

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session – Tenth Legislature**  
**16th Day**

**Thursday, February 20, 1947.**

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**RESOLUTIONS**

**RESOLUTION – ENACT LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING MINIMUM LABOUR  
STANDARDS**

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City) moved, seconded by Mr. A.D. Connon (The Battlefords):

That this Assembly respectfully urge the Government of Canada:

1. To take such steps as are necessary to have the British North America Act amended to vest in the Parliament of Canada jurisdiction to enact legislation establishing minimum labour standards throughout Canada.
2. Upon the coming into force of such amendment, to enact legislation establishing minimum labour standards throughout Canada which are at least as high as the fair and progressive standards already established in Saskatchewan.

**Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour):** — . . . they would take care of the various minima: minimum hours of work; minimum wages, age of employment and so forth, but they would have that basic form. Other provinces could, of course, improve on those minimum standards if they cared to, but you would have it there as a 'floor' under which no worker would be asked to sell his services and we consider that is most necessary.

Now this is nothing new, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that we are speaking on, today; for in the booklet entitled "Saskatchewan Replies," which contains the province's comments on the proposals of the Dominion Government to the Dominion-Provincial Conference on Reconstruction, we advocated this very thing. On page 77, there is a paragraph and I would like to quote it just to show exactly what we have done up to the present time – only about 10 lines, Mr. Speaker:

We heard the specific constitutional amendment to confer upon the Dominion power to put into effect the minimum standards of national application relating to wages, hours of labor, holidays, age for employment and all other labor matters from which quantitative standards can be set. Federal legislation of this kind would tend to eliminate inter-provincial competition for industry at the expense of labor. It would also help to remove the serious deterrent to advanced labor legislation produced by the fear presently existing in the minds of provincial authorities that they might put the industries under their jurisdiction at a serious disadvantage.

**February 20, 1947**

I imagine that, Mr. Speaker, indicates that Saskatchewan Government is already on record insofar as this matter is concerned.

Now, proceeding with the question regarding the basic wages, hours, age and so forth, there are three arguments in favor of the Federal Government taking this course. First, it is obviously the right of every Canadian worker to have certain basic minimum standards and provincial boundaries – that is the first point I want to make – provincial boundaries should have nothing to do with determining what the basic standard will be. Second, the existence of national minimum standards tend to eliminate inter-provincial competition at the expense of labor. There have been cases where certain cities have advertised for industries and have set forth as one of the main attractions the fact that they have little or no labor legislation or no standards and have advertised even on some occasions, that their standards are very low. Obviously, this is a most undesirable state of affairs and a province which honestly tries to provide reasonable standards of working conditions for its workers should not be penalized by having industry locate in other provinces where these basic standards are lower. Third, the existence of national minimum standards tends to raise labor standards all across the country and that is obviously correct. At the present time one of the most serious deterrents of having neglected labor legislation is the fear existing in the minds of all authorities that if they put their labor standards too high then it places them at a competitive disadvantage. That is quite correct; it does and the result has been that there has been a general depressing effect on labor legislation. Every province has been afraid to get out of line and thus there has been a tendency for all provinces to do nothing. We, in this province, as has been indicated by the last speaker, have pretty much got away from that. We have done plenty here and have been criticized for it from time to time.

Now to summarize briefly: First, the right of every Canadian wage earner to work under basic minimum conditions; second, the elimination of inter-provincial competition at the expense of labor, and third, the improvement of labor standards all across Canada as a result.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sticking pretty much with the intent of the Resolution. I have not digressed for a moment, but I am going to digress now for just three or four minutes. It follows along with what the Member from The Battlefords has said in connection with railway unions. He referred, I think, to Mr. Whitney, the President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen whose headquarters are in Cleveland, Ohio. Now, last fall, I think it was, the Trainmen held their bi-annual convention in Miami, Florida and apparently some of our very good members from this part of the country saw to it that the legislation of this province was given a certain amount of publicity down there among 700 or 800 persons attending that convention. As a result President Whitney wrote Premier Douglas and sent all of us a copy – that is the six of us who happened to have been elected as representing railway employees. Now there is the letter and the Resolution attached to it. It is dated December 16th, addressed to the Hon. T.C. Douglas, Premier of Saskatchewan, Canada. I have the Premier's permission to read this, by the way.

