed by the women's section of the Farmers' Union, and also endorsed by the Farmers' Union as a whole.

I also have a resolution from the Health Committee of the of the Council of Women, and I have on my desk a letter from the packinghouse workers, very strongly urging that this legislation be passed.

The provincial Ministers of Agriculture, I know, have discussed this matter on various occasions, and they feel that any legislation that comes in should be uniform all across Canada, and therefore, it should be by Federal action. The Minister of Justice has recognized this fact, and that is why he is bringing the Bill into the Federal House.

I don't wish to take the time of this Legislature to detail all the unpleasant facts of the present slaughtering method, but I have placed a pamphlet on many of your desks — I am sorry I didn't have enough for everyone; but I hope you will pass it around, and I hope you have read this because it does give very detailed information as to the methods that are now being used in slaughtering houses in Canada. If you have read this pamphlet, I am sure you won't need any further argument; and perhaps the seconder of my motion, who is more thoroughly acquainted with the actual methods in the slaughtering houses, would like to say something more about this. I have seen films of the process, and that was enough for me.

If these methods were necessary it would be a different matter, but they are absolutely unnecessary, because there is modern and humane and effective equipment available and on the market. In the case of cattle, sheep and calves there is what they call 'captive pistol bolt' which can be used and which, with one application, will produce immediate unconsciousness and the animal never regains consciousness. For hogs there is a very effective method — there are several methods actually; but the most effective seems to be carbon dioxide used as an anaesthetic. The animal is passed through a chamber of carbon dioxide on a moving belt and is rendered unconscious absolutely painlessly.

This carbon dioxide method is the method that is used in many places. Three of the largest packing firms in the United States are using this method and have been using it for some time. The Hormel Company of the United States uses it, and I think you are all aware that Hormel products are among the best that can be found. After trying this method they found it so successful that they have extended it to all their plants and they think it is not only successful but very economical, because it cuts down so much on wastage and bruised meat, because with the present methods of slaughtering hogs, where they are shackled upside down on a moving conveyor while they are still fully conscious, a great deal of struggling goes on and a great deal of meat is spoiled and lost, to say nothing of the suffering to the animals concerned.

I did a little bit of examining into costs to see whether it would be practical or not, and I find that the cost is not great. As far as the captive-bolt pistol that I mentioned is concerned, it is about \$100 for one of these instruments. It was estimated that the cost per animal, by using this more modern method, is 2 1/2 to 4 cents an animal.

March 18, 1958

As far as the carbon dioxide method for hogs is concerned, we find that it comes to less than one cent per animal, although there is some capital cost in installing this in the first place; but again, as I say, once the capital cost has been spent, the amount, according to the packers who have used it, will be saved by less wastage and less bruised meat.

Now, of course, this matter has been brought to the packers on many occasions and they have said they would study it and they keep saying they are still studying it, but nothing happens further than that, excepting in a very few cases. And it has been found in every country, before they could get satisfactory procedures, that it was necessary to have legislation in this matter.

You will be interested to know that the British Columbia Legislature has already passed a motion such as I am suggesting that we pass in this Legislature. You would also be interested to know that in the city of Toronto there was such an outcry about present methods that the city council asked the Board of Health to study this whole matter. They studied it very carefully, and came in with a recommendation asking for legislation which, of course, the city council adopted and it was passed on to the Government.

I would like to read to you actually what is contained in this Bill. This is the Bill which the Minister of Justice Fulton brought into the House in the last Session. Here is what it is:

"Section 387 of the Criminal Code is amended by adding thereto the following subsection (3):

"In proceedings for an offence under this section evidence that a food animal was slaughtered without first having been killed instantaneously and without first having been rendered unconscious by a humane method is *prima facie* evidence that unnecessary pain, suffering or injury was caused wilfully or was permitted to be caused wilfully to that food animal.

"(4) In subsection (3) food animal means cattle, swine, sheep, goats, or horses.

"(5) Subsection (3) does not apply where a food animal is slaughtered in accordance with religious ritual.

I would like to point out two things about that Bill. In the first place, you will notice, that it does not specify any particular method. It is not dogmatic about that. It merely specifies that an animal must have been rendered unconscious by a humane method before slaughter takes place.

The other thing is the exemption for ritual slaughter, and this is important because there are certain religious groups who have certain methods of slaughtering which are in accordance with their religious beliefs. This refers to the Jewish people in particular. And because of this objection from the people who hold this religious belief, this ritual slaughter is excluded from the Bill.

Now, Mr. Fulton has asked — and I will read farther what he said. He has asked for opinions about this Bill. He said:

"Before moving the first reading of the Bill, the Minister of Justice stated it is not his intention to proceed further with this Bill at this Session, but to make it available to all interested persons, including especially the Attorney Generals of the provinces. All representations received will be studied, and we shall be prepared to make such changes in legislation as appear desirable in the light of those studies.

"After making such changes as are necessary we propose to introduce and enact legislation at the next Session of Parliament."

So I felt it was very timely, in view of this statement, that this should come before the House at this Session.

We are asking also that poultry would be included. Maybe this isn't quite so important. The Humane Slaughter Association has asked for it; but there is a very simple and inexpensive process (the electric knife) that is quick and effective for all types of poultry and it seemed to us that, if the methods were being changed over at all, they might as well do the whole thing while they were doing it and not have to come back again.

Of course the reference in the resolution to the province is the fact that any law would have to be enforced by our Attorney General.

March 18, 1958

So, Mr. Speaker, without labouring it any further (I would be glad to answer questions if you wish), I do hope we all get unanimous support for this resolution, because wherever there is unnecessary cruelty and brutality it should be stopped.

So I move the resolution as it appears on the Order Paper, seconded by Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw City).

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak only briefly in support of the motion that the hon. member from Regina has moved, and to give you, perhaps, a few facts about the slaughtering operations in packing houses in this and other provinces.

It seems to me, first of all, that resolution is to add to the weight of public opinion so that something will be done across the country that will reform the present very terrible methods of slaughtering in packing plants across the country. I would like to say that the people who work in the packing plants are much concerned that more humane methods of slaughter be instituted by law; first of all, because no one who works in a packing plant wants to continue with the present methods that cause suffering to the animals, as well as danger to the operators themselves; secondly, I think, because there are actual losses concerned in present methods that reduce the net returns to the industry itself.

In May of 1955, the United Packing House Workers of America, meeting in Vancouver, passed this resolution:

"Whereas the present methods of slaughtering food animals in Canadian packing houses are, in many cases, needlessly inhumane; and whereas humane methods involving stunning of all animals are in general use in many countries; and whereas the adoption of such methods would improve working conditions for the packing house operators;

"Therefore be it resolved that this Convention go on record in strong support of the efforts of humane societies to secure governmental regulation of methods of slaughtering food animals in this country."

I would like to describe, very briefly what happens in the case of hog and cattle slaughtering in the main packing houses of Canada. I know that many of the members may have seen this operation, but for those who have not, I think that some description would be useful.

In the case of the hogs, the hogs must be shackled in a shackling pen — a shackle being a chain which goes around one rear leg of the pig. After this is done, the end of the chain must be fixed to a nail and the animal hoisted up, head downwards, to where the sticker pushes a knife into a neck artery. After the sticking operation, the pig is conveyed to a scalding tank. In the first instance, it is a very painful thing for the hog to be hoisted in this manner. It tears ligaments and bruises the animal. Of course, the animal is quite terror-stricken during the whole operation. The hog sticker is not always successful in making a perfect cut, and in the journey from the sticker to the scalding tank, is possible that the animal has not yet expired, and is put into the scalding water, still living.

In the case of cattle, cattle are usually stunned from above with a heavy hammer. I have personally seen an animal struck a dozen times before being felled. I have personally seen animals that have risen after being stunned, dash across the beef-killing floor endangering operators, jump clean through a glass window and in the ensuing disturbance, it has taken an hour before the animal was subdued with considerable hazard and brought back onto the floor. It is this kind of thing that I think is cruel to the animal, and dangerous to the operator himself. I know that any method that would do away with the kind of condition we know exists, today, would be appreciated by every person who has to work on the hog and beef killing floors of the nation's packing plants.

With reference to the reduction in damage to the carcass, it is claimed in the Hormel plant, in Austin, Minnesota, that in one year the company paid out \$50,000 in damage claims because of internal bruises to hams, caused by this shackling method; and tests, according to the United Packing House Workers of America, Publicity Department of Chicago, indicate that as many as 9 per cent of all hams suffer from internal bruises. Also there is some saving in the quantity of blood that is saved for other products. I should say, too, that apart from any extra expense there might be in providing the means for the killing methods that are described in the resolution, there is actually some reduction in labour, since the same amount of help is not required for the shackling method, when the anaesthetizing method and the captive-bolt method are used for stunning.

All these are, I think, very good reasons why the Legislature should vote unanimously for this resolution, which I think will add to the weight of public opinion to result in the more humane killing methods that have been described by the hon. member from Regina, and also in the literature that you have been provided with previous to the moving of this resolution.

March 18, 1958

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say on behalf of myself and my colleagues that I am sure we are all in favour of any new methods which would be adopted by our packing-house industry which would help to bring about a more humane slaughtering of animals to be used for domestic purposes.

I am sure that we will be more than pleased to give our support to the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Regina.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask. I would like to ask, in the matter of enforcing such an Act, what about the farmer who slaughters his own animals?

Mrs. Cooper — This just covers the packing houses. It would have nothing to do with the farmer who slaughters his own animals.

Mr. Coderre: — Yes, but the Act still raises a question of doubt, and I would like to have it clarified. I don't believe that a law should be put into effect where it would affect a certain group and is to be overlooked for the other people. It has in the Act an exemption for certain religious groups. I believe that it should have in the Act as well an exemption for the individual who does his own slaughtering because it has a tendency to put an Act on the statutes which is enforced for some and overlooked for others. I am certainly in favour of putting it into effect, but I think that . . .

Mrs. Cooper — Well, my understanding is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! It is my duty to inform the Assembly the hon. member is about to close the debate. Anyone wishing to speak should do so now.

Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our group we would like to associate ourselves with the remarks that have been made. We are certainly in favour of a more humane method of slaughtering food animals.

One thing that came to my notice to which I would refer. The mover mentioned the fact that the Federal Government, before proceeding with the Act, wanted to get some further information and help from the Attorney General of the various provinces. I believe it is not customary for the Attorney General to attend these slaughtering functions at our packing plants, and I feel, before the Attorney General be authorized to send any recommendations to the Federal Government, that

he receive delegations from the various humane societies who have made a study of methods of slaughtering these animals in a more humane way, and take the advice of these humane societies in making his recommendations to the Minister in connection with this Bill.

We will support the motion.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, there is much in what the hon. member from Meadow Lake has said. I think the methods have been pretty well determined. Representations have been made in this regard for a number of years. Representations have been made to some of the provincial governments, and it was the general consensus of opinion that, if this matter could be dealt with, it ought to be dealt with on a uniform basis across Canada. At one time British Columbia was thinking about introducing legislation, and it was pointed out, and argued by the packers, that they might be placed at some economic disadvantage, although I do not think there was too much substance to that argument.

The matter was brought to the attention of the provincial Ministers of Agriculture, who meet in annual conference, and have for the last nine years; and we have made representations to the Federal Government requesting that the matter be dealt with, as it is being dealt with at the present time.

The matter of methods has been pretty well determined. As a matter of fact, the Canadian Council of Meat Packers has, as a result of the Toronto Investigation, set up a committee of the packing industry to look into the most suitable methods of humane slaughtering. So the thing is pretty well under way. I don't think it is necessary to give the matter of method much more study; it has been pretty well cleared. The industry, itself, is fairly familiar with it, and this method of dealing with it, by an amendment to the Criminal Code, is, I think, acceptable not only to the Association itself, but to the provincial governments.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — I just want to say a word about the remarks made by the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre).

There is no doubt that a lot of slaughtering is going on out in the rural parts of the province of Saskatchewan and everywhere else. However, there are not very many places where the slaughtering is taking place on the farms any more. If you go throughout this province you will find that you have a good many quick-freeze plants, or cold storage plants, set up in the larger towns and in some of the smaller towns as well. They set up a slaughter house in that town;

March 18, 1958

if there is a Co-operative Association in the particular town they set up and operate the slaughter house. I don't see how you are going to have uniform justice unless you include slaughter houses in the Bill, and have the Act apply to them as well.

There is a tremendous amount of slaughtering done in of those places. As a matter of fact, very few of these farmers get their meat, at least in wintertime; it comes from the butcher shops; it comes from their own lockers. They kill the beef and freeze some of it, and have their own locker, and take it out as they need it. In my district I think there are seven of these smaller plants; and every place where you have these small plants you have a certain amount of slaughtering going on, and I think they should be included in the Bill. If you take the province as a whole there must be a tremendous number of animals slaughtered in these smaller places.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see, we are all interested in humane slaughter, but we in the Battlefords, too, have a great many of these private slaughter houses, and private killing on the farm, which the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) has mentioned. From what I have seen the slaughter methods that are being subscribed to here and which most of us would subscribe to, are certainly being used. They use guns in most of these small slaughter houses and do provide every care that the animal is humanely slaughtered. It is not this mass assembly line murder that you find indulged in by the packers. I don't think we have anything to fear from the small local killing plants, because I have been in many of them and I am sure that most of them use very humane methods.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to inform the members that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate . . .

Mrs. Cooper (Closing): — Mr. Speaker, I think there is very little more to say. In reference to what the hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) said, it would be the Federal meat inspectors who would make the actual inspections. When complaints come in — if there were complaints that the law is not being complied with — that would be the only way in which the Attorney General would be involved — to see that the law was carried out.

My understanding of this is that it refers to slaughter houses, and does not contemplate taking in the individual farms.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

UNITED NATIONS NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Moved by Mr. Heming, seconded by Mr. Berezowsky:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to intensify its efforts to make the United Nations a more effective organization for the good will among all nations by proposing that:

- (1) membership in the United Nations be open to all nations;
- (2) all nuclear weapons tests be abandoned; and
- (3) a permanent international police force be established to afford all nations the opportunity of dealing effectively and immediately with acts of aggression.

Mr. D.H.R. Heming (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, for some years past we have had statesmen, scientists and philosophers who have been telling us of the grave dangers of nuclear war, indicating that the United Nations had failed somewhat, notwithstanding their territorial pacts, and have not yet assumed authority whereby peoples of the world shall have security of life and of liberty. This world today, doubles itself every 80 years, and contains two billion and a half or more of people; half of whom are illiterate. It is estimated that we have four billion acres of cultivated lands of which two acres is adequate to keep one human alive for a year, which indicates there are a large number of people in this world today who are being inadequately fed. I submit, sir, that with a co-operative government acting in harmony, using modern methods of production, this phase can be removed. It was Lincoln who said, many years ago: "The strongest bonds of human sympathy outside the family should be uniting of all working men of all nations, tongues and kindreds." Many of the members here were present when Mr. Eleanor Roosevelt told us of how hard it was explain to some people representing nations the meaning of our words; and also told us of the fact that it took her over two years to bring, before the General Assembly of the United Nations, the 'Universal Bill of Rights', which was passed by that body, and which, among other things, said this:

"Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude."

March 18, 1958

Evidently something fundamental and formidable is being evaded currently by the United Nations' Organization. Sensing this, recently a group of Norwegian scientists operating with an electric brain, uncovered some amazing facts. This brain said since 3,600 B.C. there have only been 292 years of peace in this world. During that period of time there have been 14,513 wars of a minor or major character. During that same period of time, 3,640,000,000 people were killed, either by way of war or by diseases associated with war. One in every four of humanity since 3,600 B.C. has been a victim of war. The total cost of these wars was designated by this machine to be an astounding five followed by 20 ciphers of dollars; in other words, equivalent to a band of gold around this earth at the equator, 100 miles wide and 30 feet deep. This machine also stated in connection with war, that if a nuclear war is fought now, three out of five people in this world will be killed, and those who survive as men will have a life expectancy of 25 years, and women of 28 years, and their children for many generations to come will be malformed and subject to strange transmutations.

Since 650 B.C. there has been 656 armament races which resulted in 1,640 wars. In the 16 instances in which war did not happen, the races who engaged in these armament races suffered economic collapse. This machine ultimately stated, that war is not inevitable. Working through the United Nations, it is possible to establish everlasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the adoption of this motion would eventually be the lead into a world government, and of a world government many outstanding men have voiced their appreciation. Winston Churchill said:

"The creation of a co-operative all powerful world order is the ultimate end towards which we must strive. Unless some type of world super-government can be set up and brought quickly into action, the prospects of peace and human progress are dark and doubtful."

The Archbishop of York, in this regard said:

"The world has to make the choice between international anarchy or international law; but law will be flouted unless behind it there is the authority strong enough to enforce it against aggressor nations. Christians of all churches should support the conception of a world order, and practical steps towards this realization, for it is the will of God that all nations as well as individuals should live in fellowship as members of one family under His Fatherhood."

Pope Pius XII on a proposed world government said:

"There is nothing more in keeping with traditional doctrines of the church, or better adapted to her teaching on the rightful or unjust war, especially in the present world situation."

Nehru of India said this:

"I have no doubt in my mind that some type of world government must and will come, for there is no other remedy for the world sickness."

