

[Translation]

## HEALTH

INQUIRY RESPECTING INTENSIVE USE OF DRUGS IN  
TREATMENT OF MENTAL PATIENTS

**Mr. Gilles Caouette (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has he received representations on the harmful effects of the intensive use of drugs as a therapy for mental patients?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I regret, but I did not understand the hon. member's question. Would he kindly repeat it?

**Mr. Caouette (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us if he has received representations concerning the harmful effects of the intensive use of drugs as a therapy for mental patients?

**Mr. Lalonde:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Caouette (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that even though the use of drugs in psychiatric treatments may be effective in the short term, in the long term the use of phenothiazins in the case of 50,000 mental patients has resulted in permanent destruction of the nervous system and of the cells—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I should point out to the hon. member that he is giving a medical opinion and I do not think that he can express an opinion instead of asking a question. Could the hon. member ask his question—

**Mr. Caouette (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, I was just coming to my question.

Is the minister prepared to act in this area in order to limit the intensive use of these drugs, as recommended by the committee on institutional psychiatry.

**Mr. Lalonde:** Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to examine the medical opinion given by the hon. member.

[Later:]

[English]

**Mr. Atkey:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege pursuant to the question asked by the hon. member for Charlevoix. I made a submission to the Minister of National Health and Welfare one week ago today on the very subject of that question. I made further submissions orally to him on Monday of this week. The committee which gave rise to those submissions about which the hon. member raised the question is located in my constituency and they raised matters of serious and national importance. I regret to say that the minister today has infringed my privileges by saying that in fact he has had no submissions on the question.

## Oral Questions

● (1450)

## GRAIN

FEED GRAINS—POWERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS  
BOARD AND WHEAT BOARD TO PURCHASE

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. I assume from his statement that the Agricultural Products Board will be able to purchase all grades of wheat, barley and oats from the farmers. I should like to ask him if that is so and also whether it is his intention to bring in amendments to the Wheat Board Act so that the Wheat Board may also purchase grain from the Agricultural Products Board as well as from farmers?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, the prices which have been set at this time for barley and oats are on the base of No. 1 feed barley and No. 1 feed oats, basis Thunder Bay. The Agricultural Products Board prices will range downward for lower quality grain. The Products Board will not pay a higher price for higher quality grain if it is offered to it, the feed price being the basic one which will be available. The question of the steps that may be required in order to facilitate operations between the Agricultural Products Board and the Canadian Wheat Board to the maximum advantage of the Canadian Wheat Board is being determined, but if legislation is necessary it will be introduced at that time.

## PRICE TO FARMER FOR BARLEY USED DOMESTICALLY

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I am trying to analyse the formula placed before the House by the Minister of Justice. It seems to make the Einstein theory look like simplicity itself. I have done some figuring here and I want to find out whether it is not correct. As of today, on the basis of the new formula the minister has produced or that has been concocted, is it not a fact that the western farmer would receive 90 cents a bushel for his barley less than he would on this particular day on the international market?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice):** The fact of the matter is that the price which has been set for the Agricultural Products Board for feed barley, for instance, is 58 cents a bushel higher at the elevator than the Canadian Wheat Board's initial price, but it is set at this level as a midway point between the initial price and the expected final return. No farmer needs to receive the Agricultural Products Board price because, with the expected high quotas that will be available, he can and indeed should hold his grain and sell it to the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker,—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Chair will recognize the right hon. gentleman and then the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, and by that time we will have come pretty close to the end of the question period.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Again I repeat the question. As of today, is it not correct that if a farmer sold his feed barley in western Canada he would get 90 cents per bushel less