

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
FIRST SESSION — FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE  
10th Day**

**Wednesday, February 22, 1961**

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

**COMMUNICATION FROM PRIME MINISTER**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Members a communication which I received today.

“I am deeply touched by the resolution of sympathy passed by the Saskatchewan Legislature and wish to express to you and through you, to the Members of the Legislature, my heartfelt thanks.

This resolution is something that I will always treasure.

John G. Diefenbaker.”

**SPEECH FROM THE THRONE**

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kramer, seconded by Mrs. Strum:

**Mr. H. Ray Dahlman (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, I hope that it won't seem repetitious to you that each of us in turn offer congratulations to yourself upon being appointed Speaker of the House. I hope that my congratulations will not be taken as any the less sincere because knowing you personally, and having full confidence in your integrity and your sense of right and wrong, I know that all Members of the Legislature will be given fair treatment.

I would also suggest too, Mr. Speaker, that especially the Members of the Government side of the House would feel happy indeed if you were just and gave a certain latitude to the minority group in this House. I also suggest that being among the new Members, I hope you will give a little latitude to the 'fledglings' who are going to attempt to break into politics in the very heart of the debate of the Legislature. This is perhaps not a very easy

**February 22, 1961**

thing to do. I think most of us worry about our maiden speeches, especially when we're on the air and wish to speak to our constituents back home.

I wish to offer congratulations also to the new Ministers who have been appointed to their high post, and again I wish to say that I am confident they are going to justify their appointment because all of them are men of integrity and ability.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the people of my constituency who supported me and made my position here possible. I wish to congratulate every other Member who was elected to this Legislature in the last election.

You know, it is a lot of hard work. I didn't use to have much respect for politicians, but I am learning to have a great deal of respect for politicians now. I know the hard work that we put into an election campaign. Then, if you are defeated, it gives you a very, very sinking feeling. I think most of us will take this responsibility very seriously because after all, you are number one man in your constituency and the constituents expect you to work and to do the right thing for the promotion of good legislation and social adjustment.

I also wish to make reference to my predecessor, Mr. Allan Brown, who retired from politics last fall.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He's still in there . . .

**Mr. Dahlman:** — I think I am stating a fact when I say that he had the respect and the friendship of every Member sitting in this Legislature. Mr. Brown was a man of high intellect, quick on the up-take and a man who could give good decisions on the spur of the moment.

I think we have to give Mr. Brown congratulations in many ways. I think my people back home would want me to say on their behalf that he was a good Member and that he did act in a very effective manner in his role as M.L.A. I would also like to say that Allan Brown came into politics via the co-operative movement, and in my opinion that is a very good place to come from.

**Government Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Dahlman:** — Mr. Brown was one of the youngest Wheat Pool delegates to ever sit in the parliament of farmers and having emerged as a very good delegate, he was called upon to take the nomination on behalf of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, which in my opinion is the political arm of the co-operative movement.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Dahlman:** — I have the good fortune of following Mr. Brown as a Wheat Pool delegate, and upon his retirement last fall I again followed his footsteps into the political realm. The Brown family hold a great deal of respect for their locality. I can remember Mr. Brown, Senior one time said: “I sent my boys to University to get a degree in agriculture and it was the best investment that I believe I ever made.” They have been good farmers, good workmen and are highly respected in the community.

The Bengough constituency — I must say a few words about it — is entirely agriculture. The southern portion of it, which borders the U.S.A. is ranch-country and as some of you know now, it has become perhaps the biggest portion of farm income in this province. Therefore it is with a great appreciation of the value of these grazing lands that we are able to assist in many ways in allotting leases and so forth to some of the less-economic units.

The constituency of Bengough is unfortunate in not having anything in the way of industry. We have two operating oil wells, and there is an oil field developed in the Bengough-Viceroy area, which may someday develop into a producing field. We have a park area in the southern part of the constituency, which is known as the Big Muddy and which is sort of a landmark, because of the homesteaders who trekked up from the States and Manitoba came up via the Big Muddy Trail to Willowbunch, in the Notukeu-Willowbunch constituency. It is also a point of historic interest because it was in the Wood Mountain Area that Sitting Bull camped for two or three winters. Then at Willowbunch Jean Legare, who operated a post at Wood Mountain, let them across the border to surrender to the American Army.

In entering the debate, I had made up my mind that I would not be guilty of a lot of things that I didn't like that have been going on in this Legislature, namely the rag-chewing and tearing and slashing by members across the floor of the House. As a matter of fact, I thought a lot of the people didn't like those tactics, and being a very passive man I am reluctant by nature to engage in verbal combat. I don't know whether a man can do it or not. I think you have to stand up and fight in this Legislature because of the attacks made upon the Government. I'd just like to refer to what the Leader of the Opposition said when he began his speech the other day. He had this to say, and I agreed with him. I thought it was a good statement, coming from him. He said that he felt that the role of the Opposition was to give constructive criticism. That I agree with, but why he didn't carry on his

**February 22, 1961**

speech along that line is something I don't understand. That is absolutely the prerogative and function of a good Opposition to give constructive criticism, and try to give leadership and correction to what the Government is doing in their legislation. I can't say that about all the members over on the other side.

I want to congratulate the Member from Pelly. Here is a man in my opinion who should be the Leader of the Opposition. I'm not saying that to be facetious or to compliment the Member from Pelly, but I do it in all sincerity because he did, effectively give constructive criticism. I think that the members on this side of the House will concur on that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It would do you a bit of good.

**Mr. Dahlman:** — In all, it would seem that the type of criticism, destructive criticism that is levelled at this Government, is a little bit repetitious, and bears some sort of indication that there must be a little man running around here . . . a sort of a ghost writer.

**Opposition Member:** — You're too kind.

**Mr. Dahlman:** — I'm not too kind. I don't think the Leader of the Opposition needs this assistance though, because I feel that the Leader of the Opposition is a master in the art of distortion, and needs no help. I would expect, that the Leader of the Opposition would have the stature to give constructive criticism, rather than the destructive criticism that he engages in.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Your buddies wouldn't listen to it anyway.

**Mr. Dahlman:** — I also want to say something about the Member from Yorkton. The Yorkton Member, I believe, is sincere in trying to give constructive criticism. I think he's sincere in what he said when he was concerned about the hospital at Yorkton not being built, or there not being any attempt to build it. I think he was concerned because he sees a need for it. I consider that as constructive criticism, because this Government is going to go ahead with the construction of this hospital. I think, however, that now that the Member has heard the explanation, he will go back to his constituency and give another assessment of it, because I think that in the case of the mental hospital where we don't have too long a waiting list it was good, and proper, and just, for this Government, to invest that money in converting the sanatorium in Prince Albert to take care of the over-flow of the mentally retarded children. I want to say this, that I know of a good many cases where we have mentally retarded children who have been on the waiting list for entrance to the school at Moose Jaw, and have been on the waiting list for a long time. Now this is working

real hardships on the parents of these children who are becoming a very, very heavy load. I am glad that there is going to be a little bit of relief in that direction.

I see that the Member for Saltcoats is out of his chair. I also have something to say about him. It seems to me that he has tried to manufacture an imaginary sin on the part of the Government to get himself worked up into a frenzy. You know, it is a funny thing, the Members opposite, especially when there is a Provincial Election coming up, are concerned about the kind of a platform the C.C.F. are going to bring down. Do you know what they do? They just remind me of a football squad, "Here socialists" and they get bowled over, but after they pick themselves up and they look around they have found that this Legislation has been approved and accepted by the people of the province.

As a matter of fact, I get quite a kick out of a little experience I had last summer just after the election. There were tourists up from Ontario, from the Carleton County which is traditionally Conservative. Two of these gentlemen were Conservatives, and they said, "Mr. Dahlman, I hope that your Government will now implement a prepaid medical plan, because we need it badly in Ontario. If you bring it into being in Saskatchewan, then we'll get it eventually, that's what happened with the hospitalization plan." I get a great deal of kick out of some of the statements made by the Members opposite. You know, they are so concerned about the slight increase in the hospital fees, and they are a little bit concerned about the extra money they are going to have to contribute to the new construction of our base hospital. That was their cry, and we still have the cheapest hospitalization insurance in Canada today. You know, they like to forget about the main issues, and I'm going to get to that too.

The Member for Saltcoats dealt with patronage. I can't understand why he could get so worked up about patronage. I think the Liberals have been past-masters in the art of patronage. As a matter of fact, when I was a boy, a common expression was, "Oh he is a Liberal heeler". You know, I was concerned with the C.C.F., when they started into politics, because they came out with this, if a civil servant discharges his responsibilities in a good way he should not be discharged because of his political beliefs. I think the Government has followed this procedure, and I want to congratulate them for having done that. When we make the selection of applicants to the civil service, I think it naturally follows that a lot of these are going to be C.C.F.er's, because they are good people. I can just imagine what a Liberal Government going into power in this province would do with the civil servants. I don't think that because they are sitting in a glass house they can cast any reflection on this Government, because I don't think that there is a Government that has treated the civil servants as

**February 22, 1961**

well as this Government.