February 20, 1947

My Dear Sir:

At the request of the 28th convention of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, I take genuine pleasure in transmitting a copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the delegates to that convention. I am enclosing a sufficient number of copies of this communication for each Member of your Government mentioned in the attached resolution and I would greatly appreciate it if you would see to it that they are forwarded.

As President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, I want each of you to know that I join with our delegation in expressing appreciation of the progressive and constructive endeavors of your Government to serve the fine people of Canada. Wishing you the season's greetings, I am, sincerely yours, A.F. Whitney, President.

Now here is the resolution addressed to this Government:

Whereas we have in the Province of Saskatchewan the only labor Government in the Dominion of Canada and whereas in this Government we have the representation of three members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, namely: W.J. Arthurs, conductor; A.D. Conon, conductor and Dunster Heming, switchman; three other railroad men who served on this body are: Art Stone, machinist; Harry Gibbs, machinist, both union men and our Minister of Labour, C.C. Williams, a member of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, and whereas the CCF Government has done much good by the enactment of laws favorable to the working classes of our province, such as:

1. Granting two weeks holidays with pay for workers of the province.
2. Raising the amount of compensation we may claim under our Act by an additional \$500,

and many other things of great value to the working classes, and whereas the main object of the Brotherhood is to better in whatever way possible the conditions of its members, therefore, be it resolved that this convention go on record as approving the drafting of a letter by our working president to be sent to Premier T.C. Douglas and the Members of the Government expressing to them our sincere appreciation for a job well done with the hope that they will continue in the future as they have in the past.

Signed: President and his name.

Now I consider that that is one of the finest letters that we, or any other government, could possibly have received, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to keep this very carefully in our files and refer to it from time to time.

Mr. Whitney, as you possibly know, is one of the outstanding labor men in the United States at the present time. His little trouble with President Truman, last May is certainly not going to do him a bit of harm.

Now to return to the specified principle of the resolution I have some interesting information in a book entitled "Labour

**February 20, 1947**

Legislation in Canada”. Now this is sent out by the Federal Government and is entitled “Historic Outline of the Principles of the Dominion and Provincial Labour Laws.”

I intend, in a few moments, to give you some comparisons between the minimum standards in the various provinces which will be of considerable interest. There is just one sentence here I would like to mention.

It appears that there was not very much minimum wage legislation in effect up until about the end of the First War. Before the end of the War, 1914-18, the plight of low-paid women workers caused minimum wage laws to be enacted in Manitoba and British Columbia. Saskatchewan and Ontario followed in 1919-20.

Now that is all I am going to quote from this book. When this Government took office in July, 1944, we found the minimum wage standards at quite a low level: \$9 a week it was for anyone starting in; after three months experience they received \$11; after six months \$14 and then they went on from there. It could be explained that the latter amount was as high as they could go with the exception that they could make better arrangements, of course, with their employees.

The first thing our new Board did, after they were appointed, was to have a meeting and raise those minimums or minima to \$11, \$14 and \$16.80 per week. Now I would like to explain that the reason they had to stop there was that it was impossible to go any higher due to the wage control order which put a limit of 35 cents an hour on minimum wages. So 35 cents an hour multiplied by 48 hours in the week and you have your \$16.80. That, however, went out-of-date on July 1st last and the provinces were given back their authority to do as they pleased with minimum wages and is not in effect any more. I'll give you the present rates a little later on.

