

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Twelfth Legislature**  
**25th Day**

**Thursday, March 19, 1953**

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

**CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT**

Moved by Mr. Wahl, seconded by Mr. Feusi:

“That this Assembly request the Federal Government to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act making provision for the voluntary requisition of payments of annual dues by farmers to the three prairie Farm Unions.”

**Mr. W.H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the honour of speaking in this Legislature on a motion that could help farm organizations. There have been many heart-breaking experiences in promoting farm organizations, but the results obtained have justified the effort.

When some of the Farmer's Union Lodges in the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency asked me to bring their resolution to the attention of this House, it seemed proper to do this, as the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency, which instructed me to represent it, depends almost entirely on the fortunes of the farmer. In order to justify the existence of the Farmers' Union and the reason for this motion, I must review some of the history of the farm movement.

Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you are familiar with all the history of the farm movement. In my constituency, about fifty miles east of Regina on No. 1 Highway on the main line of the C.P.R. lies the town of Sinaluta. If you stroll down the main street mingling with the Indians from the reserve south of town and the farmers and the townspeople, you little realize that in a small shack north of the town, where the only dry place when it rained was under the bed, lived a man by the name of E. A. Partridge, who with the help of his neighbours fathered the first step towards co-operative trading in grain by the farmers of western Canada in the early 1900's. These men no doubt in their wildest dreams could not visualize that the powerful United Grain Growers Company Limited would be the result of their deliberations and work.

The knowledge and benefits the farmer has received through this company cannot be assessed, but the fact that it has spanned the prairie provinces and its research and elevator facilities are still expanding, speaks for itself. The outgrowth of the Grain Growers was the Saskatchewan Pool Elevators, a revolutionary movement designed to pool the farmers' grain through their own elevator systems, and the first Pool contract signer was a man named A.E. Wilson, Indian Head. I am proud to say I signed the Pool contract in 1923, and I understand that today in the mail there are the earnings of last year's crop.

**March 19, 1953**

Sintaluta is also able to boast that one of its citizens is on the five-man executive board of the Saskatchewan Pool Elevators, namely, Warden Burgess.

The prairie Pools, through their membership, have brought about sound marketing principles, and through their efforts have prevailed on the Federal Government to bring into being the Canadian Wheat Board. Now this is the farmer's dream come true. He at last has a marketing agency that returns to him all the money it receives, less handling charges, according to the bushels he has sold.

About five years ago I noticed the farmers flocking in to join the Farmers' Union, and being a businessman and realizing my fortunes were linked up with the farmers, I started to assess the situation. I was told by the farmers that in fields outside of marketing grain, they had no one to represent them, and in view of the fact of the widening gap between the price of what he sells and what he buys, he was forced to organize — one very good reason for bringing into being the Farmers' Union. There are many others.

Now the motion asks for the voluntary check-off system. I am told by other unions that this greatly helps a union, as it gives members time to do necessary work instead of spending most of their time collecting dues. The farm unions are a non-political movement, made up of people of all political beliefs, so I am asking all members in this House to support the motion.

Farmers, through their efforts, have attained a standard of living in the Canadian prairies that can only be maintained and improved on if they work together. The Farmers' Union gives this leadership. They are not trying to force, but to suggest methods that, as our history evolves, we will be able to work out our many problems to sane conclusions.

This morning, on all our desks I imagine, is a submission to the Government of Canada by the Farmers' Union of Alberta and B.C. block, Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, and Manitoba Farmers' Union, that is to be presented at Ottawa on March 16, 1953, and I notice one of the things they are asking for is a voluntary requisition, and I am going to read how it is worded. It is very similar to this, only more lengthy:

### **Voluntary Requisition**

“Once again we ask for favourable consideration of our former request for adoption of the voluntary requisition as a means of payment of the annual fees of the three prairie farm unions. This deduction would only be made by the Canadian Wheat Board upon direct and personal order of the individual farmer concerned.

“Realizing this is a privilege which has been enjoyed by most labour groups in Canada for some considerable time, we cannot see any good and sufficient reason why the Government should longer defer action on this matter. Actually it is an administrative detail of Government, but it is an important matter to many farmers.

“On occasion some Government members have argued that to adopt such a course would be a dangerous principle. Our reply is that the principle has already been established and has been operating for many years, wherein deductions are made by the Government itself for paying of assessments under the P.F.A.A., and on other occasions provision was made to make these payments attachable as collateral to certain types of bank loans.

“These instances seem to us proof that any argument for a further delay in adopting the principle is invalid. We again urge you to grant our request.”

Now I am moving the motion, and it is seconded by my deskmate, the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Feusi).

**Mr. Arnold Feusi (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with my deskmate on this resolution. His constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is the historical cradle of our western farm movements. It is fitting that he should move this resolution. It is also a tribute to him that as a businessman he should take such a direct and keen interest in our farm organizations. It is also just and fitting that I second this resolution.

Pool District No. 8 leads all other districts in farm organization in this province. My constituency of Pelly is probably the highest organized area in District No. 8. The Kamsack Farmers' Union Lodge, of which I am a member, is the largest and possibly the most aggressive lodge in Saskatchewan.

I would like to mention some of the work done by our farm union lodges to probably give our city people an idea of what the activities of the farm union lodges are. I have in mind one small lodge that is in an isolated area situated between a series of Indian reserves and the Game Preserve, which is wilderness area. A year ago they undertook the task of circumventing some of this isolation that they were subjected to, and they undertook the task of organizing and building a telephone line, and today that is a task that is completed, and the telephone system is serving the community well.

Another farm union lodge has undertaken the study of the co-operative way of life. I believe they have had meetings, probably once a week or once every two weeks. They have also undertaken the study of some of the problems facing the rural population of Saskatchewan today, and it is rather interesting to note that they have found that if our system of habitation on our farms were altered whereby we could live in small communities some three to four miles apart, we would probably eliminate much of the cost of the services that this Government is trying to bring to the people today, for instance, power. The centre of that little farm area and the proposed site of this group, the core of the group, is some three and half to four miles from a present power line. Now that would mean three and a half to four miles of power line that would serve some fifteen or sixteen farm homes if they were in one centre. As it is, today, it would probably take some twenty-five miles to serve that area. We can say the same things for rural roads

**March 19, 1953**

and telephones. That is just one of the researches that they have made.

Another fine chore that the large union, the Kamsack lodge, has undertaken was a check into a proposition whereby one of our farmers had suffered through probably neglect by the railroad firm and an elevator firm, and by the lodge taking up his problem a happy solution was worked out. I believe that that farmer, had he undertaken it on his own, would have met obstructions that probably he would never have been able to surmount. Today he is happily satisfied; he has obtained restitution — a very fine and worthwhile effort on the part of the Kamsack Union lodge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a need for concentration, time and thought to marketing problems these days. We have had a resolution before this House. Our farmers are greatly interested in it. There is a challenge to farmers today to solve their problems. Farmers are ready to take it up. Lack of funds prevents them from doing this. They need funds to hire the best brains in the country to present the farmers' case. Too much time today is needed at present to keep solvent, and hence this detracts from the time they could give to practical work.

As an educational institution alone our farm unions warrant financial aid from all Government levels, but this resolution asks only for the right of the farmers to aid themselves. The farm movement is an expansion of the democratic principles. Farmers desire to aid in moulding their own destinies. There is great need in Canada for active farm organizations to take the lead in and operate with government branches on all levels in the solution of agricultural problems. All Canada, and particularly the west, Mr. Speaker, can stand to gain if the farmer gains or improves his position. We must never lose sight of this fact. Every political group, every labour group and every business group should support our farm requests.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word further to what my colleagues, Mr. Wahl and Mr. Feusi, have said.

As the past Vice-President of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union I realize how imperative it is that some consistent form of dues collection be set up. I think that our Saskatchewan Farm Union is doing a job, as is the Manitoba and Alberta Farm Unions. Their history has proven that they are an effective, progressive and a needed farm organization.

Now, these arguments that have been put up against the voluntary requisition, I do not think are too sound, and I would like to see all members of this Assembly endorse this motion.

I want to point out as a member of the Registered Hereford Association that we already have that principle in force in that field. I do not know whether any of the gentlemen opposite or on this side of the House are members of a registered breed association, but we know — in fact I have a copy in my pocket of an application form for registration. Before we can make an application or get an animal registered today, we must be paid-up members of the Registered Hereford or any other Breed Association. That is a must. It is a compulsory membership before we can have the service of the registration department at Ottawa, and it is a good idea.

This is again just a follow-up of the same principle, but it is not compulsory and I would like everyone to give a lot of serious thought to this motion and endorse it and thus do our best to persuade the Federal Government to introduce this voluntary requisition plan. It would be very workable. The Saskatchewan Farmers' Union and other prairie farm unions have agreed to pay any costs that might be incurred through the extra book work. I foresee no difficulty in this whatever, and I know that it would certainly be of great assistance to the organized farm movement.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

### Conference re Labour Problems

Moved by Mr. Tucker, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

“That this Assembly, recognizing the right of the worker to organize and decide to withhold his labour and the right of management to decide to cease operations and that there are certain fields of activity where the unlimited exercise of these rights to promote the economic interests of either labour or management may be most detrimental to the public welfare, urges the Federal Government to call a conference of representatives of the Canadian Government and of Provincial Governments and of organized labour and management with a view to considering this problem and, if possible, establishing a process whereby, when the public welfare would be jeopardized by a strike or walkout, the dispute would be settled by such legally prescribed process.”