When the Member was discussing the report of the continuing committee on reorganization of municipal government, some how or other he was able to leave the impression that there was some sort of socialism involved here. He said he wasn't too concerned about the county system, but he was concerned about what the Government would do with it. You know, any time that a man gets up and makes broad sweeping statements such as he did, about socializing the farmers, it is, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the last spasm of the weak argument. Was there anything wrong with having a committee sit and study reorganization of local government? I don't think there was any objection when the Commission on Rural Life and Agriculture was set up, the Members opposite thought it was a good think. As a matter of fact, I think that the very fact that we set up the commission, was because the Members opposite had made statements to the effect that the poor municipalities weren't looked after. So what do you do? You investigate it, and see if there is something that you can do. You set up a commission of people who should be able to survey the situation and bring back a reasonable conclusion. It is said that "an established fact is the result of a series of observations of the same phenomena". Therefore, I think the commission that sat on rural life and agriculture did establish a few facts. The one recommendation was that a Continuing Committee be set up further to study reorganization of local government. In local government today, rural municipalities are only a minor part. Education is a bigger part of local government today, here we are not only concerned with municipalities, but we are concerned with school units, and we are concerned with administration of health services. When this committee was set up, they had to take into consideration all these things, and they brought back a report that the Opposition members don't like. Well, that's too bad, but they are trying their best to criticize the committee's report, and attribute it to this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what kind of patience the members of the Continuing Committee have, but I think they are getting pretty fed up with two-bit politicians tearing the committee apart. I have received resolutions from a number of my municipalities asking that a vote be taken. I agree with that. Opposing the amendment to the Speech from the Throne didn't put me in a position where I didn't approve of a vote. They have the right to vote now if a group within a proposed county area wished to take a vote. They have a perfect right to take a vote. I don't think that we are, as a Government going to set up any design whereby they are going to vote on that county system.

I have used twenty minutes of my air time, but I am not going to be able to deal fully with it, but as I said here we are

being sidetracked so as not to discuss the important issues. I don't think that there is a country in the world that is so effected by the world conditions as Canada is. We are so vulnerable to world conditions, and especially the province of Saskatchewan, which has to depend on the export markets for their grain and their cattle. Here is where the whole crux of the thing hinges. If we say we can't afford this and we can't afford that, we must ask the question, why can't we afford it? I would hate to be the man who would have to get out and tell the people of this province that they can't afford good roads, good schools and hospitals, and a good telephone system. We can't afford it, Mr. Speaker, because we haven't enough income and the reason we haven't enough income is because we are not getting a fair share of the national income.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Dahlman:** — Now then, where do the Liberal stand on this? I don't remember the Liberal Party and I am not speaking of people who are Liberal and voted Liberal — they certainly supported the March to Ottawa for deficiency payments, but as a party they didn't do anything because they didn't feel in a position to do so, because the conditions that prompted that March to Ottawa occurred during their regime. But the man who became the Prime Minister had other ideas. He said, "we don't want charity; we want parity" for agriculture.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Amen!

**Mr. Dahlman:** — He went on to say further that "as long as I am Prime Minister no one shall suffer unemployment." Who did come out and support the farmers in their appeal to Ottawa? The Member from Wilkie stated the other day that labour had never done anything on behalf of the farmer. Well, I beg to differ. I was one of those men who went to Ottawa at that time, and this is what Mr. Gordon Wilkinson of the Canadian Congress of Labour said:

"Mr. Prime Minister and Members of the Cabinet: The group who represent Labour and area a part of this delegation wish to add their support to the position and the brief presented to you by the western farm delegation.

Labour gives its full support to the farmers of western Canada in their attempts to earn a standard of living commensurate with their contributions toward our economy."

Those of us who live in western Canada know from first-hand experience that many of Canada's 700,000 farmers are on the brink of

**February 22, 1961**

ruin unless their buying abilities are raised to a higher level. We recognize that the two most important economic problems in Canada today are first, depressed farm prices, and high operating costs; second, unemployment and low buying power. It must be recognized that any depreciation in buying power on the part of any segment of the population of Canada has a detrimental effect on other segments. Low rural purchasing power means lack of production in urban industries. Where in the face of rising costs of operation and falling incomes the farmers are normally forced to re-trench, one of the first forms of re-trenchment is either to postpone or eliminate the purchase of farm equipment. Thus, the farm equipment industry may be one of the first and hardest hit when Canadian farmers suffer financial repercussions.

“Labour has a prime concern in the prosperity of the farm community and should be most awake in policies that will ensure farm costs do not out run farm buying power. Labour in Canada, representing the purchasing power of 3 million individuals by its one million members, believes the farm delegation has a good case, and urges your Government to give favourable consideration to their brief as quickly as possible.”

All right, then. Did the implement companies lend a hand? Oh no! But the prairie provinces bought 58.3 per cent of all the machinery produced in Canada, and they certainly must have had the facts or had this known to them, that 97 per cent of all new farm machinery purchased was bought under the Farm Improvement Load, and yet they couldn't render a hand.

How does the farmer view labour? The farmer today views labour as a customer. What kind of a customer does he want? One that is broke, or one that has purchasing power? They say there is nothing in common between labour and farmer — one is absolutely interdependent with the other . . . So is the small business man, because if the small business man sells the goods in his shop, he'll be out of business unless labour has produced more good to go in there. One is interdependent with the other.

I don't think we can describe whose responsibility unemployment is under automation and labour-saving machines. I just want to refer to one little article and this was part of a speech of the Inaugural Address made by President Kennedy who I think is rising to a great stature on this continent:

To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe, struggling to break the bonds of mass misery we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves for whatever period is required, not because the Communists are doing it; not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If the free society cannot help the many who are poor, it can never save the few who are rich.”



I think we have to view the position of agriculture or the position of the farmer and his welfare — to see how it is tied up economically with the rest of Canada. In order to survive and receive a good standard of living, we must receive our fair share of the national income. That is the responsibility of everybody, because agriculture is everybody's responsibility.

My time is up, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the privilege of having been on the air for these few minutes and wish to say I am going to support the motion, because the Speech from the Throne contains many things which I would like to revert to, but I cannot support the amendment.

**Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate I wish to associate myself with all those who congratulated you on your high elevation as Speaker to this House. Also, I wish at this time to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, because I think they have made a very excellent presentation, and certainly their material was well prepared.

I cannot say the same for all Members in this House, but in the main wish to congratulate them, whether they made a good speech or not. None of us is better than the next person in trying to do his best.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, at this time, that the good people of Cumberland, whom I wish to thank for re-electing me a third time, placed their confidence in me, and I can only say I shall try to support their views and represent them well in this House to the best of my ability as I have done in the past. I will certainly support both policies and valuable projects insofar as the welfare of the people of my Constituency and the province of Saskatchewan are concerned.

There has been much ado in this Session about the progress of industrialization in Saskatchewan. Certainly I am not going to get excited about the Opposition's criticism, because I believe we have had reasonable development considering our central location in Canada, and also considering the distance from markets and other pertinent factors.

I think one must recognize, Mr. Speaker, that industry is not concerned so much with the type of government in a province or in a country. They are more concerned with the profits they can make. Companies and corporations, as we all know, have always exploited the accessible areas of a country in the first stages of development and only in later days did they enter into more distant resources were there which were needed by the state. But if we need development, if we must have it (and I think we must), and it has been pointed out by hon. Member on both sides of the House,

then I think the utilization of our natural resources is quite feasible.

However, if we are certain after research that the necessary must be done, I think that the best answer to that is to put our own shoulders to the wheel. It is no use blaming Governments for what private industry has failed to do, and I like the suggestion of the hon. Member from Pelly the other day when he mentioned the possibility that even Governments might do something about industrial development. I agree. I agree that we should, as I said, put our shoulders to the wheel, try to enter into arrangements or agreements with private business to see if we can get industry, try to make arrangements with co-operatives. But if these things can't be done this way, then do it ourselves through public enterprise. There's nothing wrong with that. If we have the natural resources, certainly it would be a good idea to go ahead and have that kind of a development in the province.

Today, Mr. Speaker I intended originally (I thought I would have more time) to talk about the 'wake' that occurred in the Liberal Party about a year and a half ago. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the old Liberal Party was buried and at that time. If I recall, there was a wake and it cost about \$50,000 and a new leader for a new party was elected after the celebrations. But, because this is Brotherhood Week I thought it might be better, Mr. Speaker, to feel kindly disposed towards the hon. gentlemen opposite, so I am prepared to give them some good advice.

I suggest to the Opposition who, according to their leader's own statement just the other day — said that the Opposition represents the Liberals, the Conservatives, the Social Crediters, the Fascists and the Communists that they stop their shouting and raving, and get down to some constructive criticism as suggested by the hon. Member who preceded me. It was apparently intimidated by the hon. Leader of the Opposition that this would be done. I would say that instead of tearing their hair in the depths of political despair, they might move forward with us on this side in trying to get development in this province, and to build a democratic society.