Now I'll turn to some tables to prove the point I am about to make. Quite an interesting book this is: Here is one comparative table as far as minimum school leaving age is concerned: minimum age for employment compensation; maximum hours of work in mines; factories, shops and so forth. Now here is the one that I would like the Members of this House to pay particular attention to and see just where the Province of Saskatchewan stands on this very important matter. Now it is just included here in two or three lines; Alberta and British Columbia – there are two Acts, one applies to men and the other to women workers; in the other provinces the Act applies to both male and female workers; but in Nova Scotia where a male Minimum Wage Act was passed in 1945, the proclamation bringing it into effect has not been issued and in Ontario the only order applying to men is the Textile Order. Now the fact that the provinces farthest east, New Brunswick apparently has little or no legislation for the moment; in Nova Scotia the rates in factories, shops, offices and restaurants are all the same. The rate is \$12 a week in towns of 17,000 and over; \$11 a week in other towns. Now we come to Quebec. Quebec is often spoken of as the ‘low-wage zone’ in the Dominion of Canada and the figures I am about to quote would seem to prove that, although I have heard since that they either have improved or are considering improving conditions a great deal: The fact is – factories – women in factories have four zones; zone one 26 cents an hour; zone two 24 cents; zone three 22 cents and zone four 20 cents. Shops are

February 20, 1947

the same. Offices may run from 15 to 25 cents an hour and here is one that seems to go back to the dark ages almost – hotel and restaurant employees, waiters, maids, elevator operators, etc.; 20 cents an hour in zone one; 16 cents in zone two; 13 cents in zone three and 10 cents an hour in zone four; bell-boys, storekeepers, all drawing 10 cents an hour. I thought we were away from those conditions long ago. Here is Ontario – it has a rather peculiar Act inasmuch as it does not apply to men, except in the Textile Industry and it applies practically all the way through to women. Toronto – we often hear of “Toronto the good”; but I don’t see anything very good about these wages, \$12.50 a week; \$11.50 towns of 50,000 and over; \$11 for populations of 5,000 to 50,000; shops – \$12.50 in Toronto; \$12 in Ottawa and so forth. Hotels and restaurants – 26 cents an hour. I will not go into all the details.

We come up a little when we get to Manitoba: cities 30 cents an hour, \$18.50 a week; rurals 26 an hour with \$12.48 a week. Shops, offices, hotels and restaurants are the same all across the board.

Saskatchewan – I point out this is just a little over a year old and we still have our old rate in here, Mr. Speaker; \$16.80; \$14 a week for towns within a five mile radius. That is the same all across the board and it is the same for male and female help.

Alberta – we strike something a little better; \$15 for female, \$20 for men. That is the same all across the board. It appears they are a little ahead of us there in Alberta as far as men are concerned.

British Columbia – \$14 for female; 40 cents an hour for men and so on. Now in all fairness I think that I should say that British Columbia has improved their act since the first of July and we understand that at the present time, they get \$18 a week there for a 44-hour week.

Now Manitoba – Saskatchewan too. I should say something about Saskatchewan – we now have something better than \$16.80. We have a straight \$18.50 a week from the day the person starts and that stays. I don’t expect the rate to remain there. The employee, when he becomes more experienced we think, should be able to strike a better bargain with the employer and get something higher than \$18.50 a week. I do mention the provinces, though, of British Columbia and Alberta and suggest to the Members of this House that we are going to have to look to our laurels as far as minimum wage is concerned. We don’t want to be trailing behind. We want to be out in front, or at least as good as any other province in the Dominion of Canada.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish briefly to refer to the Dominion-Provincial Conference of Labour Ministers held in Ottawa last October. All provinces were represented with the exception of Prince Edward Island, which I do not believe has a Department of Labour. The question of establishing national minimum standards of wages and other working conditions was not on the conference agenda. That is the very thing we have been discussing this afternoon but it was not on the agenda down there and it was clear that neither the Dominion or any of the provinces had any desire to discuss the question. There was nothing the Saskatchewan representative could do other than express his regrets that this highly important matter had then been neglected.