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, the reason for my decision to bring this before the Legislative Assembly was prompted by three recent events. One of them was the threatened railway strike which it was realized would do a tremendous amount of harm to the country, and which was settled fortunately without it coming to the point of another strike occurring; and the second matter was the resolution of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture passed at their meeting recently in Victoria, which they passed fearing that a railroad strike was about to take place. It reads as follows:

“Whereas the principles of agricultural conservation in the broadest sense, that is, utilisation of land and the products therefrom, is in the national interest,

“And whereas the fundamental principle on which our democratic civilization is founded is that of law and order, that the supreme governing body shall be that of government legally elected to administer the law,

**March 19, 1953**

“And whereas we recognize the right of the worker to organize and decide to withhold his labour, and the right of management to decide to cease operations,

“And whereas it is our belief that even with the best of intentions on both sides these work stoppages by strike or walkout are inevitable where a clash of economic incident occurs and where no scientific system or democratic law is provided to protect the innocent bystander of society, it is our opinion that individual and collective freedom ends when the freedom and wellbeing of society is challenged or violated,

“Therefore we respectfully submit that, just as laws were made in the interest of society to make illegal settlement by force of disputes between individuals, that now at least, where the public welfare is jeopardized, laws should be made to settle by legal process disputes between organized sections of our economy.”

I am advised by the President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture that that resolution was passed at the annual meeting of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and has been sent to the Government at Ottawa for its consideration.

Then recently, and in fact at present, there is a strike of grain handlers going on at Vancouver, and it has been going on for some time, stopping the shipment of grain out of Alberta. I have here the statement, or rather part of the statement — I will not read it all — issued on behalf of the Alberta Wheat Pool, which is one of the employers. This was reported in the ‘Western Producer’ of February 26, 1953:

“This crop year Canada has at least half a billion bushels of grain available for export. It is of urgent importance not only to the farmers, but to every businessman and to every individual in Canada, that export sales should proceed at the highest possible level. If the Wheat Board cannot fulfil its commitments, other countries will likely take over the markets. Wheat will pile up in Canada, and general unemployment and depressed conditions will prevail.

“To our way of thinking, it is a serious situation when two hundred and fifty relatively well-paid men have the power to tie up the grain export business in great seaports and to cut off the vital exports of grain which mean so much to the welfare of Canada.”

The statement goes on to deal with the actual terms of employment which are being struck against. I will not bother going into that part of it. I thought on reading it that, if that situation could be created on the Pacific Coast, if a similar strike were to take place at the height of the

shipment of grain also at the Great Lakes, what a terrific effect it would have on our whole economy, and it seemed to me that the time had come to give some consideration to that situation.

I thought there was a very good editorial in the 'Western Producer' on the question, dated February 26, 1953. It was the leading editorial, headed "Dangerous Strikes," and reads as follows:

"However, it is becoming more apparent as time passes that industrial stoppages which pose threats to the national economy or to important sectors of it, are recurring at very short intervals. In addition to the railway crisis, there was only last fall the action of the grain handlers at Lakehead, which, had the contemplated strike not been avoided at the last moment, would have brought the movement of grain eastward to a standstill, with disastrous consequences for western farmers. As this is written, the strike of elevator employees at the west coast has halted Pacific shipments which had been fully booked to the end of the crop year. At the same time it has disrupted railway traffic and tied up thousands of boxcars in transit.

"It is time that this problem was faced squarely and its true nature recognized. It is folly simply to wait for each separate crisis to mature, and then under pressure of impending catastrophe, feverishly try on almost any terms to settle it. That is bad for the country no less than for the blood pressure of the negotiators.

"The proposal of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture that a legal process be devised to deal with all such contingencies which will make it quite clear that in certain specified industries at any rate, no stoppage in operations occasioned by either party to a dispute will be tolerated, is what is needed.

"Labour no doubt will protest any denial of the right to strike. This is understandable. Management would be equally reluctant to accept limitations on its full freedom of action; but both parties must be brought to realize that the interest of the community is transcendent, and neither the right to strike nor walkout can be allowed to cripple the economy of the nation or the ordered life of the community."

Now then, as has been stated, the attitude that labour has taken — I would like to put that before the Assembly. I think I can do it best by reading a statement given out by all four labour organizations at the time of the proposed settlement of the railway strike in 1950, when it was proposed that Parliament pass a law ending the strike. This is cited in the publication for Autumn, 1950, of 'Public Affairs', which is put out

**March 19, 1953**

by the Institute of Public Affairs at Dalhousie University. This is from the statement given out by the Canadian Catholic Confederation of Labour, the Joint Legislative Committee of the Railway Running Trades, the Trades and Labour Council and the Canadian Congress of Labour. This is what they stated in that regard:

“We are unalterably and unequivocally opposed to compulsory arbitration for the following reasons:

“1. Compulsory arbitration removes the sense of responsibility which both unions and management have developed, but it is collective bargaining which has developed this sense of responsibility. Compulsory arbitration means the end of collective bargaining, and neither management nor unions will bargain in earnest when they know that the decision will ultimately be taken out of their hands. Responsibility will be shifted from the parties to a Government-appointed tribunal, and both parties will be encouraged to make extravagant demands accordingly.

“2. Compulsory arbitration is no use unless the awards can be enforced. This might require substantial police action to make the workers remain on the job and work. Who will do the enforcing? We will not accept the ‘police state’ even in this embryo form.

“3. Compulsory arbitration would in most cases require the appointment of arbitrators by the Government. Experience suggests this would generally mean judges. Our judges are eminently qualified for their normal work, but with few exceptions they are not equipped to deal with the complicated matters involved in most industrial disputes. They are usually drawn from the section of our population which has little or no knowledge of workers’ problems. Those who are appointed to sit in judgement of such matters ought to have knowledge and understanding of labour-management problems.

“4. Compulsory arbitration would lead to illegal and wildcat strikes. Negotiated settlements are accepted because they reflect the will of the rank and file. Imposed settlements involve submission, not acceptance. This would lead inevitably to industrial unrest.

“5. Compulsory arbitration puts industrial relations into the arena of politics.

“6. Compulsory arbitration will not work. Australia has had it for 46 years. Australia has a smaller population than Canada, but in 1948, the last year for which complete returns are available, the number of strikes and walkouts in Australia was 1141; in Canada it was only 154. The number of persons directly affected



in Australia was 301,025, while in Canada it was only 42,820. In Canada, in 1949, the total number of strikes and walkouts was 137, the total number directly affected was 51,347. Australia, in the first nine months alone, had over 600 stoppages, with more than 227,000 persons directly affected.

“These are the reasons why we oppose all legislation seeking to establish compulsory arbitration as a basis for settling industrial disputes. Our present labour laws have brought a wide measure of industrial harmony. We want that further improved. Until now we have never experienced a nation-wide tie-up of our railways. This is the first. Crises call for cool heads. Government and Parliament should not allow this one case to drive them in panic into drastic, repressive legislation from which all, labour, management and ordinary citizens, will suffer for generations to come.”

That is the quotation from the statement of the Labour Unions in regard to the proposed compulsory settlement of the railway strike. The difficulty was that it was necessary somehow to bring the strike to an end, and it was finally found necessary for Parliament to pass a law settling the strike, in spite of the attitude of the Labour Unions.

The situation is recognized by labour that there are some fields where a strike would be so disastrous to public welfare that it is not to be thought of, and they have been considering that particular problem. For example, it is well understood that you cannot have a strike of your Armed Forces in the middle of war, you cannot have a strike of the police force, you cannot have strikes of people who are looking after the sick in hospitals, and there are different fields like that. The question is, what is to be done to protect the people who are working in those fields? They definitely have no right to strike. Obviously their rights should be fully protected so that they do not suffer from the fact that they are in a field where it would not be regarded as right to strike.

That has been recognized, I understand, because since I put this resolution on the Order Paper I got a letter dated March 14 of this year, from the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada by the chairman of the Provincial Executive Committee, and he says in this letter, and I am quoting from part of it:

“I think it is but right that I ought to advise you of labour’s stand in connection with such matters. This matter was thoroughly discussed several times at meetings of our Provincial Executive, and advice sought from our Congress headquarters. The decision of our Provincial Executive, confirmed by Congress headquarters, that they would only agree to city firefighters and policemen, as they have a no-strike clause in their constitution.

“Hoping that this information may be of some guidance to you in presenting your motion,”

**March 19, 1953**

and he states that he is forwarding a copy of the brief which they presented to the Government on December 17 last. I see that, in this brief, in the item headed "Saskatchewan Fire-fighters" it states that the Saskatchewan Executive of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada strongly endorse the actions of the Saskatchewan Fire-fighters' Association and the Police Association in asking for compulsory arbitration:

"We respectfully request that the Saskatchewan Government pass the necessary legislation which applies to these associations only. No other class of workers are affected in any way by the suggested legislation, and we see no reason why the request should not be granted.