I think they could ask themselves this question: Where are we going in this changing world? If you could permit me, Mr. Speaker, to read from a book, I shall read one or two paragraphs. This has reference to a situation in Great Britain when the Labour party was arising out of the smoldering embers of the defunct Liberal and Conservative Parties. This writer says this:

“On that assumption we are on the eve of greater and more fundamental changes affecting the lives of every class and condition of men and women that has yet been seen in this country. Hence the new struggle with which the political atmosphere is palpitating. Capitalism is to be arraigned before the supreme court of the nation, condemned, sentenced and executed by instalments — Chinese

fashion. The composition of that court is not today favourable to the persecution. But who will be the judge after the next general election?"

The same writer goes on to say, later on about this movement that had risen out of the common people who were fighting for freedom and social justice:

"Can it be arrested? Nothing will be done until the danger is visible to every eye. To vary the metaphor no one will believe in the flood until it is upon us. Trained weather prophets who forecast its coming will be laughed at or told they have a personal or party interest in ark building. It is an old tale — as old as the dawn of history. As in the days before the flood, they were eating and drinking and knew not until the flood came and took them all away."

Mr. Speaker, isn't it true today after listening for 10 or 12 days — it seemed that long we have heard this kind of thing in this House — they cannot see this thing coming. May I go on to one more paragraph? This gentleman says the trouble can be averted in only two ways. This man, Mr. Speaker, was not a socialist: he was not a Social Democrat. I will tell you who he was after I get through with this paragraph:

"The trouble can only be averted in two ways. One is the systematic inculcation of sound doctrines of economic truth into the minds of the working people of this country. The second, and the more important, is the rooting out of the social evils which furnish the revolutionary with striking and indisputable object-lessons of the failure of the capitalistic system as an agent of human happiness."

I will end by saying this, and I quote again:

"Without the latter, the former is virtually futile."

The gentlemen opposite asked me who wrote this book. This book is called "Where Are We Going" and it is written by the great Liberal David Lloyd George.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — The writer — the great Lloyd George, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure we respect the gentleman who saw the decay of Liberalism predicted and foretold. He saw that the day would come when people would work together for a worthwhile and decent purpose which could bring a happy way of life, a result not possible under capitalism. I might add that David Lloyd George's

**February 22, 1961**

own daughter has for some time been a member of the British Labour Party, counterpart of the C.C.F. here. The movement in the New Party recognizes, Mr. Speaker, that people are dependent on each other as well as interdependent. Those of us who are socially inclined, and consider the goals of human happiness more important than the acquisition of wealth and power are proud to build a way of life which recognizes social interdependence among individuals and nations, Mr. Speaker.

This kind of realistic philosophy and purpose of living gives people some hope and dignity, and a faith in the future. That is why we are building a society and legislating empiric laws under which there will be a fuller measure of social security and equality.

The world is going forward, Mr. Speaker. Even the imperialists overseas are beginning to see the true light, and they have called upon the leaders of the democratic countries, from Sweden, India and elsewhere to give leadership in the United Nations. Only in these is there planning. And may I remind hon. Member opposite that it is the capitalistic imperialism of Liberals and Conservatives that has brought about the kind of situations we have in the world today. It was this, according to David Lloyd George himself, which brought about the scourge of Nazism and Fascism in the world. It wasn't about the Bolsheviks who sent great leaders of Russia into Siberian exile; it was the Czars, and let us never forget that. Let us not forget that it was the power politics of the Liberal Party here in Saskatchewan that made the people come together and decide that, for their own good, they should establish a party of the people which is socially-minded and is called the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, or the C.C.F. today.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, some reference has been made in the Throne Speech on the current and unhappy situation of farmers. I have stood up in this House for the last eight years — this is the ninth time, I think — and I have brought to the attention of this House the difficulties under which the farmers have been living. For years and years the Opposition always told us in reply, how well off the farmers were and it wasn't until last year that they admitted farmers were hard-up. The only reason for that was Liberals were not sitting in Ottawa.

But we have a different problem today. They are not there, but we have another capitalistic party sitting at Ottawa, and that is the Tory Party. I recall quite well the gentleman who is the leader of that party coming to us, and as has been mentioned by the hon. Member who spoke a few moments ago, when Mr. Diefenbaker said: "Farmers are entitled to parity, not charity". But let's see what they now say. They are trying to find a way out. They

argue that the farmers are hard up because they produce too much. That's what they say now. Mr. Harkness has been quoted in the 'Country Guide' and I have it here, January 1961, and I would like to read it. Farmers should:

“co-operate to voluntarily abstain from producing beyond the capacity of Canadians to consume, and of our ability, in the present world situation, to export”.

That's the answer now. That's the way they are trying to get out of a difficult situation. Oh, they're brilliant! Mr. Speaker, according to this kind of thinking the farmer can't win. They told us to become more efficient, and now that we are more efficient we are told that we produce too much, so we can't win. As a matter of fact I think it's stupid. That kind of argument is stupid.

But that's not as bad as what I am going to read to the hon. Member in just a moment. Mr. Diefenbaker, according to the same report has told farm leaders, and I quote from the same issue of 'The Country Guide':

“If there is no pay-off, there will be no payments.”

This is like something I remember quite well — if you don't vote Liberal, for example, you won't be able to drag the roads past your farm!

In other words, the Prime Minister makes it very clear in a language which is easy to understand, that if we don't vote or support his Tory party in the next election, then the gains in the event that he should be re-elected with his Party could be revoked.

This is an incredible threat, and every farmer should take note of what I have said, so that when the cohorts of politicians come around asking for a vote, we should know what to tell them in no uncertain terms. This is not only a threat, Mr. Speaker, but it is a despicable misuse of power by a demagogue in a democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my Constituency are fearful about the world situation as are the people in other parts of Saskatchewan and Canada. We are not happy about the present course which the great powers are following. We know that the millions of people in China and other parts of Asia are in need of food and encouragement, and in order to get food; when people are hungry they will be ready to fight for it. We may not like their government, but we must remember that governments change. They come and they go — (the Liberals should know better than anybody else after what's happened to them!)

**February 22, 1961**

I say this: if we fail to give aid to those countries then future generations might be justified in condemning us for what we didn't do when we could do it.

It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that our governments in Ottawa prefer to pile up armaments and strategic weapons of destruction instead of increasing our peaceful productive capacity. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what if we do have surpluses? Are not surpluses wealth?

**Government Members:** — It's like money in the bank.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Cannot we barter this wealth or make some satisfactory arrangements with the countries who are in need, whether it is Asia or Africa. Many Canadians go hungry from day to day. Cannot we do something about the disposition of the surplus wealth which this country is able to produce, Mr. Speaker? I say we can, and I say it is our duty to do so. I say that if we find the positive approach we may discover that our markets will be redeemed, and we may find out that our unemployed will again be employed instead of walking the streets of this country without any hope.

Is it not better to try and do what I have said, and increase our productive capacity instead of selling out as the Tory Government has done in Ottawa by giving concessions to big business such as cutting down the amount of tax money they should pay. It is their duty to pay more to the treasury of this country, when increased profits are made. Would it not be better to do it that way, because when taxes are reduced does not mean that these companies are going to expand their plants and provide work for the unemployed? All they are going to do, and history has proven it, Mr. Speaker, is to put that much more money into savings, into loans or in other words, into their corporate coffers.

What we need is to see that more money is made available to the rank and file of the working people and farmers who proceed to spend the same on goods and services, thus creating a market for those things. I repeat, it is obvious that such a program would require greater production to replenish stocks and goods, and in this way the working force could once again be encouraged to go back to work.

I would have liked to talk about the report of the Continuing Committee, but I think a more suitable time will arise later for me to do so. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, something that was mentioned in this House by the hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who I think has been, and still is employed by the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, through the Northern Administration Branch, as a school-teacher. It might be questioned by some people whether he has a right to sit in this House.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Withdraw!

**Mr. Guy:** — Will the hon. Member withdraw that remark?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not say that he could not or was not entitled to sit in this House. I say there might be some question . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, we heard that, since he was employed by the Government, he should not be sitting in this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I would think there is a question of privilege being raised here.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I am quite prepared to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, but I will not withdraw the fact that he does work for the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan through the Northern Administration Branch. That is true.