John Foster Dulles:

"The United Nations is a beginning.; it is inadequate and faulty as are all great beginnings. There are few substitutes for learning by trial and error. There have been trials and there have been errors. The lesson is to persevere. Confidence has been impaired, but we need not be discouraged. What has to be can be. When it is suicidal not to have world order, world order is possible."

Einstein, the great scientist said:

"If we hold fast to the concept and practice of unlimited sovereignty of nations, it only means that each nation reserves the right for itself of pursuing its objectives through war-like means. Under those circumstances, every nation must be prepared for that possibility, which means that it must strive with all its might to be superior to anyone else. This objective will dominate more and more our public life, and will poison our youth, long before the catastrophe is actually upon us. This we must not tolerate, as long as we still retain a tiny bit of calm reasoning and human feeling."

I have an extract here that was published in 'Time' magazine in 1944. This was an extract from an address of Marshal Stalin, of November 6, 1944, speaking at a Moscow meeting:

March 18, 1958

"The United Nations face undoubted victory, but a full peace is not yet secured. New wars must be made impossible. The only way to create is a special organization of the United Nations to preserve peace and security, give it armed forces, and make it responsible to apply them immediately to avert or suppress aggression. This is not like the League of Nations without resources of power, but will be a new armed organization to avert new wars. It will be effective if the great powers which bore the brunt of the war continue to work unanimously and in concord, and only so."

Our former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Lester B. Pearson, when receiving the Nobel prize at Oslo, last December, called for new attitudes and said this:

"A great gulf has been opened in man's material advance, and his social and moral progress, a gulf in which he may one day be lost, if it is not closed or narrowed. The stark and inescapable fact is that today we cannot defend our society by war, since total war is total destruction, and if war is used as an instrument of policy, eventually we shall have total war.

"If we could internationally display on this peace front some of the imagination and initiative, determination and sacrifice that we show with respect to defence planning and development, the outlook would be more hopeful than it is.

"The grim fact, however, is that we prepare for war like precocious giants and prepare for peace like retarded pygmies."

It appears, however, that although we still have with us the nuclear bomb, it is not being used to decimate mankind currently other than by indirect sources, and the present menace facing us now is not the bomb so much as the experimental explosions of this bomb which are being undertaken by nations who manufacture them. This radioactive fall-out is even now circling around this earth every seven to 10 days, gradually dropping to earth where it poisons land, vegetation, water and all living things. These particles enter the bodies of human beings, and the body takes them and uses them in the form of calcium to form bone, causing cancer of the bone and, in some instances, leukemia. It is estimated by scientists that today there are 12,000 babies who are suffering severely from radioactive contact.

If we are to prevent the testing of bombs indiscriminately it will only be a short time before other nations besides those which already have them will be also trying to make their own bombs and demand the same right to explode them experimentally

In 'Time' magazine of February 17 last, scientists indicate that this persistent fall-out of strontium 90 affects the bones of all people, all over the world. "Since last, year this atomic fall-out has increased in human bones by 30 per cent. Young children have ten times the amount of this poison than adults. If these tests are to be continued, it will not be necessary to wage war, as we will gradually kill ourselves by this atomic fall-out."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, in 'Newsweek' of February 24, the United States of America are now moving a huge task force to Bikini, 14,000 men, 120 ships and 100 planes to make a series of nuclear tests in the Pacific, the result of which will be to add to our stockpile of strontium 90.

'Look' magazine last week carried an interview with Mr. Bevan, the potential Minister of Foreign Affairs of the next Government of Great Britain, and on that basis he was asked one question: "What do you think should be done to stop the nuclear arms race?" He said:

"We of the Labour Party are in favour of stopping British nuclear tests immediately. We should expect the United States and the Soviet Union to follow suit. This is important for several reasons. First, we must prohibit other less responsible countries from building and testing their own nuclear weapons; secondly an agreement to stop tests would reduce international tension. Each side would know whether the other was keeping the agreement, and finally I see no justification to poison the atmosphere in time of peace, for any nation to poison the atmosphere of other nations, and that goes for us as well as for the Russians.

"For the argument advanced by a few scientists here and in America that radioactivity has not yet reached the danger point, is plain 'poppycock'. You don't have to be a scientist to know that any radioactivity fall-out endangers lives, it is evident that there is fear in minds of scientists, substantiated by laboratory evidence, in regard to potentials of both nuclear bombs, and currently, and most important, the fall-out of strontium 90."

March 18, 1958

I hope those in power will assume the responsibility to preserve lives of us and all people everywhere. Not for myself, nor for ourselves, Mr. Speaker, but for our children's children, I ask that this motion be passed so that they shall not be borne deformed, nor suffer the agonies of radioactive contact.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, there is not much that I can add to what the mover of the motion has said, but I do wish to point out a few of the points in the resolution, and also what is mentioned in the preamble.

We do recognize (I think all of us do) that Canada, as one of the nations associated in the United Nations has done a considerable amount of work through its representation to try to bring about peace and harmony throughout the world, which is, after all, the main purpose of the United Nations. It is generally recognized, when we talk about world government, that before it can become a fact, certain understandings must be brought about in the world. I think, when we consider the first point in the resolution, that membership in the United Nations be opened to all nations, that is a very important factor in bringing about the goal of which we dream. When we see today that there are nations scattered throughout the world who are not associated, or not allowed to associate themselves together with other nations in the United Nations, we question whether we can bring about the kind of universal peace that we dream about. When we see nations such as Germany, divided in two, Korea split in two, again we ask ourselves this same question.

As an individual I feel there can be no peace in any community whether it is national or international, unless there is justice, and then there can be no justice without law, and there can be no law without a government, or a legislative body to enact, interpret, and enforce that law. So, when we think of the United Nations, and visualize that eventually it becomes a world government, when we analyze the goals towards peace. We feel we must have all nations incorporated and joined together in that one organization. Such seems to me to be the first step, and I as a Canadian, feel that our government, the Government of Canada, can do a little more towards trying to make this organization of the United Nations somewhat more effective.

It may be asked, "Why is it suggested that the membership to the United Nations be open to all nations?" We have six or seven strong nations who because of their power, can more or less dictate to the world. Well, that isn't, the kind of world government we visualize. We must understand, and recognize that nationalism and sovereign states have developed over thousands of years by isolationism or for other reasons, passed through a course of development, and we cannot ignore their national status today.

I think the first step before we can have an understanding between nations, is that we must first of all have recognition of the national states, whether it is on an ethnic basis, or whether it is on a cultural basis. It is only after these have established a self-respect and dignity that they will be prepared to associate themselves with others to form a United Nations or an eventual world government.

There is no use trying to ask the nations of the world who have been underprivileged, who have been tramped down, to appreciate the meaning of world government and the meaning of world peace. Nationalism, I believe, is an expression of the people for self-government and independence, and it is only from that goal that you go on to envision a federal form of world government. I think that whether the existing political entities are partitioned or built up into Federal states, that is not too important. We find cases where in this world we have associations of states, such as the United States of America, under which there is one common language and one culture. On the other hand we have the U.S.S.R., which is an association of a number of states into a federal group. I say it is not so important. The important thing is that, once they feel they have their self-respect and their dignity, and where they feel they have good reason to become federated, from that point on, with such understanding, we can find it much easier to have them associate into a larger organization such as we visualize in the United Nations. That is why I think it is very important that we approve and encourage our government to do all it can possibly do to see that the United Nations be open to all.

I think the other point has been pretty well covered by the mover, when he discussed nuclear weapons. I think we all understand the dangers to our society and to the world. If the strong nations of the world today do not get together as we feel they should, there is only one end, and that is, of course, death to the human race, whether it is through war or through the activity of nuclear energy which is being scattered throughout the world by the various tests and explosions that are carried on. I do not intend to go into that; I think it has all been very well covered. But I do wish to mention something about the international police force. When we look at the purposes of the United Nations, and then we look at the Charter, one of the points enunciated is the purpose of maintaining international peace and security, by force if necessary, and by peaceful adjustment where possible. That is one of the first points in the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

When you are building an organization such as the United Nations, with a goal of world government, you cannot have all these various nations who must associate themselves, group themselves together, to think alike. Because of past history, as I pointed out,

March 18, 1958

the cultures of past civilizations, there are going to be some disagreements. Of course, the best way to solve those disagreements is to try to do it by peaceful means. Force has never been too effective.

I would like to illustrate to the hon. members here that not too long ago we had difficulties in the Near East, in Egypt, and no one could guess when the clash broke out what might happen. We all feared a world conflagration — a World War III. But it so happened that, through the United Nations Security Council, and because of the goodwill of a few of the more understanding nations, it was only a matter of a few days until we had a small United Nations' expeditionary force in the area, not to fight the Egyptians or the Israelites, but to stand between two armies, waiting until they could cool down a little bit, so that friendly talks could be brought about, and an understanding arrived at.

I recall reading in the first instance that it was Denmark which sent about 45 such United Nations peace officers. They were very, very effective, and we know what happened as a result of that force and a subsequently larger force. Their presence engendered good will and understanding, which has brought about some peace between the two nations, and has averted war.

I think we must never forget that Canada can play a very large role in establishing peace, and I think we must remember, when we talk about a police force in the world, that it is not going to be a police force such as armies of the larger nations. It must be a police force using peaceful methods in an endeavour to solve the problems that exist between nations who may be desirous of settling their problems with implements of war. I think that is the purpose that we have in outlining point (3) of the resolution:

"That a permanent international police force be established to afford all nations the opportunity of dealing effectively and immediately with acts of aggression."

I do not think it means that we would be able to set up an army that would be, say, aggressive. It would be a peaceful force that would try to keep order until such time as the United Nations themselves could solve the difficulty or the misunderstanding.

I think in the past Canada has done very well. I would like to quote the former Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. King, once had to say in this connection. He pointed out this:

"That this time" (and I think it could be referred to today) "the present is one of those moments of transition where the old order is passing away. The end that we seek to serve transcends the limit of race and the bonds of nationality, and we shall not be guarded by any consideration of national pride or prestige."

He also pointed out this:

"That power and responsibility must go hand in hand. It is for each nation to remember that, over all nations is humanity, that international security depends primarily upon the maintenance of an overwhelming preponderance of power on the side of peace."

On the side of peace — not on the side of war:

"Power, however, is not exclusively concentrated in the hands of any four or five states, and the Conference should not act on the assumption that it is." (He is referring, of course, to the Conference in San Francisco.)

I would also like, in conclusion, to point out that Mr. Pearson, who represented Canada some time ago at the United Nations, has also made his stand known, which is very much the stand that is indicated in this resolution. I would like to quote what Mr. Pearson has said. I quote from "A United Nations Peace Force", the last page:

"Even if governments are unable to give the United Nations a fighting force ready and organized to serve it on the decision of the Security Council", he wrote in April, 1957 issue of 'Foreign Affairs', "they should be willing to earmark smaller forces for the more limited duty of securing a cease-fire already agreed upon by the belligerents. We might in this way construct a half-way house at the cross roads of war, and utilize an intermediate technique between merely passing resolutions and actually fighting."

"If the experience of the United Nations expeditionary force is not built upon" (and he's referring to this United Nations' expeditionary force

March 18, 1958

which was sent to Egypt) "we shall only go back again to the situation in which we found ourselves last November, when everything had to be improvised; when there was no precedent for making units available, no administrative and financial procedure, and no organization to which the Secretary General could turn in the task which was given him by the Assembly of putting a United Nations force into a dangerous and delicate situation."

He referred to the situation in 1956. He goes on to say this, Mr. Speaker:

"We improvised successfully then; we cannot reasonably expect to see the degree of success the second, time."

I would like to say that I think Mr. Pearson is absolutely right. The United Nations must have a police force — not an army, but a police force ready at all times to enter into any part of the world where it is sent to restrain aggression; not to fight on behalf of one side or the other side, but to try to hold down aggression until such time as the nations of the world, assembled together, can resolve such problems.

I think this resolution is certainly worthwhile supporting. It is more or less in line with what our leaders, whether it is Mr. Pearson, or Mr. Coldwell, and what the late Hon. Mackenzie King have said; I think it is the feeling of the people of Canada that much is being done both in the technical field and in other fields by the United Nations to bring about peace and security in the world; but we feel, as we say in the preamble, that to bring about this harmony and goodwill we can do much more towards this end. This resolution encourages the Government of Canada to do just that. Therefore I am very happy to second the motion.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you to give a ruling on this resolution, as I feel it is out of order, because it is an 'omnibus' resolution. It asks three distinct questions:

Firstly, 'membership in the United Nations be open to all nations'. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is a distinct question and one that has had considerable representation presented on both sides of the question.

Number 2: "That all nuclear weapons tests be abandoned" — again, another very controversial question on which there are arguments for and against. I suggest to you that it should not be included with No. 1.

Number 3: "a permanent international police force be established to afford all nations the opportunity of dealing and immediately with acts of aggression". I doubt much If there is argument against No. 3 — there are very few, at least, against it. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to rule as to whether the resolution is in order or not.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, before you can make a ruling, I would refer you to a great many precedents, both in other Chambers and in this one. I can, for example, as a precedent, turn to the next page (page 4 of today's Order Paper) to an amendment that was moved by the Leader of the Official Opposition to a resolution, in which he asked for things which are completely separate and apart from one another — such things, for example, as marketing boards for major agricultural products; that the farmer be given the opportunity to deliver at least a normal crop each year; the next one — to lower the cost of marketing grain; deliver it to the elevator of his choice. All of these are things which could be considered separately, and it might be considered in the nature of an omnibus amendment or resolution also.

These all have for their purpose, to try to establish throughout the world harmony and good-will among all nations, and these are three different methods that are suggested to do it. I would submit that the resolution certainly is in order, and that there is nothing there which would prevent members from supporting all of these — or if there are any of these that are repugnant to any member, then, of course, they have the right to move an amendment to have those struck out, and if they can convince the majority that they should be, then, of course, that will be done. So, I would, respectively suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the proposals made by the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) be dismissed by you, and that you rule this in order.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, may I speak?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, the fact that it has been done in this House, as the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines), has stated, is no criterion because I think that you agree with me that the House rules have been broken continuously in this House. I have said so from time to time . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I think that should be withdrawn. I do not think any of the members should be allowed to cast an aspersion upon you in that manner . . .

March 18, 1958

Mr. McCarthy: — I'm not casting any aspersion . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It is terrible.

Mr. McCarthy: — . . . on the present speaker. I expressed that opinion. I think I have expressed it in this House before, and I think I am entitled to express it again. There are a lot of rules in this House that have kind of gone along, and I am not blaming anybody in particular for it. But they have gone along and gone along. They do a lot of things, here, that I don't think you can find any justification for in any book of rules. And I am not an authority on rules.

In a resolution of this kind, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to you the unfairness of it: I might be perfectly in favour of the last clause; I am not in favour of the middle clause and I am not decided on the first one, but it does not matter. If I am put into a position where I have to vote on this resolution as it stands, I will have to vote against something I want, or vote for something that I do not want. I do not think that our British system of Parliamentary procedure allows this sort of thing. True, it has been done. The hon. Provincial Treasurer referred to the amendment on page 4. May I point out to him that that was not our resolution. That was their resolution . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McCarthy: — . . . and that we amended some of but it was in that form before, and we only added something to it. So he cannot hook that onto us. Those moves have been allowed to go through from time to time, and I think it is high time — These rules are laid down for a certain purpose, for certain reasons, and they came down to us through time from the British House of Commons and our Canadian House of Commons, and I feel quite sure that, in this particular instance you cannot justify that kind of a resolution by any stretch of imagination.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to recall to you when you were in the House a few years ago. There were some of these omnibus resolutions being introduced and Mr. 'Jake' Benson, the member for Last Mountain . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — At the time, he introduced a resolution in regard to agriculture. This was one of these omnibus resolutions containing four, five or six different clauses. The Speaker at that time ruled that this, definitely, would be the last time that he would accept a resolution of this kind. He said that it was too unwieldy, had too many different subjects brought into it, and

he ruled that he would not accept this and the House would not accept any resolutions of that kind. Well, these things are creeping back again. I might say the resolution that the Provincial Treasurer referred to, you were asked your opinion on it by the Leader of the Official Opposition, whether if it was broken up it would be in order, and after that, we moved an amendment, which is in accordance with the rules of the House. Now, what I would like to say is, let us get back to the old days, in the past few years, when if we had a subject we dealt with that subject, and the ruling was made by the Speaker at that time with regard to debating resolutions. I think it was a wise ruling, a good one; and I think we should get back to that. As the member for Cannington said, as it is, in order to vote for something we do want we also have to vote for something we don't want.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, may I point out that I think this resolution is entirely in order. Also, the wording of 1, 2 and 3 in the clause may appear different to the members than what appears in the Charter of the United Nations, yet that is exactly what is incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations. When we talk about membership of all nations, in the United Nations, No. 2 says: "To respect the rights of self-determination of all peoples". It is one of the things in the Charter. Insofar as nuclear weapons' tests being maintained or abandoned, it says in Clause No. 4 "to maintain international peace and security." You cannot have international peace and security unless you abandon tests. The third one, there about the maintaining peace, again, with a police force, you will find again, in the charter in Clause No. 1. What we have pointed out here, is exactly more or less what is in the United Nations' Charter, and all we are asking in this resolution is for the Government of Canada to continue doing what it has been doing, just pushing a little harder, to bring about the happy day when we will have peace in the world among all nations.