**February 20, 1947**

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Resolution has been clearly explained, this afternoon, and would be a big benefit to thousands of wage earners, especially those of the lower income tax or income groups. They are the very ones that we are talking of this afternoon. Those people in the lower income tax groups and if and when we have national legislation in all of the nine provinces of Canada governing these minimum conditions, it is going to improve the lot of thousands of men and women in this country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson (Cannington);** – Mr. Speaker, the discussion on the Resolution now under consideration has wandered far afield. We have heard references to the proposed railway strike in the United States, the effects of what happened in that connection on the political future of the President of the United States. We have heard a good deal about what has been done in Great Britain; but we may accept that the subject matter of the Resolution is one that is of importance and of very considerable interest to the Members of this Legislature.

Throughout the discussion it has either been said definitely, or at least inferred, that the legislation in connection with labor and for the protection and betterment of labor in the Province of Saskatchewan, is very largely to the credit of the present Government. An examination of the history, or a study of the legislation on our statute books, would reveal that this is very far from the truth and that anyone who attempts to establish that idea is either ignorant or deliberately attempting trying to misrepresent the actual situation.

A good many years ago, in the Parliament of Canada, an Act was passed called the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, generally referred to as the Lemieux Act. That was an Act which was intended to assist in the settlement of industrial disputes, or in other words, strikes or differences between employers and employees. Very shortly after that Act was passed in Ottawa, it was confirmed by the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan. Now it is true that it was subsequently established by an appeal, I think, to the Privy Council, that the province was not authorized to enact such legislation. The Act was declared ultra vires. But at least it is an indication that even that long ago the members who represented constituencies in the Province of Saskatchewan were interested in and were desirous of, doing what they could to promote the welfare and the betterment of labor and of labor relations.

The very first time that a request was made to any government in the Province of Saskatchewan to pass a law in regard or with respect to collective bargaining, establishing the rights of individuals to belong to trade unions and prohibiting employers from discriminating against men who belonged to trade unions, was made late in the year 1937 and at the Session of 1938 the Bill, exactly as asked by the Provincial Executive of the Trades and Labour Congress in Saskatchewan, an Act, word for word and in complete conformity with the request that was presented to the Government at the time, was passed by the Legislature of this province. Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that it was a very short and a very simple Act. It recognized, as I have said, certain principles that the representatives of organized labor wished to have established: the right to organize in a union;

February 20, 1947

the right to bargain and protection against unfair practices on the part of their employer because members of unions were active in their trade union operations.

That Bill was passed at the Session of 1938 and it represented no long drawn out delay, no controversy with the Government; it was passed at the first Session of the Legislature after the request was presented to the Government – and I am in a position to make that statement, Mr. Speaker, because I was the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan when that representation and that request was presented and I was the Premier of the Province when the Act was passed.

Long before that particular legislation was placed on the statute books, various governments, some of them Liberal and one of them Conservative, had placed on the statute books of this province many different Acts for the protection and for the betterment of labor, such as the Acts governing industrial standards, masters and servants, mechanic liens, minimum wages, one day's rest in seven, thresher employees, warehousemen's liens, weekly half holiday, Workmen's Compensation Act, Workmen's Wages Act and others. So that it cannot fairly or truthfully be said, Mr. Speaker, that previous governments or previous Legislatures in this province have been indifferent to, or neglectful of, the just claims and the requests that have been made on behalf of labor from time to time.