After telling all the fine things that have been done in the province of Saskatchewan such as schools, the beautiful hospital this Government built in La Ronge, and a hospital to be built elsewhere, and the schools we built, the services that we proved today for the trappers, the miners and others. He failed to tell one thing that prior to the time he worked for this Government about 15 or 16 years ago, there were no schools, hospitals . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to suggest this is going too far, suggesting that I am a civil servant of this province. I think the hon. Member should withdraw those remarks.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I believe the hon. Member has withdrawn his statement on a previous occasion.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not saying the hon. Member is a civil servant. I said he is working for the Government of Saskatchewan, and I stand on my rights to say so.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, that is a serious charge. I think those remarks should be withdrawn from the record. This gentleman is not in any sense working for the Provincial Government. He is engaged as a school teacher in the northern area, and simply because that area is administered by the Provincial Government, that does not classify him as a civil servant.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Those words must be withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

**February 22, 1961**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I believe the Member has already withdrawn so if this is acceptable to the Members involved, we will consider the matter closed.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, if he had remembered 15 years ago, as I remember, he would have seen no hospitals, no schools, no nurses, doctors. When people got sick in the north they died. When they were out trapping and brought in their furs, they were exploited. There was nothing there until this Government came to power, and being considerate of human needs began to build schools, hospitals, etc.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Not only that, Mr. Speaker. These ‘friends’ as they say to the government of Saskatchewan, took the land that belonged to the people of my Constituency — some 20 townships of it, and went ahead and gave away the best trapping land in the province of Saskatchewan, to the Hudson Bay Company, and I shall forever keep on reminding them of that. It was not until the C.C.F. Government came to power and the lease expired that we were able to go ahead and return these lands to the province to whom they belonged.

At this time I want to thank the Minister of Natural Resources for going out of his way, so to speak, to do what he feels is just and right I want to thank the Government of Saskatchewan on behalf of the people of Cumberland House, for making it possible for them once again to make a living on their native land.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I would also like to thank the Government of Saskatchewan for giving the native people equal rights to those that the rest of us have. They are human beings; they have the same rights, the same dignity and the same respect for themselves.

I do not like anybody getting up in this House, and I refer to the hon. Member for Athabasca who said that we did wrong in giving the Indian all the rights that we have given.

**Mr. Guy:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I think if he will go back to my remarks he will find that I did not say that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think that is something that could well be taken up at the close of the debate.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I say this: Surely if the children



of this province are to attend decent schools, vocational and high schools, universities, instead of log shacks, then surely we must provide the costs. Surely if we are going to have the kind of services this Government has given, we are going to have to pay for those services.

We like the services; we like the amenities the Government has provided for us in the north. We like the roads, and I would like to say at this time, because my time is up I cannot speak for all of the services that my Constituents would still like to have increased, but I do hope to be able to do so at a later time in this House.

I therefore wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I shall certainly support the Motion.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I want, without any formalities, to start right into the remarks I have to make this afternoon. I want first of all to spend a little time on a question of socialism. You know we do get into some problems. In this morning's "Leader Post" I see that there is a petition out in the Bruno area, signed by 300 people, asking for some more socialism — asking for the Government to take over and put under socialism the brick plant at Bruno. Now what would my hon. friends opposite say to that? Of course, this article goes on to point out that:

“a company spokesman said, ‘lack of orders had forced the plant to close’ and claims the Saskatchewan Public Works Department stipulations in contracts denied the plant access to markets by insisting that only brick and tile manufactured by the crown-owned Saskatchewan Clay Products plant at Estevan be used in construction of Provincial buildings.

Well now first of all, that isn't true. There have been many buildings built with brick other than brick made at Estevan and with many other materials. As a matter of fact, if the Bruno plant had got all of the orders for brick for public buildings built in the last year, it probably would have amounted to 6, or maybe at the most 12 days work. I am allowing 12 days there to be generous, but that wouldn't keep them in operation. Those same orders at the Estevan plant would amount to 3 or 4 days work. Now a couple or three years ago, the people who owned this plant approached the Government and wondered if we would be interested in taking it over — we looked at it and we said we weren't. They approached us again a short time ago, I took it up with the Board of Directors of the Saskatchewan Clay Products, of which I happen to be the Chairman, and we decided that we weren't interested in

it at this time. In the last couple of years, there has been an expansion in the privately-owned brick plant at Claybank, in their production. There has been a new plant producing brick in Regina; there has been a new plant established at Edmonton which ships brick into Saskatchewan, and yet these people say, because they couldn't get some of the government orders, which in total would have amounted to no more than two weeks work, they had to close down their plant. This is a pretty fictitious story, Mr. Speaker. Now, I am sorry to know that the plant has had to close down, but it must be noted, that even private enterprise plants find the competition tough. But the tough competition was not only the efficient plant at Estevan, but also the other brick plants in Alberta and in other places in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk for a little while about the subject of local government. One of the things that has amused me about this question, is how quickly the Liberal party and the Liberal Members of this Legislature are to oppose any change at all, not only before they have a copy of the report of the continuing Committee, but before they know what changes are being proposed. They're agin it, but they don't know just what they're agin.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh yes we do, — we know what is being proposed.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . because they don't know yet, and I don't know what is going to be proposed, as a result of the report of the Continuing Committee, but there in this Legislature think about it, after we have the report, after it's available, and after people have had time to do more than just look at the colors on the cover of the report.

The inference has been made, Mr. Speaker, that every member on this Continuing Committee has been plotting for the destruction of local government, which of course is a most ridiculous inference. That has been the tone that has been going through the discussion in this House, and I think it might be interesting just to take a minute's look at — who are these people? First of all you have three people who were appointed by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, Mr. George Dawson of Neville, a director with the association, and Mr. W.J. Irvine, who is vice-president of the association now. Then there are three from the Urban Municipalities Association; Mr. Herbert Greenwood of Rosetown, who incidentally has been Reeve of a rural municipality for many, many years, and has been mayor of the town of Rosetown, also for a number of years. Mr. J.J. Battleford, who also was (emphasize the was in this case) a Member of this House, at one time — he was — he isn't now. I don't think we can say that a man like Mr. Maher is plotting to destroy local

government. I don't think that we can say that these other men are doing that. Then there's John McAskill, who was mayor of Saskatoon, now City Commissioner of the city of Saskatoon — he is still City Commissioner, and he was mayor of that city. Three are representing and appointed by the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association; Mr. A. B. Douglas of McTaggart near Weyburn, who I believe, is president of the School Trustees Association; Mr. George Hindley of Palo, who also I think was president of the Association, and Mr. J. Albert Trew of Lemsberg appointed by the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association. Now all of these people are interested in local government and in its welfare, and to subscribe any other motives to the members of this committee, except the best of the motives, sincere motives, of people who are studying this whole question, trying to bring about any necessary changes which will make local government more effective, stronger, better able to carry out its responsibilities and to give service to the people of Saskatchewan. You know, Mr. Speaker, no Government, as a matter of fact, no Legislature exists for its own benefit. The only reason that Governments should exist is because of the service they give to the people they govern, and I think that is important to remember too. Then of course, there was a member appointed by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and by the Saskatchewan Association of Health Regions. This committee, Mr. Speaker, had a very great deal of work to do, and I think they did it very well.

I would like to go into some of the history of local government, because we do now have quite a long history. I think it is correct to say that all through this period, there has been a fairly good spirit of partnership and co-operation between the local government organizations, like the School Trustees Association, and the Urban Municipalities, and the SARM, and the Provincial Government. They have worked together and on a number of occasions, suggestions have come from these organizations, which have been put into effect by the Provincial Government. As a matter of fact, one of these organizations recommended doing away with the public revenue tax, and it was done. As a matter of fact, it was a province-wide system of all-weather municipal roads, in which the province would pay half, and that suggestion was taken up and we have the grid road program. I hope this good spirit of partnership and co-operation will continue.

To start with the history of local government in Saskatchewan goes a long way back — 85 years as a matter of fact — to 1875 when there was the first authority in the North-West Territories, for the establishment of local government. Then in 1898 provision was made for one township — units of local government. At that time the principle concern of these small local governments, was protection against prairie fires, and the patching up of a few creek crossings and mud-holes on the prairie trails, which were largely used and served the purpose of roads in that day. The duties were

**February 22, 1961**

quite simple. The first representative local government was introduced in 1902. Previous to this time local government was on the basis of a town meeting. There was an annual meeting at which the people laid out the program of work to be carried out during the year and appointed an overseer to see that that work was carried out. Then it was 1903 when representative government, that is counsellors were elected with power to formulate policies, to carry out programs, throughout their term of office.

In 1906, just a year after the province was formed, a municipal commission was appointed to study the situation and if possible, to devise a system of local government which would be suitable for the province of Saskatchewan. That report was tabled in the Legislature of Saskatchewan in April 1908. I believe, the report itself was completed in 1907, but it wasn't tabled until 1908, and the copy of the report I have here I obtained from the Library. Now, this report, suggested for that day some pretty drastic changes. I suggested a great enlargement of the size of units of local government. There were still some units which were just one township, and there were some with two or three townships. They suggested a 9 township unit, in some cases 9 times as big as the previous units, and naturally this caused some concern, because the same questions were raised then, that have been raised now — it's getting too big — too far away from the people, and all this sort of thing. These same objections were used, but nevertheless, the Legislature passed the first Rural Municipality Act in the Session of 1908 and 1909.