Mr. Speaker: — With respect to this motion, I realize the quandary into which an 'omnibus' motion sometimes places the members who are in agreement with one part and not with another. But, as a matter of fact, when I put this motion to the House, I was, by so doing, ruling the motion in order. If the House wishes to split this motion into its component parts — in other words, with the same preamble, to vote on each of those three paragraphs separately, then that, of course, will be the wish of the House. If that is not made clear to me, I must rule the motion in order.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, with that ruling, I would like to adjourn the debate so that I could have the opportunity of splitting it into three parts, and debate it in three parts. I would beg leave to adjourn this debate now.

(Debate Adjourned)

March 18, 1958

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, March 4, 1958, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Dewhurst:

"That, in view of the continuing deterioration of the agricultural industry, this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to call a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference which would include representatives of farm organizations, and that the Provincial Government, either at such Conference or directly upon the Government of Canada, be requested to press adoption of policies for agriculture including:

- (a) Parity prices for all agricultural products, using deficiency payments where necessary;
- (b) a comprehensive system of forward pricing;
- (c) National Marketing Boards for major agricultural products;
- (d) a program of full employment to maintain the domestic market for agricultural products;
- (e) Sale of agricultural products by barter arrangements, or in the currencies of the importing nations;
- (f) a program of national crop insurance; and
- (g) a national credit program to meet the needs of agriculture."

and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McDonald:

"(1) That clause (c) be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

'(c) marketing Boards for major agricultural products when requested by a large majority of the producers concerned';

"(2) That the following clauses be added after clause (g):

'(h) farmers be given an opportunity to deliver, and be fully paid for, at least a normal crop in each crop year;

- '(i) lower the costs of marketing grain;
- '(j) deliver to the elevator of his choice;
- '(k) increase research into new uses for surplus agricultural products;
- '(l) bring wheat, oats and barley under definite price supports;
- '(m) extension of the program to pay storage on surplus grain'."

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, there are some good things in the amendment proposed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald); but there are also some cases of unfortunate wording.

For example, the amendment refers to "marketing boards" rather than "national marketing boards". I propose to move an amendment to the amendment, which will have the effect of wording this clause on marketing boards as follows:

"National Marketing Boards for major agricultural products where such products involve interprovincial or export trade."

In the amendment, paragraph (h) asks for an opportunity for farmers to deliver and be fully paid for at least a normal crop in each year. I feel sure that the Leader of the Opposition did not intend this wording to infer that we go back to a system of open marketing; but in fact, if the farmer is going to be fully paid for his crop in that year we would have to abandon the present system of Wheat Board marketing. I therefore suggest that this paragraph be reworded to read as follows:

"the opportunity for farmers to deliver to the Canadian Wheat Board at least a normal crop in each crop year; and in addition to receive an initial cash payment through the Wheat Board on grain suitably stored in sealed bins on the farms."

This will not interfere with the present system of marketing. It will, in addition, make provision for advances on farm-stored grain. These advances would be, in fact, initial cash payments, the same as a farmer receives when he delivers his grain to an elevator.

March 18, 1958

No one can have any quarrel with an attempt to lower the costs of marketing grain, but I think the suggestion that the farmers be able to deliver to the elevator of their choice needs some expansion. There is no sense in talking about this problem unless provision is made for the distribution of box cars to the elevators on the basis of the farmers' preference. Therefore the farmer must be prepared to express any preference he has, in advance of marketing, so that the necessary arrangements can be made for distribution of box cars.

Paragraph (k) suggests research into new uses for surplus agricultural products. This research should also include new markets.

I am also going to propose to add to paragraph (m) of the amendment the suggestion that not only would farmers receive payment for storage of grain in their sealed bins, but also the initial payment should be increased during the crop year to encourage construction of farm storage facilities.

One of the problems of marketing our wheat is the great rush with which it comes to market in the fall. This creates a great problem for the Wheat Board, and all of our facilities. If storage facilities are available a farmer can, instead of delivering his quota of grain in the fall, hold that till March or April; he has saved the Canadian Wheat Board a good deal. He has saved that the problem of taking that much more grain into their system. He has saved them the question of paying storage on it for those months. So it seems to me that it would be only fair to the farmer, who has the initiative to build some granaries, who can hold back some of his crop to get some payment for the service he is giving to the Wheat Board.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the amendment needs to be discussed very much more at this stage by me. I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Nollet:

"That clause (l) of the proposed amendment be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"(l) That paragraph (c) be amended by adding thereto the following words: 'where such products involve interprovincial or export trade'.

"2. That paragraphs (h), (j) and (k) be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"(h) the opportunity for farmers to deliver to The Canadian Wheat Board at least a normal crop in each crop year, and in addition, to receive an initial cash payment through the Board on grain suitably stored in sealed bins on the farm.

"(j) distribution of box cars to country elevators on such a basis that farmers will be able to deliver their grain to the elevator of their choice.

"(k) increased research into new uses and new markets for agricultural products.

"3. That the following words be added to paragraph (m):

"to include payment for storage to the farmers when grain is suitably stored in sealed bins, and increasing initial payment during the crop year to encourage construction of farm storage facilities."

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in seconding the amendment to the amendment, I would like, first of all, to point out that perhaps the original resolution said a bit more than it ought to have said. However, the detail in the original resolution had to do with setting up a guide to a marketing conference that might be called by the Federal Government, a guide to the establishment of prices and dealing with various kinds of agricultural products across Canada. I thought it was in order to that extent.

However, the amendment I think, Mr. Speaker, was dealing with regional matters, with problems that are peculiar to one section of the agricultural economy of Canada, and for that reason I thought it was rather out of place at the time. However, I feel that the amendment to the amendment, as proposed, has certainly clarified the original amendment made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and also sets forth the viewpoint of this Legislature expressed from time to time, particularly the viewpoint expressed in the report and recommendations of the Select Committee on Marketing and Farm Income.

I would like to make reference to some of the statements made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he was proposing his amendment. He mentioned that we ought not to concern ourselves with export markets outside of the United States, because . . .

March 18, 1958

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I never said any such thing.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He mentioned that the American market afforded us the greatest possible market for surplus agricultural commodities.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! There are a great many different questions involved in the motion, the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. I think we would get along better if the hon. member confined himself to the amendment to the amendment, to begin with.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again. The Minister has misquoted what I said, or misinterpreted it. I did not say it was the greatest market for our surplus agricultural products. What I said was that we would probably have far more surplus agricultural products if it wasn't for the market in the United States. I think the Minister realizes that the United States is not the greatest market for our surplus agricultural products, which are the cereal grains.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, there is, I will agree, a good future potential market in the United States, but we have not as yet reached that circumstance. I could also mention that the hon. Leader of the Opposition stated — and I think I'm in order. Mr. Speaker; I am speaking here to the amendment to the amendment which deals with interprovincial and export trade. I don't know of any other opportunity that I would have to reply to some of the observations made by the Leader of the Opposition, if I didn't have the opportunity now.

He mentioned that the American market would be much more remunerative, that we could expect much more for our products on the American market than any other export market, because of the . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege. I wish the Minister would go back and read what I said. I said that we have received more for the agricultural products that we have been exporting to the United States than we could have received from any other market in the world — in the past; not in the future!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He was talking about the past and the future. I made a very careful note of his statements.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, read it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — All I want to point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition is that we have not for a number of years exported to any extent meat products and dairy products to the United States, or any other products excepting cereal grains; and as compared to the other markets in the rest of the world, our export of grain to the United States has been nominal, too. He should be aware of the fact that they have embargos on meat products in the United States, because they have not reached that point where they need to import large quantities from outside sources, particularly Canada.

When he says our market in the United States in the past has been more remunerative, I would like to point out to him that, consistently over the past years, the price of hogs has been lower in the United States than it has been in Canada.

Mr. McDonald: — We never exported any.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now one of the reasons that pork did not come into Canada was because there was a disease embargo and it is still in effect. The same holds true in regard to cattle. While we have been exporting, on an average, years ago, some half a million head to the United States, this is only a small quantity of Canada's potential production.

In the field of pork products, when we had the United Kingdom market we were selling in the neighbourhood of some 600 million pounds of pork. When the agreements with Britain were not renewed, then we had a surplus of pork in Canada which did not find its way into the United States market, with the result that our farmers in western Canada went out of pork production. Since then we have been gradually building up, not a surplus, but increased pork production in eastern Canada at the expense of western Canada. So even though the total number of our hogs has come up in the post-war period very gradually, that increase has not been too noticeable in western Canada; and if there was any real encouragement to hog production, we would find great difficulty in finding a market south of the border for our pork products.

I am not going to deal with the tariffs that are set up, but the very fact that the United States has tariffs against our meat products much higher than our own against theirs, would indicate that we have not as yet reached the stage where we can expect to send our surplus meat products to the United States in any large quantity, particularly . . .

March 18, 1958

Mr. McDonald: — We're sending it all there.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . if we increase our production. I will give the hon. member some figures that may be of interest to him. For example, back in 1948, our total export of cattle to the United States was 439,000 head; it dropped to 386,000 in 1949, and just over 400,000 in 1950. In 1951 we had foot-and-mouth; in 1952, 13,000 head; in 1953, 65,000 head; in 1954, 83,000 head; in 1955, 59,000 head; in 1956, 45,000 head. This year we have again had the American market, particularly for feeder cattle. There has been a heavy liquidation of livestock in the U.S. because of drought, but as compared to the total number of livestock there, the reduction in marketing was not too great. Our market now in the United States is back again, but we don't know how long that is going to last (that is, in the immediate future), because of their very heavy pork production.

When we were talking at a marketing conference in Ottawa about the possibility of sending our then surplus pork products to the United States, I can remember the remarks of the agricultural attache from the United States, Mr. Flood, and his advice to us was: "We have all the meat that we can possibly eat. Why don't you Canadians just eat a few pounds more of pork and beef products like we Americans do, and surpluses will disappear." Now that has been pretty well the policy of the previous administration at Ottawa — to eat it all at home; to eat all our beef and pork at home. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we need to find other export market outlets not only for our meat products, but also for our cereal grain and other agricultural products. At the moment we cannot depend entirely on the American market as being a stable and remunerative market to us, in either case.

The other thing I want to speak about is that the amendment made no reference to national marketing boards. We are talking about a National Marketing Conference, and obviously we are talking about national marketing organizations. The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned that marketing schemes should not be implemented unless the majority of the producers indicated they wanted them, which we agree with, and legislation is on provincial statutes which makes ample provision for a vote. But of course, the hon. Leader went on with one of his sweeping statements again, and said: "Why doesn't the Provincial Government do that?" The Provincial Government, as he well knows, has provided the procedures and an opportunity for producers by vote to set up provincial marketing boards. We always have acknowledged that we had the authority to do that, and we have provided the means under which our producers could set up provincial marketing boards. We have had some experience with them. We set up a Honey Marketing Board, but it was no more than set up when honey products came in from Manitoba — after we had set a price in our own province. Now reference was made to Ontario, too. They have many provincial marketing boards there that are operating quite successfully,

because the products they are handling are consumed almost entirely within the province of Ontario, but similarly, if they were to set a price, for example on hogs, and the price would permit our hogs to go to Ontario, they would be unable to prevent our hogs from flooding the Ontario market.

I have seen some pretty good illustrations of that, Mr. Speaker, in the field of apples. Nova Scotia apples came on the market in Ontario at a price where a good deal of ill feeling was caused in an attempt to try to stop Nova Scotia apples from coming into the province of Ontario.

We know that provincial marketing boards, because of those factors, have their limitations, and that there must be a national marketing organization to take a product that goes into the interprovincial and export markets of the world. That is well recognized. It is so futile for anyone to get up in this House and suggest that the province, within its limited jurisdiction, can solve all of their marketing and farm income problems, as is repeatedly suggested by the hon. members opposite.

Mr. McDonald: — We've got to take the lead or we'll never get it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This matter of interprovincial trade has been the bugbear of every marketing board, and still is, even in the province of Ontario.

Now, aside from marketing, I was pleased to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition supporting the idea of national credit. The reasons for this are very obvious, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say at this point that I got a little tired of this constant talk about the province should do this and it should do that. We are all aware of the limited jurisdictional powers of a provincial government, and when these statements are made — I know the hon. members opposite know these things, and I think sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we have reached the point where we can carry our political enthusiasm to the point where it doesn't serve the public interest very well.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now we, as provincial Ministers have met in conference repeatedly for the past nine years. We are all unanimous in our opinion that agriculture needs long-term credit at very low rates of interest because of the nature of the credit required and the uncertainty surrounding the agricultural industry. For that reason every provincial Minister of Agriculture has placed his signature on a document presented to the Federal Government through the present Minister of Agriculture, asking for a comprehensive national

March 18, 1958

credit program. Perhaps we are going to get it, and I will give any national government full marks for doing so. I notice our Liberal friends are talking about it now, too; but they are a little bit late on the deal, I think. It is desirable for two reasons. First of all, low interest credit, because it is decidedly a long-term type of credit we require to develop farmsteads over a long-term period of time. As we all know, you just don't jump into farming and become established overnight. It takes a long time, and, therefore, low interest rates are necessary. Everyone knows the province cannot provide money at sufficiently low interest rates to be of any material benefit to the farmer, with the exception, perhaps, of short-term credit; but on the long-term credit for the development of farmsteads it must be at low interest.

The other reason is this: I believe that a national agency should handle this thing of farm credit; that is, the same national agency that has the responsibility for fiscal policies, the national agency which alone can determine whether agriculture is going to be on a sound or unsound basis. We in this province attempted farm credit under former administration — the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Organization. We know our sad experience with this credit organization not only from the viewpoint of administrative behaviour, but also because of the very risky nature of our agriculture economy here, the uncertainty of prices and the problem of natural hazards. I think the Government dropped some \$11 million or \$12 million in that venture.

It is true there are farm credit organizations in both Quebec and Ontario that have been referred to by the members opposite, and they are operating very well; and again their problem is not as difficult, because most of the products that they produce find a ready market, and are consumed, within their own provinces . . .

Mr. McDonald: — What about Alberta?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and they do it primarily in the production of specialized products that find a ready market in cities like Montreal, Toronto, Quebec and other heavily populated industrial centres. It is a limited credit, and it is doing a good deal of good on behalf of those farmers. But for our kind of credit, since our farm units are larger and we haven't the diversity of production, and where almost all of our products are exported, and we live under variable natural circumstances, in my mind the same government agency that has the responsibility for farm income and taking farm products into the export and interprovincial markets should assume some responsibility for providing the kind of credit that will really be useful to our farm people.

I was pleased, too, to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition support the idea of crop insurance. That this is something that ought to be incorporated in any discussion that takes place on a

national level. I should mention it has been suggested to us why don't we go into crop insurance? The answer is so obvious that I shouldn't have to enumerate the reasons in detail. We all know that, in the event of two or three dry years, this provincial economy could not, of its own resources, support an adequate crop insurance plan that would give our farmers the income that they require. In other words . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Is it the wish of the Assembly that we proceed to debate the motion, the amendment and the amendment to the amendment all at once?

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — He wants to take a fling at the 'thirties.

Premier Douglas: — Could we take each of the amendments . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I don't expect to speak again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: — I would agree to it, Mr. Speaker, that we debate them all. It would probably speed it up.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am talking about crop insurance; it is in the amendment to the amendment and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I am in order in talking about it. This is almost a Throne Speech debate. This is really not a motion that is before the House. It is a submission; it is a brief that we are presenting to the Federal Government, so I think I should be allowed a little latitude.

In the matter of crop insurance I notice that this matter is being dealt with by the Manitoba Legislature; and, here again the three western Ministers suggested and offered our full co-operation to the Federal Government in developing a crop insurance plan. Mr. Shuttleworth, in Manitoba, who is in a much more favourable province than we, a province which probably could, with some degree of success, engage in a crop insurance plan on its own, states the provincial economy couldn't stand it. In Manitoba, they don't have the same natural hazards. The P.F.A.A. payments, as we all know, are not as great in that province. In fact they are building up a fund there, whereas the national government has to contribute about 30 to 40 per cent to our P.F.A.A. payments in addition to what is deducted from the farmers' products in this province. Yet Mr. Shuttleworth said that the provincial economy could not afford a crop insurance plan — that it is a national deal; and in that province, which has a Conservative Opposition, the Government is being told by that Opposition: "You fellows do it on your own". Some have the same story right across the board.

March 18, 1958

It should be a national plan and it ought to be incorporated, I think, in a comprehensive marketing and farm income policy. It is not good enough to just talk about a marketing conference and a marketing scheme to deal with marketing. It has always been my opinion that what we are actually dealing with, and what we actually mean, is farm income, and farm income is determined, of course, primarily by the price that the farmer gets; secondly, his so-called 'take home pay' is determined by the costs that he is expected to pay; and thirdly, of great significance to us are the climatic hazards that we have to face. Now all three of those bear significantly on farm income. Therefore, any plan that has for its purposes a guarantee of at least a minimum income to our farm people, must take into consideration this factor of crop insurance. It has always been my belief that the two could go together very handsomely.