**Mr. Williams:** — On a Point of Order. The Leader of the Opposition has been suggesting that deliberate false statements have been made. I would like to know when I made false statements in this debate.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, in a very few moments I am going to cite an instance where the Minister of Labour, in this House, made a statement which was not in accordance with the facts; now whether it was due to ignorance or desire to leave a wrong impression in the House, I don't know, but I am coming to that just in a minute. Since the Minister became Minister of Labour I said the statement was made in this House. Now I am not so concerned about the reputation and record of the previous Governments other than to get clear of this inference, or this impression, that always before in the history of this province, until 1944, have the elected representatives of the people of the province been indifferent to or have disregarded the just and proper claims of labor. Now I quote these things merely to show that in this respect, as in every other respect, which is of public interest, all the Legislatures of the Province of Saskatchewan, from the time this province was established, have been considerate of and have paid attention to the problems and requests, not only of labor, but every class and condition of our people and I say it is an unfair imputation, an unfair impression to try and leave, an unfair inference that only in 1944, the men who were elected to represent the citizens of this province became interested in this very important section of our citizens. Now, as I say again, any one who wants to create that impression, anyone who carries on that propaganda, evidences thereby either his ignorance of what has happened or a direct and definite wish to leave a wrong impression and a man who is guilty of that can accept either one of those alternatives as the reasons for his actions.

**February 20, 1947**

**Mr. Williams:** — I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those remarks. I presume they are directed at me.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Now, over the years it was my privilege, my duty from time to time, to meet delegations representing organized labor in the Province of Saskatchewan and I think there was not a year passed during the time that I was a Member of the Government, or head of the Government, that the properly authorized representatives in the first case of the Provincial Executive, I think, is the title, of the Trades and Labour Congress and latterly the delegates representatives of another organization the Canadian Congress of Labour, appeared before the Government and presented the resolutions which had been passed at their annual gathering asking the Government to do this or to do that, to pass certain legislation or to amend certain legislation. I think I am quite safe, Sir, in making the statement without boasting, because it was my proper duty to do so, but I doubt if anybody could find any member, anyone who was ever a member of any one of those delegations over the long period, some nine or ten years, when they waited on the Government annually. That would say that on any occasion that any request and any presentation they made was not listened to attentively, was not received sympathetically. I am not saying, for a moment, of course, that all that they asked was done; but I don't think anyone can find any member of either of those groups which met us from year to year, that could say that they did not have ample opportunity to present their requests, that those requests were received, that they were given every opportunity of explaining them; and would agree that, insofar as the previous Government was concerned, its attitude towards labor was not unsympathetic and the statute books are the best proof of that.

May I give another example? In the fall of 1938, I think it was – I am speaking from memory – probably the most serious strike which occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan took place; that was in the Estevan coalfields. For a period of six weeks, or eight weeks or longer, Members of the then Government, with representatives of the employers and of the employees, sat here in Room 267 from day to day arguing and discussing the various points at issue. It wasn't settled in a day; it wasn't settled in a week; it wasn't settled in a month but, finally – and in a measure – the results are due to the conciliatory attitude taken by the employees, to the concessions made by the employers and to a very considerable extent to the conciliation measures that were carried out by the Government of the day, with the result that strike – and as I say, it was in my recollection, the most serious strike in the last 10 or 15 years – was finally settled and an agreement was signed by the employers and by the employees, which was to be operative until the end of the War and one year after.

Now you may think, Sir, that I have spent too much time in laying this background, but as I said, so repeatedly – has the impression been left so repeatedly, has the statement been made, leaving the inference that nothing whatever had been done in the Province of Saskatchewan to improve labor conditions or to protect the laboring class until July 1944.

It is well known to every Member of the House, Sir, that for many years now a major desire on the part of representatives of organized labor has been the establishment of a uniform



February 20, 1947

national labor code. As has been explained, this afternoon, that objective was reached to a very considerable extent by the passing of P.C. 1003, and by this further fact that seven or eight of the provinces enacted the terms of PC 1003 as their provincial labor code; so that we had the very happy condition and had reached very nearly – oh, I am not going to argue that PC 1003 was perfect or that it was wholly acceptable to labor representatives, but it at least was the nearest approach to the establishment of a national labor code. Because, in July 1944, it was the law of Canada insofar as war industries were concerned and insofar as industries that came under federal jurisdiction were concerned and it was also the law in seven or eight of the provinces. In that respect we had reached the position which labor men had not expected, and I am sure that responsible labor men regarded it as a very, very substantial step, a very substantial measure of progress in reaching their final objectives.