This first Rural Municipality Act provided that the Government, either the Minister or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, had complete power to alter the boundaries of municipalities, and to make adjustments when boundaries were altered. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council had power to disorganize any municipality. They had power to disorganize any Local Improvement District. There were two existing rural municipalities at that time, the Rural Municipality of Indian Head, and of South Qu'Appelle, and these municipalities were left, but in the section that stated that they would be left to carry on under the previous provision — in that very section, it was provided that the Legislature could alter the boundaries of these municipalities which had been established. So even back in 1908, the Legislature recognized that it had a responsibility for setting up the areas in which local government could be carried on. Now, previous to that time, other areas had been set up, and here they're coming along and changing them, and making them much larger, giving them a new constitution for a local government — and no vote on it, at that time.

**Mr. Guy:** — No demand for it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the electors had no vote on either the size of the unit, or the

constitution of the unit. Before I pass on though, I would like to mention that in 1908 and 1909 there were 27 Liberals in the Legislature at that time, when this authoritative and drastic legislation was passed. The Opposition was a party called Provincial Rights, which later became the Conservative party. Now the provision was, after these territorial units of approximately 9 townships were set up, that any 50 resident electors in the area could petition the Government, and have a vote held — not on the boundaries, not on the constitution, but on whether or not they would continue as an unorganized area, or whether or not they would have local government. Under this system 200 rural municipalities were organized by this process, by the end of 1912. Now as I said before, there was some opposition to the new forms of local government, and I would refer you to a book called, “The History of Rural Local Government in Saskatchewan,” this is a book that was produced as a technical reference document, of the Commission of Agriculture and Rural Life published in 1955, and on pages 26 and 27 of this book we find some interesting . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Who wrote it?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It doesn't matter who wrote it — what is important

**Mr. McCarthy:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. Member has got no point of order, he should just sit down, it doesn't matter to him who wrote it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If the hon. Member says he has a point of order, I must hear his point of order.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — My point of order is, that anyone quoting has to give the person who wrote it — that's the rule of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think it would be in order.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I told him what the book is. It's headed 'Province of Saskatchewan — Royal Commission of Agriculture and Rural Life — History of Rural Local Government in Saskatchewan,' and I thought the hon. Member knew so little about local government, that he could not have read this book.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I've read every page of it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And yet he's read every page of it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — On the point of order, you must state who wrote the book.

February 22, 1961

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I did tell him — The Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life produced this book.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that the hon. Minister has given you all the information that is available.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Strong objections were raised by some to the advent of the rural municipalities. Abusive power of debenture was feared, since this was a new power granted to rural municipalities, which the Local Improvement Districts did not have. Opponents of rural municipalities were afraid the excessive debt burdening future generations of taxpayers would be undertaken. They urged further that taxes would be unnecessarily high. The contention was made that once established, a rural municipality would be left to shift for itself, without any financial aid from the Provincial Government. I may say that that fear was well-grounded until 1944. The opposition even included those who thought that their horses, oxen, cows, hens, farm implements, and even clothing would be taxed. Why we heard the Member for Saltcoats talking about that the other day, either the Member for Saltcoats or the Member for Yorkton, that they were going to get taxed to the last cow and chicken under any new system of local government. Now the book says, and I would disagree with it a little, that all the objections proved groundless, — but I think they did get left to shift for themselves to a certain extent. Now these remarks come from the Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for 1909 and 10 — that's where these remarks are taken from.

Now, the new rural municipality, it was explained, need not be a more expensive unit of local government, because now 9 townships rather than an average of 4, as in the old Local Improvement Districts, contributed to the cost of local government. The objection that the Provincial Government would cut off the rural municipalities, and leave them adrift on their own proved groundless — when the Legislature in 1909 voted \$60,000.00 to the rural municipalities for road building. That is a terrific vote — \$60,000.00 to the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan for road building. And anyway, in spite of all of the opposition, they went through with the reorganization of local government at that time.

But at the end of 1912, there were still 90 remaining territorial units who had not petitioned the Government, who had not had a vote. What did the Government of that day do, Mr. Speaker? The Government, by order, created those 90 rural municipalities, without a vote, without a petition, and without a request, and there were at that time 45 Liberals in the

Legislature of the province of Saskatchewan. And I venture to say that there wasn't one of them worked up about this dictatorial manner of foisting local government upon the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it all depends on where you sit, and when these people were doing it, it was all right, when somebody else tries to do something to get the best kind of local government, then it is all wrong. I think that the motives and the opinions of the municipal commission, appointed back in 1906, and reporting in 1908, cannot be questioned any more than you can question the motives of the Continuing Committee on local government, which is doing the job today. It is quite a parallel situation. The same fears were expressed at that time as are being expressed today. Some, I imagine, feared centralization of power, but that didn't take place either.

Now, there is no doubt that this Commission and the Government of that day did as good a job as really could be expected in setting up local governments. But that was in 1908-1909, when local governments was set up. There is no doubt, that rural municipalities have served the people of this province well, but there are some things that we should remember. First of all, that since 1908 almost everything else has changed: Farming methods, size of farms, instead of the quarter and a half section, the section, the section and a half or two section farms. Methods of travelling have changed greatest of all and consequently the need for roads has also changed. Methods by which roads were constructed have changed. Some of my hon. friends will remember holding these two-handled scrapers for the team of horses in building roads. Then we got changes from that point on, until you would not recognize the machinery for dirt-moving today as having any relation to that old scraper.

Then besides the need for roads a very important and fiery question, which with the developing civilization in the province of Saskatchewan, came to the fore — the question of health needs and welfare.

Practically everything has changed except the basis of rural local government. I might mention, on the other hand, that the Members opposite have not changed very much, Mr. Speaker.

But during recent years, many people in Saskatchewan, have come to the conclusion, that it was time to question the

suitability of these venerable institutions under these changed conditions. First of all, there was some talk about this back about 1943, when we had a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. They appointed The Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council. This Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council had as its membership, Chairman Dean F.C. Cronkite of the University of Saskatchewan, Mr. W.G. Baker, M.L.A. for Moose Jaw was a member of that Council. Mr. G.G. Cooper, of Swift Current, Mrs. W. Cruickshank of Regina and another well-known name, Mr. T.A. McCusker of Regina, a farmer outside Regina, Mr. William Walker, a lawyer from Canora and J.H. Wesson, President of the Wheat Pool. That was the Council. The Council studied the question and they also came to certain conclusions. I believe, the hon. Provincial Treasurer read some of these to the House the other day, but I would like to read one from the report of that Committee, and it is found on page 84:

“The Council therefore recommend that a committee be set up to investigate the problem of adjustment of municipal boundaries. Its membership should include a representative of the University of Saskatchewan, organized farmers, The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, The Urban Municipalities Association and a technical agriculturalist, under the chairmanship of a Government appointee, not necessarily from any of the interested Departments.”

They came out with some definite recommendations for further study of this question of local government. That committee reported after the government that appointed them had passed out of existence, but it was the same committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, following this, we had the Royal Commission on Agricultural and Rural Life, with which everyone is conversant, and I hope everyone has read the reports of that Commission. But I want to refer to report number 14, the last of the reports. On page 59 at policy 3, the Commission stated:

“The commission found on the one hand justifiable and realistic demands for improvement in services, but it found on the other rather serious weaknesses in the planning and administration services and in the general political



environment in the case of rural municipal Government and its functions. The Commission was forced to conclude, that no improvements should be attempted without fundamental structural reorganization.”

The Committee recommended alternative forms of organization, the modified county or the full county. They recommended certain steps of procedure, and this is very interesting, because the steps that have been followed are almost exactly as recommended by this Commission. First, the careful study of the Commission proposals by local governments, provincial organizations and community forums, with guidance to the Provincial Government derived from such procedures; the appointment by the Provincial Government of a Local Government Boundaries Committee, having representation from the Organizations, directly concerned with reorganization.

Then they recommend common boundaries for municipalities and school-units. They recommended modified or full countries; they recommended an early study in regard to towns and villages with a view to their incorporation into the modified or full counties; they recommended effective planning in the administration of road services provided by both local and Provincial Governments, and without waiting to carry out the other provisions of reorganization or the other recommendations, or even to deal with them. The Government has gone ahead with the planning of road-services through the planning of the grid-road program in conjunction with the highway program in the province. Substantial assistance has been given to the municipalities to put that program into effect.

Well, the first thing they said was that it should be studied, so we called that provincial local government conference in the fall of 1956. Some of the hon. Members opposite objected, because Ministers of the Government had some things to say at that meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to belong to any Government that has not something to say on problems which come up, and we did on that occasion, a number of us, present to that Conference the situation as it existed at the present time in regard to local government. But there was a great deal of time at that conference, was spent in discussion too, and out of that discussion there came agreement for the appointment of the Continuing Committee. This continuing Committee has a sub-committee on reorganization and boundaries; a boundary committee was recommended, and it has a sub-committee on responsibilities and finance and a secretariat.

**February 22, 1961**

The Committee has held nearly 100 meetings of either the whole committee, a sub-committee or the executive of the committee.

Then, to give good measure, the members of the committee together with the secretariat and its advisors to the Committee, decided that they would hold these consultation meetings throughout the province to lay before the people their proposals, and over 70 of these consultation meetings were held. That is the first time, that any committee or commission of this nature has ever gone through this kind of a process.