I quite agree, too, that when we talk about parity prices that it is a good question to ask — what price would you arrive at suitable to everyone? I think that is a good question because the size of farm units vary from farm to farm; soil conditions, and weather factors come into consideration, all of which, of course, have a great bearing on the farmer's production costs. A big operator on favourable soil and climatic circumstances can produce wheat very cheaply, whereas another farmer on a smaller unit or even a larger unit would have higher production costs. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, let us recognize the situation as it is and attempt to deal with it realistically. I am saying that we can devise ways and means of incorporating into the price of agricultural commodities sufficient to cover these risks, for example, 40 cents a bushel for wheat; and then I say, pay the money out and make appropriate deductions much the same as we do under P.F.A.A. Such deductions would be made on the basis of the amount of produce that is marketed by each individual farmer. Thus the big operator would contribute, percentage-wise, proportionately more to such a fund, and perhaps on a graduated basis, because, too, as the operator gets bigger, and has a bigger volume of production, then graduate upwards the contribution that he is expected to make to this kind of fund for crop insurance, for workman's compensation, for accident insurance, and any other benefits that are now enjoyed by people outside the agriculture industry.

I like to look at the industry as a whole,. What I see is some 700,000 people gainfully employed in this industry in Canada, and they are deserving of the same protection as is now enjoyed by people working outside the agricultural industry. I am convinced that we can devise a marketing and pricing plan which will make provision for suitable deductions to provide crop insurance and all of these other things are of such great concern to us, and also place this agricultural industry on a sound self-sustaining basis, so that it can carry itself and so that any credit, whether it is provided by a federal agency or a provincial agency, has some possibility of repayment.

When I say all this, Mr. Speaker, I say this too — that any credit agency ought to be strictly administered. I think the day has gone when we can afford to have slipshod farmers. Farmers, like others, must realize that it is a very exacting kind of occupation. It calls for a high degree of skill and technical know-how, not only of farm mechanics, but an understanding of animal husbandry, field husbandry, soil and particularly farm management. So I say, whatever program we may have in terms of crop insurance or credit, should be managed very strictly, and I think, the selections ought to be made carefully. I don't think you can pick just anybody who might wish to go into the business of farming. The applicant's record of performance ought to be considered.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and also because I believe the amendment to the amendment more clearly reflects the thinking of the Legislature as expressed from time to time, perhaps with the exception of the Select Committee Report, which the hon. members opposite refrained from voting on — and I cannot condemn them. We can't say they voted against it or voted for it; they just sat, Mr. Speaker. But I want to remind the hon. members opposite that the Select Committee Report contained within it a good deal of the purpose of the amendment suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. So we are gradually moving ahead, and I certainly welcome and congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for moving a step forward. I notice, in 1954, they voted unanimously against the suggestion that we have a national conference, but the shoe is on the other foot now. They want a conference now. I notice, too, when these very important matters were proposed in the Select Committee Report, and because of certain minor objections compared to the importance of the main recommendation for a conference, the hon. members over there just sat. They were on a sit-down strike at that time. So they have been blowing hot and cold on these issues. I hope they can see their way clear to support the amendment to the amendment which I think pretty clearly states many things that I know I would like to see.

I am convinced, for example, that we are coming, and we must, of necessity, come to a system of cash advances on farm-stored grain, not loans; not the kind of a thing that we have now; it is limited — but a cash advance, through the Wheat Board, for grain suitably stored in sealed bins on the farms. I think it is the farmer's right to get compensation; after a year of work he should at least get half of his pay. I want to say, and I feel quite keenly on this point, our storage facilities in Saskatchewan on the farms are poor. Let us make no mistake about it. We are losing a lot of grain that is out in piles and in poor bins, and even if the national government has got to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It being 12:30 the House will recess until 2:30.

March 18, 1958

Continuing at 2:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, when I was so rudely prevented from taking my seat because of the hands of the clock, I was saying, or had endeavoured to make the point, that we do need a wide market not only on the North American continent, but elsewhere, in connection with the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities which we can produce so abundantly in Canada.

It has been suggested in this House that we might, to some degree, overcome our adverse trade balance with the United States if we sold to them more agricultural products. The name holds true for the United Kingdom, and we could never (I think I proved) export, on the basis of actual demand in the United States, sufficient agricultural products to make any great material difference to our adverse trade balance. That matter will have to be settled in other directions as well.

The other thing I would like to refer to briefly is the statement that was made that full agreement was expressed with the proposal that a program of full employment was necessary to sustain agricultural prices. Basically, that is correct. We know by experience, however, that in the post-war period when the rest of the economy was booming to inflationary levels, when employment reached high levels, the agricultural industry receded economically. That is the paradox we are facing in this post-war period. There is no assurance to us that agriculture is going to be prosperous just because the rest of the economy is prospering. Very effective measures will have to be taken on behalf of the industry in order to provide the industry with its fair share of the national income. For that reason I am pleased to note, and I am led to believe, that all members in this House are going to support the proposals and the suggestion that we have a national conference on marketing and farm income.

I would like to make one more reference before I take my seat, and that is the addition of the word to that section of the amendment that deal with research and other uses for agricultural products. In this regard I am glad marketing was added, because we are aware of the fact that this matter of putting agricultural products to industrial uses is very limited. It can be confined, primarily, to farm commodities such as oils, flax, rape, mustard and that sort of thing; but insofar as wheat and other staple food commodities are concerned, it has been proved pretty well that the price to the farmer would have to be so low that it would not be an economic proposition, from the point of the farmers to produce food commodities for industrial purposes.

So there are limitations in that direction, and I am pleased that the word "marketing" was added, because it is in that field that I believe we are going to finally find disposition for the potential surpluses which are produced in this country, particularly in the light of the fact that I have reiterated so many times before, that there are hungry people throughout the world. I think it is a reflection on ourselves and our whole belief and confidence in our democratic institutions that we cannot conduct our trade with other countries, and our internal affairs, in a manner that will reflect the greatest possible benefit to the most people — in this case by taking food commodities to people in other areas of the world who are hungry.

I am glad, too, that we are having agreement on a national conference, because I think it pretty well answers this repeated charge that I hear from the Opposition, that the law of supply and demand should be permitted to function. I have argued in this House and out of this House, that the theory of supply and demand is not working any more. I have in my hand a report of what I am saying here, a copy of the "Financial Times", in which an article appears under the heading, "The Paradox: Inflation in Spite of Recession". This is particularly applicable to the agricultural industry. Here is the writer in this Financial paper who says this . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Who is he?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And I quote this particularly for the benefit of the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson):

"Having abrogated the laws of supply and demand we have created a standard of living and behaviour in our highly industrialized manufacturing economy while still depending on a very volatile practice for primary unmanufactured products."

We know that the law of supply and demand won't work. The only place it is supposed to work is with farmers. I have never seen the price of things the farmer requires in this operation of his farm go down materially with the fluctuations that are so prevalent as far as his commodities are concerned.

There is another interesting paragraph here, when this gentleman says:

"Very great progress has been made in the development of secondary manufacturing industries, but most of these require a prosperous primary economy."

March 18, 1958

And he includes agriculture in that prosperous primary economy. I sometimes think that we too often assume that industrialization is a magic wand that is going to bring material prosperity to everyone. The post-war period has proved that this is not the case, and I can say there is no reason why, primary agricultural countries or provinces cannot be just as prosperous and just as liveable as any other area, whether it's an industrialized section of the country or the world or not. It seems to me that for all too long agriculturists have been considered as persons who can take the economic rap in an economy that is supposed to be based on supply and demand, and I hope that a conference of the nature that we are asking for here, will once and for all turn their backs on a theory that has long since been outworn and which isn't in existence any more, particularly as a means of controlling surplus agricultural commodities. There is no relationship between the prices of things the farmer produces and the surpluses that he has from time to time. Nature plays a big part in that; his cost-price relationship plays a big part, and I think it is incomprehensible and foolishness for people who are supposed to direct the destinies of nations to feel that somehow or other we can achieve perfect balance in production in relation to demand, by price manipulation. It can't be done. In the light of the present situation in the world, I think we ought to be extending every effort to produce more to feed hungry people in other parts of the world.

I feel too, that it is just as advantageous to Canada to export food commodities from these shores as it is to export any other commodity. As a matter of fact, this country was built up on the basis of credit — credit that we were able to acquire as a result of the exportation of food commodities to other lands. And I think it is still good business, and I am hopeful that a conference of this kind will take an enlightened viewpoint not only to the problems of agriculture, but to the problems of bringing about better and more free trade relations based on actual need of the various people throughout the world for different commodities, whether they are food commodities, industrial products or whatever they might be.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendment to the amendment more clearly sets forth the thinking and viewpoint, I know, of this side of the House, and now, the viewpoint of the members on the other side of the House.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, the motion, the amendment and the amendment to the amendment that I believe are now being debated, are rather all-embracing, covering a national economic problem extremely vital and very important to the future economy of the prairie provinces and the Dominion of Canada.

This afternoon, I just wish to take a few minutes to deal with one phase of the amendment to the main motion: "Lower the cost of marketing grain." I don't know if we have a full appreciation of just how important it is to bring the cost of the movement of grain from the truck as it enters the elevator to the unloading and moving from the docks in the United Kingdom or on the Continent. Back in 1923, the farmers of western Canada set out, on their own to establish grain-handling facilities that would assist in lowering the cost of the physical handling of grain at the local country points and the terminals, both at the head of the Great Lakes, Vancouver and Churchill. It is interesting to note that there have been no increases in the charges for the physical handling of grain at country elevators for the past thirty years. Two and three-quarter cents a bushel is charged at the local elevator for elevating and storing for two weeks. That was in effect some thirty years ago and remains in effect today.

I think it is a well-known fact that country elevators had, as their primary purpose, the movement of grain. In recent years, however, there has been a storage problem; but basically, country elevators were for the specific purpose of handling of grain or the movement of grain from the farmer's truck to a car on the railway siding. Looking back over the past thirty years of operation of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, it is interesting to note that the net savings on that percentage of Saskatchewan grain handled by that organization is \$84,158,000 — that is, in savings on the grain that was held by Saskatchewan Pool and Saskatchewan Pool terminal elevators since their inception in 1925. In the last crop year ending July 31st last, the net savings were \$4,512,000. That is an indication that the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan, working in co-operation with their fellow co-operation in Manitoba and Alberta, have made a real contribution towards the lowering of the cost of the physical handling of grain both at country and at terminal elevators — Fort William, Port Arthur, or Vancouver. The movement of grain from the time it leaves the truck at the local country elevators until it is unloaded and cleaned in the terminal elevators, works out at approximately 18 1/3 cents a bushel, taking an average freight rate in the province of Saskatchewan. So for terminal elevator charges, local country elevator charges and cleaning charges and freight rates, the cost of putting a bushel of grain in store and cleaning at the Head of the Lakes or Vancouver, is 18.35 cents a bushel.

It is rather interesting to start following that grain from there to its ultimate destination. Having in mind that I am not including storage charges (because storage charges vary both at country and at terminal elevators, depending upon the length of time the grain is in store), it is rather interesting to note that the cost per bushel of moving wheat from in store Fort William, Port Arthur, to C.I.F. Liverpool, England, ('C.I.F.' stands for cost, insurance and freight) to unloading at Liverpool is 37.196 cents a bushel, Add that to the

March 18, 1958

18-odd cents per bushel to move it from the country point to the Head of the Lakes, and you get a charge of around 55 1/4 cents a bushel. I think it is rather important to keep that in mind at the moment, and if you are moving the same bushel of wheat from 'in store' Vancouver to Liverpool, England, shipping via the Pacific ocean and down through the Panama Canal, it works out at 25 1/3 cents a bushel. Add your 18 cents-odd to that, and you get a charge of 43.4111 cents a bushel from a country point in the of Saskatchewan to Liverpool.

I think it is rather interesting, also, just to look at the movement of grain from a central point the province of Saskatchewan to the Port of Churchill, and then from Churchill to Liverpool, England. Using the 18.35 cents a bushel as the average cost to move it to Churchill from a central point in the province, you add to that 19 3/4 cents a bushel, and you get a shipping cost from Churchill of just under 38 cents a bushel against over 55 cents a bushel by the Head of the Lakes to Liverpool and approximately 43 1/2 cents from Vancouver.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — I just didn't get that rate. Did you mean to say that it is 55 cents from the Head of the Lakes to Liverpool, and 45 cents from Vancouver?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Yes, from a central point in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Loptson: — From an 18-point rate?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — The 18-point rate, plus the elevator handling charges here and the terminal handling charges.

Mr. Loptson: — That is 18 cents per hundred or is it 18 cents per bushel?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — A bushel.

Mr. Loptson: — Where is the point in Saskatchewan where it is 18 cents per bushel?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — A central point. An average freight rate point.

Mr. Loptson: — At 18 cents per bushel? I think you are mistaken there. Oh, that is handling charges as well?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Handling charges as well, yes. I am speaking on the basis of a bushel of grain.

Mr. Loptson: — And you are including the freight and the handling charges, and it is 55 cents from the Head of the Lakes to Liverpool as compared to 43 from Vancouver.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Including the local freight charges to get it there, yes, 55 1/4 cents against 43 1/2 cents from Vancouver, against 37 3/4 from Churchill.

During the recent years, particularly when there is a freight rate inquiry or when the railways are asking for an increased freight rate, there is some reference made to the Crows' Nest Pass rate. There could come a time when the railway companies might make an appeal to the Governor General-in-Council to alter the Crows' Nest Pass rate. The Government of the province of Saskatchewan, recognizing this possibility, has done a considerable amount of research work in connection with the Crows' Nest Pass rate, and we are in a reasonably good position in the event of this becoming a major issue.

Having said that, might I also make reference to another means of transportation that is looming very large in the Dominion of Canada. I have reference to the St. Lawrence Seaway. And again, having due regard to the change in the cost of transportation that that route could bring about and, also having due regard to the legislation setting up the St. Lawrence Deep Seaway, the Government of this province, in consultation with the governments of the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba, has had this question under review for some weeks, making a study of the history of tolls in the canals on the St. Lawrence Seaway, making a study of the agreement with the United States and the legislation, and also making a study of the tonnage of freight that would move in and out of the St. Lawrence Seaway to Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway port. We are in a position to place before the Government of Canada our views in respect to this, what might become an exceptionally important means of transportation, which would have a bearing on the cost of moving grain from the country points to the markets of the world.

I believe that is all I wish to say other than, possibly, to suggest that the amendment to the amendment now before the Assembly appears to me in keeping with the thinking of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool delegates' agricultural program as passed at their recent convention in November of 1957.

I appreciate the opportunity of saying a few words in support of this amendment to the amendment.

March 18, 1958

Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to this debate. This motion was originally introduced by the member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). The main purpose of the motion was the calling of a Federal-Provincial Conference. The purpose of this Conference being to stabilize the suffering farm industry. Every member of this House, I am sure, is very deeply concerned with the welfare of the farming industry because, even today, it is still our basic industry. Every member here, I am sure, is interested in the welfare of this industry. Many of us are farmers. Most of us, or all of us, represent farmers.

This motion has been debated in great detail, and many figures have been given. I did run across a few figures that I thought would be interesting at this time. From 1952-56, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the net income of farms all across Canada dropped by 15 per cent, but in Alberta, in the same period of years it dropped 27 per cent; in Manitoba, 31 per cent, and in Saskatchewan 28 per cent. So the farmers in western Canada suffered the greatest drop in net income. For that reason I think it is very fitting that this Legislature has taken time off, and considerable time, to discuss the farming industry and the welfare of it.

Also I have figures here to show that the small farmers of western Canada in particular suffered the greatest loss. When this motion was originally brought in there were seven clauses added. I would have preferred if none of these clauses had been tacked on to the original paragraph. The paragraph could have been worded simply "urging for a Provincial-Federal Conference at which the welfare of agriculture could be discussed." I feel that the tacking-on of these seven clauses is provoking unnecessary arguments. Seven more clauses were added by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) when he brought in his amendment. I don't know why that was done; maybe to further provoke argument at this time. I think the main purpose was to call for a Provincial-Federal Conference to study the situation of agriculture, but the seven extra clauses were added, maybe just to show that they were in opposition.

When the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) was speaking a few days ago, he expressed the fact that when religion and liquor were discussed, politics shouldn't enter into the picture, and then our friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) very wisely injected that wheat should be classed in the same category. I fully agree with him, but this House has just done the opposite, because we now have 14 clauses here. Last year, a similar motion was brought into the House, and then I was guilty of bringing in an amendment to the motion, and the Leader of the Opposition spent half of his next speech chastising me for bringing politics into this particular thing. I just had one clause in that amendment, and he had seven!

At dinner time I checked over these 13 clauses with the amendment to the amendment — we have 13 clauses now attached to the original motion, if I've counted right. I checked them over clause by clause, with our agriculture program. When I say "our", I mean we in the Social Credit Party do have an agricultural program. I have it right here with me, but am not going to go into it, because I am not going to be guilty of dragging politics into this very serious discussion. I did check it carefully, and I am very happy and proud to say that all the 13 points that we have added to this main motion cover exactly what we have in our program. So I am rather suspicious, where these 13 points come from, because they are in full harmony with our agricultural program.