In the first Session following the election in 1944, the Minister of Labour introduced a new Trade Union Act in this Legislature. That was his privilege and his right; but in introducing that legislation he made the statement that PC 1003, which had been enacted by a previous Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan, ceased to function, or ceased to be the law of this province, when the War was over. That statement is the one that I said was not correct and when the Minister was questioned he admitted it; but I presume outside of the House – I don't know, I haven't any concrete evidence of it – I presume outside of the House he continued to repeat that statement.

**Mr. Williams:** — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that outside of the House no such statement was ever made. He is either making it up or it is pure guesswork.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, the statement was made in the House, Mr. Speaker, within the memory of every Member of the House. I didn't say I could prove the Minister had repeated it outside, because immediately he made the statement in the House he was checked and he had to admit that it was not strictly correct.

**Mr. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, am I to gather from the Hon. Member's remarks that he is of the opinion that PC 1003 will continue after the official termination of the War?

**Mr. Patterson:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that at all. I am saying that this Legislature enacted a provincial Act which comprised the contents of PC 1003 and that thereby became a law of the Province of Saskatchewan. The fact that the Government of Canada might cancel or annul PC 1003 didn't affect the position insofar as the Province of Saskatchewan was concerned.

It continued to be the law of this province until it was repealed, as it was repealed, and that was the Government's privilege. I am not complaining about that, I am not objecting to that, but I am objecting to this suggestion that there was on the statute books of this province, legislation which ceased to function or ceased to be operative automatically by reason of the finish of the War.

Now I had forgotten, for a moment, one other interesting item in connection with the development of labor legislation in

**February 20, 1947**

the Province of Saskatchewan, and at the risk of making my remarks not quite so connected, I think I'll go back to it because I'd forgotten it just for the moment.

In the Session of 1943, the then Member for the city of Moose Jaw, Mr. George Baker, introduced a Bill greatly extending the rights and the powers of labor unions as compared with the Bill I referred to earlier which was passed in 1938. The Bill which Mr. Baker introduced in the 1943 Session was based on a Bill or an Act passed by the Legislature of the Province of British Columbia just prior to that date. Now, as a matter of fact, that Bill was introduced rather late in the Session and because, as I say, it extended very widely and enlarged very greatly the provisions of Chapter 312 of the Revised Statutes, there was a good deal of discussion and a good deal of argument and a good deal of debate in the Legislature and it was referred to the Law Amendments Committee and properly so. Representatives of labor and representatives of employees appeared before the Committee and offered their comments, their remarks and their objections. It didn't seem possible for the Committee to arrive at anything of an unanimous decision, or decision that would be generally acceptable; and the decision was made that the whole matter would be referred to a commission, and that was done. During the summer of 1943 that proposed Bill was referred to a commission headed by Mr. Justice Martin, which received representations, considered the whole matter and presented a report to the Government, which was presented to the Legislature. In the meantime, however, PC 1003 had been adopted by the Federal Government as a federal, or national, labor code and that labor code seemed to be generally acceptable to labor. Now, I am not going to say that it was perfect, or that in every detail it was accepted; but labor agreed that it was a great step forward and so that Bill was dropped at the Session of 1944 and, as I have already explained, an Act was passed by this Legislature making the terms and conditions and contents of PC 1003 the law of the Province of Saskatchewan. That, as I have said, is where we stood until the Session in the fall of 1944.

