

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session – Fifteenth Legislature
5th day

Monday, February 14, 1966

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

STATEMENT RE CFQC RADIO REPORT

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — I would like to draw attention to a report that emanated over the radio station CFQC, last Friday evening. On Friday evening Mr. Les Edwards of CFQC stated on that station as follows:

Reports state that Mr. Walker in a verbal exchange was not as civil as he might have been to the Speaker, and commented to the effect that the Saskatchewan Legislature is not yet the Reichstag.

Mr. Edwards went on to say:

The Speaker of the Legislature must be shown respect due to his office.

An attempt was made in this was to create the impression amongst CFQC listeners that I had made this statement in response to a ruling made by Your Honour. I examined the transcript, I have it here before me. I find that the Premier had been quoting from what he said was an agreement, and I got up and I said "Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said the agreement provided for so and so, and the rules are elementary, all members have the same rights". Mr. Speaker, I recall quite clearly that there was a stir and some shouts from the other side, "Sit Down" but I went on and I said "Some hon. members over there may think that this is the Reichstag but it is not yet". Your Honour, that is taken directly from the transcript of this house.

Your Honour's first interjection into the proceedings was after I had made this statement, and not before. It is, therefore, impossible that the statement could have been directed to Your Honour, as Your Honour had at that point said nothing in these proceedings. It is pretty clear to anyone who was here that the comment was directed to an outburst from several members of the government side directing me to sit down. I have had an opportunity of looking at the report made by the pressmen in the gallery to CFQC, and there is nothing in the report to justify the statement made by Mr. Edwards.

I, therefore, draw this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, from my place on the floor in the house, and protest most strongly against this scurrilous kind of unjustified abuse from Mr. Edwards. I want to say just one further thing, Mr. Speaker, I hope that when I make a criticism of other people that I do it with a sense of justice and fair play. I don't mind being criticized for

February 14, 1966

things that I do that are wrong, but I resent very much an attempt to stir up hostility against me for things that have no justification in fact whatsoever.

I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that I have endeavored, as I think Your Honour knows, at all times, to abide by Your Honour's rulings, and to accept them graciously. The comment that was made that time was clearly not directed to Your Honour, nor had I any intention of making it to Your Honour. I want to say one further thing, that if anybody knows anything about the history of Nazism they know that it was the Leader of the Government who subverted the Reichstag and not the Speaker.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Minister of Health): — He should apologize and get it over with.

WELCOME TO LEBRET SCHOLASTICATE

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are called I would like to welcome to the legislature a group who are sitting in the gallery to your left, 20 students and their leaders from the Oblate Scholasticate at Lebret, who are visiting with us this afternoon. These 20 are from various parts of our province of Saskatchewan, and also from other provinces of Canada. I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming them to our midst and hoping that they spend a very worthwhile day in Regina, and that they enjoy the proceedings. They are in the charge of Father Tetrault, the bursar at the Scholasticate and Brother Aubrey.

Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

INQUIRY RE QUESTION ASKED ON FRIDAY EVENING BY MR. LLOYD

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wonder if the Premier can now give the answer to the question which I asked on Friday evening. He wasn't certain of the answer as to whether the broadcast sponsored by the government — daily news broadcast from the legislature — was to continue during the period between now and February 16th.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — I have no further information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lloyd: — A follow-up question, Mr. Speaker. Then I submit that this is rather important, there are certain rules that have pertained to legislature broadcasts generally. I would have thought that the Premier would have had some information by this time in regard to it.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government, when can

we expect to get a copy of the Manpower Survey Report, or the analysis of it – apparently the government conducted it last year – and whether a copy of that survey will be tabled with this assembly?

Mr. Thatcher: — I'll look into that and try and get the hon. member an answer tomorrow. Meantime, might I say to the Leader of the Opposition that I have been informed that those broadcasts will have been discontinued until Thursday.

CONDOLENCES TO INDIA ON DEATH OF PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Speaker: — Recently, the Commonwealth, indeed, the whole world, learned with shock and sorrow of the sudden tragic death of the Prime Minister of India, Lal Bahadur Shastri. I thought that members would wish me to express the sympathy of this legislature to the commonwealth country and the people of India in their grievous misfortune. This, I did and received the following reply:

New Delhi, February 3rd, 1966.

Dear Mr. Speaker:

I am extremely grateful to you for the expression of sorrow and the message of sympathy you have conveyed at the bereavement we have suffered by the sudden and tragic passing away of our late Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri.

Your message has given us solace that there are so many others to share our grief at this great loss.

With best regards,

Yours sincerely,
Hukam Singh
Speaker, Lok Sabha.

DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES OF THRONE SPEECH

On Friday last, the hon. member from Hanley, voiced the complaint that copies of the Throne Speech had not been distributed to members as soon as it had been delivered by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

As it is the duty of the Legislative Assembly office to distribute the speech after receiving it from the Premier's office, I made inquiries in regard thereto. I find that immediately after the speech was delivered, copies were put in the two members' lounges on either side of the chamber, and other copies were delivered to the offices of the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). I understand this was done because of the difficulty of distributing papers to members at their desks on opening day.

I have given a directive that in future, in addition to the present method of distribution, copies are also to be placed

upon members' desks immediately after the adjournment on opening day.

QUESTION RE TRANSCRIPTS

On Friday last, the Leader of the Opposition drew attention to the fact that he had received from the Legislative Assembly office a transcript of assembly proceedings with a note signed by a former employee of his office. On inquiry into this matter I find that an out-of-date pro forma was inadvertently pinned on to the transcripts before they were sent out. The clerk asked me to express his apologies for this oversight and for any inconvenience it may have caused. Steps have been taken to see that it will not recur.

COMPOSITION OF SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — moved:

That the report of the Select Special committee appointed to prepare lists of the members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this assembly be now concurred in.

Seconded by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. D.G. Steuart)

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in regard to this motion, because I object to the report made by this committee. The proportions recommended for the committees are all out of order according to the proportion of the different parties in the legislature. It has been recognized in the past that the proportions on committees somewhat resemble the proportions in the house, and I know that some of the hon. members opposite may point out to committees that were composed in previous years, and their composition. But I would like to say that in those years when we had the honor to be the government party, I cannot remember any case when the opposition asked for another member, or more members on the committee, when they didn't get it. They couldn't, of course, have a majority on a committee, but certainly there was no request for more members than were on those committees.

Now, I just don't want to take too much time, but I do want to point out what kind of situation exists. For example, in regard to the three committees, Agriculture, Education, and Municipal Law, each of which is composed of 24 members, the constitution insisted upon by the government members on the committee was 14-9 and 1, 14 government members, 9 official opposition, and one Conservative. Calculated on the basis of the membership in the house would be 12.6 to 10.5, not 14 to 9, and of course, the proportion for the Conservative party comes out at approximately .5. It is recognized that in this case we won't split the man, but we will have the whole man on the job, but the difference I want to point out is between a 12.6 and 10.5 ratio to a 14 – 9 ratio.

Now, the fair thing, of course would be to knock off the

fraction for the opposition, and I recognize that the government is entitled to have a majority on these committees. All members are entitled to have a voice too. The fair thing would be to knock off the fraction of the opposition, which would make it 10 for the opposition and to add a fraction for the government, which would make it 13 – 10 – 1, which would give the government a clear majority of 2 on that committee over both parties on these committees.

Now, on the committee, we tried to get the government members to adopt this procedure. They laughed at it, they wouldn't have anything to do with it at all . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I wasn't laughing.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Well, I thought the Minister was laughing, maybe that is just his normal appearance, but I thought he was laughing about it anyway, and I am pretty sure that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) was laughing about it, because he does laugh rather easily. Well, when we couldn't get the government members to agree to a ration of 13 – 10 – 1, we tried to make a compromise and get them to agree to 14 – 10 – 1, but they would not agree to that. Nothing else in regard to these committees with 24 members but 14 – 9 – 1, giving them a majority of 4 in the committee. That is the majority they have in the house now if you don't count Mr. Speaker, and that is counting Canora that is being generous.

It is a fact that members of the house have a right to sit on these committees and by their majority the government is apparently going to steam-roller through a report of this committee which will take away from members their right to sit and speak on these committees.

Now, two other committees on Law Amendments and on Private Bills are committees consisting of 26 members. The proportional representation should be 13.6 to 11.4 and, of course, one Conservative. If we follow the same procedure of dropping the fraction for the opposition and adding a fraction for the government party, it becomes 14 – 11 – 1. They insisted on 15 – 10 – 1, which is rather unreasonable.

Now, again we tried every way we could to get some change and some compromise, some fairer approach to this question, but the government members wouldn't move at all.

The two other committees about which I wish to speak are the two largest ones, on Public Accounts and Crown Corporations. Last year they had 31 members on each of these committees, and they were composed of 18 government members, 12 official opposition, and one Conservative. 18 – 12 – 1. The proper proportion is 16.8 – 13.6 – 1. But anyway the government proposed that these committees be reduced in size from 31 to 28. We opposed the reduction of the size of these committees, but this isn't the major issue, I don't think. They are reduced by the report of the committee to 28. The proper proportion on a

February 14, 1966

committee of 28, is 14.7 - government members, 12.3 — official opposition, and 1 Conservative. But they insisted on 16 – 11 – 1. Now to drop the fraction in the one case, add it in the other, would have made it 15 – 12 – 1. They insisted on 16 – 11 – 1, maintaining a majority of 4 on this committee. I wasn't to say this, that isn't quite as bad as it was last year, but if we can't make any more progress than this each year, it is going to take a long time to get justice in the appointment of these committees.

So, I would suggest that the house vote against the report of this committee and let the committee go to work and do it over again, and do a better job.

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank), talks about the number of members of the opposition he wanted on these committees, but he was very quick to accept when we cut the two largest and most important committees down. In fact, I think his exact words were, "Well, I think this is better". We suggested one be cut off the CCF, two off the government; he said "This is better". Which proves the point he really wasn't trying to get more numbers. He is quite happy to cut one member off if he gets two off the government . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I must correct the hon. member, I said, "This is better in regard to proportion." This is what I said.

Mr. Stuart: — Well, you were quite prepared to accept it on that basis, so you really weren't fighting for members.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is putting words in my mouth. There used to be people over here who didn't like that too, and I want to say that I didn't accept it, except that we had to accept it because the Minister was in control of the majority of the committee.

Mr. Stuart: — What a perishing thought to think that I ever used my majority. I recall, Mr. Speaker, we gave in on one committee, mind you, it hasn't met for 20 years, but we did give in, very democratic. But the truth is that what the members of the Opposition were after was to try and cut down our majority. We have ministers on these committees, these ministers are busy. It might not be like it was in the old days, Mr. Speaker, when they didn't have so much to do, but we are very busy, we have a great deal to do, and we can't have too many ministers tied up in these committees. We have only 12 ministers, not 15, so they are really earning their pay, and we try to be very democratic. In fact, it is better than it was last year, they never objected at all last year. I think the truth is they went to sleep, and kind of missed the boat, but anyway I just

assure the house that we did give them every consideration. I think that in view of the fact that we do have the responsibility of moving the business of the government along, and moving the business of the committee along, we must have a majority on those committees at all times as is our right. No one has suggested it is not our right, a reasonable working majority. I think the other hon. members who are on committee with myself will point out that in spite of the sanctimonious protestations of the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), we can go back into the records and show that they weren't always quite as democratic as he might like to point out now that he is in the Opposition.