I think that is about all I want to say on this. If we wanted to make a political issue of it, we could bring in an amendment say to Clause (a) but I will not do so at this time, preferring to follow the advice of our friend from Saltcoats. I do feel that the main purpose of the motion was the calling of this Conference — a much-needed Conference, indeed — to study the welfare of our farming industry. And because the 13 clauses, although they are not in full agreement with our program yet, I am sure they satisfy the wishes of the western farmer, so I am going to support the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Alex Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, there is just one comment I want to make on this. I was following with a great deal of interest the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet), particularly his reference to the law of supply and demand being an outworn and outdated law, only a myth, or, as he said before, "a capitalist bogey-man". It seemed to ring a bell somewhere. The Minister of Agriculture has spoken in a different vein regarding the law of supply and demand, and I just want to read to you from 'The Leader-Post' of February 25, under the heading: "Campbell nominated by C.C.F." I wondered whether the Minister of Agriculture was telling the same story at this convention as he told in the House. I was rather amazed at the Minister's speech:

"Renewing his demand for parity prices, he said other parties were responsible for the agricultural squeeze, because they blamed the Provincial Government for the farmers' plight and consequently did nothing about it.' Price manipulation is no way to control farm production', he said. The law of supply and demand, on the other hand, would induce farmers to switch to products for which prices were relatively high, and away from those with low prices. In this way there would be a trend to more diversification, and greater stabilization would result, Mr. Nollet said."

March 18, 1958

I have difficulty, Mr. Speaker, following the Minister of Agriculture when I read his press reports here and then read what he says in the Legislature. After listening today, I am more confused than ever as to whether there is such a thing as a law of supply and demand. In one minute the Minister says there isn't; next, he says there is. It's like picking petals saying "She loves me now — she loves me not; she loves me now — she loves me not". I don't think he understands yet whether there is a law of supply and demand.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. When I love her, I love her all the time!

Mr. A.H. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I will confine my remarks to the amendment to the amendment, and first of all I would like to refer to that part of the amendment to do with marketing boards. When he introduced his sub-amendment, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) attempted to chastise myself and other Liberal members for moving the amendment we moved to the original motion, as far as marketing boards are concerned. He said, too, why, did we remove the word 'national'. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we are asking for a Dominion-Provincial Conference to study certain problems with regard to agriculture and one of them should be marketing boards, I doubt very much if a Dominion-Provincial Conference would study provincial marketing boards. I think it should be taken, without having to be written precisely into that motion, that we are referring to national marketing boards. On the other hand, the amendment to the amendment strikes out that part of my amendment where I suggest we should have a vote of the producers. I am one of those who believe that, if we are going to set up marketing boards, be they provincial or be they of national scope, the advice of the producers of the products concerned should be sought and it should be followed. I do believe that any marketing legislation ought to have the support of the producers concerned. Therefore I wish, in the amendment to the amendment, we had included that part of my original amendment. However, I am not going to quarrel over that, because surely any government that is going to set up marketing boards would consult the producers concerned.

Then in the following paragraph of the amendment to the amendment, we are talking about storing grain, and it reads, "stored in sealed bins". I wonder if we are doing the right thing here. I think all hon. members have had the opportunity of visiting a good many farms in the province of Saskatchewan, and in case they have not, I can inform them there is an awful lot of storage in the province of Saskatchewan that is good storage, but it is not in a position to be sealed. There are literally hundreds of thousands of bushels of grain stored in what originally were built as machine sheds. There are plenty of storage spaces today that is being used for dual purposes. You will have storage in one end of the building for wheat, oats or barley as the case may be, and in the

the other end will be the farmer's combine or his tractor. Now, it is impossible to seal that bin; but I want to repeat that, in many instances, it is excellent storage. You may have a plywood structure covered with aluminium and a cement floor, and, as I say, with big doors on the end, and probably the combine or tractor or some other farm implement stored in the same building. As far as I am concerned a lot of that storage is much better than the old granary that was built some years ago, because most of this machine type storage is new construction, and I wonder if we should exclude that type of storage from any payment as far as our farmers are concerned.

Then in clause (j) — "distribution of box-cars to country elevators on such a basis that farmers will be able to deliver their grain to the elevator of their choice." Here again, when the Minister was moving the amendment to the amendment, he suggested that the Liberal opposition had voted against it. Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The Liberal opposition voted against the farmer having to state in his permit book what elevator he was going to deliver his grain to. I don't believe that any farmer should have to sign a document saying he was going to deliver his grain to a particular elevator. I do believe that a farmer ought to be given the opportunity to deliver to whatever elevator he wants to deliver to, and I do believe that the distribution of box-cars should be such that the farmer will have that opportunity. I am pleased that this method of bringing this about has not been stated in the amendment to the amendment, and therefore I feel it will receive the support of at least the majority of the members of this House.

As far as paragraph (k) is concerned, they have added the words 'new markets' as well as 'new uses' for agricultural products. I am sure no one would have any complaint about that. As for part (m) of the resolution, again the only thing I would bring to the attention of the members is that this storage should be "in sealed bins". Again I want to say that I am not in complete agreement with that. I am not going to oppose it just because you call for sealed bins, but I would hope that, if a Conference should be called, we won't be so stringent as to say that grain must be sealed in a sealed bin. Surely to goodness the farmers of this province are honest. I think they are, and I would have confidence in extending payments for storage to grain even if the bins were not sealed. I for one would think that the loss would be far less than if it were sealed in some of the old portable granaries that are now in existence in Saskatchewan.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate from Thursday, March 6, on the proposed motion of Mr. Gibson:

"That this Assembly, while welcoming Federal participation in health programs such as hospitalization insurance, regrets the failure of the Government of Canada to include tuberculosis and mental institutions in the national hospitalization plan, and urges that, instead of continuing its piecemeal approach, the said Government should proceed forthwith to the development of a comprehensive national health insurance program by:

- (a) Convening a Dominion-Provincial Conference for the purpose of establishing the foundations of such a national program;
- (b) introducing at the earliest possible date enabling legislation to give effect to the program emerging from such Conference, with provision for provincial administration thereof, and
- (c) entering into bilateral agreements with each Province willing to establish a comprehensive health insurance program, failing general agreement by all provinces of Canada to participate.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that, generally speaking, I agree and condone the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Morse. I think it is very necessary, and certainly something that sooner or later is going to come about, that we will have a national health scheme in Canada. I think the sooner it is inaugurated the better it will be for all citizens of Canada.

There are just a few points I wish to bring out in regard to this resolution. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is only a matter of time before such a Conference is called, and only a matter of time before this scheme is inaugurated. Therefore, I was a little disappointed in the way this motion was introduced into this House. Perhaps it is a feminine approach; but I found that, if I am asking somebody for a favour, or I am asking somebody to do something, I get along a lot better if I don't attack them and call them names before I put my proposition to them. Politically, it seems to be different. Every time the members across the way want something from the Federal Government, they

start by insulting them and by condemning their prior acts, their future hopes and aspirations, and generally calling them down to the best of their considerable ability in that field.

It is difficult to understand how we are going to get very much from the Federal Government, which, whether you like it or not, is going to be either a Conservative or a Liberal Government — certainly not a C.C.F. Government.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Certainly not a Liberal Government!

Mrs. Batten: — And certainly not a Social Credit Government. Well, I am not saying it will be a Liberal Government; but it is going to be either a Liberal or Conservative Government, and both these parties were certainly condemned. The Leader of the Conservatives was called an "Abraham Lincoln in coat-tails". I believe the hon. Leader of the Liberals was called a "Messiah" and so on and so forth, and then the Liberals were condemned for six pages of the Hansard, among which was said, and I want to quote this part:

"For my part, Mr. Speaker, I will accept that National Hospital Insurance as a fact when I see it in operation, and after 40 years of waiting we are entitled to be somewhat sceptical. Let's not fool ourselves that the interests opposed to health insurance — for instance the Canadian insurance companies, the Chamber of Commerce — have thrown in their hat."

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And the Liberal party!

Mrs. Batten: — And then to go on — here is the man with great optimism who is moving a motion and hoping that the Federal Government is going to come in and help us finance our health scheme, and this is what he says, this is how he is putting his proposition:

"As social reformers, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have not been very energetic or determined, and the Conservatives have yet to prove that they have departed from their traditional role of opposition to social reform. There are those who assert that Canada will endanger its national economy if we embark on a comprehensive plan of health insurance.

March 18, 1958

"In other words, we are saying we probably cannot afford it. It is interesting to observe that this is the view of the Canadian Insurance Officers' Association, and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce — the same organizations that have opposed national hospital insurance."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine a better way to make sure that we don't get national health insurance from the Federal Government than to go about it in just this manner.

I was interested to know that the Journals of this House show that, in the Session of 1956, there was much the same resolution passed by this House. There was a lot of discussion, pages and pages in the Hansard showing what was said, and I would be very interested to know what happened to that resolution? Was it sent any place? Were representations made to senior governments on behalf of this resolution?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, it was forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada, who in turn forwarded it to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mrs. Batten: — I hear it was put in the wastepaper basket. I don't know if the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) is an authority as to what goes on in the wastepaper basket of the Minister of National Health, but probably he knows. Well, if that is what happened to these resolutions, I submit, Mr. Speaker, we are wasting your time and the time of the House in discussing it, and therefore at least, if we are going to move resolutions in several fields (and I think they are probably good things), I think there should be continued representation and we should see to it that something is done about these resolutions, not merely provide fuel for passions in this House and for a flow of oratory in this House that is not conducive to good thought, or any sort of decision; it is just a waste of everybody's time, and the people's money.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You can do something on March 31, Mary.

Mrs. Batten: — I don't know what will happen on March 31 that will make any difference, according to the mover of this motion. Therefore, I would like to say just one or two things about what I think is the most important part of this resolution, and that is the exclusion of tuberculosis and mental institutions from the proposed national hospitalization plan. I agree with this House in the prior resolution that those things, if possible, should certainly be included in the National Health plan when that is implemented; but I have a few reservations about it, and I would like to just point these out. In the first

place, I don't see any reason why tuberculosis should not be considered in the general plan, as certainly it is a physical ailment and has now been well covered in Saskatchewan, and has been for many years, as a provincial responsibility, and it certainly can be included without needing any special qualifications in the plan itself.

Mental health is something just a little bit different, and for that reason I would like to speak specifically on that point for a few minutes. It is true that our mental health problems, in every civilized country of the world, seem to be growing until they have become so great that it is estimated that half our hospital beds in the United States and Canada are filled by mentally ill people. There is also further research being done in the interrelationship between physical illness and mental attitude, and no doubt within a few years we will have much more knowledge about just how those two are interrelated. It is estimated that no doubt many physical ailments are caused because of mental disorders, or ill-adjusted mentalities or emotional factors. Therefore, I think that mental health is a field in which very much work has to be done. Very much work has been done in this field in Saskatchewan, in all of Canada, the United States, and all parts of the civilized world.

At one time, many adjustments were made on a local level. The country doctor who attended people knew in many cases that, although they complained of a backache or some other physical ailment the trouble was really an emotional block, or mental ill-adjustment. He was able to prescribe for them in his own way, because he lived very close to their families. He was a part of the society in which these people moved. Most people belonged to an organized church group, and I don't think that in any place in the world is there a class of people that are better psychologists than our ministers, priests and rabbis, because they deal with the spiritual life of people, which, of course, is part of their emotional and mental life, and by dealing with that they can do them much more good than anybody else in the medical field.

Because these people were in a position of authority, they could deal with these mental illnesses, and do very much for these people before they reached an acute state. Now, because of our so-called centralized civilization our industrialization, things have changed. For one thing people travel around so much more. For another thing children travel. They don't go to school in their immediate vicinity. The teacher doesn't board with their family. She has no idea what the home atmosphere is, in many cases. As a mother (and I think very many people in Canada will agree with me), I prefer to have my child go to a school that is close to me, even though it may not get the academic, qualified teacher that it might in a larger city, but at least he or she is being taught by a teacher who knows the child's background, who knows the child's parents, who realizes that when there is trouble in the family, when there's ill-adjustment, the child is going to suffer. That is reflected in the child's attitude, and the teacher can do something about it.

March 18, 1958

The same applies to the family doctor, but we are getting away from that. I am not saying we should try to hold back what we call 'progress'. That seems to be the trend, and I think more and more people are going to go to specialists when they are ill; and they are going to go to larger schools where the teacher doesn't know their home background. We've got to adjust to exactly those situations.

One of the problems there is, that people are just not getting the type of help they need and they become mentally disturbed. Quite often they become acutely ill before anything at all is done for them, and I don't think anybody can say they are free of responsibility. It is a responsibility of the neighbours. It is a responsibility of the home, basically. It is a responsibility of the church and society as well as the Government, and I think that this should be recognized. At the same time the constitutional responsibility rests with the Provincial Government, and I don't think that should be forgotten for one moment. Certainly we can't do all that we would like to do on a provincial level, through financial inability, and I think that the Federal Government has recognized that by giving us the national health grant.

I don't think it is quite fair to say that the Federal Government has been discriminating between the mentally ill and the physically ill. Certainly there is a difference there, and no matter how much we want to make people stop condemning, or making fun, of the mentally ill, we cannot say it is exactly the same thing. It isn't. It is true that much work has been done in the field of preventive medicine for the physically ill, and very, very little has been done for the mentally ill, or those who might become mentally ill. That is one of our greatest problems, and I think one that this Government should look after as soon as possible.

Just to give a very brief survey, I want to point out that the federal mental health grant was first made in May, 1948, and it was the second single health grant made to the provinces, being surpassed only by the general public health grant. Initially it was \$4,000 and it was increased bi-annually. During the five fiscal years 1948-49 to 1952-53, over \$24 million was made available to the provinces. Out of this, unfortunately, only 52.7 per cent was actually expended. I want to congratulate our Department of Public Health (I am sorry the Minister isn't here) because our grant the last fiscal year from the Federal Government for mental health was \$422,805, and out of that we were able to use almost 94 per cent. I think that was a very fine thing, certainly something for which he should be congratulated.

I think, too, that Saskatchewan has one of the largest utilizations of this grant outside of Quebec, and I believe Newfoundland. These grants can be used for various purposes. They have been used by various provinces quite often for short-term treatment centres. Approximately 20 per cent of the grants have been devoted to the organization

of psychiatric services in general hospitals and mental health clinics. The nature of the program has varied from province to province. The thing I wanted to bring out was that this problem has not been ignored by the Federal Government, as one would suppose, from listening to the mover and seconder of this motion.

I want to point out, too, that we cannot in Saskatchewan just pat ourselves on the back and say that we have done everything we can do for the mentally ill. We certainly have not — and I would like to quote someone whom I think is one of my firmest allies in this project, and who has worked at it a lot longer than I have, and that is the junior member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper). I had thought that having her so vitally interested in this problem would certainly move mountains, let alone governments, in this province, and that certainly very much more would have been done for mental health than has been done in the last two years. I want to quote what she said two days ago. She said:

"I think there is far too great a disparity in the amount spent for the mentally ill, even in this province where we spend by far the greatest amount — the disparity is still too great, \$6.65 per capita for the mentally ill and something close to \$30 per capita for the physically ill."

Then she went on to say:

"I know they are not entirely comparable, because the mentally ill are not altogether bed patients. But on the other hand, you must remember that medical care is included also in this figure for the mentally ill."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that mental treatment is far more expensive than physical treatment, because anybody who knows anything about psychiatrists knows the number of hours it takes to understand a human mind, and anyone who knows anything about the field of mental health knows the cost of research in this field. It is far greater than that of physical ailment.

I say, too, that this problem has been recognized in every single province of Canada. The national average for maintenance expenditures had risen to \$2.55 per day in 1952-53, and it was only \$1.77 in 1948—49. In 1952-53, Saskatchewan patient-day cost was \$2.89. Now, at that time it was not the highest. Newfoundland was the highest at \$4.29; British Columbia, \$3.82. As you can see from the schedules that are presented by the Statistics Department of Canada,

March 18, 1958

there has been a rapid increase in the amount of money spent per mental patient. But this is not necessarily a good guide to show that they have been getting care. It can cost a lot of money, and still not be very efficient care, and not provide very good results. This is indicated by the fact that discharges from hospitals could be much better than they are. The discharges per 100 patients in Canada averaged 14.9 in 1932; in 1956, the average discharge per 100 patients was 43.1. Saskatchewan's discharges in 1956 per 100 patients were only 36.5. Discharges from the mental hospitals are not entirely fool-proof as to the effectiveness of treatment, either. This is one way, I think, that Saskatchewan can take great steps forward in leading the other provinces, and maybe setting up a system of mental health in preventive care and cure and research that could be followed by the rest of Canada. I think it has to be done by some type of relationship between the Department of Social Welfare and the Department of Public Health.

I have found in my own practice a number of very pathetic cases, because there wasn't this close relationship. A number of years ago a woman came into my office and asked not to get a decree of judicial separation from her husband. She told me the circumstances under which she and her husband were living, and he was guilty of cruelty in a legal sense, and he was guilty of almost abnormal cruelty in a human and moral sense. I did not exactly believe everything she said — one doesn't, without a little more evidence; but I asked some of her neighbours to come in at her request, and I spoke to her neighbours separately from her, and I found out that these cruelties she had told me her husband was perpetrating were quite true. He actually did lock her up in her room, and did other things — he was abnormally jealous; he wouldn't let her speak to other people; she never went out. And then I found she had been a mental patient.

When I wrote to the institution to which she had been confined to find out what her mental health was, to find out whether she would be a competent witness on her own behalf, they wrote back to me and said, "No, she wouldn't. She has hallucinations". I wrote back and asked what those hallucinations were. So they explained in detail that her hallucinations were all against her husband. She told them (and this was her hallucination) that he kept her locked; he wouldn't let her go out, and enumerated all the things which were actually facts; they were not in any way hallucinations. But they had had this woman in the mental hospital for a period of 18 months, because she suffered from hallucinations, yet nobody had gone out to investigate to find out whether it was true or not. Her husband had committed her, and when he was present he had spoken to the doctors, and advised them these were hallucinations, and they had accepted his word for it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley (Minister of Social Welfare): — May I ask the hon. member a question? Would you mind telling us about when this happened?