"This request is endorsed by our parent body, the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, of which we are a part; the American Federation of Labour and all the individual trade councils of this Province. It is also in operation in some of the States across the international boundary and some provinces in the Dominion of Canada."

I read these items, Mr. Speaker, to show that the farmers of this province, which is the basic industry of the country, feel that this is a very serious matter and that while the general attitude of labour is against compulsory arbitration, they realize that in certain fields where a strike is not to be thought of, then there should be (in fact they advocate) compulsory arbitration.

The more one looks into this matter, the more difficult it appears, because as stated in the item I have already read, where they tried compulsory arbitration in Australia, the situation has not worked out as well here. I believe they tried compulsory arbitration in New Zealand, the first of any of the present free countries in the world. They passed such a law in 1894. It was repealed by other than a Labour Government and re-enacted later by a Labour Government in 1936, the Compulsory Arbitration Law, and as has already been indicated, Australia has a compulsory arbitration law. Great Britain had one right through most of the war, and has recently repealed her compulsory arbitration law.

Canada, I think it might be fairly said, pioneered in the field of compulsory investigation, the idea being that there could not be a strike until the matter was thoroughly investigated, and then a report would be made where public opinion could be apprised of the exact issues in dispute, and that that would be brought to bear on the parties to the dispute, and they would be likely then to settle on a fair basis. That was known, I believe, as the Lemieux Act, passed in 1907.

Now I was under the impression I must say, Mr. Speaker, that our compulsory investigation law, giving a time for investigation, time for cooling off as they say, was actually very satisfactory; but since I have looked into this matter, I find that there are some people now who say that it is no longer as effective as it used to be; that, as in the railway strike, all it means is that the settlement of the matter, its final coming to a head, is delayed and delayed, and in the meantime perhaps the situation changes; then by the time it comes to the final report of the commission looking into the matter, it is not satisfactory to the parties, and by that time, instead of having cooled off, they have been, as they say, 'hotted up'.

I have seen it suggested by very great students that that law should be re-examined in regard to its effectiveness. In our country here we, of course, have the added difficulty that certain disputes are within the jurisdiction of the Provinces and others within the jurisdiction of the Dominion, and that certainly makes the whole problem even more difficult.

If one grants that there are certain fields where a strike would be most disastrous to society as a whole, then, as I suggested, even the labour unions say that they realize that strikes cannot go on indefinitely in such fields, there must be provisions made for the public intervening and settling the thing on terms that are fair to both sides. If that is recognized in such fields as the fire-fighters and policemen, then, when you come to the question, for example, of handling our grain at the seacoast, where in a dispute there, if both sides took a completely adamant attitude whereby shipment of our grain out of this country might be held up in the fall of the year when there is a real congestion of boxcars, and they need to load ships at the Head of the Lakes just as fast as they can, one can just imagine, with no machinery at all to settle it (as apparently seems to be the case) what a disastrous effect that could have on our whole economy in western Canada and in the rest of Canada.

It seems to me that it is time we began to look into this most important problem, and as the editorial in the 'Western Producer' suggests, not wait until we are caught in some terrible crisis like that and have to act on the spur of the moment.

That is the reason why I am bringing forward this resolution, because undoubtedly there are such fields. We know that a railroad strike if it is protracted in our country, especially if it happens in the winter, can have a very disastrous effect upon human life and health in our country, which depends upon the railroads often for their supplies of fuel and food, and for other necessary supplies. Today, if a railroad strike takes place, there is no provision in law for settling it, and today we have to rely entirely on the sense of responsibility of the management and labour. If that is true in regard to the railroad, it is true in regard to the people who handle grain and other such items as that.

If you are going to suggest that the time might come when these proposed strikes shall be settled by government action, then, as suggested in regard to fire-fighters, there must be some provision whereby in our free state of society the rights of those workers shall be fully protected by some sort of a labour court or something that will decide on these problems and without society being injured by a long and protracted strike.

I was very interested in an article by the editor of the Institute of Public Affairs at Dalhousie, in regard to this problem, in the Autumn issue of 1950. I think perhaps he takes an unduly pessimistic view of the situation, but it is interesting anyway, because this is entirely a non-partisan publication, and by a student obviously of this great problem. He says:

"Ibanez Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse pale into insignificance alongside the dread quartet which today rise unrestrained across the face of a quaking and uncertain world, for instead of the Four Freedoms promised by Roosevelt and Churchill in the Atlantic Charter, the Four

**March 19, 1953**

Fears of Totalitarianism, War, Inflation and Industrial Strife once again haunt the human race ad mid-century.”

He goes on later in this article to indicate what his suggestion would be. He says:

“What is needed is not an economic policy to go with the new era of industrialism in Canada. That we already have. Rather, the most urgent requirement is a set of political and social concepts as a foundation for industrial self-government. The consequences of failure to provide such a foundation are ominously foreshadowed in the railway dispute. Compulsory arbitration in that dispute sets a precedent which in the last analysis means that both management and labour have been deprived of their economic freedom as punishment for conduct detrimental to the national interest. Such development fairly bristles with danger signals to a free society such as ours.”

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I am quite conscious that this brings into conflict two of the great problems of our democracy, two competing principles involved: (1) to preserve the hardly-won freedom of our citizens to strike and withhold their labour if they feel that they should and (2) to protect the public interest against strikes and walkouts which do irreparable harm to the country. It cannot only apply to the leaders of labour but it can apply to the owners of industries necessary to the welfare and protection of our country; that in a dispute the fault might lie largely on their side, that they would deny the use of their plant to labour when they felt they were not satisfied.

Then on the other hand there is the preservation of our basic freedom in regard to these matters, and that is recognized in the resolution which I propose to move, as you, Mr. Speaker, will have noticed. It is set out in it that the right of the people to withhold their labour is recognized, and then recognizing the rights of society itself. It seems to me that this is a most difficult problem. It is one that it is recognized by everybody as a real problem of democracy, and it would be far from my intention to suggest any solution to it now because it is too complicated and too difficult. But I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the proper thing to do in our federal system is first of all to have a conference at which organized labour will be represented, at which organized employers will be represented, at which the public interest will be represented, perhaps by some real expert in these problems who has studied them in other countries as well as our own, and particularly in the United States where they have a federal system; and also where the Provinces will be represented. They will have in mind the difficulties that, for example, are faced today by the farmers of Alberta, and that might well be faced by our farmers if a protracted strike took place on the Great Lakes.

I do not think that a conference like this could be expected to give the careful study to a problem like this, as to some solution, as to how far steps should be taken in saying that in any particular area it is so vital to the public welfare that there should not be protracted strikes or

walkouts, how far should be gone in the light of present economic conditions, and then what should be done to amply protect the right of the working man who happens to go into that line of work. It seems to me that a conference might lay down the terms of reference of a Royal Commission which could be set up to fully study this problem, and on which would be represented organized labour, the organized employer, the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments, and which would have the right to examine the situation in the light of our conditions and what has been done in other parts of the world, and try to deal with this most important problem.

I feel that in the light of what happened in connection with the railroad strike, when as stated the matter had to be settled by legislation which many people thought was a very bad precedent, but it was felt there was no other way out because that strike could not be permitted to continue; when I think, seeing what is happening today with the tie-up of grain on the Pacific Coast, what could happen if there was a real tie-up of grain in regard to the Great Lakes, and then consider other fields where we are saying on the one hand that it is wrong for labour to strike and on the other hand saying to them if they do strike, finding fault with them, and in the next breath telling them that there is no provision made for seeing to it that their rights are protected just the same as if they had the right to strike, we are letting a situation drag on which one of these days will land us in the position where we will again have to take some sudden and drastic action.

It seems to me that this Legislature might very well call this matter to the attention of the Federal Government with a view to calling a conference, and the purpose of that conference would be to lay the foundation for a Royal Commission to look into this matter to protect the public interest, to protect the rights of our producers particularly in provinces like ours, and to protect the rights of labour as they should be protected in democracy.

I move the resolution standing in my name on the Order Paper, seconded by Mr. McDonald.

**Mr. D.H.R. Heming (Moose Jaw City):** — It is true there might be need of some type of compulsory legislation governing the strike weapon of labour, but the strike weapon of labour has been a long while in effect, and it was hard fought for. As you will recollect, the Todpuddle Martyrs were the first originally; they were debarred from recognition and were sent to Australia and elsewhere for organizing. Since those days all men who belong to organized labour have sought to retain the strike weapon as an ultimate weapon in event of the bargaining feature falling through.

Not for myself alone do I speak, Mr. Speaker. When this motion came on the Order Paper, I contacted the three major provincial groups of organized labour within the province, and asked them what they thought of the motion, and as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, the head of the Trades and Labour Council of Saskatchewan informs me that they are against any proposed compulsory legislation, but under their charters they do have policemen and firemen on the international charter to which they belong, that is Trades and Labour. These two classes are not permitted to strike.

**March 19, 1953**

Personally I think possibly some other method could be arrived at whereby the same results could be achieved by not letting them strike, by resorting to some type of proxy action whereby they could get equal treatment with other civic employees. That is my own personal idea.