But I will assure him that as the years go by, and as we sit on this side of the house, we may get more mellow, and we will have lots of years to get mellow . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — That isn't the word, it is odorous.

Mr. Steuart: — Speak for yourself.

Mr. Gardiner: — I am only gong to add a few words to what the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) has just said. I would just like to say first to my friend the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) that I don't intend to change the expression on my face, or go into committees with a long face on. I intend to conduct business in a fair and forthright manner. If I can't do it in one of good feeling towards the Opposition across the way, well then I wouldn't want to be in this particular position that I am in.

But I would like to say, in adding to what the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) has stated this afternoon, that in looking back over the record, as I pointed out last year, in the times that we found the numbers in this house approximate to what they are today, there was always roughly a three to four per cent difference in the amount that the government had and the membership that they held in the government side of the house. Both in 1964 and in the period from 1948 to 1952 there was a slightly larger percentage proportion commanded by the government in all committees of the house. So I think, when he read the figures out today which indicate in most cases that in the important committees there would be some difference of about 1.6 per cent in the amount the government would have over and above that they would be entitled to by percentages, he indicated the committee was very fair in its proportional representation this year. I would just like to indicate that, in spite of the fact that this house approved the membership allocated last year, the government agreed, as the Minister of Public Health pointed out, the government members on the committee agreed to a further fair split on the two major committees that meet during the session.

I thin that, when the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) indicates that there has been unfairness in the decisions of the committee that you are now being asked to approve, I would say

February 14, 1966

that he is being unfair to the members of that committee. I think that they did a very good job. I think that they were fair in the changes that they made from last year. As I remember the procedure in the past, it was very seldom, if every, that numbers on committees were changed from the time one election was held until the next one, unless there was a change in representation in the house.

I just want to indicate that this year the government did allow a change on the two important committees and did decrease their percentage in the representation. I think that the house should accept this as a spirit of fairness on behalf of the government in giving proper representation as we see it. I think Mr. Steuart pointed out why any government must have possibly a little higher percentage of representation on committees than they would be entitled to by the membership in the house. So I say I think members in the house should vote to support the report f the committee which sets up the standing committees of the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The assembly resumed that adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone) for an Address in Reply.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, last day when I addressed Your Honour in this matte, I pointed out that the record of this government is not the success which the Premier and Liberal spokesmen would try to make us believe. I pointed out that this government staked its all on its claim that it would induce a higher rate of economic activity, that it would induce a more rapid rate of economic activity, that it would induce a more rapid inflow of capital into the province, that it would correct the population drain. The fact is that the D.B.S. report that the government has failed in every one of those endeavors.

We on this side of the house will continue to bring these facts to the attention of the public. We believe that at this time, when the North American economy is booming at an unprecedented rate, Saskatchewan should continue to lead the rest of Canada if we are to catch up with the loses, with the stagnation that occurred in this province during the 1930's, if we are to regain the lag which occurred in this province prior to the war in 1940 and 45. They have stopped citing the figures, Mr. Speaker, with very good reason, because the figures no longer support their cause.

I had some comment about some motions for return that had not been honored, that had been delayed, and I said something about these returns involving the personal affairs and the political affairs of the members of the government. I think I said something about expense accounts by Ministers of the Crown. In case I didn't make it perfectly clear on Friday when I was speaking, I want to make it abundantly clear that I am not in

any way criticizing the size of those expense accounts. All I am saying is that the legislature is entitled to have full particulars of the rate at which they are paid and the amounts. I am not criticizing the Premier for having a larger expense account than previous Premiers have had in this province. I think if people are to be compensated for their qualification, I am the first to concede that whatever category, or whatever genus, or species we have now in these offices, that they are undoubtedly in their offices long enough for the glow, the pleasure of anticipation, to have sort of dampened into the mundane realization, and for them to have come to some realization, some appreciation of the financial sacrifices which one must make to serve in the cabinet of Saskatchewan.

Insofar as I am personally concerned, Mr. Speaker, I feel free not to say that I, for one, would have no objection, and would make no complaint, if the members of the cabinet were to see fit to adjust their salaries more into line with present day realities. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I did say last year, in your absence, we were in committee and I don't suppose you heard about it, but I did say that I thought a start should be made by increasing the stipend of Mr. Speaker, and I recall that the Premier undertook to take it under advisement, but didn't do it. I think that this matter should still be reviewed, and if the government has this whole matter under review, that something should be done about it, because everyday on this side of the house, I am quite sure, recognizes that the salaries which are presently paid have fallen a long way behind current salaries for current relative responsibility in the private and the business world. So I make it perfectly clear that I do not cavil in any way at the amount of the expense accounts. All I say is that the government ought to come clean with the legislature and the people of Saskatchewan, and tell us what those expense accounts are based upon. They shouldn't have had to wait a whole year to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier — I am sorry he is not in the chamber — quoted yesterday, of the day he participated in this debate, from a magazine called "Canadian Cattlemen", and he quoted a passage from an editorial in that magazine, the issue of October 1965, which criticized the west coast trade unions in their salary negotiations with their employers. The statement which he quoted was one which was very critical of these working men, these sweepers and grain handlers. I thought it might have been a good thing if the Premier had read a little more of this editorial as that the house could have judged from what position this editorial speaks. This editorial went on to say something which I think would interest the Premier, and perhaps the members of his government. It says:

Which Road to Socialism?

and then it goes on to say:

So, at each election, and frequently now between them, the game is to invent government give-aways,

possibly the most startling in recent months was the announcement that Premier Thatcher's Liberal government, which turned out a left-wing Socialist power, but kept Medicare, is now going for Home-owner grants, like they have in Social Credit B.C. If you pay municipal taxes the government gives you a rebate. Fifty dollars is a nice even figure. This scheme has made Premier Bennett's B.C. government smell like roses among small property holders. So why shouldn't it work in Saskatchewan?

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is an editor who thinks that the present Premier is rabid progressive, an ultra progressive left-winger who ought to be discouraged and this editorial says so. So, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Premier would quote that editorial as authority for anything, unless of course, he quotes it with approval. He also acknowledges that the \$50 Home-owner grant is just a bribe to the people of Saskatchewan, as alleged in the editorial. If he believes that then perhaps we know a little more about what goes on inside the Premier. As a matter of fact, the Premier said something in his speech that other day – I can't quote exactly what it was – but he said something which he attributed to Sir Winston Churchill. This statement attributed Socialists some kind of corrupt, or venal moral outlook, and accused them of envy and so on. I suggest that that statement was made at about the time the Premier of this province was a Socialist, or at least was claiming to be one.

I suggest that the Premier is in a better position to judge whether or not the statement of Winston Churchill may apply to some Socialists because he know just how he felt about it when he was claiming to be a Socialist. Apparently he thinks that those words adequately describe the Socialist that he was, but for his information I tell him that it does not describe the Socialists who sit on this side of your Honour.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne — and I would like to turn my attention to it now — makes reference to a proposal by the government to introduce legislation to permit full realization of the irrigating benefits of the South Saskatchewan River Development Project, to permit full realization of the irrigating benefits of the project. Now that, of course, has a nice generous sound. Se people free to enjoy the benefits of something. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we look forward with some anxiety to the legislation. There is some suggestion by the Premier and by the other government spokesmen that the legislation contemplates taking away certain rights, which farmers have in the province now, and the setting up of irrigation districts. I know that the government, and Liberal spokesmen generally, have made much of the fact that there was an agreement between the province of Saskatchewan, entered into back in 1958 with the government of Canada, to provide certain works sufficient to permit the irrigation of some 50,000 acres of land in the various areas that are capable of being irrigated. But, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that every one knew then and

I think it is still acknowledged that there were from 250 to 500,000 acres capable of being irrigated in Saskatchewan by that project. To suggest that the government in entering into that agreement had singled out the farmers of the Broderick area for compulsory irrigation is to put a construction on that agreement that is not justified. The government contemplated, of course, that it would have policies which would encourage irrigation to the extent of some 50,000 acres. The government that day contemplated that it could have works in existence to carry the water for irrigation of that number of acres. But there was nowhere implicit, or explicit, in the agreement, or in the government policy of that day, that this particular 50,000 acres was going to be selected by the government for irrigation.

Indeed, the previous government was carrying on public relations activities in a number of areas adjacent to Outlook, areas comprising several times the area of the Broderick district. It was the hope of the government that if sufficiently generous and humane policies could be advanced to those people, that in that general area it would be possible to find a block of some 50,000 acres where the people were prepared and willing to undertake to irrigate their land and to pay the costs of water rights.

Now this government, apparently, has singled out a particular area which is mostly in the constituency of Hanley, and has said that this is where the irrigation is going to be whether you like it or not. The government has made suggestions that it is going to pass legislation to deprive the farmers of that area of any say in the matter!

The Premier says they are buying up land in the area, and that they have bought up, I think he said, some 12,500 or 12,700 acres, and that I guess is true. Although it may be an exaggeration, it is at least in part true. The fact is that nobody in that area is able to sell land to anyone because nobody in the free market will purchase land in that area. I haven't heard of a single land sale to a private individual in that designated area since two years ago. I am told by people who live there that there is no market for land in that area, there is no sale of land in that area, except to the government. I say this, the government has created conditions in that area which gives them a monopoly on the purchase of land. To say that that is making government funds available on a voluntary basis for the purchase of land on a voluntary basis, I suggest, is to qualify the truth.

The fact is that if the land is not being taken by the harsh processes of expropriation, it is being taken by something which is equally repulsive, that is the deprivation of any alternative market for that land. The government is paying something like \$50 an acre, according to the last prices I have seen, with an extra allowance of \$10, \$15, or \$20 if the land is in Class A, B, or C, irrigable shape. Then, of course, they are paying something in addition for buildings, I understand.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have occasion in my law practice to

see land being bought and sold around the Saskatoon area. I want to say quite frankly that those prices are at least one-third, or more, short of the average market price of land. I want to say that in the Saskatoon area, and I mean in the 50 mile radius around Saskatoon, fair average land is selling for well over \$100 an acre. For the government to be taking this land at \$70 or \$65 an acres is, I say, unfair to those people there.

But, Mr. Speaker, the complaint I have goes back much further than this. I say that the government oughtn't to have to buy this land, oughtn't to have to evict these farmers or push them out. If the government would come forward with some kind of irrigation policy that was acceptable to the rural and financial responsibility for the burdens of irrigation, if the government would under-write the costs and under-write the markets for the products of irrigation farming, I am sure that there people in that area and around Saskatoon in general, who would be more than willing to give it a try if it could be tried on a fair basis, if it could be tried on the basis of a fair prospect for return for investment for their labor. The fact that there has not been a single person come to that area to my knowledge offering to purchase land, so that they can get in on the proposed new irrigation project, convinces me that the present terms with the government offers are inadequate and sadly deficient.

Mr. D. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — What did you offer?

Mr. Walker: — And so, Mr. Speaker . . . what did we offer? Well, what did you offer before that again? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the time for making an offer had not arrived prior to 1964. Now this government has been in office for two years and it has not enunciated a policy yet which is acceptable to the farmers of that area. The time is drawing short, the time is getting close, and the government ought to come forward with some policy to those people which they will find acceptable. I know those people, Mr. Speaker. They are reasonable people, they are educated people in the ways of farming and in the ways of business, and they know when a thing is sour. The look at it, and they know that this government's offer is just a bad tomato.