The report will be presented soon, and one of the questions that arises is what are the Members of this Legislature going to do with that report?

Now, I want to take you back again for a minute to the quotation in this book of history.

The question arose in regard to whose responsibility it is. It is quoted here that:

“In 1939 the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upheld the exclusive legislature power of the province, in relation to municipal institutions in a case, in which the Ontario Legislature dissolved four municipalities and created the city of Windsor, in the area of the dissolved municipalities.”

Somebody took this to court and it went right through to the Privy Council and the judgment states:

“The Court, in sustaining an Act of the Ontario Legislature dissolving four municipalities, and creating a new municipality in the area involved as a proper exercise of the exclusive power of the provincial Legislature under the B.N.A. Act stated, ‘Sovereign with its constitutional power, the province is charged with the local government of its inhabitants by means of municipal institutions. If local government in any particular area becomes ineffective or non-existent because of the financial difficulties of one or more municipal institutions, or for any other reason, it is not only the right, but it would appear to be the duty of the provincial Legislature to provide the necessary remedies, so that the health of the inhabitants and the necessities of organized life in the community shall be preserved’.”

I just wanted to read that to the Members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, because I want them to realize that they have a responsibility on this question, that this Legislature is the only body in the province of Saskatchewan that has any power to set up institutions of local government or to improve them, and it has the power to destroy them and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, you can destroy things by leaving them alone when they have become out of date on account of changing circumstances.

Now, I don't know what decisions are going to be made, but I am trying to persuade my hon. friends to look at this question from an unbiased point of view. It is interesting to know, that in the province of Manitoba, and I am quoting from the "Western Producer", February 2, 1961, the statement made by the Manitoba Municipal Inquiry Commission by C.N. Argue, President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. He says:

"On the basis of our studies to date, we believe the ideal size of units for Manitoba would be one with about a \$4 million assessment. The Inquiry Commission was formed by the provinces, rural and urban municipal associations, to look into the feasibility of reorganization. Its report is not due to be presented for another two years. The type of unit, most favored by the committee to date, is one with coterminous school and municipal boundaries and with one council to direct both municipal and school affairs."

So you see, things are happening in other places and my hon. friends had better be prepared to look at this report to consider it not only on prejudices, not on a narrow political view, but on the merits of this report.

The motives of the Government I do not think can be questioned in regard to this procedure of having this matter studied by the Royal Commission on Agricultural and Rural Life, by the Continuing Committee and then considering the report and taking whatever action is considered to be in the best interest of the people of this province, because, Mr. Speaker, the stronger and more effective local government is in this province, the more able local government is to carry out its responsibilities to give services to its people, and the greater will be the satisfaction given to the people of Saskatchewan. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Government of the province can at least bask in some reflected glow from that success.

**February 22, 1961**

When we have put local government into a position where they can do a good job, then I think the Government deserves some credit, and my hon. friend admits that is true. But with the Opposition it is different. Actually, insofar as the Opposition is concerned, the political incentive they have in this thing is just this: the less effective local government is and the more complaints there are about local government services in the province, the more political gain they will be able to make, the more political trouble they will be able to make for the Government. They have no incentive for good local government and the Liberal Party in this province has demonstrated over and over again, that they are not interested in local government; They are interested in the Liberal Party. They are not interested in the welfare of the province, and rather than see either good local government or a hospital services plan or anything else put into effect by some other Government, they would sooner see the province of Saskatchewan go without it. That has been their attitude and I have been in this Legislature for a long time and watching their actions, both when they were in power and when they were in opposition. So, unless the Members opposite can cure themselves of that situation, I will have to take their advice pretty lightly. I can't see that from a political point of view they have any incentive to want good local government in Saskatchewan.

We have on the Government side every incentive to want to have good local government, because the better local government is, the less trouble, the less problems we will have. That is one reason why we are interested in this study that has been made and hope that it comes through.

The Member in the Opposition have been so far making pure political capital out of it. I have in my hand here a copy of "The Saskatchewan Liberal." I don't know when this came to life again, it used to exist 30 or 40 years ago, maybe not quite that much, but this is a message from Ross Thatcher to the Turtleford electors, I hear they have an election up there some time now. He says . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Wait, till you hear the results.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** —

"The C.C.F. seem determined to bring in the county system, which almost invariably will mean higher land taxes."

He is right here trying to make political capital out of

it. The candidate up there says:

“I am not opposed to the county system.” Oh, no, he can’t be opposed, the Liberal style is not to be opposed to anything or be for anything, but to be lukewarm water, for nothing and against nothing, so that they can’t be caught.

As far as local government is concerned, a number of the hon. Members have been asking questions the last few days and they have been getting answers. The Member for Gravelbourg, the Member for Melville, and the Member for Yorkton, asked questions about grants to their municipality in the last year. It is very interesting to know, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities in these constituencies, 25 of them in the fiscal year 1959/60, got grants from the Provincial Government which on the average were \$22,151 for each municipality. I remember, when we had a Liberal Government in power, when we did not get \$22,000 for 50 municipalities, and then you only got it in election year.

I took the trouble to look up some information in regard to this particular point and I find that taking the best three years of record of the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan, the grants they paid for market roads, bridges and ferries, was, on the average in these three years, less than half a million dollars. The years, I took, Mr. Speaker, were 1938, election that year, — it was a good year for grants; 1943, when there should have been an election, but the Liberals got scared and they extended the life of the Legislature and they did not have one, that would be a good year for grants too, and 1944, when they had an election. These were the three best years for grants. We find, that the current assistance is over 12 times the average in these three years of Liberal record.

Look at the grid-road program: In the 1959-60 year for grid-road programs a total cost of \$6.25 million, approximately, and the province paying \$3,850,000, the municipalities paying \$2,400,000, the provincial share was 61.51%, the municipal share 38.49%.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we wanted to destroy the municipalities we would leave them as they are, letting all other things go by, because they are less able to carry out their responsibilities and then, therefore, we have them completely under our thumb by giving them grants, or withholding grants, and all the rest. That is not our method, and that is not the way we want to do it. We have not given those grants on that basis. Every municipality, regardless of their situation or where they are, can come

**February 22, 1961**

in on the grid-road program; they all can get equalization grants; there is no difference in other local government grants in any way, school grants, or anything else.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — On a point of order, do I understand the Minister to say that all municipalities get equalization grants?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Personally, I think that is not a point of order.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, I did not say that, and I agree, Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. I did not say that. I said that all municipalities can get the equalization grants, if they qualify for it. I left out those words “if they qualify for it”, because I thought, that my hon. friend was intelligent enough to understand that because it is on a formula basis and some municipalities don’t qualify for it. My hon. friend over here would give the big grants to the municipalities with the biggest assessment and the least need for it. That is not the way we do it. We give the largest grants to municipalities that need it the most. I would admit readily that the equalization grant is not as big as I would like to see it. Certainly I would like to see that improved, but when I hear my hon. friends opposite crying about local government, and I know all they did to local government in the past, I can’t give their tears very much credit at all.

The school grant question has been dealt with. The grant when we took office was two and three-quarter millions, and this year it is over 10 times that much. In those days we had unpaid teachers, we had log schoolhouses up in the north part of Saskatchewan with the plaster falling out of them.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Now, we do not have anything.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The former Liberal Minister of Education whom I see flitting about the halls of this building at times, once upon a time told a group of schoolteachers who were complaining about these schools: “If I were a teacher there, I would plaster them with my own hands.”

Well, you know, they plastered those log schools with mud and he might be well qualified for putting in the mud.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — These schools were in existence in those days when the country was flooded with goods which could not be sold. We had a Liberal government in Ottawa; we had a Liberal government in Saskatchewan. But the schools had no furniture except rough home-made furniture in many of these, some of them made from rough lumber, and no equipment for a teacher to work with at all. These are the people, who now would like to pose as the champions of local government.

One municipality, I have the record of it, the Municipality of Three Lakes number 400 got grants in 1959 as follows: \$37,000 in 1959 for roads, \$33,000 in 1960 and \$32,000 in 1961. With other small items, such as controlled road-side grassing and social aid grants, over \$40,000 each year. Now, it is just ridiculous when these people start crying about the poor municipalities when we know what they have done about it.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, now to congratulate you on your election in this Office. I fully expect that you and I will have the occasional argument. I am sure that on your part, and I assure you too on my part, that the arguments will be carried out, because we each sincerely and honestly believe the points we are putting forward, I am sure that his Legislature will enjoy getting along with you in the high office of Speaker.

I want also to pay my compliments to the mover and seconder of this motion upon which we will be voting before very long. It is a long time since they moved the resolution. I don't think we should let those people move and second another resolution in this Legislature, it takes too long to get rid of it, Mr. Speaker. But they both did an excellent job in their speeches.

I want also to congratulate the Premier. I am sorry he is not able to be in his place today, as he is in Eastern Canada with the Provincial Treasurer at the Dominion Provincial Conference. Since the last meeting of the Legislature, he has again won and maintained the confidence of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It is a great record for one Premier, to have maintained that confidence for such a long period. Long since has it broken all previous records in this province.