The Trades and Labour Council are against compulsory arbitration except in those two instances. The Canadian Congress of Labour are opposed to it in its entirety for all unions, and it might possible be that that Trades and Labour Council would legislate for the firemen and for the policemen. If it should so happen that the Canadian Congress of Labour set up an organization to deal for these men, it would be on the basis of not having compulsory legislation. That is as it might be some day.

I would like to quote from the Executive Secretary of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, C.C.L.:

“You will know that our Federation has consistently opposed moves towards compulsory arbitration. This attitude has been expressed in our annual legislative briefs to your Government over the past four years. This stand is in conformity with that of our parent organization, the Canadian Congress of Labour.

“One resolution begins by conceding the rights of workers to organize, and if need be strike. It ends by proposing the consideration of a legally prescribed process which to our mind is a nice way for compulsory arbitration which would deny the rights to strike.

“We hope this resolution is not a part of the numerous attempts being made across this country to introduce this method as a universal means of settling labour dispute.

“It is noted that the resolution speaks about the application of this process where the public welfare would be jeopardized by a strike. This kind of term could be employed to cover the whole, or virtually the whole, field of collective bargaining. What was the public welfare and how was it jeopardized would be presumably determined by government or its agency. Labour, not unnaturally, recognizes the dangers in that sort of a situation and opposes the overwhelming powers which government would have.

“The principle of collective bargaining calls for agreement by negotiation between labour and management. This would suffer a great and damaging blow of incalculable effect on the nation, were legal arbitration to be legislated. Good employee-employer relations grow out of the give-and-take at the bargaining table. The presence of a compulsory settlement will result inevitably in the rapid by-passing of tried bargaining usages to the business of arbitration.

“From 1946 to 1951, according to D.B.S. figures, only one-tenth of one per cent of working time in Canada was lost on account of strikes of walkouts. This figure could

be compared to the estimated 86 per cent of all lost time which is lost because of illness in industry. More time, in the same vein, was lost because of unemployment in the first six months of 1950 than was lost because of strikes in the first fifty years of this century.

“In Saskatchewan where time lost from strikes is perhaps lower than the average, there are like comparisons. In 1950, 236 days were lost because of accidents reported to the Compensation Board for every one day lost because of strikes. In Saskatchewan, in January 1953, days lost due to unemployment in that month were triple those due to strikes in the whole preceding seven-year period, 1946-52.”

That, Mr. Speaker, was the Canadian Congress of Labour. The Chairman of the Running Trades Committee of Saskatchewan, too, expressed an opinion. I would like to quote that opinion also:

“In my opinion the resolution is worded in quite innocent language designed to accomplish a noble purpose, but the sponsor of the resolution is bound to be more concerned towards injecting a Taft-Hartley curb on our unions.

“It may be that some industries are of such vital importance to the welfare of the nation that a tie-up is out of the question, and government intervention is necessary such as has been experienced with our transportation wage disputes. However, it should be carefully set out, the industries which it could be claimed are essential to the life of a nation, but labour must most certainly be on their guard lest the choice of those which might be classified as essential are too much on the employers’ side.”

The general contention of the thing is that the labour of Saskatchewan, and mind you we are a small group in comparison with the organized labour of Canada, we have a little over 15,000 T. and L. men, 10,000 C.C.L. men, and the balance of the 30,000 are running trade and independent unions, out of over a million in the Dominion of Canada. It would seem somewhat presumptuous for us, a small group in Saskatchewan, to ask the Dominion of Canada to take certain action without consultation, as is suggested in the resolution.

There was one phase, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition did quote too the brief and exact extracts in connection with compulsory arbitration in Australia and where in the last year they had a report on (1948 I understand) that phase and there were about ten times the number of strikes in Australia that there were in Canada, with Canada having about twice as many organized labour, or more, than Australia.

It is true that the Dominion of Canada, in 1950, passed special legislation of a compulsory nature in connection with the railroad strike, but it was the first time that that was done in Canadian history, and I submit, Sir, that they still have that power any time they wish for the good and welfare of Canada, that the Canadian Government at Ottawa can pass any legislation they so desire in a national emergency.

**March 19, 1953**

In Canada, as I say, at the present time we have five and a half million (or close thereto) of a labour force, and about four million of them are paid wage-earners and a little over a million are organized labourers. Our percentage of organized labourers in Canada, in comparison with the United States of America or with Great Britain, is slightly down, but our record in connection with dealing with our employers in Canada, I think, fares as well in Canada as any other country in the world.

The thing that I seem to sense, Mr. Speaker, is that the things which were promised the working man (and that is the low-paid wage-earner) during the war, the absence of fear and the absence of want, these things are basic and should be given consideration and held in the minds of all legislators when they enact basic labour legislation, and I would like to read a few paragraphs of the Universal Bill of Rights of which Canada, being a member of the United Nations, sat and agreed to, but which to date they have not put into legislation. I would read three paragraphs of the preamble, which mean a lot:

“Whereas the condition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

“Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind and the advent of a world in which human beings should enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want have been proclaimed as the highest aspirations of the common people,

“Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law.”

And a few of the articles of the Declaration itself, Mr. Speaker:

“Every one has the right to life, liberty and security of person. No one should be held in slavery or servitude. Slavery and slave trade shall be prohibited in all forms.

“Every one has the right to freedom of movement and resident within the borders of each state. Every one has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country.

“Article (20) Every one has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

“Article (22) Every one, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and rulings of each state of the economic, social and economic rights indispensable for his dignity and the right . . .”



“Article (23) Everybody has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work, and to protection against unemployment. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration, insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection. Everyone has the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests. Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including a reasonable limitation of working hours, and periodical holidays with pay.

“Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and wellbeing of himself and family, including food, clothing, housing, medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age and other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.”

That, Mr. Speaker, is behind the move of organized labour in these days. They are desirous of assuring a better living and in bargaining with employers, they can and are achieving that. But I will admit that there is a great fear, both here and in the United States of America, that the organized labour movement has gone too far too fast, and that an attempt is being made now to restrict its growth, restrict its movements, and I submit, Sir, that it is not right.

The power of legislation, and the recognition of the obligation that Canada has assumed by virtue of being a member of the United Nations, I think show that now, although the Committee that was requested by the Dominion Government to amend the B.N.A. rights some while ago and which all boiled down to the idea of changing our own Dominion Act for the first time after the Treaty of Westminster that we had an opportunity so to do, they failed to reach, and I sometimes think, Sir, that something like this resolution calls for it may also fail to reach; but I contend that the Federal Government itself has the jurisdiction, if they so wish, to enact legislation for the good and welfare of Canadians in Canada, especially by so virtue of the fact that they have agreed to this Universal Bill of Rights which guarantees certain things to all people.

You recollect, Mr. Speaker, in 1867, when they first formed our Confederation of five provinces into one Confederation, the idea those days was that the Federal Government had all power within its own self, and the legislators of the provinces would only be minor small governments acting within very limited powers of jurisdiction. In fact, I will quote what Sir John A. MacDonald said:

“We thereby strengthen the central Parliament and make the Confederation one people and one government instead of five people and five governments, one united province with their local governments and legislators subordinate to the general government and legislature.”

In those days, Mr. Speaker, and still today the Federal Government maintains the right of appointing lieutenant-governors. A province cannot touch this. They still demand the right not to assent to a Bill; the

**March 19, 1953**

Dominion Government can yet, a year after legislation has been passed here, declare it ultra vires. They claimed in 1867 that they would have power over property and civil rights, they would have power even to go within provincial jurisdiction, and have certain educational powers and privileges of religious minorities rights. In treaties with other countries they also claimed the rights on behalf of the Provinces as well as themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that seemed to strike me most was that in 1867, and I believe they still have the power — the power to bring any work under exclusive jurisdiction by declaring it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more provinces. I think, Sir, that they still have that power, and any particular work means anything and everything because they did in those days attach to themselves the power of commerce, the power of trade, and the power of taxation, and originally intended that they should maintain this.

But from those days down to these days, with Lords Haldane and Watson and the various interpretations that have been placed upon the British North America Act, have divided authority so much that the B.N.A. Act, today, is a shambles.

As I said before, they are unable to amend our own Act — the British North America Act — today, and it looks like they never will amend it because the Provinces cannot agree; but I still think that if it became a question of emergency, any emergent legislation, the Federal Government can if they so desire call it to the advantage of the Dominion of Canada, which they did with the railroad strike; and although, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned with the actions of the Federal Government indirectly and aside from this, I understand at the present time there are some amendments before the House of Commons in connection with amendments to the Criminal Code. There are one or two of those which labour on the Federal scale are somewhat afraid would interfere with the rights of labour and would tie their hands down in Section 509A whereby if they impeded any movement of any ship or any engine or any car, why they could be sent to gaol.