Mr. Speaker, I think there aren't enough members of this legislature, or people in the province who know what the government's policy is. The Ministers themselves don't know, don't seem to know. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) went up to Broderick and assured the farmers there that it was the policy or the intention of the government to relocate people who couldn't get relocated, to remove them if they wanted to be moved, and place them on other equivalent holdings somewhere else. He no sooner got back to Regina than the Premier speaking at a Liberal meeting here in Regina, denied that the government had any such plans. So I say that the government hasn't done a good job on making its policy known, if it has a policy.

So, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this legislature a committee, I think it is the Select Committee on Agriculture, composed of member of this house, whose job it is to consider farm problems and the agricultural policies of the government. I would suggest that that committee be convened, that it be convened at as early a date as possible, that the farmers of that area be invited to come in and make their complaints and their position know to this committee, so that the people of Saskatchewan will have some knowledge of what is the root cause of their dissatisfaction, and this government submit to the committee its legislation for public hearings and for public comment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Walker: — I would say that the government may be able to make out a case for riding roughshod over the rights of these farmers, for depriving them of their right to vote before being forced into an irrigation district. But if they can make such a case they ought to be able to make one before a committee of this legislature, particularly when they overload them with Liberal members as they sometimes seem to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I had the utmost difficulty in reading the Speech from the Throne, to really get down to the hard facts which the government proposes to put forth. You read such things as this; for instance company registrations in 1965 increased by about 20 per cent over 1964. Now that may very well be true, and if it is true, it is simply a repetition of facts, of a fact which has existed for many years in this province, that company registrations have been going up and up and up. However, Mr. Speaker, to any person who simply looks at the bare facts, company registrations in 1965 increased about 20 per cent over 1964. Well, I recall a client who had a business in Saskatoon in partnership. He certainly started wondering whether the stability of this province was as great as it had been prior to 1964. It passed through his mind that we might have another depression as we had before under Liberal government and that he might lose his home if his business went broke, so he got busy and he formed a company so that he would be, so that his home would be safe in case his business went broke. It may be that he is one of this 20 per cent increase in company registrations over 1964. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, merely stating the bald fact doesn't really prove anything. It really doesn't prove anything. I don't know what it is intended to prove. It's just sort of thrown out by . . .

Mr. Steuart: — It is a better field out here . . . fellow paying taxes . . .

Mr. Walker: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member brings that up. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing which the hon. member and his colleagues used in the Hanley by-election and they got their snouts kicked for it. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that

since he brings this up and I haven't bothered to answer this anywhere else in Saskatchewan, but since the hon. member brings it up, the record is plain and simple. The fact is there was not just one city worker who had a home in that municipality who paid taxes on his land and not on his houses. There were several others, one of whom is an official of the Liberal party, a high official of the provincial executive of the Liberal party. He paid no taxes on his home either. His home is just up here six miles north, a well-known doctor who raises a few horses and pays taxes on his land but not on his buildings, and the family resided in those buildings and attended the local school.

Mr. Steuart: — Who is it?

Mr. Walker: — So, Mr. Speaker, there were no less than a dozen or more people in that municipality who, by reason of small agricultural holdings, paid not taxes on their buildings because they owned land which was agricultural and which was used for that purpose. As a matter of fact an attempt was made by a Liberal friend of the Minister over there to raise this matter at a municipal convention. It was discussed at a municipal convention, but it has not been discussed since the government changed. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I paid the exact taxes that I am required by law to pay, just as everyone else did in the municipality there. But this is an example of the kind of dirty, cheap, little politics that seems to find itself right at home in the garbage can between the ears of the Minister of Public Health and some of the people he had working for him in Hanley constituency in 1964. They finally gave him his answer, Mr. Speaker.

Now I want to say one of two other things about the Speech from the Throne. I think those of us in Hanley who see this item, "You will be asked to approve legislation that will enable construction of a multipurpose water supply scheme to meet the needs of municipalities and industries in areas south and east of Saskatoon." We will welcome this but we will have some misgivings about what the government has in mind, because we will recall that the Premier announced at a potash meeting in Saskatoon that there would be a publicly owned water transmission service there for the industries of that area, and for the municipalities of that area. You will recall that the potash company at Allen had asked for permission to build a private line. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the premier flatly ruled out that request, and then you will recall that one Herb C. Pinder made a statement at the same meeting, regretting that the Premier had committed himself to this kind of Socialistic nonsense. He even went so far as to say that he had had strong words with the Premier before the Premier made his announcement. Well, I would say that, if he had strong words with the Premier, the Premier had strong words with him too, because I think every member on that side of the house knows how strong they can be. I, for one, found myself applauding the Socialistic instincts of the Premier that he was going to do the right thing about this. But then as time went on, I noticed that he did agree to allow a temporary line to be erected by the potash company. His first instinct was right, that if there is going to be money spent on

water lines, then this should be available as a public carrier to all people, and not as a private line, because the potash company can obviously build all the lines they want. The municipalities can't afford to have a duplication of line for the cost per 1000 cubic feet goes up. Of course, this doesn't bother the potash company but it bothers people living in little villages and towns who have no water supply. So he was right when he said that this should be a public carrier owned by the public. But I hope that his relenting will not set back or delay or interfere with the efficiency of the proposal which he lays down here. I hope that although he doesn't say so in the Speech from the Throne, he intends that this will be a public body carrying water for the public, as a public carrier, and that this will not be a scheme owned by Mr. Pinder, or any of his friends. The Speech from the Throne doesn't say this. I hope it is a public body, a public organization answerable to the government, so that we will in our area welcome the construction of any kind of provision for the regular supply of water to the people and the industries there.

He speaks of housing. Every member of this house, I think, will concede that something needs to be done, not only about the deficiency of housing in our urban areas, but about the sad state and the dilapidated state of many of the homes in our rural areas. The previous government did a great deal to improve this situation by introducing its Farm Sewer and Water Program. I notice this is one kind of Socialism that the Premier didn't turn off. He is boasting about what it did last year.

The present government now that this problem is being taken care of ought to do something constructive about assisting in re-housing not only in urban areas but in rural areas. Yet the suggestion of the creation of a "housing entity" seems to refer to or be dependent upon industrialization. I would hope that the entity, whatever that is, will be available to give assistance also in rural areas.

The Speech from the Throne also takes a brief bow in the direction of consumer-protection legislation. I congratulate the government for taking this faltering, hesitant, small step in this direction, but when I think about it it looks to me as though this legislation is really introduced more at the behest of the used car dealers than of the public. I hope that it provides real and genuine protection to the public and is not aimed principally at restricting competition among used car dealers, because there are used car dealers who may be put out of business by some arbitrary standards that might be set up, who really have a place in the business, who really do have an effect in terms of keeping prices down, in terms of keeping costs down. I hope that there will be no legislation here which will put out of business anyone who is presently in this business, who is rendering a real service to the public, simply on the grounds that they don't have so many square feet of show room, floor space or anything like that. I hope that the legislation is genuinely aimed at helping the public and not the established used car dealers. But we'll have to wait to see it. I note the Attorney General nods his head apparently in agreement with what

February 14, 1966

I am saying and I take some reassurance from that fact.

I think that this is an area which the government might go much further in, Mr. Speaker, this business of consumer protection. The previous government went some considerable distance. Indeed the consumer protection legislation of the previous government did cause some political embarrassment to the government because we introduced it too abruptly and sometimes a little ahead of public demand. I think now that the government ought to take advantage of the public demand to extend itself in that direction.

I said something the other day about this government's record so far as civil rights is concerned, so far as the rights of the public is concerned. I was sorry to hear the Premier make his usual anti-labor jibes as he did his usual attempt to implicate the CCF and the trade union movement in some kind of behind the barn deal. I can't help but feel that this stems from a lack of respect which the Premier has for the democratic rights of anybody who has less money or less power than he has. I think that the Premier ought to remember that there are many people in this country who don't have the social position or the financial resources or the influence which he has. They don't have the same access to the courts that he might have because of their lack of financial resources. The Premier ought to remember that to the working people of this country some kind of co-operative or group action is the only way by which they can protect and secure and establish their rights both economic and political. I notice that the Premier did not make any complaint when the president of Rio-Algoma or Rio-Tinto or whatever it is, came to my constituency and intervened in a by-election campaign there. He didn't raise any complaint about people in industry having no place involving themselves in politics but for workers, he thinks the rule should be different. Workers ought to be excluded from using their democratic privileges to gain economic and political advantages for themselves.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) is another who does his best to disparage and deprecate the rights of working people to engage in any way they should see fit, freely and without any compulsion or interference from the government in exercising their political rights. So he spoke down in Moose Jaw the other day and tried to create the impression that the Trade Union Movement was somehow injuring its own members when it engaged in political activity. I wish he would go to the Chamber of Commerce and tell them that. It would have more effect there and more cogency and it would be more justified if he would tell them that. But to go to Moose Jaw and try to leave the impression, the insinuation that just because two members of this legislature happen, in their off-duty hours in this legislature, to be employed by the trade union movement, and because they happen to engage in their political capacity in some political activity in a by-election, the hon. member, the Minister of Public Works thinks that somehow this is reprehensible, that they shouldn't be permitted to do this because they are also trade unionists, because in their other capacity

they are trade union officials. It may please him if trade unionists wouldn't and evidently it does please him that co-operative people so far haven't directly engaged in political affairs. It would please him too if nobody would engage in political affairs except Liberals. This would please him obviously. This I suggest is a totalitarian frame of mind, a concept which ought to be hidden and ought not to be displayed publicly. If he really thinks this, the less he says about it the better because thinking people would look at it and will judge his attitude towards the rights of his fellow man by this kind of thing. So I suggest that the Premier in attacking trade unionists because they engage in the free enterprise practices of this system ought to remember that we can read more out of what he is saying than he apparently thinks in this connection.

Now, the Premier made the suggestion that the members of the CCF-NDP – he complained about the difficulties that farmers were having in obtaining the delivery and export of their 1965 wheat crop – ought to direct our political friends in the trade union movement to abandon, to give up their right to bargain collectively for their wages and for their working conditions, and that they ought to devote themselves singlemindedly in handling the wheat on whatever terms their employer might choose to impose. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier often likes to mouth phrases, give utterance to the thought that free enterprise is his goal, free enterprise is his faith, his credo, but this I suggest is really a sham. If he doesn't really believe that workers themselves also have the right to bargain for the sale of their labor just the same as farmers and others, professional people, have the right to bargain for the sale of their labor then he doesn't really believe in the private enterprise system.

But when the Premier is currying favor with the voters of this province, he seems to completely disregard the rights of a minority, particularly a minority who have no vote in Saskatchewan or in his constituency. I suggest that this is just political expediency on his part. To suggest that the grain handlers ought to be deprived of their right to bargain freely for their services, this is a totalitarian concept directed against a small minority because they don't have any votes in Saskatchewan. It is in keeping, it is in line with the crude attack which this Liberal government made against one C.E. Basken, former Power Corporation employee. This I say is the harshest, the most unjustified assault against political freedom in this province in a quarter century. I hold no brief for Mr. Basken. I don't even know him. I'm not personally acquainted with him. I've never heard of him until he was singled out for assault by this government. He was an employee apparently of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The legislation under which the Power Corporation is established gives him just as much right as an employee to engage in political activity as any other employee in any other business or industry in Saskatchewan. There is no right, either in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation Act or in his contract of employment, or in his union agreement for his employer to interfere with or dictate or restrict or curtail

his political rights.