I must also congratulate the Provincial Treasurer. Not only on the very fine speech he made the other day, but also on his quite apparent ability to carry on in that very

**February 22, 1961**

important office in charge of the finances of the provinces.

May I also congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his election as Leader of the Liberal Party, and on getting into the House, and becoming the Leader of the Opposition. He does occupy an important position. I will certainly disagree with him on many occasions, but I do hope that we can keep those disagreements on a non-personal basis. May I also congratulate all of the new Members. I think that all of the new Members have displayed, at this Session — the ones that we have heard — an outstanding ability to speak. That doesn't mean that I agree with all that they have said; I don't agree with all that everybody says even on this side of the House, and I don't agree with very much that is said on the other side of the House. I confess we do agree on a few things. But it is a good thing to see that the people in the Legislature, the new Members who are elected to the Legislature, have this ability to talk and put across their ideas, because their ideas whether they are bad or good, will never get consideration unless they are able to put them forward.

I was disappointed in the speeches that I heard from the other side of the House. They sounded like the same old scratched record, with emphasis on Socialism and trying to create some fear, apparently, that this is a terrible thing, and occasionally not distinguishing between the different types of Socialism. I wish my hon. friends would keep things straight and would say Democratic Socialism. We don't mind being called Democratic Socialists — the Democratic Socialists throughout the world are a very substantial group of people, and the native land of my hon. friend from Arm River has a Social-Democratic government for many, many years, and if he hasn't been back recently, he should just go back, and see how good it is over there.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — That's why he left.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I think we all agree that we are opposed to any dictatorial methods, like either the Fascists on the right or the Communists on the left. We don't believe that those methods can be justified by any end, because when you use the wrong means then, when you get to the end, the end is nearly always different. I think we should agree across this floor that none of us want to see those methods used.

I could call my hon. friends Socialists, for they believe in a very considerable degree in Socialism.  
Socialism



in many ways has been used for many, many years. There is the social ownership of the post office, an old, old one — nobody thinks of it as Socialism, but it sure isn't private enterprise. The Federal Government has all kinds of socialistic enterprises, and once in a while people complain about the Liberals getting to be too Socialistic. I admit, my hon. friends are inclined to be quite democratic, I hope they can give us the same credit.

One thing I noticed is that the hon. Members opposite have rather fallible memories. They seem to remember some things so well, but never to think of others at all. Even in this Session we heard one or two talk about the woollen mill and the shoe factory — they just can't forget. But they can forget the sodium sulphate plant, because it's successful. You see anything that turned out to be not too good, or a mistake, or a failure, they will remember forever. They remember things that don't succeed; anything that succeeds, well, they don't want to mention it. That's the reason they don't like the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, because it's too successful, and they don't think it should even have a head office. They think it should be camped out someplace. These things, I can't just overlook. They have forgotten many things in the past that I have mentioned before: the way they treated the municipalities; they have forgotten how they opposed the larger school units; then when one of the Members on this side of the House, (the Premier, I think) said they opposed the automobile accident insurance, they denied it until he brought in the quotation. But these things are all true. They've forgotten the situation that existed in regard to hospitals in Saskatchewan in 1944 — we had not enough hospital beds to accommodate the people of Saskatchewan, but still there were hospital beds empty, at that time, because people didn't have the money to go to hospitals. When they got sick they stayed sick at home. Nowadays, people can go to hospital when the doctor says they need to go to hospital. The situation has changed a great deal, but they've forgotten. They've forgotten that people, in those days when they were the Government, had to beg in many cases for medical care, and they are now talking in terms of, "Oh, don't be in a hurry about this medical care plan." Then they say, "Oh, we didn't have the money to do these things."

**Mr. Danielson:** — You were the ones that stalled.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They didn't have the money, but they never tried to get it, because their

**February 22, 1961**

philosophy, insofar as the natural resources were concerned, was to give them away with practically no returns. From the one big mine that we had in Saskatchewan while the Liberals were in power we were getting less than \$200,000.00 royalty. For the last 15 years that mine has averaged well over, I haven't figured this out, but it is well over a million dollars per year in royalty, probably a million and a half or a million and a quarter, and they are still paying lots of income tax to the Federal Government. They didn't try to get revenue, and you're not going to be able to give good government, and no political party deserves to have the responsibility for government, unless they've got the courage to raise revenue, and they've got to raise it by fees and charges and royalties on our natural resources, and by taxation, and it takes courage to do that.

It doesn't take any courage to get up over here and holler about the mineral tax, and holler about the gas tax on farm trucks, and all this sort of thing. Opposition always want to cut down taxes, but they never do, because they cease to be Opposition when they become Government, and then they have to face the realities of life. They can't get away with that any more. You can't increase services and cut down taxes, but they never seem to realize that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Which ones are going up this year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I didn't say any were going up. I hope none will go up. I'll be surprised like you will, when I hear the budget address.

You know, sometimes you would think, when you listen to these people over here, that the Good Lord just put the resources here since 1944. But they were here before that — they were here — but they didn't make much out of them. Well, let's look what happened. In 1944-45 the resources revenue was \$1,700,000.00; now for many years it has averaged over \$20 million a year.

**Mr. Danielson:** — We didn't pay 85 and 90 thousand . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And we wouldn't be paying the prices for these products now, if the Liberal Government at Ottawa had maintained a system of price control, instead of letting everything go out of order.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . labour friends.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — As far as I know, all of the Members in the Opposition have stated that they're going to vote against the motion, to endorse the Speech from the Throne. What's in that Speech from the Throne? Well there are some very good things in it, and you should just have a look at it — Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — . . . nothing in there to talk about.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Here are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Members are going to vote against: The Speech from the Throne states "my Government has consciously followed a policy of scheduling the maximum amount of construction work during winter months." Are you in favour of that or against it?

**Opposition Member:** — You never do what's in there anyway.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We participated in the federal winter works program. Weren't you in favor of that — further training for unemployed people? But they're going to vote against it. Then this also included the crop insurance plan, which in 1961 will be the first year that it goes into effect. Are you not in favour of the crop insurance plan? Don't you want a plan available to the people of Saskatchewan? And then I suppose, and I can understand this, that they are against sewer and water systems, because they probably like the good old times, and can imagine how sociable they would be.

It provides for the continuation of work on the South Saskatchewan River, but I suppose they're against that. The Liberal Government at Ottawa would never do anything about it anyway. It mentions in this Speech, further grants for education, but they're going to vote against the Speech from the Throne, against urban centres being served with natural gas, against teachers' scholarship funds. These are all the things that are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. They are against increasing the student aid fund so that more loans can be made from the Student Aid Fund. We mention here, the technical institute at Moose Jaw which has been completed, and the training of Metis youth in northern Saskatchewan. My hon. friend from Athabasca will be against that. The progress made in construction of the University buildings, and the medical care program, the housing for senior citizens

which is going on constantly throughout the province. The program of subsidized rental housing units which is being put up throughout the province; The further development of other services such as parks, forest access roads, highways, and the grid road program and so on and so forth. Thus, Mr. Speaker, when we take the trouble to get down and read about all the programs that have been carried out in this province, I am amazed that everybody in the House doesn't vote for it.

Somebody mentioned during this debate a whole list of people who were former M.L.A.'s who had been hired by this Government. Well I happen to have in my hand a list of former Liberal Member who were hired by the civil service. And you know, Mr. Speaker, this appears to be a good old custom, and I think it's probably not bad, because at least some of the people who get elected to the Legislature have some ability and some brains, and can work usefully, at least I would hope so. If they are able, after they are out of the Legislature, to work in the public service, why shouldn't they work. Is there anything against it? Well, here's the list of Liberal Members — here are 10 — just a minute now — Gerhard Ens of Rosthern, he resigned in 1914, and he was appointed to the public service May 1st, 1914; Dr. James W. MacNeill of Hanley Constituency resigned in 1913 and appointed March 15th, 1913 to the public service. (Was it bad?); Andrew Cunningham of Pheasant Hill, was defeated in 1917 — he didn't get a job until 1934.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's a long time.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't know, maybe he was like the rest of us, hard up. Then there was Mrs. S.T. Ramsland of Pelly, who was defeated in 1925, and got a job in 1925; D.J. Seitz, of Swift Current was defeated in 1929; (that was a bad time to be defeated) he didn't get a job until 1935; Mr. H.T. Halvorson of Cyprus, defeated in 1929, was appointed to the public service in 1943; S. J. Latta of Last Mountain . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — There was a good man.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . was defeated in 1929, and he was a good man, and he got a job on October 29th, 1934, and he continued to serve under the CCF Government until the time he retired. E.S. Clinch of Shellbrook, was

defeated in 1934, and he got a job in 1935; G. Cockburn, of Redberry, defeated in 1934, got a job in 1935; R.J. Gordon, of Lloydminster was defeated in 1934 and he got a job in August, 1936; O.D. Hill of Melfort was defeated in 1929, and he didn't get a job until April 12th, 1943, and he was continued on under the CCF Government. Now that isn't a complete list; I know that there are others. But I think the point is that good people, just because they've been in politics and either have resigned or the political fates went against them, if they can give good service, there is no rule that they should not be hired.