I notice, too, Mr. Speaker, that on the other side of the line they have a Bill before the Congress down there, too, which makes it seem as though certain high men in this country have joined hands with certain high men in the country to the south, whereby labour shall be attacked as a whole at one and the same time. There is a Bill down there (HR7647) which wants the Congress to give power to an employer to demand an injunction against anybody who goes on a strike. The injunction will be in force for 80 days, after which time receivers will be appointed for the management and receivers for the union, which means that as long as they wish to have receivership they will be there without any chance of bargaining. I would submit too, Sir, that on account of the difference of opinion which has existed between labour and management it has made management smarter and they have used their brains to more advantage. I think that has contributed in no small amount to our great national production here and in the United States of America, by virtue of the fact that the men who are affected had to be smart in order to survive. I think that is one of our main avenues of advancement in the future. If they want to establish a legislation whereby there will not be any incentive to do anything but lay down and let the Government do it all, why then, Sir, I think we are barking, for the time being at least, on the wrong trail.

I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, looking over the motion very conscientiously, to move an amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr. Stone:

“(1) That all the words after the word ‘operations’ in the third line to the word ‘welfare’ in the sixth line be deleted, and

“(2) that the last three lines be deleted and the following substituted therefor: ‘setting forth basic national rights of labour, management and public under a National Labour Code’.”

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

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition bringing an important matter like this before this Legislature, and in my opinion it is one of the most constructive things he has done since he has been in this House.

I do not agree with his narrow terms of reference in the motion, but I do not blame him for coming to that conclusion, because there are thousands like him — and he mentioned some farmers. After all people are very busy; they cannot go into all the ramifications of all the problems before us, and we are apt to rely on high-paid research workers and statisticians and journalists and correspondents to bring to us, in very brief form, the solutions of all our problems, and sometimes they are tinted according to the way in which these workers are paid. We have heard quite a lot of rumblings recently about a Taft-Hartley Bill in Canada and compulsory arbitration for the workers of this country; but I want to traverse a few years, Mr. Speaker, so that we can come up to date, and I want to try and point out the reasons of our problems today.

I think if you remember, during the war there were restrictions. Some of the restrictions labour did not like, and certainly there were some restrictions that management and industry did not like. But I think you will agree, and I think all members will agree, there was wonderful teamwork during those years. The Government of that day had to be commended for the job it did. There had to be teamwork because we had a big job to do, and I think you all agree that all of us were more or less secure at that time. I think the management were not doing too badly; labour was doing pretty good, and I think the farmer was doing pretty good. I think I remember one of the farmer members mentioning, the other day, that they were nearly parity prices during the war than at any time during our history. The price of their products was closer in relation to the cost of production. So we had wonderful teamwork during that period, Mr. Speaker, and the Government played its part in keeping labour in line and keeping management in line.

The ink was hardly dry on cessation of war, and certainly the war plants had not had time to re-tool for peacetime production, before there was a clamour for these restrictions to be removed, and they became quite prominent even during 1945. In 1945, of course, we had an election, and our Liberal Party promised to retain these restrictions. I think you will remember some of the advertisements that went out at that particular time. But it was some time in 1946 when they in their wisdom, and abetted by the Progressive-Conservative Party, decided that the restrictions had to go.

**March 19, 1953**

Now all the labour organizations mentioned — the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, Canadian Congress of Labour, Canadian Catholic Federation of Labour, and the Dominion Joint Legislative Committee — went together and warned the Government at that time just what would happen if they removed these controls or restrictions, and they pleaded with the Government, along with other public organizations, farm organizations, not to remove those restrictions but to continue on during the post-war period. They also warned the Government at that time that, if they did remove controls then organized labour would not stand idly by and see their standard of living depressed; they would have to fight if the laws of the jungle were brought back once more in this country.

That brings us up to date, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to you that industry have got everything they have asked for without any fight whatever. Organized labour has had to fight for everything to retain that decent standard of living, and just exactly what has happened is what those labour organizations told them would happen at that time. The low-income worker, the worker with fixed income, the man with a small pension, small earnings, these were the ones that would suffer.

Now, I want to say that labour would not be satisfied with the terms laid down in the motion. They are far too narrow, because we feel that we are not getting our fair share of the national income. I think the national income, last year, was pretty close to \$23 billion and, after all, labour — and when I speak of labour I do not just mean industrial workers, I mean workers of the soil, too — are mainly responsible for that national income; and when you think of \$22 billion odd produced by a small group of people of some 14 million, it is a pretty tremendous undertaking, and I say we are not satisfied that we are getting a fair share of that national income, when we look and see the kind of houses that our people have to contend with today — our workers and our low-income workers. We are not satisfied that our children have the benefit of equal educational opportunities. We still contend that there are not the proper medical care services today in this country of ours. And speaking of medical care, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that whereas only 10 per cent of the days lost in industry are through strikes, yet some 86 per cent of the time is lost through sickness and ill-health. We are going to pay a lot of attention to strikes which cause 10 per cent of the stoppage in production, and we are going to close our eyes to this very important matter.

You will remember that, during the war, the majority of the best of our man-power and woman-power was in the Armed Forces, leaving behind a corps of people who either could not comply with the medical requirements or the age limits. These were left behind to perform a very important job, and I think they did a wonderful job. It is interesting to note that many of the big industries during the war were concerned about the production-time lost through sickness and illness. They did have clinics set up. They had a full-time doctor and a nurse. They tackled common ailments such as colds, headaches, eyestrain — yes, and they realized too that men do come to work sometimes with a hang-over, and they did encourage men to get some relief so that they could produce better after a hang-over. It was realized even during the war the time that could be lost through sickness and illness, and it is always a surprise to me that those who oppose a national health insurance scheme will always look on one side of the ledger and look at the tremendous costs, and close their eyes to the other side and fail to see the dividends that could come from such a scheme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out the benefits that accrued during the war from a sane system of some kind of teamwork between management and labour. I pointed out the results today and who had benefited. I looked at the last budget brought down at Ottawa, and was hoping that there might be some solution in that budget to solve the unrest there is today amongst the workers. But in spite of the fact that industry has got everything that it has asked for, without any trouble at all, yet in that budget again it has been handed a nice, big, juicy steak once more.

I say that workers have had to fight for everything they have had, and, in my opinion, this is just a move to get one more thing. Industry, I say, has got everything they wanted — not quite. There are just the large labour groups; they are the big, bad wolves; we must chop their heads off.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the railroad workers, and everybody knows that the railroad workers, of course, are a big organization and a powerful organization, and that I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, holds up my idea that this is a last move on the part of management and industry to get the last piece they can out of our economy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that the amendment offers more. I am satisfied that labour at any time are willing to sit with any group and discuss their problems; but if we are to be given the responsibility — and we have a responsibility because we do produce most, practically all of the wealth of this nation; if we are to accept those responsibilities, then we must be given a good share in the affairs of our nation. I suggest that, if any attempt is made to bring about compulsory arbitration, rather than reduce the power of the labour organization you are going to make them more militant, and I think you are going to drive them faster towards political action and do something along that line.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for those few reasons I am going to support the amendment.

**Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, speaking in support of the amendment, may I first congratulate the junior members for Moose Jaw and Saskatoon on their very able presentation of the case for a National Code in preference to what we have in the original motion.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that strikes usually get front-page publicity with comparatively little publicity for the settlements that come some time afterwards. According to the Federal Minister of Labour, the Hon. Milton Gregg, V.C., in a report to the Senate Committee, 39,000,000 man-days were lost during the first fifty years of this century, which does sound like a tremendous figure. However, that is less than time lost in unemployment in Canada during the first six months of 1950. Furthermore, there were 4,862 union agreements in effect in Canada in 1950, and only 1.1 per cent of those were affected by strikes. I think that is an excellent record, Mr. Speaker — approximately one strike in every hundred agreements.

I have some further comparative figures here, Mr. Speaker, in regard to time lost through accidents, unemployment and sickness, and it is a fact — let us look at the figures for Saskatchewan: In the year 1950, 1,200 man-days were lost because of strikes in this province; yet 283,360 man-days were lost because of reported accidents only. See the tremendous difference there.

**March 19, 1953**

Now as far as percentage is concerned, strike time lost, in 1950, in this province was two-fifths of one per cent of the total time lost because of accidents reported to the Compensation Board; and putting it another way, 236 days were lost by accidents for every one day lost in strikes, which merely bears out what I say, that strikes do get undue front-page publicity in our press.

I have in my hand a booklet got out by the United States Department of Labour, Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary. In other words, Mr. Tobin is the American counterpart of the Hon. Milton Gregg in Ottawa, or at least he was up until a few weeks ago when the Eisenhower Government came in — I do not imagine he is there any more; in fact, I know he is not, because Mr. Durkin, who was one of the top officials in the Plumbers' Union in the United States, is now the Federal Secretary of Labour. They call them Secretaries down there; we call them Ministers here.

There is a good deal of interesting information in this booklet, and for the benefit of the House I am going to read some brief extracts from it which — I do not want to take up too much time of the House, Mr. Speaker, — will explain or illustrate the rise of labour for the past century and a half. The first item I want to make reference to, is a cut. Apparently it has been an advertisement, a photograph in this booklet, a trial — the trial of twenty-four journeymen tailors charged with a conspiracy before the Mayor's Court of the City of Philadelphia, September sessions, 1827. It shows labour was having a pretty difficult time during that period, and ran afoul of the courts on a good many occasions.