What were the facts with regard to Mr. Basken's political activity? Well, it's all recorded in the report of the committee that the government appointed, the fact-finding committee that the government appointed to look into it. Early in 1964 Mr. Basken undertook to apply for leave of absence from his job with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation so that he would be free to devote himself to political activity and the leave of absence was granted without pay for six weeks prior to the election, commencing on March 9, 1964. On that date he commenced work as an employee of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor on behalf of the CCF in that election. There is no law against that anywhere. He went back to work a few days after the election and from April 27 to September 9 no complaint was made to him by an official of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation or by anyone else about his activities on his own time during that election campaign. After he went back to work on April 27 he was given two or three days leave of absence which was part of his annual holidays, and he still had two weeks of his annual holidays that he had not used, to attend a CCF convention which I believe was in Regina. Apparently he also attended another CCF meeting one evening after work during his off-duty hours. Now these facts are clearly on the record of the hearing of the Board of Conciliation that was appointed by the government to gather the facts in connection with this matter. There is no evidence to disagree with those facts. Those facts are undisputed. On September 9, so the evidence shows, he was called in by his supervisor and, it is clear from the hearing of the Board of Conciliation which was later set up, he was told that he should not be speaking against the government. Later, on September 24, he was called in by the acting general manager, Mr. Clipsham at that time, who said according to the evidence which uncontradicted by any other evidence appearing before this fact-finding board and I quote:

We have received word from higher authorities,
Mr. Clipsham said,
that you are to be moved out of Swift Current and we are offering you the position of roving district operator in Saskatoon.

Well, there was no such position at Saskatoon as roving district operator. This would have meant that had Mr. Basken gone to Saskatoon he would be surplus staff there, subject to usual exigencies that apply to surplus staff.

The acting general manager was asked what would happen if Basken refused a transfer. According to the sworn testimony contained in the transcript the general manager said – this is not contradicted by any evidence called by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation or anyone else – “It's either Basken or . . .”and then he made a gesture of drawing his finger across his own throat. That evidence is not contradicted by any testimony which the Power Corporation put in or that anyone else put in. This is undoubtedly the fact.

It's pretty clear to anyone who knows the facts that the action which was taken against Mr. Basken was purely and simply disciplinary action aimed at persecuting him on behalf of the Liberal party. I would like to read from paragraph 29 of the Minority Report of the Conciliation Board as follows:

A meeting of the executive council of the union was convened later on the same date.

That is on October 1st, 1964, in Moose Jaw with Mr. Basken present.

The Canadian director of the union, Mr. R. Duncan was in attendance and the meeting agreed that Mr. Duncan should try to meet with the Hon. H. C. Pinder, Minister in charge of the corporation. A further meeting of the central executive took place on October 2 at which Mr. Duncan reported a telephone meeting with the Minister in which the Minister informed Mr. Duncan that he was calling from the Premier's office, that they had discussed the matter of Mr. Basken and could find no reason to change their attitude and that they were following through in accordance with the actions which they had already started.

That's Mr. Duncan's sworn testimony in the transcript, not contradicted anywhere and indeed, corroborated by Mr. Brown of the Power Corporation, the only witness produced by the Power Corporation in the hearing.

The result was, Mr. Speaker, that when Mr. Basken refused to accept this transfer to Saskatoon, a transfer to a position which had no legal existence, he received a letter from the general manager on October 5th dismissing him from the corporation. When Mr. Basken applied to the Minister of Labor for a conciliation board, to investigate his complaint and to try to conciliate this difference of opinion, Mr. G.J.D. Taylor, Q.C. of Saskatoon was nominated by the union to represent Mr. Basken on this conciliation board. To represent the employer, the Power Corporation, Mr. Robert H. McKercher who I believe at last report is the secretary of the Saskatoon Liberal Association, or president, I'm sorry, of the Saskatoon Liberal Association, was appointed to represent the corporation. I make no quarrel with this because the employer and the employee representative are normally nominees of the interests of those two groups. I don't quarrel with it, I simply say that Mr. McKercher is avowedly an apologist for the Liberal party and a Liberal party official.

Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — How about . . .

Mr. Walker: — I've already said, I don't quarrel with the fact that these people are nominees of their respective interests and do represent them but just so that the record will be clear, I want to make it understood that Mr. McKercher represents the, is an official of the Liberal party. When these two people . . .

Mr. Stuart: — Can you tell me where Mr. Taylor is from?

February 14, 1966

Mr. Walker: — Yes, he is an alderman in Saskatoon and the president of the Saskatoon CCF Association. I thought that was known to my hon. friend.

Mr. Steuart: — I thought maybe you wanted to go back and . . .

Mr. Walker: — I want to make it clear that I don't disagree with these people having a right to have a political or partisan affiliation. But when these two people were unable to agree on a chairman what happened, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of Labour appointed one Allistair M. Nicol of this city, another defeated Liberal Candidate, to act as the impartial arbiter of this board, to act as the chairman of this board. Well, I think we know who Mr. Al Nichol is. He has been a Liberal functionary for as long as I have known him and I've known him for more than 20 years. He comes up to my constituency periodically. He holds meetings in Hanley, the town of Hanley, and I haven't lost the town of Hanley since the last time he was up there.

Mr. Steuart: — How about old man . . .

Mr. Walker: — This chairman, Mr. Speaker, is an aspirant Liberal politician who tried for a nomination and wasn't even able to get it. Now when you look at the kind of people who got Liberal nominations this speaks volumes in itself, Mr. Speaker, without intending any disrespect to yourself. Sir.

Mr. Steuart: — You better be careful.

Mr. Walker: — Now, no one will question or cavil at the fact that the dismissal of Mr. Basken was a political act. This fact that it was a political act is confirmed, in the case there are any doubting Thomases here who don't believe it, by a staff news-letter put out at the direction of Mr. Herb Pinder on October 2, 1964. This is dated just about three weeks after Mr. Basken had been fired. This is what Mr. Pinder is quoted as saying in this company organ, as follows:

Before the change of government the Liberals in opposition promised no witch-hunt in the civil service or crown corporations

I might say that it's a bit of an innovation for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation official newsletter to start talking about Liberals and Conservatives but apparently things have changed since last April. Now they talk about what Liberals said and what the CCFers and Conservatives said. Apparently politics is now unabashedly forward and the employees . . .

An Hon. Member: — More Penny Powers . . .

Mr. Walker: — . . . the employees are no

longer able to disregard their employer's political affiliation. They are told, this is what it says:

All employees performing their function honestly and impartially were assured of continued productive employment in the interest of the province.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that there was no suggestion anywhere in this conciliation report that Mr. Basken did not perform his functions honestly and impartially. No suggestion whatever. But going on . . .

At the same time . . .

This is Mr. Pinder speaking

At the same time, and without equivocation, it was stated that those who chose to take or continue a political position while employed directly or indirectly by the government on behalf of the public, would be placing their employment in jeopardy.

You see the inconsistency between those statements between those statements. The first statement says as long as they were performing their function honestly and impartially they were assured of continued productive employment in the interests of the province. This is the statement, Mr. Speaker, which the Premier made to the civil servants the day that he took office and I applaud the statement. It is a good statement. Unfortunately it wasn't a true statement like many of his statements. But the second statement went on and added a qualification which contradicted the original statement by saying that if they took a political position, not in their place of employment or during their hours of work, but if they took a position, period, they would be placing their employment in jeopardy.

Then it goes on:

Almost all public employees have maintained a neutral political attitude as a wise sensible course and their continued loyalty to Saskatchewan through its government is a quality to be admired.

Some, however, chose to involve themselves in party politics during the election and some have continued to align themselves against the government.

Do you get the significance, Mr. Speaker, "Some, however, chose to . . .

Mr. Steuart: — We get it all right.

Mr. Walker: — "Some, however, chose to involve themselves in party politics during the election". Revenge, retaliation, Mr. Speaker, is cloaked by those words.

Mr. Steuart: — Irish math.

February 14, 1966

Mr. Walker: — “. . . and some have continued to align themselves against the government.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is then pretty plain that the Power Corporation has decided to make support of the opposition the price of the job of the employee. It goes on to say:

One such case is now under management consideration. He chose to act as a campaign manager in the last election and as such become involved in serious political controversy despite clear warning of possible consequences.

He says that “one such case is now under management consideration”. This newsletter is dated October 23. Mr. Basken was dismissed on October 5th. That’s a downright lie, Mr. Speaker, that this was still under consideration. It was not true. It’s not true and it’s not the only thing in this statement that is not true.

Mr. Steuart: — Might be another one.

An Hon. Member: — . . . make another speech next year.

Mr. Walker: — And the statement goes on. And so, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of . . . there’s nothing to substantiate that Basken engaged in any kind of political activity during his employment with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. If there was any evidence of that, why didn’t the Crown put it in? Why didn’t the Crown put it before the commission? Before the board of conciliation? No, as a matter of fact, the other misstatement is that he wasn’t the campaign manager. But that’s incidental. You can expect to find at least two factual errors in a statement that length and in this one there are four.

The statement also said, of course, that Mr. Basken persisted or engaged in this activity despite clear warnings of probable consequences. Well, Mr. Speaker, the statement itself doesn’t hang together. It says that his sin was in acting as campaign manager for one of the candidates before the election. Then it says, however, we had to fire him because he didn’t heed our warnings. The fact is that the warnings, if any, could not have been given before the alleged offence had been committed because Mr. Pinder wasn’t the Minister until after Mr. Basken was back at work. So the statement is untrue in at least three or four respects.

The first question, the first issue to come before the board of conciliation when it was set up, was the question of whether the hearings should be in public or in private. I should think that the Liberal party has nothing to fear from the press of the province but they apparently feel they have. They weren’t willing that the hearings ought to be in public. There is a long tradition, Mr. Speaker, in Canadian and British law

that inquiry proceedings such as this should not only observe the rules of natural justice but they should be held in such a manner that every citizen can manifestly see, that it is manifestly clear to every citizen that the rules of natural justice are being observed.

By a two to one decision, the commission decided that it would not hold public hearings. Mr. McKercher said he was opposed to them and the chairman decided that the hearings should be confidential. I think that the editorial in the Leader Post of January 20, 1965, put the issue very well. I said:

Inevitably when decisions are reached to hold hearings behind closed doors, suspicions are aroused that there is something to hide and that there are apprehensions the disclosures may be unpalatable.

And it goes on to say:

The only difference between the closed and open hearings is that the evidence is presented behind closed doors, or in public, with interested persons being permitted to attend to listen to the testimony and the news media being free to keep the public informed.

With sittings in camera, public knowledge of what went on will be restricted to contents of the report prepared by the board and what is garnered by hearsay. The people are entitled to a full disclosure of the facts in the Basken affair. This they can only obtain if the hearings are conducted in the open.