Mrs. Batten: — It happened about 1948. At that time, when I wrote back a very indignant letter, they were able to send somebody out to investigate the case, but it was not until this matter was going to come up to court that this happened. I am not blaming the authorities, because I realize how short-staffed they were, and I realize that, under the circumstances, they were doing all they could. However, this shows you the type of terrible injustice that did happen, whereas, if there had been a close relationship between the two Departments — there was an inspector of Social Welfare in the district who could have investigated that and could have found out and solved this problem, without all this terrible cruelty and pain that resulted.

There is another case where I think the Department of Social Welfare should be closely combined with the care of mentally ill. I think probably the Minister of Public Health knows there are many cases in Saskatchewan — at least there is one which happened about a year and a half ago in my own constituency, where a mental patient was released from the hospital, and they thought he was cured, and I have no doubt they did all they could for him; but he committed suicide a very short time after he returned home. It seems to me if there had been some sort of liaison between the two departments where he could have had some rehabilitation, or at least somebody to keep an eye on him, to recognize the symptoms, this man and his family's welfare would have been safeguarded. Those are the things I think we have got to look at in the future. I think another way these patients can be assisted, and by which we can do a lot for preventive care in the case of mental illness, would be by going ahead with this plan that was apparently approved by this Provincial Government. I refer to the plan for smaller mental institutions.

I think that the plan as enunciated by the American Psychiatric Association stating that mental patients should not be further than 70 or 80 miles from their home, and that they are better off in a cottage-type of hospital, is very, very sound. It is very difficult to take somebody away from their home, to send them to either Weyburn or Battleford, hundreds of miles away from where their people live. The people probably cannot get away to visit them; they lose the close relationship they have; they are not in contact with the doctors; they are not advised as to how to treat them, and then when they do come home, the problem of getting used to home, the problem of the family getting used to them and being able to do something for them is almost insurmountable.

March 18, 1958

I think I agree most sincerely with the hon. junior member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) that we are being penny wise and pound foolish, and I get very indignant when I hear our estimates for rebuilding or adding much more to these huge hospitals when we so desperately need smaller hospitals in Saskatchewan. We are a widely scattered province, and I think this Government could do the people of Saskatchewan a very real service by not delaying any longer, by instituting this program, by starting to build these smaller hospitals. I think you will find that, sooner or later, the Federal Government will initiate this scheme, and if there is some plan formulated whereby they can participate and help in the financing of a really good mental health scheme, I am quite sure they will do so. I am a great deal more optimistic than the mover and the seconder of this motion, but I take great pleasure in supporting it, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word; it will only take a moment. I am glad the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) is so optimistic. The reason probably that some of us have not been so optimistic is that we consider that the promise about health insurance made in 1919 is not yet carried out in 1958. That doesn't make for very great optimism, and that is probably why we are not as optimistic as the hon. member is.

I was rather interested, first of all, in her remarks about the presentation of this resolution by the mover. I gathered from what she had to say that she felt the mover would have done better simply to have stated the case for a Dominion-Provincial Conference for a comprehensive national health insurance program, without regretting the failure of the Government of Canada to include tuberculosis and mental institutions. The inference was that, since we were asking for something, we ought not to begin by criticizing. Well, that is rather strange, coming from people with a Liberal tradition. The great Liberal party was built through the last century by people who not only had the courage to champion great causes, but to fight for them, and we are not asking somebody for a favour when we pass a resolution like this. We are asking that the people of Canada (who will pay for this) will take a forward steps, which has already been taken by almost every civilized country in the western world, and set up a system of national security in respect of medical care and hospital care. Countries like Great Britain, after the last World War, which have much less wealth than we have, set up a complete and comprehensive national health insurance system. The Scandinavian countries, other countries of Europe, countries like New Zealand and Australia — all of these countries have set up national health insurance.

I don't think we are under any obligation to come with an apologetic air and say to any government, "Now we won't say anything to offend you, but in all humility we would ask you to please take some forward steps." I think the people of this province, and the members of this Legislature, have a right to say to whatever Government is in Ottawa, "We think you have delayed this matter too long and, in spite of pre-election commitments covering a period of now 40 years, you have continued to neglect this matter to your shame and to the shame of this country."

With respect to the particular regret which is contained in this — the failure of the Government in Canada to include tuberculosis and mental illness into the hospital plan — I might say just a word about that. The member from Humboldt has pointed out that it is not correct to say that they had not done anything about mental illness, and she quotes the fact that they have given some grants to the provinces, and for that we give them full marks. Those grants have amounted to, at the very highest, \$400,000 in a single year, and yet the members can look at the estimates and see that the

March 18, 1958

cost to the Provincial Government, that is to the people of Saskatchewan, is about \$9 1/4 million; that the people of Saskatchewan are spending \$20 for mental health for every dollar which the Federal Government is contributing. I don't think that is a very fair allocation of costs, and I agree with her this is one of our most pressing problems in a technological and complex society such as ours.

I want to point out, moreover, that we did not even ask the Federal Government to assume all the costs. When the Federal-Provincial Conference was held last November, the Prime Minister, in opening the Conference, having in mind that a number of the provinces (including this one) had asked for the inclusion of mental illness and tuberculosis under the National Hospital Plan, began the conference by stating that the Federal Government was prepared to include tuberculosis and mental illness in the national hospital plan. But, he said, "we are only prepared to do this providing the \$68 million which it will cost for the Federal Government to make its contribution to mental illness in the plan, shall come out of the tax-sharing pool." I want to say, as far as the Saskatchewan delegation was concerned, that we immediately acquiesced and, as a matter of fact, eight out of the 10 provinces got up at the Conference, and said, "We are so anxious to see mental illness included in this national hospital plan that we are prepared to contribute from our tax-sharing pool." That included, of course, the province of Newfoundland, the province of Prince Edward Island and the province of Manitoba, all of which have Liberal governments. So actually it would not cost the Federal Government anything to include mental illness; they would take it out of the tax-sharing pool. Someone might ask, what is the advantage of getting mental illness covered if you are going to take it out of the tax—sharing pool; you are going to pay for it yourself indirectly?

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — There wouldn't be very much.

Premier Douglas: — Well, we think there would be a great deal of advantage.

Mr. Loptson: — Advantage to taking it out of the pool?

Premier Douglas: — Yes, because it would establish two things. One, it would establish a definite principle that there is no differentiation in the matter of people having a physical illness or a mental illness. There is a difference in treatment and accommodation required, but if a person becomes mentally ill he is just as much in need of having that care paid for out of the insurance fund as if he were physically ill, and probably more so, because most physical illnesses, with the exception of prolonged illnesses such as cancer, tuberculosis and a few illnesses of that sort, are of a short duration, whereas mental treatment is a fairly prolonged period; and if there is any type of illness in which the financial barrier ought to be

removed, it is mental illness.

I think the other advantage we have to keep in mind is that it would remove the thing the member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) was talking about the other day, and that is the difference in the expenditures between mental illness and physical illness. You can't completely compare the expenditures, because in a hospital dealing with physical ailments there are a great many which have to do with anaesthetics, X-rays, costly deep X-ray therapy for cancer — a lot of costly procedures which are not found in mental hospitals. So, even if you gave the very best type of psychiatric treatment it is doubtful if it would cost the same per day. The fact remains, however, that the discrepancy between the relative cost at the present time is too great.

If mental illness came under a national health insurance program so that the person's costs for being in a mental hospital were paid out of the insurance fund, it would certainly raise standards, raise them immeasurably. It would also help to do the kind of thing that the member for Humboldt has been advocating — the setting up of small psychiatric hospitals. But I want to point out the unanimous position we are in if they don't include mental illness in the hospital plan. I don't know what the present Government is going to do about the regulations, but certainly the previous Government had come to the point where they were pretty ready to agree that a psychiatric wing in a general hospital would be covered under the hospital plan, but not a separate building for exclusively psychiatric care. Now that at least was a forward step. At first, these psychiatric wings were not going to be included and when Mr. Martin first agreed they would be covered, we thought that was a forward step. But this will be the type of situation we will face. We'll take a type of community like Swift Current. If we put a psychiatric wing on the General Hospital, the patient will be covered under the national hospital plan. If we put a small psychiatric hospital a block away from the General Hospital, they will not be covered. Now, of course the natural thing to do would be to take these small psychiatric hospitals and attach them to general hospitals, and the Federal Government would be in the awkward position of trying to decide whether or not this attached wing is a psychiatric wing or a psychiatric hospital. The thing will become, in my opinion, administratively impossible, and we might just as well in the first place include mental illness.

I wish to inform the member from Humboldt that one of the reasons we have not proceeded post-haste with the small psychiatric hospital is for this very reason. We would be strongly criticized if, two years from now having built the small, psychiatric hospital a block away from the general hospital, we found it was not covered under this plan, whereas if we had built it adjoining the hospital,

March 18, 1958

it would be covered. We would certainly be open to criticism. We would like to have that point cleared up. If they are going to be covered whether they are separate or not, then they should be separate. If, in order to get them covered by the hospital plan we have to put them on the same grounds, then that is where we ought to put them. Until that point is cleared up, it is very difficult to know just what type or plan we ought to establish.

I feel that this Legislature ought to stress very strongly the whole idea of a comprehensive national health insurance scheme. I hope and am sure they will back the Government when we urge insistently that mental illness and tuberculosis shall be covered under the general plan, and that the plan should be put into operation as soon as possible. At the Dominion-Provincial Conference we asked that the plan should become operative at the first of January. Now it has been announced it will become operative the first of July, although no legislation has been passed to that effect. It is simply a statement made by the Minister of Health. The fact that it wasn't started on January 1st, as we asked, has already cost the people of this province \$5 million. If it does start July 1st, that at least will be of some help.

I want to say with reference to this resolution that was passed by the Legislature, as with previous resolutions, we are not simply passing them for the fun of passing them. I think they have two main values. One is that this resolution be sent to the Prime Minister of Canada, whoever is the Prime Minister of Canada after the 31st of March. He, of course, will turn it over, as the Prime Minister always does — two copies are always sent to him; one for his own use, and one to be sent to the Minister whose Department it will affect, and that will be done. Secondly, of course, the fact this matter is discussed in the Legislature and has the support of all members of the House does help to create public opinion behind this idea. We have moved a long way. Not too many years ago the Federal Government made little or no contribution to help progress. By means of grants, they have commenced these programs, and now we have a national hospital insurance plan on the statute books in Canada. True, it is not operating yet, but there is a distinct prospect that it will become operative. We are making some progress, though I don't think we are making it fast enough. I don't think we can be criticized for being insistent and even demanding, but I do think that the support by this Legislature of this resolution will help strengthen our hand in any negotiations which will take place.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Premier, when you send the copy of the resolution as passed to the Prime Minister, do you send an accompanying letter or brief pointing out that it was passed unanimously and the general feeling in the province as to its support generally, and so forth?

Premier Douglas: — There is no accompanying letter — nothing more than a letter of transmittal. It would certainly not be within my power, or anyone else's to comment on the resolutions, or try to interpret the resolutions. There is a letter of transmittal, and the resolutions themselves indicate whether or not it is passed on division.

Mr. Cameron: — You take the resolution as it is, and the vote is recorded on it.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, that's right. Whether it was passed unanimously or by division.

(The question being put, the motion was agreed to unanimously.)

March 18, 1958

NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIPS

The Assembly resumed from Thursday, March 13, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thorson:

"That, with a view to further removing financial barriers to higher education, this Assembly urges establishment of a National Scholarship Program in Canada which would provide annual awards to Canadian students of demonstrated ability to enable them to study at recognized universities, the cost of such program to be shared by Federal and Provincial governments as follows: 50 per cent by the Government of Canada, and 50 per cent by the Provincial Governments, the share of costs allocated to each province to be in the proportion its population bears to the population of Canada."

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate on the motion of the hon. member from Estevan (Mr. Thorson), I would like to say that I am sure all hon. members, as well as all the people in Canada, are interested in seeing advances made in education at all levels, both in the secondary and the university levels. Certainly, a national scholarship plan is something which we have sorely needed in our Dominion.

I propose to deal with the motion in three portions, the first which calls for a National Scholarship Plan; secondly, the portion which suggests a method of finance; and thirdly, the final portion which suggests how the population of each province will become a factor in the disposition of the cost per province. Listening to the hon. member for Estevan the other day, when he introduced the motion, I found that he spent little, if any time on the last two portions of the motion, but devoted most of his speech to describing some of the reasons why he felt we should have a national scholarship program. He went into great detail to describe the relationship of our university students in Canada with respect to university students in Great Britain and the United States.

I am afraid, however, that that the hon. member from Estevan may have left a wrong impression with the Assembly regarding the establishment of a Saskatchewan Students' Aid Fund. While it is true that legislation was brought in for this plan in 1949, by the Government on your right, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the hon. member, and to the hon. gentlemen opposite that it was in 1942 that a Liberal Government of that day in co-operation with the Dominion Government, set up a program of financial aid to assist students in this province to attend the university and the normal school, and I regret that he omitted to mention that.

I understand that, the following year, this program was extended to include nurses-in-training. This was put into effect without any legislation and by mutual agreement. Now, in 1949, it is true that this plan was first put on the statute books by the Government opposite. But again, I would not like this Assembly to have received the impression that nothing was done about student aid until 1949, as was mentioned the other day.

I would like now to say just a little more about the efforts which were made by a Liberal Government back in 1942 in this respect.

Mr. Thorson (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I would like to point out that I did not suggest that nothing had been done prior to 1949. I simply dealt with what had been done since 1949.

Mr. Foley: — Then, I would like to fill the hon. member in on the background of this plan. In 1942, a Liberal Government expended a sum of \$42,000 to assist students in the University and the Normal School. During the last session prior to the present Government taking office, the Legislature appropriated the sum of \$50,000 to be used for student aid, and, through an Order in Council an additional \$10,000. When this present Government took office in 1944, they had a sum at their disposal of some \$60,000 to be used to assist university and other students. Of this, in that year, only \$34,600 was expended. So I feel that, in consideration of the Budget of the province at that time, reasonably good beginnings were made. And of course, the Student Loan Fund has been an important source of assistance to university students up until the present day.

Much has been said in the last few months concerning the subject of education. A great many organizations, in the past two or three years, have devoted a great deal of time to the study of educational problems. We have available extensive and exhaustive reports made by Canadian Teachers' Federation, the Canadian Trustees' Association, and most recently, of course, by the Ottawa Conference on Education. I do not propose to deal to any extent with the need

March 18, 1958

for scholarships today. I think that has been well dealt with already, particularly in the Brief which all of the members received from the university students themselves.

I might just review, briefly, some of the things which the university students mentioned as being reasons for the necessity of a national scholarship program. They mentioned the need for trained personnel; the need for competent leadership; the problem of rising costs, and the incapability of many families to provide funds; the problem of student earnings being inadequate; the inadequacy of the existing Dominion-Provincial bursaries. Most often bursaries are from \$100 to \$500. They are not enough and, according to their figure, at the present time Dominion-Provincial bursaries only supply about 7 1/2 per cent of the total cost of a university education.

They mentioned some other astounding statistics in connection with a university education. Of the students who begin Grade 1, about 4 per cent become university graduates. Between 40 and 50 per cent of those who are planning on attending university say that finance is their greatest problem. So there is no question, then, of the need for a national scholarship program.

Now, going on to the second portion of the motion we come to rather a startling development. We have sat here in the Legislature and listened to the hon. members opposite blame all their troubles and problems on Ottawa, and we have heard them suggest that nothing can be done because of the fact that they cannot get assistance federally. In this connection we heard, this afternoon, the impossibility of a provincial crop insurance program and the impossibility of a provincial marketing system, because of the fact that Ottawa had not instituted something federally. And now, suddenly, we find a resolution in front of us, Mr. Speaker, in which this province undertakes to pay half the cost of a national scholarship program. It seems to me that this is a reversal of policy, and one needs to examine it carefully to try and determine why there is such a change.

First of all, the cost of a national scholarship program would be very great. Various authorities have attempted to estimate the cost of such a program, and figures seem to vary. The Canadian Trustees' Report on School Finance suggests that the provinces could use up to \$150 million annually, and since this report was made in 1955, it is suggested now by a professor of the University that \$200 million might be closer to the actual figure.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — I would like to ask a question. Are you speaking of the cost of the scholarship plan when you are talking of \$150 million? That's what you're talking about.

Mr. Foley: — I was beginning to develop a point on that cost. I did not suggest that the figure I mentioned was the cost of the national scholarship plan. It is the estimated cost or, shall we say, the estimated amount which widely separated individuals have determined might possibly be needed to place education on a firm basis throughout Canada. Now various estimates have been made about how much would be needed to institute a scholarship program, and we have to go no further than our own Federal Liberal platform to get the thinking and the estimates of one group on what might be done to assist education. The Liberal program suggests that some \$25 million would be spent annually on 2,500 Canada scholarships and 7,500 Canada bursaries.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — What is the hon. member quoting from, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Foley: — I am quoting from a press report of a speech by the national leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Pearson, from 'The Leader Post', dated February 11.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — That is this year; not last year?