We go up then another decade or a decade and a half, to the late 1840's. Industry had revived, labour was in great demand, prices were climbing, trade unions once more showed signs of activity. As industry spread new locals were formed. By 1854 most important trades showed some degree of organization in the larger centres. Many of these unions collapsed only to be promptly revived and crushed again in 1857 in another downward sweep of the business cycle. I mention that particularly to show that the trade union movement met with great opposition as the decades went along.

We come up to 1860. There was a definite trend towards higher wages and shorter hours for workers.

Here is something of interest. The work-day, often from sunrise to sunset early in the century, was shortened to ten hours for most skilled artisans in the large cities by 1850. At this time factory workers were beginning to work from eleven to twelve hours a day. By 1860 the average work-day for non-agricultural employees was estimated at eleven hours, while building trades averaged about ten.

Wages in 1820, which ranged from 75 cents to \$1.25 a day for common labour depending upon the locality and season, were from \$1.00 to \$1.25 a day in 1850. Wages of more skilled artisans and mechanics in the cities advanced from \$1.25 and \$1.50 a day to between \$1.50 and \$2.00 by 1860.

Here is something entitled "Industrial Strife," which takes on another feature:

"In 1873, and again in 1876, several of the leading craft unions attempted unsuccessfully to revive interest

in a federation based on a strictly trade union programme. Trade union membership meanwhile was being seriously reduced by a new economic depression. In 1877 the railroad strikes” . . .

and we have heard quite a bit about that recently, and some more this afternoon —

“ . . . the railroad strikes which originated in Pittsburgh but spread throughout the country brought in their wake riots, martial law, intervention of State and Federal troops, and some fatalities. A notorious secret association known as the ‘Molly Maguires’ gained control of lodges of the Ancient Order of Hibernians” . . .

My seatmate may know something about them; yesterday was a famous day —

“ . . . in the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania, the product of the distress and poverty of this period. The ‘Molly Maguires’ used terroristic methods against employers and strike-breakers. The group was finally broken up by State authorities with the arrest and conviction of several ringleaders who were charged with a series of murders.”

Violence, of course, throughout that period, was quite common. Here again is another example of it. This refers to as recently as up in the 1890’s:

“Large corporations which had appeared on the economic scene vigorously fought the efforts to unionize their employees. At times, these clashes resulted in violence, injuries and even death. For example, the unsuccessful struggle of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers against the Carnegie Steel Company at Homestead, Pennsylvania, in 1892, was climaxed by a pitched battle between company-imported Pinkerton detectives and strikers, which resulted in ten deaths before the intervention of the National Guard restored order.

“The strike of the American Railway Union, led by Eugene B. Debs, of the Pullman Parlour Car Company of Pullman, Illinois, in 1894, provoked sympathetic walkouts on many railroads serving the Chicago area. Federal and State troops were used and court injunctions were obtained against the union. Twenty-five persons were killed and sixty were injured during this controversy. Elsewhere in the country industrial disputes flared into open violence.”

There are quite a number of other excerpts here that would be of interest to this House, but I am only going to take three or four more. Here is one that comes into comparatively recent times (1935) and I quote:

“The National Labour Relations Act, the Wagner Act, passed July 5, 1935, guaranteed the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively with their employers. It also prohibited employer-dominated or -financed company unions.”

**March 19, 1953**

This, Mr. Speaker, is the act on which the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act was largely patterned — the Wagner Act of the United States passed in 1935.

I might just say in passing that we set up a Labour Relations Board in this province (and I have mentioned it here before, Mr. Speaker) consisting of two representatives of employers, two of the employees, and two representatives of the general public. We felt when we did that eight years ago, it was only fair. Quite often in labour disputes the general public has been the innocent bystander and has suffered to some extent. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition made some reference to that earlier this afternoon. We felt that with representatives of the public on the Board, it would be a good thing and they would look after the interests of the public. I might say both were women, one representing the farm and the other the urban centres.

Just before I put this booklet down, Mr. Speaker, there are three or four other dates here that are quite famous in the history of labour, and it may be surprising to know that we can go away back as far as 1791 to record that the Philadelphia carpenters struck, unsuccessfully, in May for a ten-hour day and additional pay for overtime. This was the first recorded strike of workers in the building trades.

In 1806 — just to show you the feeling at that time against unions — I refer to members of the Philadelphia Journeymen Cordwinders who were tried for criminal conspiracy after striking for higher wages. The charges were: (1) Combination to raise wages, and (2) combination to injure others. The union was found guilty and fined. Bankrupt, as a result, the union disbanded. This was the first of several to be tried for conspiracy.

Something interesting here: Just over a hundred years ago, in 1842, Massachusetts and Connecticut passed laws prohibiting children from working more than ten hours a day.

1877 — we will skip the other dates — the first recorded instance of the use of Federal Troops in a labour dispute during peacetime occurred during a strike of railroad workers against a 10 per cent cut in pay. Railroads operating east of the Mississippi river were involved. This strike was marked by violence and property damage. More than one hundred were reported killed and two hundred injured. 1882 marks the setting aside of one day a year for Labour Day.

1886 refers to the Chicago Haymarket riot in which one policeman was killed and several others wounded, “aroused public opinion against unionism and radicalism, and for several years stopped the movement for the eight-hour day. The meeting in the Haymarket Square had been called as a peaceful protest against the killing of four strikers and wounding of others during a strike for the eight-hour day at the McCormick Reaper Works.”

None of us in this House, of course, can remember back that far, but it is in the not-too-distant past that there was a great deal of violence in the United States and to a lesser degree in Canada, of course.

Then I refer again to the Homestead strike, 1892-1894, to the strike of the American railways. In 1902, the United Mine Workers ended a five-months' strike against anthracite operators, agreeing to arbitration by a presidential commission.



“The Anthracite Coal Strike Commission appointed in 1903 recommended a 10 per cent wage increase in conciliation, but was denied recognition.”

We will skip over to 1914, which will be the last reference I will make:

“December 1, the President appointed the Colorado Coal Commission which investigated the Ludlow massacre and labour conditions in Colorado coal mines, following an unsuccessful strike by the United Mine Workers.”

There is a good deal more interesting information here, Mr. Speaker, but time does not permit me to go into it to any great extent. However, I hope I have given some background to the history of strikes in the United States and the violence with which some of them were met even to the extent of using the Pinkerton Detective Agency, Federal troops, police and so forth.

Now, it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that strikes may be inconvenient — they usually are to a good many people — and even expensive; but I think the figures and dates I quoted prove that, in latter years, this has tended to be reduced to a great extent, and I cannot think in this country, or in eastern Canada either, of them getting to the state as to where they might be considered dangerous. The quotation the hon. Leader of the Opposition gave — a joint statement of four groups in Dalhousie — by the Canadian Catholic Congress of Labour, C.C.L., Trades and Labour, the Railway Running Trades, stated definitely that two organizations were opposed to compulsory arbitration, and further that it meant an end to collective bargaining; for obviously, the parties concerned cannot bargain properly and in good faith knowing that the final settlement is going to be made by somebody else. The suggestion was made that judges could be appointed by Governments to act as arbitrators, but they have not the knowledge of labour matters. They may be very fine gentlemen but labour does not want to have boards of this kind set up, and they feel just as strongly about it now as they did back in 1950.

Some reference was made to the possibility of strikes in hospitals, and I think we would all agree that that would be a terrible thing; but up until now I have never heard of a strike in a hospital in the United States or Canada, or anywhere else as far as that is concerned. Employees are not unreasonable and are not going to expose the general public to undue hardship or undue dangers, as would be the case if such a thing as a strike in a hospital ever did take place.

Reference was also made, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Saskatchewan Firefighters and the Police were requesting legislation that where (now this is very important) they have a ‘no-strike clause’ in their agreement, in the event of a dispute that the two parties cannot agree on, then it should be referred to a Board of Arbitration. Now it is quite correct that the Trades and Labour Congress of Saskatchewan did approve of that request to this Government, but at the same time they did definitely state that they would go no further. That was as far as they would go — with the firefighters or the police, and would not recommend any other industry at all.

Now, as I stated a few moments ago, labour is opposed to the resolution as it is on the Order Paper, but I know is favourable to the

**March 19, 1953**

amendment which has been requested for a good many years, requesting a National Code. It is only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that all provinces should operate under similar legislation. We would of course — and I say this just in closing — expect that the National Code, if and when it ever does come about, would be at least the equivalent of the legislation in this province. We are very proud of the labour legislation here, and would not want to take a retrograde step by accepting something inferior.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that I will support the amendment.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — I am not a labour specialist, or anything like that; I am just a farmer, and I have a few thoughts that I would like to contribute on this occasion. They will be very brief.