Well, Mr. Speaker, fortunately, one of the members of this board, who was an eminent lawyer of this province, who dissented from the findings of the majority and who had the legal training and the conspicuous integrity which enabled him not only to understand the minority point of view, but to express it very well. He has done so in the report of the Board of Conciliation. Indeed, I recommend that the report to the reading of every member of this house if they want to see what the Liberal government is doing in this regard. It may be said by some Liberal spokesmen that Mr. Taylor's point of view merely represents the union point of view. Of course, it was found out to be true that his point of view does represent their attitude; but if it is suggested that any of the conclusions which he enunciated in the report are not borne out by the evidence given by the hearing, then I invite the Minister of Labour to lay the whole transcript of the report on the table of this house, so that members of this house can read the whole transcript of the hearing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Walker: — And I invite him furthermore, to select and read to this house any passages in the transcript which do not substantiate, which contradict the conclusion reached by Mr. Taylor in his report. Unless some member of the other side is prepared to do that then I think people of this house and the people

of the province have a right to assume that his conclusions are unanswerable.

It appears from the minority report, Mr. Speaker, that the public was not to have the opportunity of hearing what was disclosed before the committee, but it appears there was an even more serious limitation, the committee itself decided not to get the whole story. If we refer to paragraph 49 of the minority report, we find that each side had furnished to the other side a copy of what purported to be a statement setting out all the documents in the possession of that side relating to the matter in issue. It soon appeared, however, that the Power Corporation had refrained from disclosing three letters which it had. It refrained from disclosing the existence of these three letters until they were asked for by the board. First there was a letter from the Power Corporation dated July 6th, 1964, from Mr. Pinder to Mr. David Beggs, who was at that time the General Manager. There was a letter dated July 8th, 1964 from Mr. Cass Beggs back to the Minister to the Acting General Manager, who by this time was Mr. Clipsham. The Power Corporation took the position that these documents were privileged and that they could not be produced, even though the committee was meeting in private.

The Corporation's position was bolstered by an affidavit made by one David Gordon Steuart, that as Minister in charge, he had, he said, examined the communications and he said:

that I have come to my independent decision, after considering the material submitted in full, that the communications belong to a class of documents which, on the grounds of public interest, must be withheld from production.

That was the position taken by the Minister. "His independent conclusion".

Mr. Steuart: — Independent . . .

Mr. Walker: — It should be noted that this Board of Inquiry, Mr. Speaker, was prepared to accept that independent conclusion of the Hon. David Gordon Steuart. Well, there are many people who wouldn't. It should be noted that it was nowhere argued, anywhere before this commission, no place in the evidence was it argued that the documents were irrelevant to the issue before the board. It was only argued that the Crown simply didn't want to produce them. Fortunately, Mr. Taylor in his minority opinion quoted from the evidence and the argument before the board. I think that this brief extract from the record, taken from the transcript for January 25th, 26th, and 27th, page 139, is most illuminating. Mr. McLeod who was the counsel for the employee, Mr. Basken, said:

I would respectfully submit, that if this inquiry

is to be a useful one that the board should exercise its power and examine, not some of the facts involved in this case, but all of them. In that connection, it may be of some interest to consider what the duty of the board is. The board was appointed by the Crown to investigate matters in which the Crown is involved. Now can the Crown having given the board that duty and function, how can the Crown turn around and have its cake and eat it too: can they approbate, and reprobate: can they blow hot and cold; can the Crown, having placed upon this board the duty to investigate and inquire, then turn around and say 'well, I am sorry but you can't investigate and inquire into certain areas of this matter'?

The Chairman — You are assuming in that statement that these documents might be relevant, which is another matter.

Mr. McLeod: — I am not, if I may say so, making that assumption, Mr. Chairman, because I have seen the documents. I am quite prepared to say that they are relevant and that they appear on their face to be relevant and I don't have to make any assumptions as far as I am concerned.

The Chairman: — Well, I do.

Mr. McLeod: — Well, you have my . . .

and he was interrupted.

Mr. Taylor: — It is not disputed between counsel, is it as far as counsel is concerned?

The Chairman: — I don't think it is admitted at all. You endeavored to get that admission from Mr. McIntyre yesterday, as I understand, Mr. Taylor, and you didn't make it, to my knowledge.

Mr. Taylor: — Are we to be left in a position, if I might direct a question now, is it the position of counsel for the corporation, and is it the position of counsel for the Crown, that this board must, because of the position taken here by the Crown, be left in any doubt that, if admitted, these documents would be material to the issue? Are we to be left in doubt? Is a veil of secrecy to be thrown over that position?

Mr. McIntyre: — Is this question directly from the board or one member of the board?

Mr. Taylor: — My question.

Mr. McIntyre: — If the board wants to inquire then I will put it to the board very simply. You asked me yesterday and I told you the name of

C. E. Basken appeared in every one.

It is not denied, Mr. Speaker, that these documents were relevant, it is admitted that Mr. Basken's name appears in every one of them. Yet the government takes the position that having constituted a committee to find the facts and report to the government what it should do, that the government should deny that committee access to the very facts on which it should base its report. How much credence or confidence can be placed in any report submitted to the government, where the government itself has denied the committee access to the information which the government asked the committee to report on?

You have the situation where the government-appointed chairman, and the government-appointed member of the board, threw a veil of secrecy around the proceedings of the board, and in that very next breath drew a veil of secrecy around these three most relevant letters by not even allowing the board to have access to them.

Well, the matter was referred by the board to the Court of appeal, and the Court of Appeal, I say with deference, I agree with them, ruled that the board had the legal right to refuse to see the documents, or refuse to compel the documents to be produced if it wished. This doesn't relieve the board of the responsibility of having made that decision. According to the Court of Appeal it had the right to refuse to see the documents, but nowhere did the Court of Appeal say that it was its duty to refuse to see them.

The next issue that appeared to arise was: who had the responsibility for the burden of proof? Who had to carry the onus of establishing his case before the board? Was it really necessary for the employee to show that he had been employed and that he had been unjustly dismissed without notice? Well, the rule is that if an employee shows that he has been employed, and if he shows that he has been dismissed without notice, the onus falls then on the employer to show that he was dismissed justifiably. This is a well-known rule of the Common Law in this province enunciated by the Court of appeal case of Butler vs. the CNR, a 1939 decision. For the benefit of the Attorney General, reported in volume 3, W.W.R.625.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — 1939 . . .

Mr. Walker: — Yes, and there Mr. Justice Gordon, ruled and I quote:

It is only necessary for the plaintiff to establish that he was employed for an indefinite time and that he was dismissed without notice. The onus then shifted to the defendant to prove that such a dismissal was justified.

That is the Common Law rule, but this board chose to reverse that rule, and to put the onus on the employee. This principle

is well known, Mr. Speaker, it was followed in the case of *Loren vs. Super Drug Markets Limited*. (That wasn't Loren that had trouble with the Premier, although his name is the same.) 1965, 53 W.W.R. Page 25. There, Mr. Justice Tucker quoted the words used by Mr. Justice Gordon in the *Butler* case with approval, and Mr. Justice Tucker said:

In my opinion the defendant company has failed to establish any cause for complaint which would justify the dismissal. It is clear that the onus then is on the defendant company to justify the dismissal, and so the plaintiff was entitled to reasonable notice.

So, notwithstanding this very reasonable rule, well established in the Common Law, this board, this Liberal-dominated board, overruled these well-established legal rights of Mr. Basken. They reversed the rule. They required that Mr. Basken should bear the onus and that he should lead his evidence first.

Well, the minority report of the board, page 72, says this:

The corporation, never at any time, during the course of the entire proceedings, produced any evidence to justify its conduct. Had the corporation been called upon to do so, in the first instance, as it should have been, the board's inquiry would have been soon completed.

Because the plain fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the corporation produced no justification before that committee for that dismissal. None whatever, and I invite the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), or anybody else who has access to that report to find justification in that report put forward by the corporation justifying that dismissal.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — You'll have your answers.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, you have this Liberal politician at the head of the board, denying the public access to the proceedings before the board, the right to hear the proceedings, and denying the board access to the three most relevant documents in connection with this whole matter, and the board slavishly going along with the government's position in that regard.

I intend to make some other reference to proceedings before this board that showed that the Premier himself is either exceedingly careless about the statements of fact which he makes concerning this matter, or he is ignorant of the most fundamental and basic facts involving the dismissal of Mr. Basken.

If we refer, Mr. Speaker, to page 47 of the minority report, we find a lengthy direct quotation from the evidence and I would just like to read it. Well, there may be some members

February 14, 1966

of this house who have the same cavalier attitude toward justice and people's rights, but I suggest that this doesn't apply to all members of the house.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare): — Take it as read.

Mr. Coderre: — Like your little gimmick on telephones.

Mr. Walker: — Here is the answer given by Mr. Basken. Sworn before the tribunal.

We went into the matter of the dismissal . . . No, this is the evidence . . .

Mr. Guy: — Why don't you come prepared?

An Hon. Member: — Time out . . .

Mr. Walker: — This is the evidence of Mr. Gilbey, which I want to read, who was actually present, and the member for Athabasca wasn't present, even if he had been there he wouldn't have been present. The member for Athabasca, Mr. Speaker, is loquacious in direct proportion to his ignorance. The less he knows the more he says. This is the evidence, Mr. Speaker, of the man who was there, who went on the stand and testified under oath, and was not contradicted by anyone. This is what he said:

We went into the matter of Mr. Basken,

And he pointed out that he is referring to a meeting that was held in the Premier's office, he says Mr. Pinder was also there.

it was in violation of our collective agreement; we pointed to the difficulty we were already experiencing in trying to process the matter of the grievance, and informed the Premier that he had leave of absence and was entitled to do as he was doing, and we told the Premier, as the newspapers reported him, (that is the Premier) as believing him politically active on the job, that if this was his information, then he had been misinformed. We went into quite a few facts of the case, and indicated we were having extreme difficulty, in the fact we were totally unsuccessful in getting management to properly discuss the matter altogether with us, and that management had told us the action was the action of management. At this point he said (that is the Premier) 'Let me set the record straight, the actions and the instructions came from this desk – from my desk'. He was tapping his desk and he said, 'it came from my desk, let me put the record straight'. Then he went on to say there was another half dozen and again named a few of them. We got into quite a long discussion about the matter. Throughout this

Mr. Pinder took properly the position that 'we will leave this to the grievance hearing', sort of thing, with Mr. Thatcher being more willing to discuss it at least and give his view on it. During the discussion again, he repeated to me what he had said the day before, that another five or six were going to be fired, and then later on said, 'Perhaps we could discuss transfer for them', then one of our people, Mr. King, said, "You are willing to discuss all of the people you consider involved in these complaints, including Mr. Basken'. The Premier said 'No, Mr. Basken is out I will discuss the rest'. It was at this point that Mr. King informed the Premier that we could not accept that proposition. We had a right and freedom and we felt that we could properly arrange and we could not toss one name out even before starting any discussion.

Now, that is testimony from a man who was in the presence of the Premier and heard him say this. That testimony was not contradicted. That testimony was not contradicted . . .

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Was he smoking a cigar at the time . . .

Mr. Walker: — Yes, and I must say it sounds in character.

Mr. Steuart: — Is that what you call it practicing law?

Mr. Walker: — Now, I point out again, Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, it may be tiresome to my hon. friends, but I repeat again that that version of what took place in the Premier's office was neither criticized, nor questioned by any witness on the other side. In law this means, of course, that it is acknowledged. It is an admission.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the only corporation witness who did appear was Mr. Brown, who had been an assistant personnel manager, personnel relations man, and who is now no longer employed with the Power Corporation, who is now I believe, employed with the federal civil service. Mr. Brown questioned by Mr. McLeod, and I will sum up what, no, I had better read it:

Mr. McLeod: I think that answers my question. Did management have any other information, or evidence, before it in reading its conclusion that the dismissal was justified, other than complaints from the Minister about political activities.