Now, personally, I am entirely favorable to the idea of a National Labour Code. I think it has many desirable features. The Minister of Labour in his remarks suggested that it was a comparatively simple thing for the Government of Saskatchewan to enact such a measure and he gave that as his excuse apparently for sitting dumb at this Federal-Provincial Conference that was held last fall, to consider matters relating to labor. Well, it may be a simple thing; but I would point out to you that, generally speaking, the provinces of Canada are very reluctant to relinquish any of the authority, or any of the jurisdiction, which has been extended to them under the British North America Act, to the Government of Canada. He quoted the case of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Well, that's true. But in connection with unemployment insurance, no province had enacted such a measure; no province had any unemployment insurance measure on its statute books or in operation. But here we have a condition where every province in Canada, with the exception of the Province of Prince Edward Island, has a Department of Labour, and there are many different labor laws. I venture to suggest to you, Sir, and to the Members of this House, that getting the various provinces of Canada to forego or to relinquish rights and jurisdictions which are properly theirs – no question about that – is not going to be quite so simple a thing, desirable as it may be. As I have already said, I am quite in agreement that it is desirable and I am quite in sympathy with that

February 20, 1947

objective. In saying that, we could spend a good deal of time in criticizing and finding faults with the various details of PC 1003, as a Member of Saskatoon did; but he agreed, as I have stated, that we had attained in this province a very substantial measure of uniformity in regard to labor legislation and, as I understand it, that it one of the labors primary objectives. I think we might very well forget petty discussion or petty argument about this feature or that feature in a general support of the primary and first objective.

The Minister of Labour of this province has not yet indicated to us whether Saskatchewan is prepared to forego and forfeit or give up or withdraw – whatever you like to call it – its constitutional rights and its constitutional responsibilities. It would be interesting for us to know whether they are prepared, in the event of the Government of Canada and the other provinces agreeing to establish a National Labour Code, to withdraw or give up its jurisdiction with respect to the enactment of labor legislation and leave it to the federal authorities and to a Federal Labour Code.

I was very much interested in the speech by the Hon. Member for The Battlefords. He expressed his wish to be fair, treat everybody alike, very moderate, quite a comparison from the first speech he made in this Legislature in the Session of 1945, when he expressed something of the opinion or the idea that he belonged to a rather superior class of labor. I was very much interested in the impassioned address of the Hon. Member for Swift Current. Apparently he is not satisfied with the 18 CCF Members who now represent 18 out of the 21 constituencies in this province, because he tells us we must have labor members going from this province to speak for labor. While those are mere . . .

**Mr. Gibbs:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned we must have more. I didn't say anything about the members.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, I'll accept the hon. gentleman's explanation. But generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, those who presume to speak for labor bodies, I might very well quote the union to which they belong or the body of which they are a member for whom they claim to speak and we would be glad to have a statement from the Hon. Member for Swift Current to that effect.

**An Hon. Member:** — How about you doing that?

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, I am not presuming to speak for any labor union or any labor organization as the Member for Swift Current does and, as I say, we would be interested to know his experience and his activities in connection with organized labor and labor unions.

Now, the matter is not, as I have said, one that is quite the general sentiment that is enclosed or contained in the Resolution. I am in agreement with it. I think it would be a very desirable thing. I see certain practical difficulties, Mr. Speaker, but I think it would be desirable if we could have uniformity in our labor legislation across the Dominion of Canada. It might create some problems and some difficulties, maybe more serious than we have now, but as a general objective, and as something to be desired, I am in agreement. I, – taking

**February 20, 1947**

up the second part of this – “to enact legislation establishing minimum labor standards throughout Canada, which are at least as high as the fair and progressive standards already established in Saskatchewan.” Now, from the remarks made by the Minister of Labour it would appear that in certain respects Alberta and probably British Columbia are in advance of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I would be reluctant to go on record as being satisfied with what we have attained in Saskatchewan if somewhere else, something better had been accomplished, and I propose, therefore, to move, seconded by Mr. Danielson:

That all the words after “establishing” in the third line of paragraph (1) be struck out and the following substituted therefore: “a National Labour Code”; and

That the word “Saskatchewan” in the fourth line of paragraph (2) be struck out and the following substituted therefore: “in any Province of Canada”.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:55 o’clock p.m.