I find, however, that the general producer back on the farm suffers most from any strike. I do not care whether it is a packing-house strike or a terminal strike or a strike on the lake, shippers or anything else. It is always the natural producers, the farmers, who get the short end of the stick. We had an example of it, last fall. I am not critical of labour at all, but what I cannot understand in my limited way is why a thing which affects not only the labour and the management or the employer, but affects the whole national economy, should be allowed to happen in a wheat producing country as we are, where we pile up our wheat in the fall by the millions and hundreds of millions of bushels. We have a navigation season here which is very limited, and it is to our interest to get every bushel of grain that we can from our farms down to the terminals, then across the Lakes to seaports so that they can be available for shipment during the season over the oceans, because there is where we must unload 80 per cent of our production. No group no matter how powerful they are (and I apply this both to labour and management) should by their obstinacy, or by their unreasonable attitude to each other, be permitted to tie up the transportation system of this country and jeopardize not only the 500,000 farmers in this country who are dependent on the markets for their living — not only them, but the national life as a whole, because we have been told in this House quite often that now, this last year at least, the wheat production of western Canada is the greatest productive part of our whole economy. It exceeded the paper or pulp industry by a considerable margin during the last year.

That is one instance. I remember in 1947, I think it was, though the year is not so material; it was the last big packinghouse strike we had. And what happened then? Well, the Minister of Agriculture is looking at me very intently, and he may be able to give us some inside track of that; but we find that just in the fall of that year, when the heavy marketing season of hogs and livestock was in full swing, this strike was brought on, and we know what happened. If I remember correctly that was called a 'wildcat' strike or something like that; but we were the ones who suffered, and there were thousands and thousands of hogs that had to be kept back on the farm for the reason that there was no way of shipping them out to the markets where they could be processed and taken care of.

Again last fall, what happened? Just at the height of the shipping season of our grain — as matter of fact I happened to be in the Pool office here in Regina the very morning that the President of the Saskatchewan

Wheat Pool stepped off the train from Winnipeg after having been helpful in finally settling the strike, and I have a vivid recollection of his impression of the great money and effort and disaster that pretty nearly overtook western Canada just through that one strike.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking for either labour or management; I am speaking just for the farmer who is always the victim, no matter what happens, when these two powerful elements clash, and I say to you that I do not know how to remedy this thing. It is immaterial to me how it is done, but it is not showing business ability, and there is certainly lack of honesty of purpose, if the people of Canada cannot get together on a problem as vital to all of us as this is.

We are not living today in a jungle; we do not carry a club or a gun or a rock to put the other fellow out of business. We have gone past those days a long, long time ago, and I say to you that this amendment — as a matter of fact I see nothing wrong with it, only that it is weakening the resolution — sort of nullifies any attempt at all to do something that would have been for the benefit of everybody concerned.

I am sure there is no man in this House who would do anything in the world to weaken the ground and the position that labour occupies today; but I would point out that, because of those responsibilities (and that applies to labour and management alike) it might be well that we take a second thought and a second look at this picture. I have not got here, but I wish I had, the statement made by Mr. Mosher not long ago, to the effect that he thinks perhaps the time has come when the demands by labour can no longer be met by management, and he points out that there might be other ways of getting the thing adjusted in some way. The consequences of anything like that I am not going to go into; but these are things that we should seriously consider, and when we look at British Columbia now, what do we find? Here is the terminal elevators full of wheat and boats come in there at great expense — I think I saw in the press where it costs some boats about a thousand dollars a day to lie idle at that port without any grain. All that is involved is 250 men, and I think it is a month or more that this strike has carried on. Surely to goodness, commonsense and business acumen can fix this thing up. There is no question about that; all we need is the machinery. I am surprised that the labour unions in this county — they are powerful, they are well organized, they are well led — should be afraid to sit down with the employers and with the Government, under the watchful eyes of the Provincial and Federal Governments, and work out some certain rules through which strikes of this kind could be settled without having to spend months and sometimes more, while the national economy and certain people in the country who are dependent on these services, suffer.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — I was not going to make any comments at all, but since the hon. member for Arm River purported to speak the farm viewpoint I would like very briefly to express my own viewpoint as a farmer, too, on this question of labour.

I can recall very well, Mr. Speaker, the time when wages were very low — as a matter of fact when boys were being farmed out to the farms at \$5 a month. This was a time when we experienced the greatest economic difficulties in agriculture. I learned very early on in the farm movement, and in my very close association with the working people, that if labour got better

**March 19, 1953**

wages and enjoyed better living standards, similarly the farmers could expect to receive more for the product of their labours.

I quite agree with the hon. member for Arm River that these very sharp economic conflicts are not desirable; but surely this proposal contained in the resolution proposed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not going to find a solution to the inherent conflict that takes place between employer and employee. I regret that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and again the hon. member for Arm River confused the issue by presupposing that the farmer was the only one who suffered as a result of strikes. We know that industry suffers similarly. We know that labour itself suffers as a consequence of delays; but the strike is the only weapon they have. It is part of the kind of economy and the kind of society under which we live, which is a competitive society, just referred to by the hon. member for Arm River as being the 'law of the jungle', and which seems to be the rule of the day. I have always thought, Mr. Speaker, that by building a proper economic system, a co-operative type of economy, we could remove many of these inherent conflicts, and I suggest that that is the only way they are going to be resolved. They are not going to be removed by legislation, and you cannot expect the lion and the lamb to lie down together, or compel them to lie down together by law. We are not going to stop labour, if they are driven to desperation, from finally resorting to strike action, no matter what we do.

So in the proposed amendment it seems to me that a National Labour Code, if it were implemented, if we had a code of that nature which would apply across the country, it would at least afford in some degree a formula under which labour and management could get together.

The hon. member for Arm River referred to the strike that took place at the time when we were transporting our grain to the seaports. I would like to draw his attention to the fact that one shipping firm has a monopoly on the shipping on the Great Lakes and diverted their boats to the shipment of ore which was more remunerative, and we finally had to appoint a Transport Controller to get those boats back to haul grain again. I would like to suggest to him, too, that on many occasions the packinghouse people and the machine company people have victimized the farmers by raising their prices at a time when there was no strike in the offing, and when no increase in wages had actually taken place at all.

I would suggest to him then, if his criterion is correct, there should have been a strike in the huge fertilizer plant at Calgary, since the price of fertilizer has gone up in recent years from \$65 to \$106 a ton. There was no labour problem involved there at all, and I suggest to him that inherently the farmer is less victimized by labour than he is by capitalism. As a matter of fact, when one scrutinizes the record you find the exploitation taking place as a result of the same type of employer endeavouring also to ride on the back of the farmer by increasing the price of everything that goes into farm operation costs.

I suggest, too, that if labour and farmer will work closely together, they can reconcile many of these differences by building a co-operative commonwealth in which such inherent conflicts between human beings will be removed.

**Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

(Adjournment agreed to)

## MOTION RE GRAIN STORAGE

Moved by Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg), seconded by Mr. Dewhurst:

“That, in view of the fact present public grain storage and transpiration facilities seriously fail to meet present day conditions arising in part from farm mechanization and inequalities in the quota system, this Assembly urges that, in the interests of orderly marketing and the stabilizing of farm income, the Federal Government make immediate provision for:

- (a) storage payments comparable to elevator storage charges on grain suitably stored by farmers;
- (b) substantial advance payments on grain stored in approved bins.”

**Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw a few important points to your attention before moving this motion.

We all know the desperate need of the farmers, this last two or three years, for storage payments for the wheat which they have had to hold on their farms for quite long periods of time, as well as for the advance payments on the grain which they must hold. In the first place, I think we all realize, as we drive throughout Saskatchewan, the tremendous need for proper storage. We can see on farm after farm old and dilapidated bins which are not fit to keep a cat in on a good day, and yet we have to store thousands of bushels of grain in those same bins for periods up to a year, through some of the most adverse weather conditions possible.

We know also that the space at the various delivery points throughout Saskatchewan is not anywhere near adequate. With the present high mechanization of Saskatchewan farms we find the crop being taken off, in good weather at least, in a matter of a few weeks. All of that grain could be hauled in. The machinery is there so that all of that grain could be hauled in if space was available, and yet we find that the total elevator storage space at those points have increased not very much in the last five or ten years.

We also know that the storage space at these small towns throughout Saskatchewan varies quite considerably. We know that the storage space is not in proportion to the wheat acreage of that area. We find tremendous variations in the yields per acre in different areas, and all of this goes to make for very serious inequalities under the quota system as it operates at present.

I know that the Canadian Wheat Board has done a very excellent job in improving their methods of establishing their quotas for different points over the past few years, but I do not think any system can be devised where they are going to keep the quotas strictly equal as between delivery points and according to need.

I want to just point out, Mr. Speaker, that, in Hansard of February 17, the Minister, Mr. Howe, in answering some questions, pointed out

**March 19, 1953**

that as of November, 24, 1952 (just last fall) out of 329 delivery points on a 15-bushel quota there were 264 delivery points on a 5-bushel quota. I think we as farmers can readily remember that situation. We found areas that were thrown open on a 15-bushel quota. The farmers in those areas could deliver up to 15 bushels per seeded acre immediately, or almost immediately, that the crop year started. We found other areas where month after month would go by when the farmers could not deliver a bushel of grain, although a 5-bushel quota was established. The elevators were plugged, and there were only possibly one or two farmers who were able to get in a few loads of grain to plug that available space, and after that there was simply no wheat moved in that delivery point for sometimes months.