Mr. Brown: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. McLeod: Just tell us, if you will,

Mr. Brown, what that complaint was precisely.

Mr. Brown: I don't know what the complaint was, you see this is what I tried to explain yesterday, because all I know is what Mr. Clipsham had told me about complaints being received from the Minister. (That would be Mr. Pinder.) What the complaints were, other than Mr. Basken had been active politically in this area – this is the only knowledge I have. I can't enlighten you any further on that.

Mr. McLeod: Had the management been given any ultimatum with regard to dealing with Mr. Basken?

Mr. McIntyre interrupted this line of questioning and said:

I don't know from whom this is supposed to come but I would put my position very simply that this is an attempt to get into the area as to what was said or done by the Minister. I would object and I would think it would be proper objection on the grounds that we had the first go-around, as I remember correctly, on certain documents and other things that were privileged, and my recollection is that with respect to privilege, this was absolute.

Mr. McLeod: Well, I think he can answer my question, simply had the corporation, had management been given any ultimatum?

Mr. Brown: I don't know of any ultimatum, I am not familiar with any ultimatum at all, in my understanding of the term.

Mr. McLeod: Had management been given instructions?

Mr. Brown: I believe so.

Mr. McLeod: Can you tell me where those instructions came from?

Mr. Brown: Well, from the Minister, to my knowledge, from Mr. Pinder.

Mr. McLeod: What were these instructions?

Then Mr. McIntyre objected again.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have anything to say to that, Mr. Sandstrom?

Mr. Sandstrom objected and that ended the questions.

So, Mr. Brown acknowledged that there was political direction given to management to dismiss this man. Then after a long

legal wrangle, the questioning continued:

Mr. McLeod: You see we had arrived at the point where I had asked you what the instructions of the Minister were, and objection was taken to that question. So that now I am simply asking you not what the instructions from the Minister were, but asking whether there were something other than mere complaints which motivated the actions of management with regard to Mr. Basken?

Mr. Brown: I believe there were instructions.

Mr. McLeod: I am not asking you what they were.

Mr. Brown: No, I believe there were instructions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that makes it perfectly clear from the admission of the witness of the Power Corporation themselves, that this was not a decision made by management, but this was based on instructions from the political level – from the Minister. There is no evidence anywhere in the proceedings before the board that Mr. Basken was alleged to have engaged in political activity during working hours. None whatever. The political activity complained of, as I pointed out, took place during the period when he was on leave of absence.

Now, what do we find the Premier saying about this case. Well, I happen to have here a transcript of what the Premier said when he was questioned by an announcer of CHAB in Moose Jaw. I am sorry he is not here. The Premier was asked this question by the interviewing announcer whether he accepted the responsibility of the action taken against SPC employee, Mr. Basken, which ultimately resulted in his dismissal from the corporation.

The following is the text of the Premier's reply:

As a matter of fact it was management that handled the Basken case.

What a short memory. Quoting from memory, indeed. He told us yesterday he was quoting from memory, a man with a memory like that shouldn't be quoting from memory.

I would like to comment on it. Mr. Basken was working for the Power Corporation, and was a very, very, strong CCF organizer and worker. When the election was over, management suggested to him that, at least, in office, on company time, he should discontinue his political activities.

This is not true, there was not one shred of evidence before the commission that management asked him to discontinue his

February 14, 1966

political activities. They fired him. That was the first intimation he had from management as to his conduct. Then it goes on:

For one reason or another, apparently he choose not to do so.

Pure fabrication, Mr. Speaker, pure invention.

and management decided that in the interests of the Power Corporation, they should transfer him, not fire him. Transfer him, and this they did to Saskatoon. Mr. Basken refused the transfer at that time, management dispensed with his services.

Now, as far as I can, I have read what he said. Oh, I just want to read one more, I will read the whole thing.

Now as far as the Liberal government is concerned, we think that the man's politics on his own time is his own business.

Sure sound like it after the way Mr. Pinder scolded the employees of the Power Corporation.

We would like an individual to be discreet, we wish our Civil Service was just like the on in Ottawa, where the Civil Service doesn't interfere in politics.

Get that? Where the Civil Service doesn't interfere in politics. I hold up a clipping from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix:

Fresh Breeze Sweeps the Province, Thatcher Aide tells Young Liberals.

The past five months have been the most important period in the history of Saskatchewan, a senior provincial government official told a Saskatoon Young Liberal rally here Thursday night, Edward Odishaw, Executive Assistant to the Premier.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we wish our Civil Service was just like the one in Ottawa, where the Civil Service doesn't interfere in politics!

We don't want people out organizing fro the Liberal party on company time, or on government time, any more than the CCF. We wish the Civil Service in a general way would remain neutral. We will insist that they remain neutral on company time. What they do on their own time is their own business.

This wasn't the case with Mr. Basken. What he did on his own time apparently wasn't his own business, so the announcer, who apparently wasn't born yesterday, said:

There is o Liberal Political activity going on at

the present time, then I take it?

And the Premier's reply

Well, certainly, we haven't asked for it, and as I say, what we desire as a government is to have neutrality from the Civil Service, and from members of the Power Corporation, and in no way would we deny them any rights of any other individual.

Pure unadulterated falsehood, Mr. Speaker. He is wrong when he says it was handled by management. It was not handled by management, he knows it was not handled by management. He knows who did handle it. He can't possibly be mistaken when he says he had nothing to do with it and that it was handled by management. He is wrong when he says that Mr. Basken was engaging in political activity during working time and he is wrong when he says he chose not to discontinue his political activity when he was so instructed by management.

When he says, "What these employees do on their own time is their own business", the staff newsletter sent out under Mr. Pinder's signature gives that statement the lie.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to go into the merits of the Basken case, I'm merely using the evidence that appeared there to go into the merits of the Premier, to go into the whole question of the integrity of government, the integrity of this government.

There are some passages there, which suggest the point of view of the Liberal party, the attitude which the Liberal party takes to the 'spoils' system, to the whole question of political rewards and political punishments. I just want to quote this passage from the evidence. This is spoken by the Chairman of the Commission, the Chairman of the Board of Inquiry when he is questioning Mr. Duncan:

I am trying to understand your point of view, Mr. Duncan, to me it has always seemed peculiar that labor would tie themselves to any particular party and risk the situation that arises when that party is not in power.

In other words, labor takes the partisan point of view, that is fine when their party is in power, but when their party is out of power they may get the axe. He is right at home in association and hobnobbing with the Premier of this province.

Mr. Duncan's reply was:

Yes, we are not fortunate enough to be perhaps in the same boat as industry, where they apply the finances and this sort of thing to both parties of their choice, so they have got an 'in' either way. We feel it is a little more clear cut than that, but there are some principles and philosophies involved that just can't be shunted around from

February 14, 1966

party to party – aren't and can't because of the present structure and ideas of each of the parties.

So the Chairman then said:

Would it be correct to say this then, Mr. Duncan, that in the field of labor relations there is much more involvement than were collective bargaining?

Mr. Nicol said:

And would you not also say in the dispute which we are dealing with here it appears to have gone far beyond the realms of collective bargaining.

Mr. Duncan said:

Well, I would think it has and it hasn't. There are certain aspects of it that have hinged themselves directly upon collective bargaining, and this, of course, are the terms that have been broken. There are other things that go beyond what would normally be classed as subject matter for the collective bargaining table, and this, of course, is the laws of the province that have been ignored. Then the question that goes even further and broader than this is the laws of the country that have been ignored in the civil liberties respect.

Mr. Nicol replied:

What I am trying to suggest to you, Mr. Duncan, is that when labor chooses to go outside the field of collective bargaining and engage in partisan political activity why should labor not expect to take the consequences of that activity?

The whole philosophy of political reprisals and punishment is part of the Liberal stock-in-trade. They accept it is a natural and inevitable result of being opposed to the Liberal party, and that view is endorsed by the person who was appointed Chairman of this board.

Mr. Nicol said:

Let's take the case of a corporation that does spend money actively supporting one political party, and it loses the election – this party is not elected, but it has been out actively campaigning to elect the losing party. Should that company be surprised if it suffers the political consequences of its actions?

I was astonished, Mr. Speaker, in the last half of the 20th century that there is still a province in Canada where that kind of view prevails apparently among high circles of the Liberal party, the party in office.

Mr. Duncan says:

Would an individual in that company be fired because of that?

Mr. Nicol replies:

I am not talking about individuals within the company, I am talking about the company itself. Suppose it loses its licenses, or fails to get something that it comes to government to ask for at a later date — should it be surprised that it doesn't get these things?

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in this province and for the last twenty or twenty five years, I would say that I would be surprised if any business that came to the government for a license was denied a license, just because it didn't actively support the party in power. I would be astonished and surprised that that situation exists in Saskatchewan, but I am beginning to think that it does, under the Liberal regime in this province. These words, these connotations are not my words, Mr. Speaker. These are the words of a highly placed official of the Liberal party, who apparently has the confidence of the hon. gentlemen opposite, because he was placed in control of a fact-finding board to sit in adjudication upon the civil rights of a citizen of this province who lost his livelihood through the illegal acts of that government.

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, nonsense, poor Basken was a victim of your . . .

Mr. Walker: — He certainly was a victim of you people. If you have any evidence . . .

Mr. Steuart: — What is your evidence?

Mr. Walker: — Does the hon. member want it to be sworn, and testify now. If the hon. member wants to testify, I would like to ask him a few questions, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest he probably wouldn't answer any questions here, any more than he would if he had gone down before that board.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

An Hon. Member: — Pretty vicious at that when somebody is not here.

Mr. Walker: — I won't read it all to you, but in conclusion, the Chairman of the Board attempted to describe the firing of Mr. Basken as not an act of management, but as an act of God. There may be a few people opposite who would subscribe to that point of view, but they are not to be admired or emulated, Mr. Speaker . . .

February 14, 1966

Well, Mr. Speaker, over the years the Liberal members when sitting in the opposition used to delight in quoting from resolutions of CCF conventions, pointing out that the government of that day should have been more careful to fire or dismiss civil servants who engaged in political activity. The fact that these resolutions were passed each year by CCF conventions, I think is sufficient proof to any ordinary reasonable-minded person that the CCF government did not engage in the firing of people for political activity. There mere fact that our own party supporters complained about our refusal to do so, in my opinion, constitutes proof that the previous government was not guilty of that crime.

Mr. Coderre: — How about 20 years ago?

Mr. Walker: — But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to escape hon. gentlemen opposite that if we had complied with those resolutions, the resolutions would have ceased appearing. There would have been no repetition of them from year to year. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it shouldn't escape the attention of hon. members opposite that the previous government knowingly engaged people who were known to be Liberals, and who were engaged on the basis that they had enough integrity to do a competent and honorable job for the government even though they were Liberals. That is asking quite a lot. A former Liberal member of the legislature, was appointed, as we all remember, to a responsible civil service position, and even though The Public Service Act expressly prohibits engaging in political activity while a fulltime employee, unless you go on leave of absence, this particular civil servant was able to see out and solicit a Liberal party nomination and do a little campaigning for his political party without any leave of absence. As I understand it, civil servants of all political persuasions were allowed to do this. As I recall it, one even sought a Liberal nomination and ran against one of the members here in Regina. Even though he was a civil servant he organized and got ready and took a nomination. He chose voluntarily to resign his civil service position, but that of course, is his own business.

Under the previous government I thought we had developed a sort of humane and democratic approach to the rights of citizens, to differ with the government if they wished so long as they did a conscientious, capable job. I don't think my hon. friends can point to any evidence that that is not the situation with regard to the previous government.

Now apparently, Mr. Speaker, we have reverted to the old Gardiner days, to the old days when jobs are the reward for political service and firings are a punishment for political disobedience.

I well remember reminding this house, the first session I was here, 20 sessions ago now, of an incident that occurred back in the early 1930's down in the constituency of Weyburn. I recall that in the election in 1935, in the poll that surrounded the Weyburn Mental Hospital, where only civil servants

voted, it was discovered on election morning that seven people had voted CCF in that poll. An investigation was conducted which took several weeks. When it was discovered that they couldn't ascertain which of these employees had voted CCF, the word simply went out that seven of them had to be axed in order to show that the government meant business, and they did. They did. This is the kind of political reprisals which destroyed the village of Lidice, in Czechoslovakia, because of a Nazi storm trooper assassinated there by a citizen of the community of Lidice.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, are we now reverting to those old political pork barrel days, which Jimmy Gardiner fastened on this province back in the 1920's and continued in this province up until 1944. Certainly the evidence points that way. I can remember even three years ago, one of my constituents saying that if the Liberal government ever got into power again in Saskatchewan they would turn the hand of the clock back.

I think I got reported in one of the newspapers, and I was chided by Liberal members that I was still living in the dark ages and that I had too suspicious a mind. Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently my suspicions have been amply justified, apparently they have been confirmed. This government, apparently, not only has decided to ride roughshod over the rights of individual citizens, but then has attempted, by deceit, and by the concealing of evidence, to suppress the citizen's rights to recompense and to reinstatement. This is, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the real character of this government.

An Hon. Member: — You are way off base, Bob.

Mr. Walker: — My constituents, and many people in Saskatchewan, are expressing alarm and concern about the unreliability of the government which sits opposite. The things that have been said and done in the past two years have! I know some of his colleagues make the boast that they have successfully gagged the Premier and stopped him from saying some of these silly things, but every once in a while the gag slips off. I have here a collection of headlines which I took I know that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) is just as distressed as I am. He is a decent man who came into this legislature the same day I did. He is just as distressed as I am at some of the things that I am referring to. I can't say the same for the Minister of Health (Mr. Stewart) . . .

An Hon. Member: — Speak for yourself, John.

Mr. Walker: — . . . but here are some headlines, Mr. Speaker, which have appeared in the local newspaper, originating with a statement made by the Premier in this house about a year ago now. It has to do with the subject of "heavy water". Have you noticed, Mr. Speaker, how the press in this province has just let the government off the hook completely about "heavy water"?

February 14, 1966

We have been very tolerant and generous about this ourselves, on this side of the house, Mr. Speaker. We haven't done much twitting, and I am not going to do any today. I just think the facts might speak for themselves. I have here a list of the headlines, and these headlines made by many authors, by typesetters and people who don't really have any political interest, tell a story themselves.

February 3rd. – Estevan May Get \$50,000,000 Plant

February 8th. – High Towers Plant Feature

February 20th – Will Heavy Water Plant Go West. (Financial Post headline)

February 17th – A.E. Decision In Two Weeks – heavy water plant.

February 22nd – Deterium Tender Soon

February 24th – (This is the day the Premier stood up here and made the announcement) Estevan Will Gain \$46,000,000 Plant. (That is the day the Premier told us he had a contract it has turned out to be thin air, or not air or something.)

and on the same day, the headline said:

Premier Receives Praise.

The same day another headline said:

Estevan Officials Welcome News of Heavy Water Plant.

The Premier says we have given Prince Albert a pulp mill, and I was up there and I haven't seen any pulp mill there.

Another headline on the same day said:

\$46,000,000 Plant Expected to Quicken Economic Pulse.

I am sure there were some political pulses quickened too.

February 27th – New Heavy Water Plant Process Analyzed. (it is already there now, they are now analyzing it).

Estevan Plan Contingent on Tests.

March 1st. – Heavy Water Sale Guaranteed – New Plant for Estevan.

They are quoting the Premier there.

March 10th – Estevan Plant Deal Verbal, No Written Agreement.

My colleague here in Regina finally extracted the fact from the Premier.

April 15th – Heavy Water Plant Gets Green Light.

July 21st – Estevan Plant Will Be Built – Thatcher

August 10th – Firm Pulls Out – Water Plant. Second Company in Heavy Water Proposal

August 11th – Firm Negotiates to Build Plant. Estevan Plant.

August 19th – A.E.C.L. Accepts New Estevan Plant Bid, Contract Signing For Heavy Water Said Soon.

September 4th – Heavy Water Aid Depends on A.E.C.L. Saskatchewan has no assurance yet from the A.E.C.L. that the project is economic.

Mr. Thatcher Says Water Prospect Dim
November 22nd – Heavy Water Plant Nearly Dead.
November 23rd – Heavy Water Plant Talks Are Scheduled.
November 24th – (this is the wait, you see, the talks) Estevan Plant Still Up In Air.
November 26th – Estevan Plant Lost
November 27th – Heavy Water Plant Deadline Confirmed.
November 30th – Little Hope for Dynamic. Several other companies discussed enough financing claimed – Estevan plant.
December 1st – Dynamic Loses Bid for Estevan Plant. A.E.C.L. Says Heavy Water Proposal Unacceptable Because of Financing.
December 2nd – Water Plant Opens for Nova Scotia

Mr. Stuart: — Don't give up.

An Hon. Member: — Are you glad?

Mr. Walker: — Someone, asked me, across the way, was I glad. Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't quoted a single word of what I said about the heavy water plant, but I will. I say that a heavy water plant for Saskatchewan would be highly desirable. I say that a government that was on its toes and was doing its duty could probably bring a heavy water plant . . .

Mr. Stuart: — How did you make out in the first place?

Mr. Walker: — I would say that part of the reason why we haven't got a heavy water plant in Saskatchewan is the Premier's insistence upon the doctrinaire beliefs of private enterprise.

An Hon. Member: — That is not correct.

Mr. Walker: — It is his committed and his confirmed conviction that you can only have it if you are prepared to have it on private enterprise terms. That is why there is no heavy water plant in Saskatchewan. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the time is long past when these doctrinaire politically unorthodox economic notions of the Premier ought to be allowed to stand in the way of progress in this province. I say that what we need in this province, and what we will have again in this province at the first opportunity that the voters get to make a choice, is a government that is prepared to put forward concrete proposals for social development and economic development through government support and enterprise, through co-operative support, through the enterprise of the co-operative movement and of the private enterprise sector of the economy.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of balanced approach that the previous government brought forward. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the drop in the economic development that the statistics show has occurred in the last two years is probably attributable to the strangling of the

February 14, 1966

co-operative movement and the public ownership sector which the party across the way is guilty of. I suggest that if we had had the kind of development by public ownership and by co-operative ownership that the previous government encouraged, there probably wouldn't be a drop-off in the rate of growth of our economy.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if I may just conclude by giving a word of advice to the Premier, that it is still not too late for him to avoid the consequences of his reckless folly in the Bengough constituency. It is still not too late for this government to escape the chastisement which the voters of Bengough are determined to inflict on their backsides on Wednesday of this week. The way for this government to avoid being disciplined, the way for this government to avoid being disciplined in Bengough is to issue tomorrow the writs for a general provincial election in Saskatchewan, and let all the people of Saskatchewan decide.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and the member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) for the contribution they gave to this debate. I also want to congratulate the Premier for outlining the Throne Speech debate so ably to the people in this province, so that they know what the government intends to do.

I can't say this for the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker). I have never yet in the time that I have been in the house, saw, and seen and heard, such an ill-prepared speech. He certainly didn't know what he was talking about, he has wasted an hour and three quarters on the one issue, Mr. Basken, and he tells us that the Liberals are the ones that have fired people, civil servants. I want to tell him what the record was when they took office, only one. In 1944, all the ferry operators in the Rosthern constituency, and I believe I have more than anybody else, were not rehired. The ferry operators that were hired were Socialist friends of the former government. In 1944 they brought them in as operators and once they got them in they got them into the union. In 1944 I tried to fire some of them, and I wasn't able to do so. I just wasn't able to do so. These people here were operating the ferries with stickers on their cars, stickers saying vote CCF right during the campaign and on election day. These were the type of people that we couldn't fire, they should have been fired.

Mr. Steuart: — Couldn't navigate either.

Mr. Boldt: — Now, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) the other day, I have never seen him so excited, in all my life. It reminded me of a chap that was thrown overboard and was struggling for the post that he has with the NDP party. He either must produce, or somebody else is going to take over the

leadership.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) the other day criticized the closing of Embury House, and the former Minister of Welfare asked the question regarding the boys at home at the time of the closing. The answer to how many boys from Embury House are at the Saskatchewan Boys' School, or in the Provincial Correctional Institution, is that there are none.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Now what is the record of Embury House under the Socialist administration? Here, when we took office, six boys, \$110,000 to the taxpayers, and no program. About 50 per cent of the boys that came to Embury House were admitted to the Boys' School and when they turned sixteen years of age, they were committed to the Provincial Correctional Institution here in Regina. Many of them are, perhaps, still there. I haven't checked out.

Now, what about the Boys' School? Before the former Minister of Welfare (Mr. Nicholson) and member from Saskatoon, questions me about the school, I want to inform him that the "no smoking" rule is still in existence. The school is now performing a very useful purpose, and the inmate population is now three times what it was under the former government, and under the former Superintendent. The reason for this is that the former superintendent would rarely permit admissions from the regions. He was afraid of the boys.

We now have a good rehabilitation program going for the boys, and the result is that runaways are at a minimum. Under the former NDP administration, and its former superintendent, the bad boys were locked up 24 hours a day awaiting their 16th birthday, then to be transferred over to the Regina jail. The damage done to some of these boys is irreparable, and if the truth were known to our society and to the parents concerned, legal action might well have been taken. Some "Humanity First" program.

What about the services for the aged? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), stated that this service had been done away with. Well, I will excuse him because he was in the hospital last year, but he knows that this isn't true. It was stated at the time that the services for aged would be transferred and co-ordinated in to the Rehabilitation and Co-ordinating Branch of the Welfare Department. The services to the aged are being continued.

What happened under the Socialists? When a personal friend of theirs wanted a job, they opened up a new branch, made him or her the Director with a \$10,000 salary and a brand new car. This, I suggest, happened to Miss Lola Wilson.

The NDP, including the Leader of the Opposition, has criticized the opening of additional liquor outlets. I have something to say about this.

If the closing of liquor outlets and licensed premises would stop the consumption of liquor, I would be all for it; but it has been proven over and over again that this cannot be done. It is the responsibility of government to regulate and control the sale of liquor. As communities expand, which they now do under the present, these communities are entitled to the same services as in other areas. This is what my government

has in mind.

The sanctimonious attitude which members opposite are taking is a far cry from what the NDP campaigners were using against me in the Rosthern constituency in the last general election. They told the Indians that if the Liberals were elected, Boldt being a non-drinker and a Mennonite, we'd surely take the beer away from them. And it worked on the one Arrow Reserve, I got 3 votes out of 64 and on the duck Lake Indian Reserve, I got 28 votes to the NDP 95.

Mr. Speaker, they gave the liquor to the Indians all right, but it is wrong for us to give it even to the white population. Some Socialists feel that they do not need liquor outlets. They distribute it personally.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Now, Mr. Speaker,

An Hon. Member: — Who's talking.

Mr. Boldt: — There was a lot of cry about S.G. & F., the sale of S.G. & F. and yet the opposition have failed to speak about it. I thought today, the hon. member would devote most of his time to what happened to S.G. & F., this wonderful crown corporation that made thousands of dollars for the people of Saskatchewan. But he didn't even mention it.

Mr. Steuart: — He's ashamed of it.

Mr. Boldt: — And I want to prove to you that the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker), and the senior member or one of the senior members, the lawyer member from Regina, when they were chairman of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, what business ability they had. And I want to tell the members of this house that I wouldn't have them manage a pigsty.

When the Premier asked me to take over the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, one of my first thoughts, in view of my limited knowledge, and I will agree that I had limited knowledge, was to observe and make sure that the philosophy of the government was being carried out. It soon became evident that if I was to get things done some changes were necessary. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, your government had, for instance, decided upon a policy of efficiency and economy which was designed to reduce the number of vehicles and to effect economy and manpower. In spite of the fact that these instructions had been issued to Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, no effective steps had been taken and neither end had been achieved. To me it became obvious that it would be extremely difficult to put our policies into effect unless we were to exert control, and this I set out to do. My first move then was to make certain that changes in the administration, in the set-up of the corporation would be changed. The result has been most effective. Four senior officials, appointed by the Socialists, were asked to resign. Incidentally we found it unnecessary to replace them. Promotions were made from within the corporation and the new officials, with instruction from myself, were to carry out the policies. The results as I have said before have been most gratifying.

The Automobile fleet, which stood at 91 vehicles, an appalling figure when you consider that there was only a staff of 472, many of whom were clerks and typists, was reduced by more than 25 per cent — down to 67 as of December 31, 1965. Why, the Socialists gave everybody a car. People living in Regina who never went out on corporation business, had vehicles to drive from their residence to the office. They even bought a parking lot to park all their cars for their friends. Yet, Mr. Speaker, when we asked that these cars be reduced we were told that it was impossible to reduce the fleet without impairing efficiency. We were also told that to reduce staff would have dire results. What has happened? I submit that SGIO is more efficient now than at any time in history and when we tabled the results of the corporation you will see that SGIO has hit a new high in premiums written, in total assets, and most of all in profits. At the same time the total number of employees has been reduced. The members of the opposition howled about some of the changes I have made but they must find it hard to continue to argue in the face of the success these changes have produced.

It is the goal of the government that the SGIO stand on its own feet and compete with private enterprise on a business-like basis. There will be no more handouts to SGIO, such as the schools, hospitals, crown corporations and government business.

The corporation will be expected to recognize standard insurance procedures and insurance principles. This being the case, Mr. Speaker, there must be a minimum of political interference, with not room left for political heelers. We do not expect any members of the corporation to become involved in politics, although we recognize that they must all have their own political beliefs.

Mr. Walker: — As long as they are Liberal.

Mr. Boldt: — This is a change from the feeling of the previous Socialist administration. We would not permit, for instance, soliciting of funds by senior staff for the coffers of the Liberal party as was done on behalf of the CCF-NDP by our Socialist friends when they were in power.

Nor will there be any political payoffs through jobs to men such as George Bothwell, a former advertising manager of Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office whose political ties and activities are well known to members of both sides of the house.

An Hon. Member: — Tell us about Les Hibbs.

Mr. Boldt: — Men who failed at politics such as Helmer Benson, former manager of the Saskatoon branch of the SGIO and a defeated candidate in provincial and federal elections, would not find a haven in SGIO, precedents set by men such as Benson who resigned his job in 1952 to participate in the election campaign and was then reinstated in an equivalent position as soon as the need for him in the field disappeared. It will not be allowed to be repeated under this present administration.

Nor will Saskatchewan continue to be the haven of political misfits and failures from other areas. Men such as Leonard James, a defeated Labor candidate from Britain who came to Saskatchewan on the advice and recommendations of M. J. Coldwell and George

February 14, 1966

Bothwell will no longer find this province the Socialist Utopia in which to hide their failures. Mr. James, who proudly proclaimed this Fabian Socialism on every possible occasion, became public relations officer of the SGIO for about five years from 1953 until 1958, when even the Socialists couldn't stand him any more and they fired him.

The members of SGIO have our assurance that we will not interfere with their private political views. The hon. members opposite may wonder about the political views of the agents of SGIO and well they should, because they know that one of the requirements of obtaining an agency contract when they were in power was subservience to the Socialist doctrine.

Mr. Lloyd: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that statement is entirely and completely false and it should be . . .

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I will prove it to the hon. members from Biggar. The only way an agent could be appointed . . .

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER, ORDER!

Mr. Lloyd: — I am suggesting that the Minister is making a statement which he cannot substantiate. It is false and it should be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: — The minister has a right to make his speech without interruption just as hon. members on the other side. Members for Rosthern.

Mr. Boldt: — The only way an agent could be appointed in the day of the Socialists was with the consent of the minister in charge who had the applicant checked out for political stability of the Socialist variety.

There were a number of highly qualified insurance agents in this province who couldn't get a Government Insurance contract because they would not give at least lip service to the Socialists.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland) — What about . . .

Mr. Boldt: — Certainly there have been some changes since we took over and no wonder. We had to right some wrongs. This appointment of agents as a political favor had to stop and it was necessary to make additional appointments of agents who were denied contracts in the past for no other reasons than being unacceptable politically.

The Socialist opposition may howl that there has been a witch hunt among the agencies which may leave the impression that the SGIO agency force is being depleted and its efficiency and production impaired. But what are the facts, Mr. Speaker?

When we took office there was a line-up of agents requesting Government Insurance contracts but the total agency force stood at 573, these being limited to the friends of the party.

Now, there are 609 and while a few cancellations were necessary the net result is one of greater distribution of Agencies throughout the province. The result of course, has been a fantastic increase in premium income from the agents of SGIO.

In 1965, the premium income from our agents increased from \$7,665,000 in 1964 to \$9,215,000, an increase over \$1,500,000 for over 20 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Yes, the result has been very gratifying to SGIO and therefore to the citizens of the province, although we may have hurt a few Socialists along the way.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, we intend to treat SGIO as we would any private corporation rather than a haven for hand-outs for political lackeys. During the last session, Mr. Speaker, your government decided not to renew the unfair and undemocratic section 15 of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Act despite howls of protest and indignation from the Socialists. They cried blue ruin! I remember the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) saying this. It would sound the death knell for SGIO. It was even suggested that it was done as a political promise to insurance interests in the east. Despite the fact that the Socialists suggested the costs would increase . . .

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

An Hon. Member: — You had your speech

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I also don't intend to be fibbed about either by him or anybody else.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER, ORDER!

Mr. Walker: — I'm rising to a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member purported to quote something that I said. It doesn't faintly resemble anything that I said and I deny having said what he attributed to me.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would read Hansard he would find out that these were exactly the words that he said.

Mr. Walker: — Would the hon. member please read the quotation and acknowledge the page in Hansard?

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I did not quote him at all. I just said that he cried blue-ruin. It would force the rates up. It would sound the death knell for SGIO. It was even suggested that it was done as a political promise to insurance interests in the east. Despite the fact that the Socialists suggested the costs would increase to hard-pressed school and hospital boards, the opposite has been achieved. Rates were slashed to such a degree that the results tended to indicate something was rotten in Denmark.

Here are some examples of the various rates of the province,

February 14, 1966

throughout the province, and I will quote some of these rates. These are some of the rates that we lost:

Saskatchewan Minerals, Sodium Sulphate Division, the former rate was 1.06; we quoted a rate now to .80, a 25 per cent reduction.

But we still didn't get that insurance.

Saskatchewan Government Telephones. We quoted .1785 down to .15; a 16 per cent reduction.

But we didn't get it. The ones that got it quoted a 66 2/3 per cent reduction over what we quoted.

Saskatoon Public School: .40 was a previous rate and we quoted it down to .21 or 50 per cent reduction.

And we didn't get it. The premium accepted was \$34,000. Our bid was \$43,000.

Wynyard hospital: from .70 to .41, a 41.5 per cent reduction.

Accepted total premium under SGIO was \$30. On the bid that we got we reduced our quoting price from 157 to .42. Regina Public School from .24 to .18; the Saskatoon Collegiate Institute from \$37,163 under the previous government to \$18,685, a 50 per cent reduction saving for that school district.

Kamsack Union Hospital from .44 to .30, a 32 per cent reduction.

These great reductions are representative of the entire school and hospital field where rate cuts ranged from five per cent to 50 per cent, with most reductions being between five per cent and 20 per cent. Only on risk remained at the same rate, while one increased. There are many more but I am sure I got my point across, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps I should be a little kind to the previous CCF administration and simply point out that they were away off base in their pleading for the retention of section 15. After all in the light of some of the glaring errors in judgment which I discovered within SGIO this mistake seems very insignificant.

The question may be asked; has the insurance industry simply slashed rates to embarrass SGIO or has SGIO been acting on instructions from my office and deliberately cut its rates so it would be publicly embarrassed by its actions? This is what the Socialists would like to have you believe. The facts remain, however, the SGIO slashed its own rates and retained more than 90 per cent of the business it bid on and, Mr. Speaker, paid a commission to its local agents, income which the CCF-NDP denied their agents. Certainly SGIO was embarrassed on the Saskatchewan Government Telephones Account, so much so that the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) termed their quotation ridiculous.

Well, for the edification of the hon. member for Biggar and his colleagues, I had nothing to do with the setting of the so-called ridiculous rate. I had only been in the insurance business approximately eight months. The fact, however, is that this ridiculous rate, as it has been called, was struck by three senior

underwriters of SGIO who had been employed in that capacity when the Socialists were in office. Maybe it can be argued that the high rates they set prior to the repeal of section 15 were just as ridiculous, and even more so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — As a newcomer to the insurance industry, I wondered just what was going on. The hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), who was the last minister in charge of SGIO under the previous Socialist administration, said that the rates were at a break-even point and it was not the policy of the Socialists to make large profits on schools, hospitals and crown corporations. You know, he knows better. I am sure he does. I don't like to call a man a liar but he sure was reckless with the truth.

The hon. member for Hanley also said that if this business were thrown open to competition, costs would have to go up because we would have to pay commission to the agents. The argument made sense to me. I wanted to find out what was going on because the same underwriters were employed by SGIO during the CCF-NDP regime as since section 15 was abolished. I was astounded to find out that the loss ration on schools during the past 20 years was 36.7 per cent; the hon. member says this is a break-even point. He hadn't gone to the type of school that I went to.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is again attributing words to me. Unless he can substantiate this, I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, it being now 5:30 I move to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege still stands. Unless the hon. member can substantiate the words he attributed to me I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: — I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question before he resumes his seat.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 5:28 o'clock p.m.