Mr. Foley: — That is correct. The scholarships would be handed out through the National Conference of Canadian Universities and would be awarded for four years and be worth \$1,000 a year. The bursaries, also, would be, for four years, valued at \$500 annually, bringing the total grants to \$40 million in the fourth year.

I would like to point out that \$25 million is a suggested figure for scholarships, and I think you will agree, with me that 2,500 scholarships and 7,500 bursaries make a relatively small figure when we consider that, added together, they come to 10,000 students who would be assisted; and I understand, according to the latest reports, there are about 80,000 university students in Canada at the moment.

This means, then, that we have here a Federal program which proposes to assist only about one-eighth of the students in Canada, and yet it will cost \$25 million, or if we divided by ten for the sake of simplicity, it would mean an average of \$2.5 million per province. I would gather from this proposed resolution, that the hon. member from Estevan proposes that the province of Saskatchewan spend an estimated similar amount; in other words, if the Federal Government would spend \$2.5 million, they would also spend \$2.5 million on such a program. And I want to ask them this, Mr. Speaker:

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Your mathematics man, my goodness!

March 18, 1958

Mr. Foley: — Why should they neglect educational finance in their own province to invade a program which many authorities, today, agree could be handled very nicely by our Federal Government?

I have attempted to find out something of the educational policy of the National Party which the gentlemen on the other side represent. I have found nothing in all the speeches made in this Federal campaign. I have yet to find a speaker for the C.C.F. party enunciate anything definite or tangible with regard to education. I think the same can be said for the Tory Party. The only concrete program which we have for education in the Dominion of Canada today has been advanced by our Liberal Party.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You always have a program at election time.

Mr. Foley: — Now, I think the Liberal Party has gone a step further in this matter of assisting university students. As I had the opportunity of mentioning, the other day, in the House, newly married couples would have their basic exemptions doubled for the first three years of marriage. I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that a good many of university students today are young married couples, and I think this is a direct aid to university education in Canada.

Mr. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Foley: — Wait till I am finished, Mr. Dewhurst. Now, then, the question arises: what evidence is there that we should neglect the great many needs of education here in the province, today, to go into the field of a national scholarship program?

I have attempted to do a fair amount of research on the matter and here are some of the things I have found. Professor Toombs, of the Teachers' College at Saskatoon, has this to say about Federal aid:

"The object of Federal aid would be to equalize educational programs in provinces with less ability to pay, without unduly affecting the tax rate. Ideally, grants must be made outright to provincial governments, who would then allocate funds to school boards guaranteeing to spend the entire amount on education."

He went on to state that a brief had been drawn up asking for \$150 million in Federal grants, one-third to be paid each province on a per people basis, the remaining two-thirds to be distributed as equalization money to provinces with low assessments. He went on to say that current needs would appear to approach \$200 million. Contrary

to much opinion, Professor Toombs said he believed Federal funds for education would not lead to Federal control of schools.

Going on to the statements of Dr. Wilder Penfield of the Ottawa Educational Conference, he said as follows:

"Responsibility for the support of teaching at all educational levels rests with the provinces. But, industry, labour and the Federal Government could provide scholarships. The Federal Government might also provide universities endowments of land and money, so that they could be helped, free of any Federal interference.

"Provincial Governments (according to another statement at the same Conference) would have to continue to discharge a major responsibility for education, particularly at the undergraduate level. But Federal grants should be possible for research graduate work, buildings and scholarships."

Dr. Penfield, again:

"It would seem the responsibility of support for teaching at the primary, secondary and university levels rests with the province."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that, in the field of higher education, the Liberal Party has an enviable record. I would like, with your permission, to refer, briefly, to some remarks of the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent to the National Conference on Higher Education, on November 12, 1956, in Ottawa. Speaking on this matter of Federal and Provincial jurisdiction in education, he says as follows:

"There are Canadians who deny the Federal Government any right to intervene in certain cultural fields, especially in that of assistance to students and to universities by means of bursaries or grants. It is evident that our constitution does not restrict the powers of the Federal authorities in several of these fields, for Article 93 of our Constitution states: "Except in certain special cases in and for each province, the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education."

March 18, 1958

This means that the provincial authorities have the exclusive right to legislate on education, to determine programs of study, and to specify the system of school attendance which their citizens must follow. Mr. St. Laurent goes on to say:

"On the other hand, the Federal Government has the absolute right to levy indirect taxes for any purpose, and the power to impose direct taxes, provided that they are intended for the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. Out of these moneys it can, with Parliament's approval, offer gifts or grants to individuals, institutions, provincial governments or even to foreign governments. This is a Royal prerogative that is not in any way restricted by our Constitution."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have every evidence there of the validity of federal contributions to education. He goes on to say that the Federal Government has a right to offer financial assistance in all fields of culture, and it rests with them to decide the purpose for which it is offered and who shall benefit from it.

The first example of Federal aid to education (or one of the first) was the establishment of the National Research Council in 1917, which has been largely responsible for the development of scientific research in Canada over the past 40 years. In 1948, we find training assistance being given by the Department of National Health to the extent of about \$500,000 annually. And, finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention briefly, the establishment by the National Liberal Party of the Canada Council, which has made already, an outstanding contribution to Federal education in Canada. As you will recall, the Canada Council granted \$50 million for capital construction and another \$50 million for the purpose of assistance in fields of Art, the Humanities and the Social Sciences. I want to emphasize that one of the main functions of The Canada Council for the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences was to administer a system of scholarships in these fields, to foster Canada's cultural relations abroad, and perform the functions of a national commission. One other important feature, I think, of the Council was the wish of the Government to make it as independent as possible from Government control.

I think, then, Mr. Speaker, I have advanced ample evidence to show that a Federal scholarship scheme is not only feasible from the point of view of our constitution, but certainly is acceptable by many of the leaders in education today, and is being offered by at least one major political party in Canada without any strings attached. Yet here we have a resolution asking that our resources in the province be expended on a national scholarship plan, when there

are so many more needs here in the province, on the elementary and secondary school level with which we certainly need more assistance.

It is just a short time ago in this House that we had the privilege of advancing a foundation program for education in the province. We mentioned at that time that two of the main requisites were an equalized assessment throughout the province, and a uniform mill rate. Speaking on the motion, I mentioned the fact that in British Columbia, when the Foundation Program was advanced, taxation lowered in some 40 municipalities.

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Does the hon. member have the right to discuss all kinds of things . . .

Mr. Speaker: — May I ask the hon. member if he is repeating what he said already in a previous debate?

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I was merely reverting to it, to explain why I was opposed to money going out of this province.

Mr. Speaker: — I am afraid the hon. member will have to manage that without referring to what was spoken in a previous debate.

Mr. Foley: — The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the establishment of a Foundation Program usually means greatly increased provincial grants for education, and therefore, I suggest that, if such a program is being contemplated for the province of Saskatchewan, it might be well to allow our Federal Government to take care of a national scholarship plan. I feel it was also unfortunate that the word 'bursary' was not included in the motion. There is a difference between a bursary and a scholarship. Now, it may have been intended that the word 'scholarship' should be made all-inclusive; but, nevertheless, 'scholarship' is an award made for academic achievement without regard to financial need. On the other hand, a bursary is an award made with regard to financial need of the student as long as his academic achievement is reasonably satisfactory.

I think here, in our province and throughout Canada, there is a great need for university students who may not have the highest academic achievement, but who may have sufficient academic achievement to have success at university. And I hope the hon. member from Estevan (Mr. Thorson) meant the word 'scholarship' to be all-inclusive, otherwise I would like to have seen the word 'bursary' included.

March 18, 1958

I have attempted to review the status of Federal aid in the province, at the moment. In reviewing the present existing scholarships and bursaries at the University of Saskatchewan, I find that a great many individuals and organizations, including private industry, have contributed toward this plan. I find, also, that some Federal aid is being received, not only in the Dominion-Provincial Student Loan Fund, but also, in the Vocational Training Scheme, and the Youth Training program. Now, I realize that the National Health Program has been under discussion, this afternoon. If it is implemented it may release more funds for education in the province of Saskatchewan, and I certainly hope that is so.

I note a resolution passed by the Saskatchewan Trustees' Association requesting that all of the Education and Hospitalization Tax collected in this province be expended on education. At the moment, of a total revenue of \$18,500,000 about \$12,300,000 is going to education; so there is evidence there, of the need for further expenditure.

Finally, I would like to bring in, at this time, the thinking of our own Saskatchewan Commission on School Finance, who represented the province at the Ottawa Conference. Their three recommendations were as follows:

They felt that Federal aid would be of great assistance in the matter of capital construction; that Federal aid would be of assistance in a national scholarship plan . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We are wandering all over the place. We are not near the resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is making a speech that covers the whole field of education . . .

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I am attempting to point out evidence, where requests are being made for exclusive Federal aid for the scholarship program.

Mr. Speaker: — I am sorry, I did not catch your explanation of what you are attempting to read out.

Mr. Foley: — I am attempting to read, Mr. Speaker, a report of the Commission on School Finance to the Ottawa conference on Education.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, may I say that we have had everything, and have taken it very patiently, from the educational program of the Liberal Party in this election right down now to where we are getting to Saskatchewan Commission on all fields. I mean to say, I think if we cannot confine ourselves to

this resolution, we are never going to . . .

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Why are you rising?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. I want to point out why I am objecting to this debate along these lines.

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the motion. Speak to the motion.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I am merely attempting to point out the ample evidence there is for Federal jurisdiction over a national scholarship program.

The final recommendation of the Commission on School Finance was that the Federal Government contribute at least 40 per cent of the cost of an acceptable Canadian standard of education, such moneys to be distributed to the provinces on a one-third per pupil basis and a two-thirds equalization grant.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in reviewing this motion, I have attempted to associate myself with the hon. member from Estevan (Mr. Thorson), in agreeing to the great need for a national scholarship plan. At the same time, I have attempted to point out that there seems to be little evidence to support a sharing of the costs of such a plan, on a 50-50 basis. I have also noted the great need for additional expenditures in the field of elementary and secondary education here in the province of Saskatchewan, and I feel that additional moneys, which may be forthcoming for education in the next few years, can well be spent in that field.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by Mr. Klein, an amendment to the motion, as follows:

"That all the words after the word 'universities' in the fifth line be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"the cost of such program to be borne by the Government of Canada."

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.

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

The Assembly resumed from Thursday, March 13, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Gardiner as amended:

"That this Assembly recommend to the Provincial Government that, before any basic change is made in the organization of Municipal Government in Saskatchewan, consideration be given to the report of the Continuing Committee on Local Government, and consultation be held with local government organizations regarding the best method of ascertaining the wishes of their ratepayers."

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in the dying moments of the sitting, the other day, I was thinking of how I could contribute a little to the debate in question; and the way I saw it I had to get up; and then the vote came along on the amendment which changed, the gist of the motion.

Now I can't be long-winded; sometimes I wish I could, in order to bring out all the facts and details; but in the best way I can, I will try to explain why I cannot support the motion as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in democracy and in good government. In saying that, I know that I don't believe the motion as amended is conducive to a democratic form of government, or good government, because the motion itself, or rather the motion as amended, seems to take away some of the most basic, and fundamental rights that the people, over the years, have fought and shed blood for.

I also believe, in this particular case, that governments should get the advice of committees, boards, etc., because by using boards they are in a position to have the assistance required to guide them into the legislation that is best suited to the situation. I also believe that a good government will give the right to the people concerned to express themselves by ballot. Now this motion as amended, as you notice, Mr. Speaker, is denying the right of the people of expressing themselves. The original motion embodied in it, or the purpose of it, I should say, was to avoid or prevent any drastic changes in the forms of local governments without a vote of the people; and this motion as amended is not giving the people concerned a chance to express themselves.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; I must deny this. This was made very clear when the amendment was moved. It was made very clear that this did not necessarily deny the people an opportunity to express themselves. All this did was to say that we would wait until we got the report of the Continuing Committee, and had consultation with local government organizations to find out the best way of getting the wishes of the ratepayers. The hon. gentleman is completely out of order when he attributes motives which are not intended in the motion as amended.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Why did you amend it then?

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite would only give a chance for a person to sort of get to the point. At the first thing said that hurts them a little they just pop up. I don't know what you call it, but it is a peculiar situation. You can't . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I must say to the hon. gentleman that the point of privilege was well taken. The hon. gentleman did give the impression that the purpose of this motion was to deny the ratepayers an opportunity to express their wishes.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, that's what it is.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, it is certainly that, as far as I can read, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion, the way I read it, I see it that way, and I am only expressing myself. I am only expressing my personal opinion as I read it. I am not objecting to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but as far as I can see, the way I read it, it is denying the right of a person to vote.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — There is no doubt about it.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances I have to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. gentleman is entitled to give his interpretation of the motion, but he is not entitled to state that it is the purpose of the amendment to deny — to give a motive in the moving of the amendment.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, I am not going to argue on the ruling, Mr. Speaker, but in trying to substantiate my argument I would like to read the original motion. The original motion was:

"That this Assembly recommend to the Provincial Government that, before any basic change is made in the organization of Municipal Government in Saskatchewan, a vote of the people concerned be taken."

March 18, 1958

That is the original motion, Mr. Speaker. The motion, as it is amended:

"This Assembly recommend that, before any basic change is made in the organization of Municipal Government in Saskatchewan, that consideration be given to the report of the Continuing Committee on Local Government, and consultation be held with government organizations regarding the best method of ascertaining the wishes of their ratepayers."

It does not give them the right to vote. The original motion gave them that right.

Mr. Danielson: — Why didn't you vote for it, if you meant that?

Mr. Coderre: — So, therefore, I am only bringing up my discussion and argument in that direction.

We go back Mr. Speaker, and because this motion deals with the most basic and fundamental forms of government, in the best way I can I am going to try to show how those governments were formed. We can go back probably to the stone age, or some time back in history where the family group was the basis of the government. The father and the family was the basis of government. As time progressed, and as the species multiplied, there were several family groups. The various families got together as a group and, by pooling their resources and their brains, they formed the most basic form of government. Again, as time progressed, they found that this type of government could not cope with the situations that were presenting themselves due to the greater populations, so that they formed themselves into tribes. The time came that some tribes became more powerful than the others, and we then formed nations, but it so happened that some of the larger tribes became more powerful than others. These tribes became dictatorial in their ways. They had complete control and, eventually, we grew up into a feudal system. The people of this world, Mr. Speaker, have shed blood to try and maintain the most fundamental rights of government, which in the western world here and pretty well everywhere, is your rural government, your smallest form of government which can be efficiently and effectively administered.

The purpose of the original motion was, anticipating a change, to prevent a denying of those basic, fundamental rights which the majority of people feel they should have. The motion was put there to assure the people, or the majority of the people, that they should have that right, that they should have a chance to express themselves whether they wish to have any change in these basic rights. And when I say, Mr. Speaker, that the motion as amended has taken away the one basic democratic right that the individual has had, that the people of this

world have fought and shed blood for — the right of putting a secret vote or ballot . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, are you going to allow this gentleman . . .

Mr. Coderre: — . . . not of having a group of people express themselves . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Are you going to allow him to go against your ruling?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member has the right to say what he thinks it means.

Mr. Coderre: — I probably haven't the eloquence that the hon. Minister has, Mr. Speaker, but I am trying to express my opinion in the best way I can, the way I see it.

Mr. Danielson: — You are doing fine.

Mr. Coderre: — Now, today, history has brought itself up to our present form of government. A revolution has taken place, or evolution, from the time of basic governments and feudal systems, or dictatorial systems, back to the most basic fundamental types of government, which are our small rural governments. Then we are having, it seems to me, a movement in the world which is a socialistic movement - if you may call it that. It is trying to form another revolution — to deny the small local communities that basic fundamental right.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member must endeavour to keep more closely to the motion. He has given us a speech on the development of the democratic government and so forth, which is very remotely concerned with whether or not the motion as amended is passed.

Mr. McDonald: — But it ties up with it.

Mr. Coderre: — I am not going to argue your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but the motion in question was that 'in event' of a suggested move to deny the people these rights of voting, to allow the municipalities concerned, the right to vote. I believe that you have to bring in every bit of evidence concerning it to actually develop the question. I can't help it if you have to go back in history; but everything that ends, must have a beginning, and, after all, the democratic rights of local government have had their beginning somewhere in the past, and before they end, we must go back to that history.

March 18, 1958

The motion as amended, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in the way I read it, in my personal opinion, definitely denies the right of the voter on the ballot in order to express himself; that in the event that the recommendation of the Continuing Committee is that they should have Larger Units, or some such thing.

Now, the expression of the leaders in the matter — when I speak of the leaders I am referring to the executives of the schools, the executive of the urban municipalities, the executives of the hospital boards — it is not sufficient to decide what action should be taken in the event of the recommendations of this Continuing Committee. Therefore, I say again that the elector, the family man, or the people who live in the rural municipalities concerned, must have an expression by vote. I remember when I was at the Municipal-Provincial Conference here, that the members of the Conference, in rising to speak on the matter concerned, were giving to the Government their problems — just what problems they had. That was the purpose of this Conference, Mr. Speaker. After they had spoken for 10, 15 or 20 minutes, as the case may be, the Ministers concerned would then get up and sort of 'brainwash' whatever had been said, for a period of an hour or so, whatever arguments these people were giving, the Government, with its advisors and its planning boards and everything, were undoing what was said, by these various organizations.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — There is no danger of anybody ever washing your brain.