Those conditions are very serious indeed because the farmer who might happen to get his work custom-combined, who might happen to have an early crop, would get all of his crop off within the matter of a few days, and, if he were lucky, he might even get all of his wheat into the elevator within a few days, whereas the other farmer who had to wait for the custom combiner, or who had to wait for his crop to get ready, simply could not get any wheat in because the elevators were plugged, and they remained plugged for periods of three and four months.

We also find that, as of December 9, 1952, delivery quotas in Manitoba were 15 bushels per acre all over the province. In Alberta it was not raised to the 15-bushel per acre until January 30, almost two months later; but on January 30, 1953, Saskatchewan still had 929 out of a total of 1100 delivery points, on less than a 15-bushel quota. Saskatchewan still had 929 points on less than a 15-bushel quota on January 30.

I think these figures clearly indicate, Mr. Speaker, the very serious inequality as between provinces. We do not for one minute complain about the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board is taking wheat from areas in Manitoba and even in Alberta, for they have a short haul, where they can rush that wheat to the seaboard to get rid of overseas and to supply available markets. We do not criticize that, Mr. Speaker, but we think that the farmer in Saskatchewan, who has to make storage space available for all of his wheat so that the farmer in Manitoba can deliver his, should be compensated at least in part for that.

We all recognize that there is a certain amount of storage needed in Saskatchewan, but under the present highly-mechanized wheat farms it would be quite impossible for the transportation companies or the elevator companies to handle the necessary wheat fast enough, and we think that the farmer should have some good and proper storage on his farm. I think the storage payments would certainly tend to encourage the farmers to build a certain amount of proper storage on his farm.

One other very important advantage of making storage payments available to farmers (as I said it would encourage the farmers to build storage) it would tend to lessen the terrific glut on the market during harvest time. The farmer who was not interested in getting some cash immediately could hold his wheat back and allow farmers who needed the cash to sell some wheat. That in itself, Mr. Speaker, would lessen some of the congestion in the local elevators, and it would allow the farmers to have a little better choice, or at least a little more opportunity to have a choice, to deliver the grain to his own elevator if he wished.

I know of a good many points in my constituency where the Saskatchewan Pool elevators handled well over 50 per cent of the crop in that area, but the last few years, because the farmers have to take the space as it comes available in whichever elevator it becomes available, that percentage has dropped quite considerably, probably down to a third where it previously had been one-half.

There would not be any unnecessary administrative problems. The Canadian Wheat Board has in the past (and I think it can again in the future) made it possible for storage payments to be paid on wheat. All they would have to do would be to simply increase the initial price of the wheat by a half-cent or a cent or two cents a bushel, depending on the amount of time that it was held by the farmer at the time that he delivered his grain. It would not cost anything to do that — or at least not very much; and yet it would give the farmer the privilege of getting storage payments on the particular wheat which he held for the Canadian Wheat Board.

It would not take any money out of the Federal treasury. We are simply asking for a redistribution of the present grain storage charges. We are simply asking that the farmer should be treated as the elevator companies are now treated. We are asking that the farmer, when he has to store grain, should receive payment for it, as the elevator companies now who have to store grain for the Canadian Wheat Board are receiving payment for it.

The Wheat Board would have the decision to make as to the length of time that the farmers should receive storage payments on their wheat, and they would also have the opportunity of deciding when that storage should be available. There might be some years when the transportation companies and the elevator companies could handle the wheat fast enough so that no farmer would be forced to store wheat. Under those conditions I do not think the farmer would rightfully expect that he should receive storage for his wheat, but under conditions as we have now, where we have had two or three of the largest crops in history . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member a question. I think what he says is correct; but has he thought of including in his resolution that these payments should be made only until such time as the Wheat Board is able to take delivery of the grain? Before we pass it, I think that should be put in it — if we are going to pass it.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Your suggestion was that the payments should be made available only until such time as the Canadian Wheat Board could accept the wheat. Well, that was my understanding, that that was what the resolution was asking for, and I would be quite willing to put that right into the resolution. The only thing is we are getting so many things into the resolution, and we did not want to make it too long, but if anybody cared to move the amendment I would certainly support it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is what happened before.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Yes, that is what happened, I think, during the war years, when we had that condition before . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I had in mind that it might be put in at the end. I just wondered if the hon. member would accept it — that these payments, storage and advance payments should be made until the Wheat Board was able and prepared to take delivery of such grain or something of the sort.

**March 19, 1953**

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Yes, I would certainly support that. I do not know the procedure of getting it in there now.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That could be put right at the end.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — For the crop year ending July 31, 1952, it was pointed out in the annual report of the Canadian Wheat Board that some \$15,300,000 had been paid out to the elevator companies for storage for that year. The storage capacity for western Canada has increased slightly over the past two or three years, which I think is all to the good, up to a point. The storage capacity in 1949 was approximately 262½ million bushels. The storage capacity in 1952 was some 305 million bushels. In that three-year period it increased approximately 42½ bushels; that is, the licensed storage capacity in the local elevators. That increase of 42½ million bushels is costing the prairie wheat growers approximately \$425,000 a month, or in the neighbourhood of \$5 million a year.

As I said, I do not altogether criticize the elevator companies for increasing their storage because, certainly, in certain delivery points that increased storage was necessary. But \$5 million a year would go a long way to improving and providing proper storage facilities throughout the farms of western Canada.

The other very important thing which we are asking for in this resolution is the advance payments on grain stored in approved bins. The United States has had this for a number of years under the Commodity Credit Corporation, and apparently it works very well. There has been no suggestion that it should be withdrawn — at least not as far as I know. I talked to a number of wheat-growers in the United States, across the border, and they tell me that, in the fall of the year, they put their wheat in their own bin. They apply for an advance payment on that wheat, the bin is inspected by an inspector for the corporation, I presume, and if the bin meets their approval the farmer can borrow up to 90 per cent of the total value of that wheat. Then in the spring of the year (I believe it is the end of April), the farmer is notified that he must deliver that wheat to his local elevator and take settlement; or he can return the money which he has already received, and he can take his chances on selling the wheat at any time that he wants. And obviously, if the farmer sees that the price of wheat is higher, then he will return the advance payment and he will sell his wheat on the market; but if he sees that the market has gone down, or is liable to go down, he will quite probably take settlement for the wheat at that time and deliver his grain to a local elevator company.

There is one other thing which I want to draw to your attention. As we all know, the small farmer who probably operates at a very minimum amount of capital, probably does not have very much money in the bank. By the time the harvest season comes around he has spent most of his available cash, and it is then necessary for him to either sell some wheat or borrow some more money. It is those farmers of whom I am thinking when I ask for this substantial advance payment on grain stored, because it is the farmer who cannot get his wheat in to the elevator who needs this advance money.

We know that, in the last year, Saskatchewan has probably experienced one of the worst conditions for credit buying that we have ever seen, not only with the implement companies — or rather through the Farm Improvement Loans, through the banks, and through all the storekeepers and co-ops throughout Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan have built up one of the largest



amounts of credit that probably has ever existed, and I think it would be much more sensible, Mr. Speaker, if the credit which these farmers got was based on the amount of wheat that they had in their bins rather than on how they got along with their local banker. We all know that the banks will loan money to the farmer who does not need it, to the farmer who has lots of wheat and no credit out. But it is not those farmers whom we are thinking of; it is the farmer who probably has a small store bill, a small bill with his Co-op, and possibly some money borrowed on his machinery. It is those people who need money, and who should be able to borrow money on the wheat which they have in their bins to pay off these local debts. We all recall that, in 1952, the Federal Government guaranteed to the banks that they would back up 25 per cent of the aggregate loans made to the farmers of that year by the banks.

The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, I am told, at that time offered to the Federal Government that they would advance money to the farmers if the Federal Government would guarantee 2½ per cent of the loans made. The Federal Government said they would not do that, but they would back loans made by the banks to the extent of 25 per cent. We all know how difficult it is to get money from a bank when we need it. We all know how easy it is to get it when we do not need it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I will draw my remarks to a close and ask for the unanimous support of this resolution since it is so desperately needed now. It is a tremendously serious problem throughout all of Saskatchewan, and I will move, Mr. Speaker, the resolution standing in my name.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I rise just on a question of procedure for a moment, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition has just suggested that this might be clarified by having an amendment added to it, and I wondered if the members who are going to speak on this resolution would like to adjourn the debate and prepare that amendment. The reason I do so is that we are in a bit of a problem. There are two Bills on the Order Paper in the Committee of the Whole — the Department of Telephones and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones Acts, which ought to be given assent to this week, because of the financing arrangements that are going on. If it were possible we would like to get to them this afternoon, and deal with them in Committee of the Whole — there may be some House amendments and one thing and another — and get assent tomorrow. It would help our position materially, and I just wondered if the members who wanted to speak on this would mind very much postponing their remarks until a later date. It would also give those who are interested in putting in that amendment, the chance to prepare it.

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to adjourn the debate, and I will discuss it with the Clerk of the Assembly. It may be possible that I, as the seconder, can incorporate this amendment, but if not, we will see that steps are taken. I would like to adjourn the debate.

(Agreed)

After some time in Committee of the Whole, the Assembly adjourned at 6.05 p.m.