Now some other remarks of the Members of the Opposition that I would like to comment on. The hon. Member from Pelly said, "the county is a centralization of power coming from the top down." Now that seems to be a bit of a ridiculous statement, because whether it is a 9 township area or a 39 township area it's local government elected the people in that area. The bigger areas may be better; maybe it should be a smaller area; maybe we should go back to one or two township units, if it's of such great value. The Member from Gravelbourg made the ridiculous statement that "due to greed and desire for power the Government is trying to take away the right of local government." How ridiculous can people get? I don't want all the problems of local government. We want to have local government carry on well. We want to get rid of the Local Improvement Districts just as soon as we can, so they will take responsibility for their own local government rather than have us take responsibility for them.

The Member for Saltcoats, said, "I oppose change in municipal government." He's got his mind made up, and he doesn't want to be confused with the facts. He also talked about the money spent on the Royal Commission on Agricultural and Rural Life being squandered, and on the Continuing Committee, and so forth. My hon. friends have supported governments in the past that have appointed many Royal Commissions. I don't know whether they believe in them or not, but I do know that no Royal Commission report in the history of Saskatchewan or of Canada has ever received as much attention from the Government as the Royal Commission reports made in this province since we took office. They will receive attention, and it is not money wasted. The Member for Saltcoats said he 'was horrified with the idea that education, agriculture, and welfare would be undertaken

by the county.' Well, of course, what the Continuing Committee said at the meetings was that the agricultural representative could be hired by the county, the school superintendent could be hired by the county, and they also said that the funds to do this would, at the same time, be pushed across to local government, that this would give to people in local government more power, more control over the programs that were to be carried on. When people try to misinterpret the proposals they can achieve some success.

I want to make one comment in regard to remarks made by the hon. Member from Souris-Estevan. He said if Crown Land costs were cheap this would stimulate development. Well I want to tell him, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan is now, insofar as the Crown Land costs are concerned, the cheapest place for exploration of any place I know on the North American continent. It is certainly cheaper than Alberta and cheaper than in many states in the Union. Now I realize that this kind of a policy suggested by the hon. Member was exactly the kind of policy that the Liberal Government used to follow. They'd give away the resources for nothing or next to nothing, so the result was that you had some development, but when the products were taken out and taken away you had nothing left then but a hole in the ground, and very little revenue in the meantime. As long as I have the responsibility I will want to get for our resources the best price that we can, the best bargain for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I make no bones about that. I recognize too, that the companies dealing here, have exactly the opposite position. They want to get lands as cheaply as possible, but some place in the middle we arrive at a bargain. Where it works, they get land, and we get revenue, and the revenues that the province has received does prove that it has been effective.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have imposed on you, this long, but I just wanted to assure you that I will support this motion.

**Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — I hadn't intended to get into the debate this afternoon,

but due to the long line of dribble that we listened to by the Attorney-General last night in order to try and kill time, I was forced not to take my part in the debate at that time which had been preciously agreed upon by both whips on either side of the House.

This afternoon I was very disappointed to see the Minister of Mineral Resources, knowing the ability of the Minister, also take up time that could have been utilized to far better advantage by some of the other Members in this House, and I know that one Member on the other side must be . . .

**Mr. Meakes:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I sent the Minister a note saying to go ahead.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Well I am sure that Member opposite must be very disappointed this afternoon. Now there isn't much time left in the debate, Mr. Speaker, as we must vote by 5 o'clock, but there are some of the statements that have been made during the course of the Throne Speech debate I want to deal with — Especially some of the statements made by the Premier. Time will not permit me to deal with them all, but in his rebuttal to the Leader of the Opposition, he made one statement that nobody could agree with in trying to discredit the argument and debate put up by the Leader of the Opposition. In speaking about the Crown Corporations, the Premier said, "All the Crown Corporations last year showed a surplus." Well, Mr. Speaker, they may have shown a CCF surplus, but I would like to point out to you, what their version of a surplus is. I'm going to show the hon. Members of the House a little booklet put out by the CCF prior to the 1960 election. This book is called "Facts" and one fact is headed "Public Enterprises Our Servants". The first one listed is Saskatchewan Government Airways and there is no deficit listed, just surplus. It says "Airways — surplus \$56,658," but behind that word "surplus", Mr. Speaker, is a little wee dot, so small that you couldn't detect it with your naked eye, then when you go down to the bottom of the page, you see a little wee dot with the word "deficit." That is the CCF version of a surplus.

I think the other statement, made recently by the Premier would show beyond any shadow of a doubt his attitude and the attitude of his Government towards farmers in the province. I think this statement made by him is even more serious, because over the years he was the man who was

**February 22, 1961**

responsible for setting up co-operatives as Departments of this Government, and during that course of time he served the Co-operative Department as Minister. Then when the interests of the farmer and labour had clashed, during the grainholders' strike at the west coast, what attitude did the Premier take? It wasn't in the interests of the farmer, Mr. Speaker, it was in the interests of the group that he aspires to lead after the formation of that so-called New Party this coming summer. The statement he made was this —

“The grain companies have exploited farmers in the past and it is possible they may be exploiting the workers now.”

Who were these grain companies, Mr. Speaker? One was the Alberta Wheat Pool and the other was the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool — two of the largest co-operative organizations in the world, and he the recent Minister of Co-operation. What did the Manager of the Alberta Wheat Pool have to say? He said this:

“The demands and the strike of grain handlers at Vancouver are ‘not against rich corporation, but aimed directly at farmers, most of whom make considerably less than the members of the union.’ A.T. Baker, general manager of the Alberta Wheat Pool said here.”

Then he went on to say this:

“Mr. Baker gave figures of current earnings showing that minimum annual earnings in the Pool's Vancouver terminal was over \$4900 and the average for all members of the Union employed by the Pool was over \$5100 in the year ending September 30, 1960.”

The Premier has stated that less than one-third of the farmers in the province made only \$1200 a year, and so instead of standing up for the farmer and the basic industry of this province, whose side he should have taken, he stabbed them in the back.

Then what does the editor of ‘The Western Producer’ have to say in regard to this strike, and I want the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) who spoke yesterday to pay particular attention:

“To suggest that his suffering is incidental, and that after all the strike is against the companies does nothing to repair the damage and the hurt that farmers even now are feeling as a result of the west coast walkout.”



Then he goes on to say this:

“The strike in question took place at a time when we hear many pious declarations from labor leaders concerning their regard for the farmer.”

“But the strike, graciously authorized by the union’s head office in Cincinnati, was called, and the farmers have suffered.”

That is from the ‘Western Producer’, the official organ of many of the farmers of Saskatchewan.

I am going to sum up my remarks by saying this: The attitude of the Government Members during the whole debate was that they would rather be ruined by self-praise than be saved by constructive criticism. After listening to the remarks of the Attorney General last night, I think there is one exception and I think the people of Hanley realized that the C.C.F. would be re-elected in the last election and reasoned that if they were to have a C.C.F. Government they would see that the Government had to suffer and sent him down to be the Attorney General! His attitude towards the farmers was that “Roses are more important than bread”, when he was talking in terms of the proposed palatial head office to be erected by the Power Corporation.

I was amused to hear on Saturday last that the so-called New Party crest has been designed and I think it is going to be interesting to everybody concerned, Mr. Speaker, because they said the crest contained a gold Maple Leaf, and at the bottom of the Maple Leaf would be the words, ‘Farmers — Laborites, “not labor” and intellectual Socialists.’

Mr. Speaker, I have always understood there were a great many kinds of Socialists, but I didn’t know there was one privileged group who called themselves ‘intellectuals.’

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Better than . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — But apart from this, on the bottom of the crest they have the insignia for the farmer, a fork; for the laborite, a wrench. I do not recall what the insignia was for the Socialist intellectuals, however, it was significant to me at least when they used the fork and the wrench. It bears a close resemblance to another Socialist

**February 22, 1961**

party whose insignia for the same groups is the hammer and the sickle.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I will not support the motion.

At 5 o'clock p.m. pursuant to subsection (4) of Standing Order 30, Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings, and put the question on the motion which was agreed to on the following recorded division: —

**YEAS — 32**

Messieurs

Dewhurst	Thurston	Thiessen
Williams	Blakeney	Snyder
McIntosh	Erb	Stevens
Brockelbank	Turnbull	Kluzak
Nollet	Stone	Dahlman
Kuziak	Whelan	Michayluk
Cooper (Mrs.)	Thibault	Semchuk
Strum (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Perkins
Davies	Kramer	Peterson
Willis	Johnson	Broten
Brown	Meakes	

**NAYS — 16**

Messieurs

Thatcher	McFarlane	Horsman
McCarthy	Gardiner	Coderre
Barrie	Guy	MacDougall
McDonald	Boldt	Snedker
Danielson	Klein	Gallagher
Cameron		

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