Mr. Coderre: — It is probably a trick of your trade to try and induce them. Now, I am not any too sure, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to me that the Committee was formed to advise the Government as to how they should go ahead and form the modified county system. That was the purpose of the Committee. As far as I can see, it wasn't formed to recommend to the Government whether it was advisable or not advisable, to form the system. The Government laid down, straight and narrow, what the Continuing Committee was to follow. It didn't say, "You report to us and tell us whether it is advisable or not." Well, there was a purpose to the Government in this particular case to form this Continuing Committee, and the purpose was that, if the plan or the recommendations that they made, which were the wish of the Government, didn't pan out well and there would be too much hub-hub out in the country, well, they could blame the Committee for it. The Government, somehow or other, had to find a scapegoat; so they appointed this Committee as their scapegoat; but if the thing went right they would take the credit for it.

It is a very smooth way of doing it, but it seems that, whatever the Committee is going to find out, the Government

in the various branches and departments concerned in regard to rural and urban municipalities, has all the information they want. If they had had the backbone, or the gall, to implement their thinking, they would not have had to have this Continuing Committee and we wouldn't be debating this question.

The other day in the House, (I just don't remember when, though I believe it was on this motion), the Premier got up and said: "The motion indicates non-confidence in the Continuing Committee." How wrong could a Premier of a province ever be? The motion in question, not the motion as amended, was there actually to show the non-confidence of the Opposition in the Government in the past that they would force it upon them.

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the motion and the amendment, the original motion and the amendment have both been dispensed in with; and we are now discussing the motion as amended.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion as amended, yes.

Premier Douglas: — How can we now continue to discuss an amendment that has been disposed of by the House?

Mr. Loftson: — You can speak on both at the same time.

Mr. Coderre: — I am not speaking on the amendment. I believe the only way that I could express myself — and I am sure that the Government doesn't want to muzzle; I can't express myself any other way. If they wish to muzzle me, tell me and I will. sit down. That is the only way I can express myself, by referring back to other matters. I don't believe I am speaking out of order, Mr. Speaker; at least I hope not. I would be the last one who would want to do that.

The motion in question, Mr. Speaker, was one of non-confidence in the Government. Now in order to sort of try to wrangle their way out and as they couldn't vote against it — it would be impossible to vote against it — they brought in an amendment . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Coderre: — . . . they brought in an amendment which, as I often say, is a lot of loose talk, because all it is is a bunch of words, which actually mean nothing. We know, the Legislature knows, and the people of Saskatchewan know, that we have a Continuing Committee. We know that it has to report to the Government in matters concerning the formation of some form of

March 18, 1958

boundaries in one way or another, and that is all it does. So, in other words, the Government has managed, with its amendment to the original motion in this particular case, to push through an amendment which actually changes the complete picture of the original motion. It is just a question of trying to bully things through.

Now assuming, Mr. Speaker — and I don't know whether I am in order again; I usually have the habit of being out of order all the time for some reason; but the motion as amended, I assume that, because of the fact that it has been amended by the Government, it will go through. Now I don't know whether I am in order in dealing with that.

Mr. Speaker: — The amendment has already passed.

Mr. Coderre: — The motion as amended, I should say, Mr. Speaker. Now assuming that the motion, as amended, will pass, I would like to make some suggestions to the Government. If, at any time, the Continuing Committee suggests to go into different types of local government, combining them with some continuous boundary or into larger units or a county system, it doesn't matter how they put it; but I would make this suggestion — and that brings me to another point, Mr. Speaker. The Government suggested that they had in mind taking two areas and making them 'guinea pigs' or trying them out . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member is going beyond the scope of the motion altogether.

Mr. Danielson: — It was brought out by the Premier when he spoke to the original motion.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, I just finished saying, Mr. Speaker, that there was a motion there. Now, this motion has been amended . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I ask the hon. member to keep to the motion.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, I am keeping to the motion as best I can, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how I can keep to it any better. I don't know, unless somebody can go ahead and provide me with a dictaphone in the back, I can't express myself any other way. Am I being denied the right to do so, or does this Legislature wish me to start out in French?

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, in trying to keep as

to the motion as amended as possible, I must make recommendations to the Government in that respect, because our original thought in the Opposition is not being carried out, the Government having put an amendment to an existing motion which changes the situation. Therefore, I feel that in talking to the motion as amended, I must make some recommendations to the Government. As I was saying, the vote of the people first with regard to this decision of trying out these various systems, county systems, the people of these particular areas should be given the right to vote. Now the motion as amended does not give them that right.

I believe as well, that the people in these particular trial areas (as they are known) should be given the assurance that, after a specified period of time, they will be given another chance of expressing their wish in regard to the formation of a unit.

I also recommend, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of the recommendations of the Committee, nothing should be done in these areas that cannot be undone. Now in this particular case I believe I have to refer to the question of some larger units — the Larger School Units. We have a case in the Larger School Units where many schools have been closed and, after a period of time of operation, they have been sold, and the members concerned don't find it expedient to vote themselves out; so I just thought I would bring that point in as a comparison.

People who would supervise these particular changes could be, or would be, a Legislative Committee, which would be unbiased. Now I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if the Government takes these recommendations it will safeguard to the maximum the democratic rights of the people with whom we are concerned in the event of a change. The motion as amended does not give specific rights to the taxpayers concerned of expressing themselves in the event of a change. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that any time that the democratic rights of our junior governments are infringed upon, it is time that every man who can say anything, no matter how simplified it may be, should get up and make his stand to protect the democratic rights of all the people of Saskatchewan and of all people, everywhere. Give the people concerned the right to express themselves by ballot. And the fact that this motion denies them that right means that I cannot support the motion as amended, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

(Debate adjourned)

DEPENDANTS' RELIEF ACT — Second Reading

Bill No. 73 - An Act to amend The Dependants' Relief Act.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — In moving second reading of Bill No. 71, I would point out that the principal change in this Bill is to give the District Court jurisdiction in applications made under The Dependants' Relief Act, where the amount sought to be recovered does not exceed \$3,000. This is in line with the recommendation of the Culliton Committee that District Court judges should have some jurisdiction in matters of dependants' relief. It is limited to \$3,000 as is the other Bill limiting that jurisdiction.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill No. 73.

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt): — I think this Bill is similar to certain other Bills that are being introduced, and the objection here, if I understand the Bill correctly (and I haven't perused it too carefully), is that this application can be made to the District Court if there is consent in writing, which, of course, destroys the entire validity of the thing. The Culliton report brought in the recommendation that the jurisdiction of the District Court be extended. Under the present Act, the jurisdiction of the District Court is limited to actions under \$1,200. The Culliton report recommended that these things be extended to \$3,000, mostly on the basis that nowadays \$3,000 isn't of any greater importance than \$1,200 was at the time the original Bills were enacted.

The whole point is, if the purpose is going to be to give District Court judges more work, if the purpose of these amendments is to bring justice closer to the people, to make it less expensive, more available and quicker, more efficient, then if you need the consent that in itself almost destroys any use that this amendment could have. Moreover, in a case of this nature where, quite often, quite a number of people have to be served with a notice when an application is made under The Dependants' Relief Act, the problem is, first of all to apply to the judge in order to get leave to serve these various people, in order to find out how they should be served, and quite often they are outside the jurisdiction. And if you are going to try to save an estate money, save a widow and orphans money, if you are going to put in this restriction and make it necessary to have the consent of all the parties concerned you might just as well leave it in the hands of the Queen's Bench Judge because anybody (certainly no lawyer) who ever starts an action or makes an application under The Dependants' Relief Act without first trying to get all the people who are interested in the estate together

to try to get a settlement. It is only when the basis for settlement has fallen through, when at least one beneficiary is absolutely unwilling to listen and there is no agreement between the parties, that this application has to be made. In that case you are not going to get the consent of the opposing parties, except, maybe once in a hundred cases, and all you are doing is putting the litigant to greater expense before they ever get started. There is absolutely no merit in it and it certainly is not, or was not, as far as I can understand it, the intention of the Culliton Committee to bring in this extension of jurisdiction, but limit it to cases where there is consent.

The whole idea was to extend it to \$3,000, where you could go into District Court as long as you were under \$3,000, and District Court could dispose of the case without making it necessary for the parties to go to Queen's Bench Court.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment on that ground. I will not vote against it because it is better than nothing, but it has absolutely no merit. These things, if they have to be done by consent, unless someone is absolutely unversed in the ordinary practice of law and litigation, they will realize that there is absolutely no merit in such an amendment. All it will do is make further negotiations and further expense to the litigant. It is better than absolutely no change, but it certainly is not in conformity with the Culliton report, or the wishes of most of the members of the Bar.

(The Motion for second reading agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 84 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, at this time the Government is proposing rather major changes in the administration of the land titles system. The land titles system of this province was, as hon. members know, inherited from Australia where it was first introduced, and it has remained in this province, virtually unchanged since it was introduced in 1886.

The land titles practice and procedure have gone virtually unchanged. The proposals for amendments principally involve administrative changes and not changes in the law, so far as they affect property holders. There are four sections which do purport to change the law and the rights of title holders, but I believe I will deal with these separately. My general remarks apply to the other sections particularly.

March 18, 1958

The efficient operation and administration of the land titles system is important to every person in the province. It is particularly important to people who have titles and who are interested in the security of their titles. It is important to those who wish to deal with their titles by way of transfer or encumbrance or any other way that the land titles system be reliable, dependable, efficient and swift in its administration.

The system we have in this province is commonly regarded throughout the world as being the best kind of land titles system that there is; and we, in Saskatchewan, in common with Alberta, parts of British Columbia, and Manitoba, have been blessed with that advantage ever since the days before the settlement of the province. It is now felt that some major overhaul is due of the administration of that system.

We have carefully examined the various Land Titles Offices with a view to determining their relative efficiency. The thing that was most conspicuous about the efficiency in the offices appeared to be that the larger the office the less efficient it was in terms of volume of work done per man-hour employed. Those offices which had larger than the average size staff (and the average is 12.8 throughout the system), all did less than the average amount of work per employee; and those which were smaller than average size all did more than the average number of pieces handled per employee. This pointed up the need for some close examination of the administration, the traditional administration, of the system.

It was, of course, the firm desire and intention of the Government to make certain that any changes or streamlining or reforming of the procedures would not in any way affect the security of the title or the security of the registered instruments of those using the land titles system.

There were other deficiencies which have come to be regarded as rather grave deficiencies in the land titles system, and that is the fact that a fire or a flood or other disaster to a Land Titles Office would virtually render all the land in that Land Titles District uncertain as to its title. It was, therefore, the desire of the Department, the Government, to try to evolve procedures which would provide greater security and certainty in these records.

It also became apparent that sooner or later some revised method would have to be evolved which would eliminate the accumulation of dead documents. Land Titles Offices, the bigger they were the faster they grew, were becoming clogged with dead paper which had long since ceased to have any legal significance or effect, and there was no way of separating the good from the bad without

holding a court of inquiry on every single document. There was no way of automatically separating the current instruments from the dead ones, and making it possible thereafter to cull over the dead ones with a view to a program of document destruction. There was nothing in the land-titles system as set up in The Land Titles Act to permit the use of electrical or mechanical devices and modern business techniques in the administration of that function.

There was, also, a serious difficulty as by reason of the system of filing, it was impossible to make any alterations or adjustments in the boundaries of Land Titles Districts. It was impossible for the reason that all documents were filed in serial or chronological order, and in moving, any territory from one district to another, it would, of course, be necessary to examine every document in the Land Titles Office to ascertain whether or not it ought to be moved to the new office; and, of course, there are documents which apply not just to one piece of land about which it would be impossible to decide which office they should be left in.

This created an unnecessary and undesirable rigidity in the system which did not permit the flexibility needed in order to maintain efficiency; offices with as few as five employees and offices with more than thirty employees operating side by side.

In the fall of 1956, a conference of Registrars was called to consider some of these problems. As a result of that conference, work analyses were made of the various offices and some reallocation and rearrangement of staff appeared to be indicated. As a result of those studies it has been possible, over the past year, to reduce the number of people engaged in the Land Titles system from 164 employees to 142 employees. This reduction of 22 employees (something over 10 per cent) was accomplished in spite of the fact that the total volume of work handled by the Land Titles system actually increased by more than five per cent in the year under review. In spite of this reduction in staff it was also possible to completely eliminate, or almost completely eliminate the waiting period which from time to time existed in some Districts when the volume of work was too large for the staff.

In addition, this net reduction of 22 persons was accomplished in spite of the fact that three additional positions were established of deputy registrar solicitor. The land titles system, as hon. members know, depends primarily upon the ability of the staff, the registrars, to properly apply the law contained in The Land Titles Act. This can best be done by people who have had some training in law. We have, therefore, tried to establish the principle that in each office there ought to be one, either a deputy registrar or a registrar, with legal training.

So as a result of these studies made by the registrars

March 18, 1958

and the work analyses made, this Department followed a practice which has become common in the departments of this Government., namely, to undertake a detailed and careful analysis of the work and work efficiency of the agency. This has been done in other departments through the years, and we availed ourselves, in the Attorney General's Department of the services of the expert staff of the Budget Bureau to do a detailed analysis of this work and to work out techniques and procedures to accomplish the ends which I have already described, and to overcome the deficiencies which I have described.

This team was then assigned to this study. They commenced by reviewing the land titles law of the other Commonwealth countries and the American states having the same system, and found nothing in any of these Land Titles Acts or in the procedures adopted by any of the systems which offered any solution to any single one of the problems. No help could be got from the experience of other systems anywhere in Canada or the United States. These people, then, set up a pilot study in one of the offices and did a fairly extensive program of research. As a result of that research they evolved a plan which the Department has now begun to put into effect.

First of all, the plan called for the appointment of an administrative head of the system. Formerly the system had no administrative head, except the Deputy Attorney General. The legal head of the system, of course, was the Master of Titles, whose responsibility did not extend to the day-to-day management and administration of the various offices. This administrative head then set up a team — a conversion crew. This team experimented with some new ideas and, as I say, evolved a program which is embodied in the Land Titles Bill which is before the House. Some of the things which are included in that scheme are first of all, some changes in the furnishings and equipment for filing of plans and for the filing of documents. Changes are proposed for the forms and records used in the various offices; such small but significant reforms as the use of window envelopes, which my hon. friends may think is a trifling matter, but which involves the saving of some 50,000 addresses a year and saves the necessity of employing about one extra person throughout the whole system.

The task force who studied this also revised the work flow and procedure routines of the offices so that documents flowed more naturally from one member of the staff to another. Cases were discovered where an extensive carrying around of documents was necessary, documents which formerly required over one hundred checking steps before registration was complete. The process has been simplified so that less than half that number is now required, and at the same time the same standard of security and efficiency is assured.

The introduction of photo copy machines in the Land

Titles Offices greatly reduced the amount of clerical work necessary in producing abstracts and copies of documents. A document now which is a four-page document, requires the work of one person for approximately one hour in the typing and comparing of the document with the original. A photo-copy machine will reproduce a four-page document in less than 15 minutes, and that represents a very substantial saving in staff time throughout the system.

There are the minor proposals, all of which are now in the process of implementation.

The plan, however, involves a completely fresh approach to the filing of titles. As hon. members know, the titles are filed in chronological order and bound in large volumes, with the result that anyone applying for a position as a clerk in a Land Titles Office must be able to pass a pretty rigorous physical test to be able to carry one of these volumes weighing some 20 or 25 pounds. This is simply archaic and unnecessary work and inconvenience. The new plan provides for the filing of titles not by chronological order in bound volumes, but by land description in file folders in filing cabinets, so that it will now be possible, when moving a row of townships from one Land Titles District to another, to simply ship the filing cabinet and everything is there. It will also be possible for those who are working on titles to work at ordinary sized desks without having great piles of these volumes stacked around them, and carrying them back and forth from one filing cabinet to another. As a matter of fact, these reforms in the system of filing titles and registered instruments will save approximately 50,000 man-hours per year in the operation of the systems, or a total of 32 people on the payroll.

I see time is getting short. There are other proposals which I would like to tell to the House. I want hon. members to know that these proposals are important and significant. They represent about a one-third reduction in staff; they represent a saving to the people of Saskatchewan of over \$100,000 a year; and furthermore, while some hon. members may think that they are simple and trivial, the fact is that no other jurisdiction in the world has seen fit to take advantage of these rather ingenious proposals for greater efficiency and economy.

I can go on, I think, for a moment and perhaps finish what I was going to say about this. In order to provide greater security of titles so that the Courts would not be flooded with tens of thousands of actions involving titles in the event of a fire or flood or other disaster, it is proposed to install microfilming equipment in every title as it is converted from the old system to the new system. In addition to that, every document filed in the Land Titles Office thereafter will be microfilmed, and these microfilms will all be kept in a central storage where they can be used to reconstruct

March 18, 1958

titles in the event of a fire or disaster.

I may say that microfilming is so efficient that every document in our Land Titles system can be kept in a room no larger than 20 feet by 20 feet; and these will be, as I say, available in the event of an accident happening to one of our offices. These microfilms will make it possible for the destruction of any withdrawn or discharged documents which have passed a certain period and it has become unnecessary to keep them. Even in spite of the destruction of these documents a historical record will still be available, if it is ever required, from the microfilm cabinet. This opens up the whole possibility of disposal of documents. I see it is now 5:30 and I would like to defer dealing with disposal of obsolete documents to later on in the debate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate at this time.

(Debate adjourned.)

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock.