

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session – Thirteenth Legislature
39th Day

Thursday, April 9, 1959

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, April 7, 1959, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Weber (Meadow Lake):

“That this Assembly recommends to the Government the appointment of a Select Committee of the Assembly, under the provisions of Section 56A of The Legislative Assembly Act, as enacted by Chapter 85 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1958, to inquire into the operation and administration of The Trade Union Act in all its aspects;

the said Committee to be empowered to sit after prorogation, during the interval between Sessions; to have the powers and authority, and provided by Section 24 of The Legislative Assembly Act, to call for such persons, papers and things as the Committee may deem necessary in any of its proceedings or deliberations; to examine witnesses under oath or affirmation, and to report the results of its inquiry to the Assembly within the first ten sitting days of the next ensuing Session;

the said Select Committee to be composed of such Members of the Assembly as may be named later.”

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, in speaking in the debate on this motion I cannot conceive what a Committee of this kind, if set up, as advocated by this motion, would do since its scope would be limited to the province of Saskatchewan, and unless the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) knows of some labour union misbehaving within this province a Committee would have no place to start. Since it would not be permissible to discuss union activities outside of this province on this resolution, and in order to widen the discussion of this subject I will have to move the following amendment, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson):

“That all the words after ‘Assembly’ be struck out and the following words substituted therefore:

April 9, 1959

request the Government of Saskatchewan to urge this Government of Canada to appoint an appropriate Commission to investigate Trade Union activities and administration as they affect the economy of Canada;

that the said Commission should have power to extend its investigation into provincial jurisdictions of such provinces that request them to do so.”

There are several things that a Commission of this kind could investigate. The first thing that this Commission might investigate is the possibility of stopping the tremendous loss of earnings to workers through industrial work stoppages ordered by trade union leaders. This loss, as reported by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, amounted during the years 1946 to 1957 inclusive . . .

Mr. Brown (Bengough): I don't like to interrupt my hon. friend, but are we now on the amendment or the motion?

Mr. Lopton: I thought I had to speak to the motion first. The loss, during those years, amounted to 21,565,201 working days. Adding to that at least 2,000,000 working days during the year 1958, it will make the total 23,565,201. As most of these stoppages were by unions whose members were in the high earning brackets, earning from \$1.50 to \$2.50 an hour, it would be conservative to multiply this by \$12 a day. If that is done the amount of loss in terms of money would be \$282,784,413. I might add that I am told by competent authorities that a similar amount was lost, indirectly, by non-striking workers, which would make the total \$565,564,824 during the period in question. Added to this amount may well be the union dues extracted from all union members, which, I am informed, amounts to well over \$60 million a year. For the period in question it would be \$780 million, making a total of \$1,345,564,824 during the period in question, which has been taken out of our workers' pockets. Compare this to the position of the workers at the Imperial Oil Refineries in Regina, who have worked there for over 40 years, I am told, without having to pay any union dues nor suffer any work stoppages as a result of strikes.

In order to prove that the strikes have mostly been carried out by unions in the higher wage brackets I will just mention here two or three. Here is one, for instance – a plumbers' strike in British Columbia. They tied up more than \$50 million worth of construction. Their basic wage, at the time they struck, was \$2.75 an hour. They asked for a boost of 86 cents in addition. They finally settled for 20 cents, but they were 19 weeks out on strike.

Here we have another one – a Teamsters' strike for six weeks, which tied up construction in the amount of \$120 million. Their basic wage at that time ran from \$1.80 to \$2.31 an hour. They were asking for an increase of 53 cents an hour and turned down 40 cents that was offered.

I have another one here – a walkout in British Columbia at the waterfront, that tied up something like \$28 million worth of boats. Their basic wage at that time was \$2.57 an hour; they asked for 61½ cents additional. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are an awful lot of workers in Canada that are getting very much less than that, and they have no chance of getting anything like that kind of a wage. That could be considered, I think, by a Commission of this kind.

They might investigate what portion of the millions of dollars contributed by labour unions to the support of the C.C.F. Party has been taken from the members by compulsory dues. To prove this, I would like to quote an article appearing in the Winnipeg 'Free Press', quoted Mr. James, Chairman of the Winnipeg Labour Council, speaking to the Canadian Congress of Labour, which is affiliated with the C.C.F. Party:

“Mr. James of the Winnipeg Labour Council announced that the members of the CCL are being called upon to subscribe \$1.00 per person to a political action fund. Some \$400,000 will be raised this way, and the purpose, as explained by Mr. James, is to enable the trade unions to multiply the C.C.F. representation in the Dominion parliament and to ensure legislation favourable to the workers.”

Further proof is in an article appearing at Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, where it is reported:

“One of the most influential locals in the 11,000-member union mineworkers District No. 26 CCL will next week consider stopping payment to the C.C.F. Party. Per capita tax payments have been made by most of the locals to the C.C.F. provincial and national bodies since the District Convention approved affiliation with the Party sixteen years ago.”

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the rank and file of labour does not support the C.C.F. Party, in spite of the fact that they are compelled to pay into their campaign funds. The best evidence of that is the result of the last Federal election. In the Quebec constituency, where the large Gaspe copper mine and smelters are located, the records of the election show that the C.C.F. Federal candidate received on 282 votes out of over 24,000 votes that were cast in the last Federal election. These are facts.

Another thing that might be investigated is the result of the activities of the C.C.F. within the labour unions in promoting their policies, as announced by Don Swailes, a member of the local legislature in Manitoba, and a labour leader in that province. This was reported in the Winnipeg 'Free Press'; Mr. Swailes was addressing the C.C.F. Forum at the Marlborough Hotel some time ago, and I quote:

April 9, 1959

“The time will come when the demands of workers are strong enough to make employers go on strike. Then in the absence of an employer the establishment should be taken over by the government and its production equally distributed.”

It might be investigated as to what effect this action has had in creating unemployment.

I think another thing that might be investigated is the method of taxation that would have to be adopted to replace the revenue now obtained through profits of business and industry, if this was socialized and operated for use and not for profit, as is advocated by the Socialists in Canada.

Something else that might be investigated are what effect labour costs in business and industry have on the revenues of the Government of Canada, received from the profits of these sources which are now on practically a 50-50 basis by way of corporation and income taxes.

Last, but not least, they also might investigate the desirability of disallowing any or all foreign influence or affiliation with our Canadian labour unions, as this foreign connection with our labour unions seems to have been at the root of all the lawlessness and gangsterism adopted during strikes in the past, which is all foreign to the character of Canadian people.

Many other facts could be investigated as to labour effects upon the economy of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: I shall reserve my ruling on the admissibility of the proposed amendment. Meanwhile, the debate will continue on the main motion.

Premier Douglas: On the main motion, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: On the main motion, yes.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the main motion I would like to give some information to the House in regard to the trade union history.

The Saskatchewan Trade Union Act represents the culmination of historical development which has lasted 150 years. The beginning of trade unions as we know them today can be traced back to the Industrial Revolution in Britain. One of the consequences of the industrial revolution was that the wage earners were gathered in factories instead of working at home, as had been customary in earlier times. A society emerged in which large numbers of workers were selling their labour force to the owner or owners of a factory. In this system wages were no longer fixed by the justice of the peace or other public authorities, but were determined

by contract between the employer and the employee. A single wage earner, who was dependent upon his day's labour, was helpless against an employer with capital when it came to determining his wage. The employer could wait and choose from many applicants, whereas the worker's daily bread depended upon whether or not he was able to find employment. Under those circumstances the workers had to rely upon themselves to better their condition. They began to meet and discuss ways and means of increasing their wages. This is how the first workers' society came into being.

The British Parliament of that day resorted to repressive measures. In 1799 and 1800 it prohibited combination (as the workers' societies were then called) to alter conditions of work. In theory, The Combination Acts applied also to employers. This was considered to be 'even handed justice'. Needless to say, there were numerous convictions of workmen and none of employers, though there were known to be associations of employers as well. The injustice of The Combination Acts could not last forever, and by 1824, they were repealed.

During the agitation to extend the franchise in Britain, the workers took part, and when The Reform Act was passed in 1832, although the workers were not given the vote, they had learned the value of concerted action. In 1829, the cotton spinners formed a national trade union, and in 1830 the first attempt was made to organize all trade unions into one single organization, the National Association for the Protection of Labour. Both of these organizations were short-lived.

However, other attempts to form trade unions were made. In 1834 some labourers in the village of Tolpuddle, Dorset, formed the first agricultural labourers' union, in protests against the progressive reduction of their wages from nine to six shillings a week. Six of the leaders were convicted and transported to Australia, for having taken an illegal oath in joining the union. This instance is of particular interest to Canadians since, after the public outcry had forced the government to pardon them, five of these "Tolpuddle martyrs" came to Canada and settled near the present city of London, Ontario.

The first powerful labour unions were organized about the 19th century. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers was organized in 1850-51. This was the first big amalgamation of trade unions of a variety of skilled trades and a model for other unions. Its chief characteristics were high dues and high benefits. The Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners followed and, from about 1858 onwards, trade councils were formed in the larger towns to unite all the local unions in the districts.

These marks of progress, however, brought fresh attacks through the law. Strikers were charged with breach of contract, at that time this being a crime for the workman, but for the employer only a civil wrong. Trade unions were regarded as conspiracies, and the law gave their funds no protection. These restrictions stimulated them to action. In 1864, the Glasgow Trades Council called a conference to discuss their difficulties. Then came a series of lockouts and a second conference of trade union leaders. In 1867 an organization was set up under the name of The Amalgamated Trades Council. All these labour unions were defenceless

April 9, 1959

organizations. However, the employers did not like the idea of having to bargain with their workers collectively. They continuously pressed the government to ban the existing trade unions. When some workmen were convicted of destroying machinery in Sheffield, the government gave in and appointed a commission to inquire into the operations of the existing unions.

The trade union movement was fortunate in having several able leaders who gathered important evidence and presented it to the commission. The inquiry showed that the destruction of machinery at Sheffield was quite exceptional, and trade unionism was vindicated. Instead of obtaining a ban on unions, the employers were surprised to see that The Master and Servants Act was revised and imprisonment abolished for breach of contract.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, The Master and Servants Act is fairly well known even in this Legislature, since we had one here up until about five years ago. We got rid of it because we did not like the name of it; and we did not like some of its contents, which included that an employee could be imprisoned for drunkenness, or could be imprisoned for not carrying out the wishes of his employer. It was some Act that got in here back in the early days of this province, and remained on the statutes because it had never been noticed. We are rid of it now, and we have a modern up-to-date Act called "The Wages Recovery Act" which seems to be functioning very well.

The first regular Trade Union Congress met in 1868, and, of course, was marked by the same hostile attitude on the part of many employers and many narrow-minded politicians.

In 1816, a Nova Scotia Act prohibited combinations (which was the original name for trade unions) and referred to the numbers of workmen in Halifax and other parts of the province who: "by unlawful meetings and combinations endeavoured to regulate the rates of wages . . ." It was a terrible thing in those days to attempt to regulate the rates of wages. It is likely that there were trade unions of a kind in Nova Scotia at that date, probably printers and men in the shipyards. At a meeting of the National Typographical Society in New York in 1937, there was a fraternal delegate from Nova Scotia. printers' societies existed in the province of Quebec as far back as 1827. In Toronto, the printers organized in 1832.

During the 'sixties and early seventies' the number of local unions increased rapidly. Printers, shoemakers, coopers, bricklayers and masons, painters, machinists and blacksmiths, bakers and tailors had unions in some places. Soon important steps were taken to draw the Canadian and American unions in the same trades together, and to link the Canadian unions in the same trades together, and to link the Canadian unions in a Federal organization. That, no doubt, was the origination of what are now called "international unions."

Progress, of course, was by no means smooth. In 1872 printers in Toronto and other cities struck for a nine-hour day, and this was enough for the government to arrest 24 men on a charge of criminal conspiracy, under the old law in force in England before 1824, which was still in force in Ontario.

The need for a more humane and wiser legislation became apparent. Considerable influence in this direction was exercised by the

Canadian labour unions through 'The Ontario Workmen', the first labour paper, which began to be published in 1872. Mass meetings were held and direct representations were made to the Dominion and Provincial governments and individual members of Parliament. Eventual legislation was passed freeing trade unionists from liability and prosecution for conspiracy. The provincial laws regarding breach of contract were also revised; and the Canadian labour unions were largely successful in what they had started out to do. The Canadian Labour Union was organized and directed by some excellent citizens.

I wish to quote from an address by the first president of this union at the opening session here in 1927:

"I urge upon you the necessity of being wise and moderate in your deliberations and actions; and let those who are watching your movements in this first Canadian Labour Congress be compelled to admit that we are honest, earnest and prudent workers."

The history of the trade union movement of Canada is a dramatic one. Many companies have refused to recognize labour unions in their plants. It is argued that management are the trustees of large interests and should not be expected to share this trust with what they consider to be irresponsible groups of men. Fortunately, other companies realized that refusal to recognize the unions inevitably caused resentment on the part of the employees. Enlightened businessmen quickly saw that where the union is not recognized trouble begins. There is no one who can authoritatively represent the men except their own representatives. They saw that trivial matters, which a well-organized union would not permit to become the subject of a serious dispute, may otherwise lead to a strike. They were finally getting smart, Mr. Speaker.

The advantages to the nation of strong and well-directed labour unions was gradually recognized more and more widely. The old prejudices began to disappear. In Canada, as in other civilized countries, legislation was passed enabling trade unions to function in a constructive way for the benefit of their members and for the benefit of the nation as a whole.

This, Mr. Speaker, (and I am almost at the end of my remarks) is the spirit in which the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act was conceived. Our Trade Union Act was not an invention, created out of nothing. Our Trade Union Act was not the product or the fancy of some amateur politician. The Saskatchewan Trade Union Act was inspired by the conviction, based on long experience in this country and abroad, that good wages, good working conditions and industrial peace are better for the people of this province than industrial strife. I am sure we all realize from the remarks made by the junior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), yesterday or the day before, that we have comparatively little industrial strife in Saskatchewan.

The Act guarantees employees the right to organize trade unions and to bargain through representatives of their own choosing. Large

April 9, 1959

aggregations of capital are organized and speak through one man. Why should not labour do the same? Matters likely to cause friction can best be discussed by representatives of both sides and in many cases friction is avoided.

The experience of the province with the Trade Union Act is most encouraging. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if other provinces had passed similar legislation and had applied it as objectively and scrupulously as we have done here, they would not have the trouble about which we read in the papers and of which we hear from time to time in this House.

I just have one more item here, Mr. Speaker, if I can locate it – if I can't I will just leave it. I am sure what I am going to say will be a surprise to a number of the members of this House, particularly those who sit opposite; and I again refer to the Ludlow Massacre of 1913, the company which was owned by John D. Rockefeller Jr. After this was over, of course, public opinion was greatly incensed against the employer, and, alarmed by the aftermath of the Ludlow Massacre, Rockefeller engaged – some of you are going to be surprised at the individual I am about to refer to – but Rockefeller engaged W.L. Mackenzie King, a former Minister of Labour of Canada, to conduct, through the Rockefeller Foundation, an inquiry into the means of developing a closer personal contact and more friendly co-operation between capital and labour. The opinion of the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations, however – Mackenzie King was to assist in devising specious substitutes for trade unions that would deceive, mollify and soothe public opinion about working employees' arbitrary control. In the meantime the Miners' strike was steadily being crushed by the company by the use of strikebreakers and, on December 10, 1941, after fifteen months of struggle, the miners voted to end the strike.

Acting entirely on Mackenzie King's suggestion, Rockefeller established the Rockefeller Industrial Representation Plan, which was to serve as the model for workers' shop committees, employee representation plans and other variations of the "company" union. Under the plan, miners had the right to appeal grievances to local official committees, to join committees under industrial co-operation and conciliation composed of representatives of both company and employees. However, the United Mine Workers stated that it was impossible for workers to be justly represented by a fellow-worker who depends – I don't seem to be able to find the last page, Mr. Speaker; but it all led up to the fact that the company unions were not what the workers wanted, and have never proved satisfactory. That is the role that Mackenzie King had to play insofar as John D. Rockefeller Jr. was concerned. I am not saying anything against Mr. King. I have met him on two or three occasions and he was a very kindly old gentleman; he wouldn't hurt a fly; but at the same time he did write quite a bit into the labour history of the United States in the years 1944 and 1915.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying that I will not support the motion.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): I just want to add a few words to this debate. First of all, the question that arises in my mind is – what is the motive in bringing in such a resolution, because, living in a democratic country and a democratic province and knowing that the world is trying to go forward towards freedom, I could not help but remember the attitude taken by the nations of the world in the United Nations Conference, where it was pointed out – and I might as well read some of these points for the benefit of the hon. members opposite who moved the motion and brought in the amendment. Here is what it says:

“Social justice is a prerequisite for peace. International labour organization will promote improvement in labour conditions, especially where injustice, hardship and privation to a large number of people exists by furthering regulation of hours of work, including the establishment of maximum working days and weeks. The regulations that labour supplies – the prevention of unemployment, the provision of an adequate living wage, the protection of the worker through sickness, disease and injury arising out of employment, of young persons and women, the protection of the interests of workers employed in countries other than their home”; (and here is the important thing which refers to union organization) “the recognition of the principle of freedom of association”

Yet here we are in a Legislative Assembly in a great country considering a resolution which is endeavouring to interfere with the rights of the people who have legally organized themselves.

Mr. Weber (Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not suggest that at any time.

Mr. Berezowsky: If the hon. member has not said so openly, certainly by bringing in a resolution of this kind in a province where we have a good Trade Union Act, where we have had no incidence of injustices, where we have found the labour people willing to co-operate in every way, there was no reason to bring in a resolution of this kind, I am not imputing any motives to the hon. member, but I would certainly like him to stand up on the floor and say why he has brought in the resolution.

The hon. member knows that, last year, in Ontario where the conservatives felt, as he apparently does, that the government should look into the Trade Union Act, that a commission was set up. There may have been reasons why this was done in Ontario. I don't know what happened in Ontario, and if a situation existed in Saskatchewan where labour unions were misbehaving, there might be some reason for bringing in such a resolution for the protection of the public. But when there is no such case and no suggestion of any wrongdoing on the part of the unions, what, then,

April 9, 1959

is the motive behind this resolution?

Subsequently, I was more than surprised when a member of the Liberal Party, which has often times spoken up for labour unions, now gets up and suggests that the Dominion government look into the whole matter of trade unions . . .

Mr. Speaker: I deferred my ruling on the amendment moved by Mr. Loftson, seconded by Mr. Danielson, but owing to the fact that we are near the end of the Session the members might wish to discuss both the amendment and the motion at this time, without awaiting my decision. Is it the pleasure of the House to do so?

Mr. McFarlane: Mr. Speaker, is it permissible to discuss the amendment if you haven't made your decision?

Mr. Speaker: If the House agrees to do so, because of the lateness of the time.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I think it will be difficult for any member in the House to discuss the motion without also discussing, if not the amendment, at least the remarks made by the member who moved the amendment. Therefore, I think, if the House is agreeable – the date is late and we cannot move sub-amendment which could carry on for several days; if all the members are agreeable, I think it would be advisable to allow them to discuss both the remarks made by the mover of the motion and the mover of the amendment.

Mr. McFarlane: Would that be in order, if the amendment is ruled out of order?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the House that members be allowed to discuss both the motion and the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I am doing this in order to meet the wishes of those who have made the request. If the House admits the admissibility of this amendment I will propose it.

Mr. Danielson: Does that mean the amendment is in order?

Mr. Speaker: I would take it that that is the intention, yes.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say as far as we are concerned, while I think it is really a substantive motive, I think it should be accepted as an amendment at this late date. I would be favour of having it declared in order that we can continue.

Mr. Speaker: Then I will rule the amendment in order. The debate is now on the amendment of the hon. member for Saltcoats.

Mr. Berezowsky: Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat that there is no need for any such investigation or inquiry into our trade unions in the province of Saskatchewan. I know the unions in Saskatchewan have clean hands. I can only suspect that the reason for bringing in this motion was because of concerted efforts of reactionary forces in Canada to go ahead and try to destroy working people who are trying to organize themselves. I remember a previous election when the Conservative Party had a little card saying that when they got into power they were going to get rid of all subversive elements. I only know that very recently, as a matter of fact only yesterday, the Conservative Leader in the province of Saskatchewan has taken the same stand as the hon. member from Meadow Lake.

Mr. Weber: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member at what time I said trade unions were a subversive element.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Berezowsky: The Prime Minister of Canada issued little cards saying that, when the Conservative Party got into power, they would get rid of all subversive elements. They did not say on that card who was subversive; they only indicated that if they got into power they would get rid of subversive elements. I suggest to you that it would be in the hands of the party to decide who is subversive. And who is not subversive. If they decided that the labour unions were subversive . . .

Mr. Lopton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I object to the hon. member making such an indictment . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: I am sorry if the hon. member did not hear me. I shall repeat what I said: that the Leader of the Conservative Party, and the Prime Minister of Canada today, had said in his campaign that, when he and his Government go into power (I want you to listen very carefully, now) they would get rid of all subversive elements. They did not say who was subversive. In other words . . .

Mr. Weber: But you are telling us who they are, are you?

Mr. Berezowsky: . . . if they decided that the farm organizations, or the labour unions, or the C.C.F., or the Catholic people were subversive, they would not hesitate to take action against them.

Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out, the hon. member for Meadow Lake has brought in a resolution calling for exactly what the Leader of the Conservative Party has suggested. He is following exactly in the footsteps of the Leader of the Conservative Party in Canada, and I suggest to you, and to the members of this House and to the people of Saskatchewan, that this is a concerted effort to try to bring politics into the labour picture with intent to divide the people of the province. I will not support the motion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) has the floor; but just in order that there may be no misunderstanding, the debate is now on both the motion and the amendment, since the motion is all struck out except the first two words.

Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City): Mr. Speaker, I realize that most members are wishing to go home, but I feel this motion has far-reaching limitations. I suggest that a member who would bring in such a far-reaching motion as the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) did, would at least have had some concrete evidence for bringing about such a procedure as he suggested in the motion. He gave no valid reasons for doing so. He mentions the unrest, the violence and bloodshed in different parts of this country, but did not indicate there is any unrest, violence or bloodshed prevalent here in this province at the present time. It would suggest to me that possibly some of the other provinces of Canada would do well to try and prevent some of this violence and bloodshed that he speaks of if they were to take a look at The Saskatchewan Trade Union Act. I might suggest he recommend this to his cohorts in British Columbia as something that might help them out of the chaos in which they find themselves at the present time.

He speaks of restraint and self-reliance. I wonder just how much restraint was used in Newfoundland. I want to quote from the 'Leader-Post' April 7th, a comment of the vice-president and general manager of the Bowater Pulp and Paper Mill, Mr. Albert Martin, who said "his company tried to frustrate the International Woodworkers of American every way we could."

Would the hon. member from Meadow Lake consider this self-restraint on the part of management? I suggest that, had The Saskatchewan Trade Union Act been on the statutes of Newfoundland, this labour dispute would not have reached the proportions it did. Here we have the workers choosing the union they wished to represent them, a bona fide union certified by the Labour Relations Board, accepted by the Board of Conciliation. An award was made, which was unacceptable to the company, an award which was below the standards prevailing in many of the most backward countries of the world. The Premier of Newfoundland smashed this union of the workers' own choosing; told them it was bad for them, and he would set up a union that would be better for them; he would even elect the officers for them; he would appoint a member of the Legislature as president. I ask the member from Meadow Lake, is this the type of self-reliance he was referring to that should exist between management and labour?

The member for Meadow Lake has also opposed international unions, opposed unions having their head office in the United States, and money going from this country. I would like to know if he is opposed to international industry – industries which have their head offices across the border, and which channel their profits from their endeavours in this country across the border.

I say, Mr. Speaker, there is a democratic right involved here. I do not challenge the right of an employer to belong to any employers' organization if he may wish to do so; or to any fraternal society, or service club or church organization. I expect him to respect my right to belong to the union of my own choice. I am proud to belong to an organization that has done so much in the economic and social life of mankind.

You heard the Minister today give us quite a history of the labour movement in the economic field. We can go a great deal further.

History will show the progress the labour movement has made in the social life of mankind, in bringing about universal franchise, and in the bringing about of free education for everyone, better factory hours, doing away with child labour. I can mention a lot of different things. That is why I say I am proud to be a member of that kind of an organization. That is why the C.C.F. organization makes no apologies to anybody for their stand on the question of giving the worker the unqualified opportunity of joining a labour union of his own choosing, and, going a bit farther than that, putting it on the statutes of this Assembly.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not support the motion.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised at the remarks of the mover of this motion, the other day. The member placed on the Order Paper the motion calling for a Select Committee of this Legislature to inquire into the operation and administration of The Trade Union Act in all its aspects. I naturally expected, when the hon. member made that strong request, which would involve members staying here between Sessions to conduct an investigation, with power to call witnesses, and examine witnesses under oath, to call for papers and document, and so on, that he would at least have given the House some cogent reason as to why there should be such an investigation into the operation and administration of The Trade Union Act. Are there any indications of injustices? Has any evidence been adduced that any trade union has abused the privileges and rights which it enjoys under that legislation? Has any evidence been brought forth to show that any employer has been dealt with unfairly as a result of that legislation, or any of the regulations which pertain to it? None of these things were done. There was not a single indication that The Trade Union Act requires any inquiry as to its operation or its administration.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, each year the trade unions come and meet the Cabinet, the Manufacturers' Association meets the Cabinet, the Chamber of Commerce for the Province of Saskatchewan meets the Cabinet, the Retail Merchants meets the Cabinet. Each of them suggest minor changes, many of which, of course, we do not accept. But, neither the employers nor the employees of this province have yet come and said that in principle the operation and administration of The Trade Union Act was in any way at fault. So why this request?

I would suggest that this is part of a pattern which is slowly taking place on this continent. It began with the public relations campaign of some of the big corporations in the United States, first of all in the form of a 'Right to Work' legislation, which was advocated over the continent. Everybody believes in the right to work, but what they really meant was the 'right to scab' against the trade union. That is really what they meant. It is significant that in the last Congressional election in the United States, and in almost every State but one where the 'right to work' was initiated, the candidates supporting the 'right to work' legislation were defeated. This, I think, indicates the general attitude of the people of the United States.

April 9, 1959

This has been followed by some investigation, and the setting up of Congressional Committees for investigation. As a result of those investigations, some labour racketeering has been unearthed. I think it is worthy of comment, Mr. Speaker, that the American Labour Congress itself threw out of the congress, Mr. Hoffa and Mr. Beck and the Teamsters' Union. Trade union people everywhere are perfectly agreed that when a man uses his right of position for his own personal gain and becomes a labour racketeer, and breaks the laws of the province, then he should be punished. But there is no reason to use an incident like this to try to smear the whole trade union movement. At the moment one of the biggest business men in New York is up for trial for fraudulent proceedings. But surely this is not going to smear the whole business world. But this was an insidious attempt to use Hoffa and the labour racketeers who were exposed in the United States as an excuse for beginning in Canada to promote an anti-labour campaign.

The mover of the motion himself; earlier in this Session, of course, talked about labour racketeers. Look at the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party. Almost every week he has been making this statement, and I noticed where he repeated it at a meeting in Davidson (I am quoting from the 'Leader-Post' of April 9th). Speaking of the Progressive Conservative leader it said:

"He repeated the criticisms of the province's labour legislation, charging that it is an invitation to unscrupulous elements to take over and exploit the finest efforts of labour."

He does not say how he would change the labour legislation. He does not say that there has been any unscrupulous exploitations by the elements in the communities. Just his general suggestion – something minister, something vicious, about the province's labour legislation, and therefore, the thing to do is to begin to overhaul it.

This campaign of attack on labour legislation, starting within the United States, has been gradually slipping across this country. Mention has already been made as to what happened in Newfoundland. I need not go over that again, except to remind the House that in the union, certified by the Labour Relations Board, over 90 per cent of the members voted in favour of it, in a government-supervised vote. Here was a union that took a matter of conciliation and got a unanimous decision from the Board of Conciliation, including the company's own representative. They weren't very generous. The Conciliation Board recommended cutting hours from 60 a week to 54, and raising the wages to \$1.22 commencing January 1, 1960. The company refused to accept it and, as the president yesterday remarked, they were determined from the beginning to fight this union.

Let's not get a smoke-screen around these unions. The Premier of Newfoundland, later on, talked about fining of the picket line. Nobody got fines. The laws of the country are specific. We have no cause for coercion or force being used among the picket line. An individual in a picket line is restricted to peaceful persuasion, and if he exceeds that, then he has broken the Criminal Code and should be dealt with. We have always said in this province that, while we support the principles of

trade unions, if any trade union breaks the law, it should be dealt with just as effectively and expeditiously as anyone else. But that is not the reason the Premier of Newfoundland has wanted to stop any violence. He could have stopped that. Again all he would have had to do was to set up a Conciliation Board. But he said it was with a unanimous decision that it was turned down. All right, he could have given both parties 10 days in which to settle this dispute, or set up an Arbitration Board, whose decision would be final and binding. That was what settled the Railway strike.

Legislation was granted in the Legislature which gave them, by Order-in-Council the power to decertify a union which had been selected by the workers. This is something which hasn't happened in a British country since 1871 in Great Britain when the Trade Union movement was first started. The other day the Premier of Newfoundland finally introduced an amendment which removed the power of the Cabinet to make a decision and vested this power in the Court of Appeal. Then he said the Opposition would not vote for it. This, of course, Mr. Speaker, is a shocking state of affairs to have happen in the second half of the 20th century.

As the other end of Canada we have a similar program being carried out. The government of British Columbia has brought down legislation called Bill 123, which says it is illegal to picket Crown property. Of course this may be virtually collective bargaining with the Crown. I am not saying that any government likes to have its employees go out on strike. I have had some rather sad experiences, and have spent some sleepless nights over Government employees on strike, including the strike of our Insurance employees, the strike of Saskatchewan Government Airways, and the strike of our bus drivers in the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. Those were all pretty anxious times. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that since the day that Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves on this continent, nobody has been forced to work against this will, except for a figure which he considers a right and adequate remuneration for his services. Whether workers are bargaining with the Crown or bargaining with anybody else, they have all the rights and privileges which are obtainable under The Trade Union Act. The exception is where they are in some vital industry, which is essential to the life of the community. Under the Criminal Code, those people cannot resort to strike, where life and property are at stake, such as firemen and people who are in essential industry. Again I say that has to be enforced, but if it is going to be enforced, it should not be taken advantage of. We should set up arbitration machinery so that the workers will not be exploited by virtue of the fact that they do not have the power to strike.

More serious still, of course, is the legislation in British Columbia, Bill 43. Bill 43 is now going to bar picketing for certain purposes. It is also going to make trade unions legal entity capable of being sued in the civil court. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is an old story. This was fought out in Great Britain back in 1901, when in that year a Railway went to the courts. The trade union took the case to the House of Lords, and the House of Lords found it in their favour. The trade union had assumed ever since 1871 that a trade union was an association of people banded together for the purpose of collective bargaining. They were not a Corporation. They were not in business. They could be sued

for any illegal action, but not in a civil court. This union found itself not only subject to suits by the company against whom the employees had struck, but subject to suit by any company who claimed that their goods had not been delivered on time because of the strike, or that their orders had not been filled because of the strike. This was what threatened to ruin not only that particular trade union, but all the trade unions in Great Britain. That action, along with some legislation which followed a few years later to put discriminatory taxes upon the co-operative movement, resulted in the formation of the Labour Party and the trade union members of the co-operatives coming into the Party, and becoming part of the Labour Party. The co-operative movement today has something in the neighbourhood of 80 seats in which they nominated Labour candidates in Great Britain. They contribute annually to the funds of the British Labour Party.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, since the Premier has made mention again, I would just like to make the statement that in spite of what the Premier says, they are not strictly co-operatives if they take part in a political movement . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, when it comes over the cables that the Co-operative Wholesale Society in Great Britain has a membership of something over 16,000,000 members, I am sure there will be a flawless decision on what has been handed down by the member for Melville.

Mr. McFarlane: You should make your statement in B.C.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, having said this about the motion which, in my opinion is uncalled for and is unnecessary, I also want to comment on what is even more dangerous and that is the following of a trend in this country to call in question trade unions and trade union legislation. It is significant there is nothing in this resolution about asking for this investigation of the administration in The Trade Union Act, or to ask anything about the management of the business concerns, or the employers' associations – nothing about that at all. It calls only to investigate the operation of the trade unions.

The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) has to go further. He wants a national investigation. He wants it on a scale right across Canada. I didn't get a copy of the amendment, but I gather it reads something to this effect: "That the Government of Saskatchewan request the Government of Canada to set up an appropriate Commission to investigate the Trade Unions as they affect the economy of Canada" – "and that they have power to investigate the various provincial jurisdictions." He gave his reasons, and I just want to deal with some of these. First of all, he thought that such a national commission should investigate the loss of employment from strikes. Well, the loss of employment from strikes, Mr. Speaker, is interesting enough. For every day of 1957 (these are the figures from the Department of Labour in Ottawa) which was lost from strikes, 55 days were lost as the result of unemployment.

As the member for Moose Jaw pointed out, the other day, we are losing more from accidents and are losing 55 times as much employment from unemployment as we are from strikes. We have got to be concerned about industrial accidents and unemployment. But the hon. member for Saltcoats only wants the commission to investigate this matter of the loss of time as a result of strikes.

He also wanted to know the amount of union dues extracted from the members. This is a free country. If a man wants to join an association for the purpose of bargaining collectively, along with his fellow workers, he pays his dues. This is his business. The member for Saltcoats apparently is not concerned as to whether or not the members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association pay annual dues, or the Insurance Underwriters' Association, or the Mortgage Company Association, or the Retail Merchants' Association. Do you know of any of these instances, whether it is professional business or labour, in which the members are not required to pay the Association their dues. The only thing the member is interested in are the dues which are paid by labour.

The other reason he wanted this investigation is that, he says, strikes are among the high-income groups of labour. Yet it is interesting that out of the publication – the Labour Gazette, February 27, 1959, page 203, there is a list here of the average hourly earnings for 80 classes of employment, and out of that entire 80 classes of employment there are only eight, or 10 per cent, that are paid over \$2.00 an hour. This loud cry the member brought out about the high labour costs as a result of trade unions has surely been set aside by the paper which was tabled in the House of Commons yesterday by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance admitted that, in the year 1958, increases in wages in this country were more than offset by the increased costs of living, and that, last year, in terms of what the wages would buy in the store, the workers got less in 1958 than they did in 1957. In other words, during the year 1958 the standard of living of the workers of this country, in the aggregate, was actually lower – not higher. Their effective wage was actually reduced.

Then the member for Saltcoats, in his usual inimitable style, suggests that one of the things the commission might investigate is the contribution made by the trade unions to the C.C.F. I think this would be fine if such a commission were going to investigate what contributions are made by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to the Liberal Party, and by the Insurance Underwriters' Association, and some of the other groups of special privilege in this country, who have helped to keep the Liberal Party in office in days gone by, and whose interests the Liberal Party have fought for so consistently over the years.

Finally, there isn't any reason why organized groups of workers, or organized farmers, or any other groups, if they want to contribute to any political party, should not be invited to do so, providing they do so openly and providing they recognize that they are supporting a political party because they favour its philosophy and because they believe it is fighting for the same social and economic ideals they are fighting for. When they contribute funds, it isn't funds to get special privileges. There isn't any reason why any group should not be allowed to support a political party if they feel that particular party is fighting for the same social and economic ideals.

April 9, 1959

The final reason the member for Saltcoats gives for setting up this national commission to look into trade unionism in Canada is that he thinks we should take steps to disallow (as I understood it) foreign affiliation. This question of foreign affiliation is somewhat abused. I notice that in Newfoundland they keep talking about the IWA – International Workers of America. This is ‘foreign affiliation’. The fact is, of course, that both the big pulp and paper companies are owned by the members of the British aristocracy, who have probably never been to Newfoundland in their lives. Of course they are not foreign. I don’t notice any of the people who talk about the foreign affiliations of trade unions complaining about foreign management control. It is not very long ago in this country, Mr. Speaker, that we had a case where the sale of Canadian automobiles was vetoed, not by a Canadian corporation, but by an American corporation who said that Canada and Canadian manufacturers could not sell cars to China. This surely is foreign domination. The same thing is true of aluminum and other commodities which, because the parent company in the United States is adhering to American regulations, says that the Canadian industry which they dominate must conform to American regulations and not to Canadian regulations.

As a matter of fact, the great bulk of the industries in this country are foreign-dominated, or have foreign affiliation – if you want to call this connection with American business firms that. The automobile industry is a good example. Ninety per cent of its control is in the United States. Oil companies, General Electric, General Motors – all these have their parent companies in the United States. Is it any wonder, then, that the workers on both sides of the line affiliate one with the other? Most of these trade unions have their own Canadian organizations. Most of them keep their own funds in Canada. They elect their own officers in Canada. But they have a working relationship with the union on the other side. I want to say that, rather than apologizing for it, it is a good thing they have. I was 14 years of age when I joined a trade union. I went to work in a print shop; I went to work in a sub-basement, where the arsenic fumes from the linotype . . .

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to say to my hon. friend that I did not say they should do away with them; I said they should investigate their desirability.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I say that it is a good thing that there is some affiliation. I joined a trade union when I was 14 years of age. I went to work down in a basement, where the print shop was located, where the arsenic fumes were not even carried off by any kind of ventilation. Few people know that for years the Typographical Union has maintained sanatoria to take care of printers who were ill from lead poisoning, and from the effects of arsenic fumes. What chance did 40 or 50 printers have of going to a multi-million dollar corporation asking for better working conditions? No success at all. But when a Trade Union representative came, representing several million printers on the North American continent, and backed by all the resources of that union, they were able to get decent working quarters where once in a while you could see the light of day, and where there was some pure air going through the building.

My hon. friends also speak of the fact that those workers just love to go on strike. I wonder if they have ever been on strike. I pounded the sidewalks in Winnipeg with holes in my shoes for over three months, without any pay. We didn't like being on strike. As a matter of fact, if it hadn't been for the fact that we had an international union paying a strike pay most people would have starved. Men don't go on strike because they want to. Men go on strike when economic conditions get so bad that they have no other recourse. That is why men go on strike.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is time the members of this House and the people of this country recognized that democracy, like peace, is indivisible. When some of the liberties of the workers are chipped away by misdirected individuals, and by insidious campaigns, it indirectly chips away at the basic liberties of this country. When you take away from the workers some of the rights of collective bargaining, it is only a matter of time until you begin to take away some of the other liberties. When you take away people's economic liberties, it is only a matter of time until you take away their political liberties. I was in Germany in 1936. Already at that time trade union leaders were being arrested, and trade unions were being decertified, and their place taken by union set up by . . .

Mr. Loptson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We have been listening to a harangue here for half an hour, and hardly any of it has anything to do with either the motion or the amendment. Nothing to do with it at all.

Premier Douglas: It has to do with both the motion and the amendment, and I am saying that both the motion and the amendment are insidious attacks upon the Magna Charta of labour in this province. I am saying they are an attempt to destroy the bulwarks on which the trade union movement is built. I am saying that we saw this in the Nazi Government and the Communist Government. The moment you destroy a free trade union movement, you have begun to destroy democracy. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against both the amendment and the motion.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two comments I would like to make with reference to the Premier's remarks. I did not intend to get into controversy on this but he did point this out, and I asked him to repeat the same statement here that he made in British Columbia, that we should have labour farmers and the co-operatives; they should amalgamate together under the C.C.F. banner. I asked him to make that statement here. I hope that he will make that same statement here as he made in B.C., because if there is anything that will kill the co-operative movement in the province of Saskatchewan, it is political interference, and if there is anything that the co-operative movement does not want in the province of Saskatchewan it is political interference.

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

April 9, 1959

Mr. Cameron: And one of the things that nearly brought death to the farm unions in the province of Saskatchewan was the C.C.F. political interference. Now they come across and they are asking farmers to unite with labour to form this great new political party. The farmers have turned their backs on that suggestion, because of the experiences they have had. It's all right to stand in this House and set yourself up as the great champion of labour, and to think that no one else is interested in labour in any sense of the word. The same as they attempted to set themselves up in the Budget Debate as the great champions of the co-operatives, and it was the same pioneers of the co-operative movement who pioneered the movement of the C.C.F.

I read in the paper just the other day of the founder of Credit Unions, a man of 73, who recently died. It gave his history back over the years in connection with credit unions in the province of Saskatchewan, which is one of our strong and vibrant co-operatives. He was the founder of that legislation in this Legislature; he pioneered the movement, and was recognized as the "Father of Credit Unions"; but was he C.C.F.? Not to my knowledge he wasn't. There are other people in other political parties that have a burning desire for co-operatives, too, and for credit unions for the farmers, and for labour.

I want to put this to the Premier, and I am surprised that he did not mention it. There is a great movement afoot by the C.C.F. to get farmers and labour to joining together with them as the only pure political party, and everyone else is against that. Take what was said about the Conservatives in Ottawa today, that any group that the Prime Minister thinks is subversive, he will move in and do away with it, whether it be a union, church, or farm organization, or whatever it is. Did you ever hear such childish talk as that in an enlightened democracy that we have today in Canada?

I was interested, so I just went out to get this press release of the latest Gallup Poll in reference to political support by labour, which indicates the movement for one party is rejected. It says:

"The vote against the proposal is more than two to one across the Dominion."

You set yourselves up as the champions of labour!

"Canadians don't think much of the proposal that labour should tie itself to one political party. In each Federal election, Gallup Polls, through its unique techniques, has shown that voting patterns in this country are very much the same in any segment of the population. Labour, for instance, has in the past voted in much the same proportion for the main political parties, as have the farmers. The fact remains that those who would like to change this voting behaviour" (I want to be fair and read it all) "may take hope that among those men and women who are

affiliated in some way with labour unions . . . but the fact remains that this segment of the people as in the total population, almost twice as many don't like the plan, and don't approve of it, in labour in Canada.

To find out just how the average Canadian is reacting to the idea, the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion sent forth several interviewers across the province, in homes carefully selected, to give a precise sample of the nation as a whole. Interviewers asked two questions. The first divided those who had heard of the plan from those who had not. The second gave everybody a chance to express an opinion on the merits of the idea, and the question put was, 'Do you happen to have heard or read anything about the suggestion that labour should give its support to one political party?'

The answer to that was: have heard, 25 per cent across Canada. In the labour union households, only 21 per cent had heard. Have not heard, across Canada – 75 per cent of households had not even heard of it, and in the labour union households, 79 per cent had not even heard of the suggestion.

When asked whether they approved the proposal or not, the nation divided, the very large majority in opposition: Approved, 28 per cent; disapproved, 67 per cent; and no opinion, 5 per cent across Canada as a whole. And in the labour union households; approved 31 per cent, disapproved, 61 per cent; no opinion, 8 per cent.

The west is far more familiar with the suggestion than any other area in the country . . .

Among the voters of the prairies and British Columbia, 35 per cent did not know of the plan to have labour support any one political party. In Ontario the proportion is 18 per cent. In Quebec it is 23 per cent."

So let us not have you set yourselves up as the only champion of labour, or of the co-operatives or of the farmers.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. member?

Mr. Cameron: Not until I am finished, no. You see in the Gallup Poll where you are heading, and there are many labour men in the province of Saskatchewan today, and all across Canada, who resent the C.C.F. trying to invade their field and say to them: "Come with us." There are just as many, if not more, in the co-operative movement today in Saskatchewan who have the same answer, when you go to them and ask them to join with you this "great crusade" that you are putting on for the Dominion of Canada. You had better keep some of those facts straight.

Most of the legislation that the Minister of Labour read this afternoon, down through the history of Canada – when was that out on the statute books by the C.C.F.? Of course, the answer to that is practically self-evident. When was the statute of the co-operative movement put on the books of this province? Since the advent of the C.C.F.? Or the Credit Union movement? You are receiving your answer in the Gallup Poll.

I want to say this in connection with both the motion and the amendment to it, that it is my personal opinion – I come from a rural population and we have labourers, yes, lots of them; but I don't say that we have unions as such in my constituency; but I cannot say that I can go along with the idea that any problem has arisen in the trade union movement in Saskatchewan where they are not in a position to take care of themselves. Until such a situation as that arises, I cannot entertain the suggestion contained in either the notion or the amendment, because I do not believe that labour wants interference. Labour makes a definite attempt to clean their own house where it is necessary, and is to be commended for having done so; and labour, too, is beginning to resent any political party attempting to set itself up as the voice of labour. This Gallup Poll proves that very statement.

There are many labour people in Saskatchewan, not in the trade union movement but in the labour forces within and without, who will vote for a political party as they have always done, independently or what you the C.C.F., may try to force upon them.

I say in closing that I cannot give my support to either the amendment or the motion, because I don't think, in the first place, that it is necessary, and I don't see why we should ask the Federal Government to do something, invade the Federal field, when we don't deal with provincial issues, and I have always taken that stand. If there is something wrong in Saskatchewan let's have a look at it. Let us not pass it on to Ottawa. I am not prepared to accept, or entertain the idea, that the situation warrants an investigation of this nature.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the question before the House before you put the question on the motion. I, too, believe that there is not a situation in Saskatchewan that would warrant a Committee of the Legislature, or any type of committee, to investigate. It seems to me that, if charges had been made with respect to the activities of labour organizations, then we would probably be justified in setting up a Committee to investigate those charges;

but to my knowledge, those charges have not been made, especially here in the province of Saskatchewan.

We often hear of the activities of Mr. Hoffa and Mr. Beck, but I am sure that none of us are familiar with any activities that may have been carried on, or are being carried on at present, in the province of Saskatchewan. I don't know about other parts of Canada; I am not familiar enough with them. About the only labour heads in Canada whom I have ever heard any complaints about would be somebody (I think his name is Banks) who, I think, is head of one of the seafarers' unions in eastern Canada. I have heard several complaints in respect to this individual, but I am certain that we are not concerned in Saskatchewan with his activities, and he has little or no effect on the working conditions of the people within the province of Saskatchewan.

Only a few nights ago I had the opportunity of appearing on a TV program, and one of the members of the panel was a member of labour. At that time he asked me some questions with respect to the attitude of our Party, as far as labour is concerned. It seems to me that labour has every right to associate themselves with a union of their choice. It seems to me that that is one of the rights of a Canadian citizen. It seems to me that if the Bill of Rights means anything, either in Saskatchewan or elsewhere in Canada, that is one of the principles it ought to cover.

It is a matter of history – to go back to the gains that labour has made, back to the time the Minister of Labour referred to this afternoon, to the beginning of organization – that it has been the Liberal Party in this country and in Great Britain that has given labour the benefits they enjoy today. I don't think that any political party in this country, or outside this country, has given more to labour over a period of time than the Liberal Party. We are not a party who are as narrow-minded as our friends who sit opposite. Our friends who sit opposite apparently are trying to endeavour to divide and rule, not only in Saskatchewan, but in Canada. Our friends at the moment are endeavouring to set up a political party that would be made up of labour and co-operatives, but to me, Mr. Speaker, any political party that is worth its salt and worth its support ought to have a broad enough base so that people from any trade, profession, or walk of life, could give their support to.

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: In my opinion the basis of the Liberal Party is broad enough for people from every walk of life, irrespective of what their trade or profession may be, to join and to work with us for the betterment of themselves and the betterment of people as a whole. I am proud to belong to a political party whose base is that strong.

I do not agree with any political party interfering with either labour unions, co-operatives or any other organizations. I think that one of the strongest co-operative organizations gave its answer only a few short weeks ago to the C.C.F. Party in this province when they, through their past affiliation, attempted to climb on a "band wagon" in the city of Ottawa, that the farmers and other people in this province had organized to march to Ottawa in search of a better deal for agriculture.

April 9, 1959

What was the reaction of the Saskatchewan Pool to the behaviour of the C.C.F. Party, of the people who met that particular delegation? The reaction of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was this. They said that it seems that when anyone gets a good organization going there is always somebody else who wants to jump on the band wagon. I don't think that anybody ought to endeavor to jump on the band wagon of any other organizations, and I believe that it is in the interests of the co-operative movement, the labour organizations and of management to keep their nose out of politics, and for we politicians to keep our nose out of their business.

Some of the remarks that the Premier made this afternoon interested me very much. I have always adopted the idea that, in my personal opinion, it would be better for all Canadians if we had more loopholes of management and labour in Canada. I include both of them. It annoys me very much when, in some instances, we find that sales that Canadian concerns would like to have made outside of our country have been stopped by an outside power. To me that is nobody's business but Canada's, and surely to goodness, we are strong enough and wise enough to make our own decisions!

The same thing can be said with respect to labour. I am very annoyed when, on some occasions, a burning labour question has been an issue, in some instances, for 10, 15 or 20 years; but when the showdown comes the strike takes place in Canada. I can think of no better example than the recent dispute over firemen on certain railways. This has been a burning question in the United States for many, many years and, when the thing was engineered by Canadians or Americans or who engineered it; but I do know that when a strike takes place in this country it is detrimental to the productivity of this nation, and the only wealth that labour, management or any of them has in the Dominion of Canada is the productivity of our nation. I am one of those who would go to all reasonable lengths to prevent any action by any organization, management or otherwise, that would interfere with the productivity of this country of ours. It seems to me that the only way that we can create better living conditions for the people of Saskatchewan or the people of Canada is to increase the productivity of this nation and it can only be done through the free association of free men.

Therefore, I am not prepared to support any motion or amendment or anything else that does not name specifically what we are hunting for, does not indicate exactly what procedures this Committee ought to follow. I am not prepared to give my support to that because the ultimate end may be that a Commission could be set up to investigate almost anything in Saskatchewan or Canada. If specific charges had been made against labour or against management then I think there should be a Commission – not a Commission of members of the Legislature but a Royal Commission – to investigate such a situation; but to my knowledge there certainly have been no charges as far as Saskatchewan is concerned, and that is as far as our jurisdiction goes as members of the Legislature.

It seems to me that too often we have asked Ottawa to do things that we ought to have been doing ourselves, but our main job, as members of the Legislature, is to endeavour to deal as fairly as possible with the problems that exist within the province of Saskatchewan. I do not

believe that this problem does confront us at the moment, and I sincerely hope that it never will. I hope that all political parties in the future will band together with labour, with management, with self employed and with the professions, and, through a united effort, endeavour to present policies and programs that will benefit all of the people of Saskatchewan and all of the people of Canada.

The amendment (Mr. Loptson) was negative on division by 41 votes against 2.

Mr. Speaker: The debate is now on the main motion. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Weber: Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! It is my duty to warn the Assembly that the mover of the motion is about to exercise his right to close the debate. Any hon. member who desires to speak should do so now.

Mr. A.P. Weber (closing): Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to point out to the Assembly some of the reasons why I brought in this motion at this time.

I am not disputing the fact, nor have I ever disputed the fact, that unions have done a worthwhile job in our province in an endeavour to obtain a fair living wage for our workers and to improve working conditions. I certainly am in agreement that they should be commended for what they have done to date. However, our working force at the present time in the province of Saskatchewan is quite small compared to some of our more industrialized areas, and I do not quite agree with the Premier when he says that there have been no serious disagreements between labour and management in the province of Saskatchewan. I am just going to try to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, why I came to that conclusion.

First of all, when we look at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures of the number of workers employed in industry in Saskatchewan we find that there were about 11,000 workers a year, up to the year 1956. If we compare that to some of our larger industrial areas in Canada we find that Ford Motor Company alone, in Ontario, had an average of over 15,000 employees in one factory. Therefore, if the workers in the Ford Motor company go on strike, their man-hours lost add up very much faster than man-hours lost in Saskatchewan, due to the fact that we have smaller groups employed in our various industries.

It was mentioned by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), when he was comparing the man-hours lost in Saskatchewan to the hours lost in other parts of Canada, that our loss through strikes was very insignificant. This is understandable. My point is not what has happened in the past so much as what is going to happen in the future, because as has been pointed out by Government members and members on this side of the House, Saskatchewan definitely is becoming more and more industrialized. I do think it is time for us to take a look at some of the situations which we have in this province today, with a view to rectifying them, to

prevent something happening in this province that has happened elsewhere in Canada.

When our Trade Union Act was set up we did not have anything like our Saskatchewan River dam development; we had not cement plant in Regina; we had no steel mill in Regina; we had no potash plant in Saskatoon, or many other industries that are now coming into the province. These were certainly not here at the time this Act was passed. Since this Act was put on the statutes there have been only a few minor amendments to The Trade Union Act and that, in itself, indicates that we haven't had too many problems, and I will agree that we have not had many problems; but the more we become industrialized the more these problems are apt to appear. I am quite sure that it would be much more sensible on our part to have legislation on the books which would prevent problems arising then to try to find cures for them after they have happened.

I would just like to comment on something that happened this week. I asked a question in the House, of the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Williams), regarding a certain situation in the city of Regina. The Minister gave me an answer to my question and I informed the party who was interested in the reply to the question; but one of the labour inspectors appeared at this man's place of business and informed him that that was not the case, so apparently there is some difference of interpretation.

Hon. Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member whether it was before or after the question that the inspector approached this place of business.

Mr. Weber: It was after. But there is a different interpretation or understanding of the clauses in the Act. Some of these clauses perhaps should be spelled out a little more clearly, so there will be no future instances of this kind. It is a fairly small instance, but still it could add up to large instances in the end, if applied to larger companies or corporations. I think that in itself proves to me that more clarification of the Act is warranted.

Mention was made of employment in the province of Saskatchewan and the fact that the employees have very good records as far as strikes are concerned. So I took an answer which was tabled in this House some time ago, as to man-days lost over a period of ten years; and just to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I mean by that, I am going to read a few of the answers I have here.

This is an answer that was tabled by the Hon. C.C. Williams. The question was: "How many strikes occurred; how many employees were involved"; and so on. The answer covers a ten-year period. In adding the man-days lost there were 125,150 days lost in that ten-year period. Just giving the wage-earner a very nominal wage for an 8-hour day, the sum of money involved is over \$1,000,000. Now that \$1,000,000 could have been earned by those wage earners if a strike could have been settled. My contention in bringing this motion to the House is this – it is not, as some of the members appear to think, that I am against labour. I feel that settlements should be made between labour and management, instead of running to the Government for settlement in their disputes. I believe

this could be arranged by proper legislation being placed on the statutes of this province.

Just to detail a few of the decisions that were taken to Court, and have been decided by the Courts through arbitration or other methods. I have here some lists of judgments for the Court of Appeal for the Province of Saskatchewan – they appealed against orders of the Labour Relations Board. I am going to read these to point out why I think it is so necessary to have a better understanding between labour and management. So many of these cases could have been settled had there been proper legislation so that labour and management could have negotiated on a more reasonable basis.

I would like to mention a few of these here; I have about ten or twelve of them, which are based on decisions of the Courts. The first one reads – “Orders of the Board Quashed”; next one – “Order of the Board Quashed”; the new one the same result – all quashed. This is apparently due to the fact that the Labour Relations Board did not have a proper basis on which to reach their decisions. Therefore, I think there must be a considerable misunderstanding when the labourers take their cases to the courts, and again when they appear before the Labour Relations Board. I have quite a few decisions here from competent judges, and I will read a few, because some of the members said there was no basis for bringing in this motion. I will give you part of a quotation from a decision from Mr. Justice Gordon, in which he said:

“Before dealing with these grounds of appeal, I think that reference should be made to some statements of counsel for the appellant Board. Counsel contended that The Trade Union Act contemplated that the Board should be biased or weighted in favour of labour. Further, that this intention of the Legislature could be gathered from a reading of the Act. This deal is not accepted by us. No matter what the views of the members of the Board may feel that while exercising judicial functions, they should be strictly impartial. If counsel was correctly expressing the views of the Board the respondent had every reason for being apprehensive of bias.”

I will read a decision from Mr. Justice Gordon in connection with a case where he asked: “Why should girls, who are only taking a position for a few months, be forced to join a union at all? The duty of explaining this fact to new untrained help is on the employer.” One of the orders made against this employer for “unfair practices”, we are told, was “his failure to discharge an employee for not joining the union.”

Here is one from Mr. Justice Procter:

“So far as the records show, not a single employee favoured the particular union which

April 9, 1959

they desire decertified. If a bona fide doubt existed in the mind of the Board, the doubt could have been resolved by taking a secret vote of the employees as provided by the Act.”

These are all statements made by judges; they are not taken lightly. Mr. Justice Procter said, again:

“In refusing to consider the wishes of these applicants, the majority of the Board were not acting within their jurisdiction as given to them by the Act, but were acting arbitrarily and without legal justification. They were refusing the jurisdiction given them in the very Act by which they were created to function.”

I just have a few more, Mr. Speaker, and then I will support my reasons for bringing in this motion. Chief Justice Brown noted:

“It would surely be an outrage to force these men into unionization under these circumstances, and I will not in any way facilitate such a result. The application is dismissed with costs against the applicants.”

Here is another decision. This was an application to quash several orders of the Board. The head note of the case reads in part as follows:

“Moreover, from start to finish the method of inquiry by the Board was fraught with omission and error, and the Board neglected its plain duty to conduct its inquiry properly, and truly to ascertain the facts.”

Now, I don't know if I should read any more . . .

Mr. Danielson: Go ahead, and read them all.

Mr. Weber: Here is Chief Justice Brown again:

“I would have expected the Board, at that time and in the light of the evidence before it, to have asserted itself and demonstrated its independence and effectiveness by denouncing the methods of misrepresentation and fraud that had been adopted in securing the signatures of employees of the company to the union cards before the Board at that time, and to have advised a representative of the union present on that occasion not to again appear before the

Board, insofar as this company was concerned until sufficient time had elapsed to allow the odour engendered from that application to evaporate. The Board was content at that time to advise the Union to withdraw its application, on which suggestion it acted. It was made crystal clear to the Board at that time that the union cards on which the application was based were valueless. With that background of experience the Board is again, and so soon, asked to consider another application for the same purpose.”

Here is Chief Justice Brown in another:

“One is amazed that an order or a judgment of the Board should be made unionizing these employees under such circumstances. There was, as I see it, no semblance of justice or fair play shown in the proceedings before the Board. I find myself compelled to say that, in the light of the material before me, the Board throughout this so-called hearing utterly failed to display evidence of good faith and fairness, and impartiality to either the company or its employees. The Board appeared to act as though it were in league with the union, and was determined to unionize the employees whether or not the company or the majority of the employees desired such a result.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour this matter, but I have many more cases, and I do not believe that the judges of our province would make comments such as these if they were not justified in doing so. It appears to me that it is not the labour-management problem that is to be considered so much as it is the handling of the affairs of labour and management through this Board.

I think, therefore, as far as I am concerned it is certainly necessary to have some reform made in our Act so that it would protect both labour and management. By doing so they would in turn protect the rest of the people of this province. There is no strike that has ever taken place anywhere in the world that has not had serious results not only to those effecting the strike but, through the chain reaction that is created by such a strike, it also affects workers, management, the families of the workers and the people who need the services of the result of labour and management.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would still like to impress on this Legislature that I believe this to be an important issue. It is not a political issue. No one in this House can ever say that I have ever, at any time, played politics in this House or even mentioned it. I am quite sure that those that know me realize that, in this instance, I am very sincere

April 9, 1959

in wanting to see something prevented instead of trying to cure something that has happened.

Hon. Mr. Williams: In reference to the 125,150 man-days lost by strikers in the past 10 years, have you included in that number the railway strikes of 1950 and 1957?

Mr. Weber: This is not for the past ten years; I said for a period of ten years – 1944 to 1956. No, this does not include the railway strikes.

The motion (Mr. Weber) was then negatived on recorded division by 40 votes against 3.

TAX-RENTAL AGREEMENTS

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, April 7, 1959 the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thorson:

“That this Assembly requests the Government of Saskatchewan to again urge the Government of Canada to convene a Dominion-Provincial Conference at which special attention will be given to establishing a policy whereby the Provinces receive a larger share and a more equitable distribution of funds from the Government of Canada within the framework of the Tax-Rental Agreements.”

and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McCarthy, as amended:

“and we commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government under the Tax-Rental Agreements to the payment of unconditional grants to the municipalities.”

and the proposed amendment to the amendment as amended, by the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn):

“That the proposed amendment as amended be further amended by striking out all the words after ‘Tax-Rental Agreements’ in the third line and substituting therefore the following:

“in the form of additional financial assistance to local governments, and urge that representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference.”

The amendment (Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn)) to the amendment as amended was agreed to, on recorded division, by 28 votes against 15.

Mr. Speaker: The debate is now on the amendment as further amended.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to thresh old straw and prolong the debate on this particular motion. It has been in the House before and it is an important motion. It is one that could have, and should have, I think, received unanimous support in this House. As you will recall, the motion has become bogged down and completely lost by amendments, and sub-amendments and amendments to the amendments and so forth.

In an effort to get some unanimity, something that both sides of the House can agree on in order that we can get this important motion down to Ottawa showing the support of Saskatchewan for such a Conference, I propose to move an amendment to the amended amendment which was just passed by this House. I do that for this purpose, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to read it. We say:

“We commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving support to the request to convene a Dominion-Provincial Conference, and urge the said Government to consider giving a reasonable share of money received by this Government under the Tax-Rental Agreement in the form of additional financial assistance in unconditional grants to local governments; and urge that representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference.”

Now I see nothing in that that cannot be supported in this House. It commends the Government for the stand it is taking in regard to the calling of a Conference; it urges the Government to give consideration to increased grants for the municipalities and asks that representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the amendment as proposed is not in order. In Beauchesne’s 2nd Edition, Page 129, Rule 413:

“No amendment shall call in question a principle on which the House has given a decision by its vote on a former amendment.”

The amendment as it stands now – “And we commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a reasonable share of money . . .”; this is a question on which the House has already expressed an opinion. The words “we commend” and “for giving” were inserted into the amendment proposed by the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. McCarthy: I did not say that . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. McCarthy: He is saying something I didn’t say.

April 9, 1959

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. McCarthy: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman said I said something I didn't say; and I have the right to correct him.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the hon. member continue with his point of order.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: These words "we commend" and "for giving" were inserted on the motion of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) and it was voted on and approved in this Legislature. Now the proposal in this amendment is not to commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a reasonable share of money, but it commends the Government of Saskatchewan for giving support to the request to convene a Dominion-Provincial Conference. It changes the intent of something on which the House has already expressed an opinion.

If any further proof of the inadmissibility of this amendment were needed, the proposed amendment then "urges the said Government to consider that a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government . . ."

I don't think there is any question but what it is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCarthy: Well, you're wrong!

Mr. Speaker: Order! I have no alternative but to agree with the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank). I can cite from Beauchesne, 3rd Edition, Citation No. 361:

"After a decision has been given on an amendment to any part of a question an earlier part cannot be amended."

Consequently, it cannot be ruled in order.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): Mr. McCarthy: But this very thing has been done in this House. I appeal from your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The amendment as moved by Mr. Cameron, seconded by Mr. McDonald reads:

"(1) That the following words be inserted after the word 'giving' in the first line of the amendment as further amended:

"support to the request to convene a Dominion-Provincial Conference, and urge the said Government to consider"

(2) That the following words be inserted after the word 'assistance' in the fourth line:

"and unconditional grants."

I have ruled that this amendment is not in order and the question now is: "Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?"

Mr. Speaker's ruling was sustained on recorded division by 27 votes against 15.

Mr. Speaker: The debate is now on the amendment as further amended, reading as follows:

"and we commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government under the Tax-Rental Agreements in the form of additional financial assistance to local governments, and urge representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference."

Is the House ready for the question?

Premier Douglas: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that what we are voting on now is the amended amendment.

Mr. McCarthy: Mr. Speaker, does that amendment still stand in my name? If so, I am prepared to say a few words on it.

Mr. Speaker: No, not on that amendment.

Hon. Mr. Fines: You have already spoken on it.

Mr. McCarthy: No, I didn't. I sat down in deference to Mr. Speaker, and the Provincial Treasurer jumped up and moved his amendment to the amendment, and when I went to speak again the Speaker ruled that I could only speak on the amendment to the amendment, so I never had the privilege of speaking to my original amendment. There is not a word in this thing that was in my amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. McCarthy: I think I should be able to speak on my amendment.

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. All I want to point out is that the very fact that the amendment appears on the Order Paper under the hon. gentleman's name is an indication that he spoke.

Mr. McCarthy: I did not.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, by moving it the member has exercised his right to speak.

April 9, 1959

Mr. McCarthy: No, I didn't finish.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will one person speak at a time.

Mr. Danielson: The Provincial Treasurer got to his feet . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, everybody will grant, of course, that this amendment that now stands on the Order Paper is somewhat different from the . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Will the hon. member deal with the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: It is somewhat different from the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) . . .

Mr. McCarthy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: . . . but on this question of having an opportunity to speak to it, the amendment could not originally appear on the Order Paper under the member's name unless he got up and moved and spoke to it. Even if he just read the amendment that would be speaking to it. Now, Mr. Speaker, he has actually . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: . . . he has actually two further opportunities when he could have spoken, because since that amendment was moved in this House there have been two amendments to it moved, on which everybody had an opportunity to speak, and if he did not take the opportunity to speak, it is not your fault, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCarthy: On a point of privilege. When I went to speak the Speaker told me I would have to confine my remarks to the amended amendment.

Mr. Cameron: As I see it now we are on this new amendment to the amendment, and the member has a perfect right to rise and speak in this debate, and no one can prevent him from doing so. The fact that he introduced the first amendment does not prevent him from speaking on this new motion before the House now, and that is what he is attempting to do. I want to speak on it, too.

Mr. Speaker: He is not speaking on the amendment to the amendment; he wants to speak again on the amended amendment.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think it should be made perfectly clear that we should not set any precedent in this connection.

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. There isn't any precedent. That member or any other member has a right to speak here and now. This is no special privilege that is being given.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. gentleman has the floor.

Mr. McCarthy: I don't want any special privileges in this House, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that there isn't anything in the motion now that bears the least resemblance to the motion that I moved. I am not an authority on Beauchesne, but I have some fundamental knowledge of the procedures of debate, and every rule that could possibly be broken in connection with these amendments, in my opinion, has been broken; and this Government will find, some day, that their majority will be their downfall, and they may regret that they sued their majority to bypass the rules for common debate. That is all I want to say.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment as amended, might I just point this out first. I am speaking now in my own rights, as a member of this Legislature, not by any dispensation granted to me by the Minister of Mineral Resources, nor by any precedent as mentioned by . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! On a point of order, is anybody questioning your right to speak?

Mr. Cameron: I wanted to make that clear.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Cameron: Mr. Speaker, may I point out that I have the floor and I am speaking.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Speaker, I take objection to the hon. member insinuating that I have the power to give any dispensation. I haven't. I don't want remarks like that made, and I wish he would withdraw that.

Mr. Cameron: Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the new amendment as amended reads:

“and we commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government under the Tax-Rental Agreements in the form of additional financial assistance to local governments, and urge that representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference.”

I think that every municipal man in the province would be interested to know that this afternoon, on a recorded vote, every member of the

April 9, 1959

Government stood up and fought against, and voted against the Government even giving consideration to a better deal for the municipalities.

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: That will be of interest to every municipal man in this province, and it stands on record that we in the Opposition were prepared, and so moved, to commend the Provincial Government for its action in the past years, and its interest in getting this Conference reconvened, and we so stated. All we asked was that this Government likewise give consideration to giving a reasonable share in the form of increased grants and unconditional grants to the municipalities. They will be interested to know that that request to entertain the thought, even, of consideration of increased grants, is not to their liking at all.

Certainly I am going to tell my municipal men and everyone in the district, the ‘schemozzle’ that went on here over this resolution. In order to send the resolution to Ottawa, urging the reconvening of a Dominion-Provincial Conference, they are asking us to say we “commend” them first for giving generous assistance to the municipalities – something tied in that has no relationship whatsoever to the calling of a Dominion-Provincial Conference. It was only after a harangue, and after second thoughts by the Provincial Treasurers, that they did not even go further and ask us to commend them for doing something which they never have done, and to leave the impression in the province that they were doing. How far do they think they can push the Opposition around? How much do you think you are going to get away with by sheer weight in this House, not by debates and by rules of the Legislature?

That is what I wanted to say on this, and for that reason I am not going to be a party to commending the Provincial Government for something that they are not generous about with regard to municipalities. In order that we can get a better deal for the province, you are asking me that. Before I can first do that, I must “commend” you for being so generous to the municipalities. I can do no such thing, and for that reason I will not support the amendment to the amendment.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says he is going to explain this to the people of his constituency, and I will certainly be happy to have him do it.

Mr. Cameron: I certainly will.

Premier Douglas: However, the thing to explain first is that the entire Opposition voted against giving additional financial assistance to local governments, and urging the representatives of the local governments to be invited to attend this Dominion-Provincial Conference. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the reason we voted against the amendment which was moved by the member for Cannington was that he asked us to consider giving a “reasonable share” of money received from the Federal Government to the local governments. The implication is that they are not being given their reasonable share of money.

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: But in fact, 27 per cent of the entire current budget of the Provincial Government is being paid out to local governments.

Mr. McDonald: Nonsense!

Premier Douglas: This talk about cluttering up the motion. The original motion was a simple motion asking for a Federal-Provincial Conference, and asking for a fair share of three fields of taxation. There was no need for any amendment to it. But the members opposite just could not stop playing politics. They could not bring themselves to the level of anything resembling statesmanship. They could not think in terms of the larger picture of the provincial welfare. So the member for Cannington comes along, and inserts in this motion (a motion, remember, which you were going to send to Ottawa, asking for a Federal-Provincial Conference) an amendment which practically said that the Provincial Government was giving the local governments their fair share of the money they were getting from Ottawa.

Mr. McCarthy: I said they were not getting 'unconditional grants'.

Premier Douglas: Oh, but it did not say just unconditional grants.

Mr. McCarthy: Oh yes, it did.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, these people just could not allow a resolution to go to Ottawa asking for a fair allocation of Federal funds, without using the motion as an opportunity . . .

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mrs. Batten: How do you know?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the hon. member for Humboldt please state the point of order.

Mrs. Batten: The point of order is this, Mr. Speaker. I was under the impression that the hon. Premier, who has now spoken three times, or is speaking now for the third time, had already spoken on Mr. McCarthy's amendment. He is now in detail again speaking on that amendment.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I did not speak . . .

Mr. Speaker: My records do not show that the hon. Premier spoke on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, he spoke on my amendment.

April 9, 1959

Premier Douglas: I did not speak on the amendment by the member for Cannington; I spoke on the amendment moved by the Provincial Treasurer. I adjourned the debate on it.

The point I want to make is that the member for Cannington could not leave this resolution alone. He insisted on adding to this resolution an amendment which has nothing to do with what we were asking Ottawa to do. It is only an opportunity to try to place this Government in a bad light in the eyes of the municipalities. That is something the hon. members opposite have been doing for a long time. The municipalities have got wise to them long ago, and, as far as I am concerned, we are certainly prepared to take this record to the municipalities and to the people of the province anywhere.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we could argue and argue here. Doesn't the hon. Premier realize that all he had to do was to vote against our original amendment?

Premier Douglas: That is why it was moved – so we could vote against it, eh?

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, the Government is still in the position that they can send the original motion to Ottawa. They have it within their power to send the motion to Ottawa, as it originally moved in this House; but I suggest to you that they have not got the internal fortitude to do it.

Premier Douglas: We offered once to withdraw the motion – or the amendment.

Mr. McDonald: Why should we give you permission to withdraw the motion that you put on in haste, and got yourself in trouble for doing so? Why should we bail you out of the jackpot you find yourselves in now? This can be taken off the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker; and I suggest that, in all fairness to the people of Saskatchewan, it ought to come off the Order Paper, and it is within the power of the members of this House to take it off. All they have to do is vote against it and it comes off, and then we can send the original motion to Ottawa.

What consideration are the people of Canada going to give to a resolution that comes from the province of Saskatchewan, or any other province, that pats ourselves on the back for doing something we have not done. Of course, we in the Opposition have been able to convince the Government that they have not paid unconditional grants, which was one of the conditions which they wanted to support at one time, and now they have amended their own amendment. They realize now they have not paid unconditional grants, and if the Provincial Treasurer had taken a little time and found that out, I suggest he never would have moved the amendment that he did. But he, too, has been convinced, finally, that we are not paying unconditional grants to the municipalities, so they want to take that out

of their own motion. Well, that is all right. But now they want to commend themselves for being so generous to the municipalities. They want to commend themselves for dividing the revenues that are available in Saskatchewan equally with municipal government.

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out before, and I want to point out again, that there isn't a municipal organization in Saskatchewan that is content and happy with the treatment this Government is giving them. Yet they expect the Opposition to go and tell the Government of Canada that we are so pleased with the treatment of our junior governments in Saskatchewan by this benevolent Provincial Government. I can imagine that, if we were fool enough to send this to Ottawa in its present form, we ought to be laughed right out of this Legislature and right out of the Dominion of Canada. I suggest to these people to repent their sins; take this thing off the Order Paper. You have it in your hands to do the right thing. You are the people who can send this resolution to Ottawa in its proper form, or you can send it there cluttered up, where it is meaningless. I challenge you. I defy you to take it off the Order Paper. You have not the internal courage to do it, and we know it; and you are going to stand up and be counted in this House.

Premier Douglas: You bet. Right away!

Mr. McDonald: Now, if anyone has ever – let's call it 5:30, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The House will recess until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Resuming at 7:30 o'clock p.m.:

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, when you called it 5:30, I was dealing with the resolution which was placed on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and the several amendments and amendment to the amendments, and amendment to this further amended motion. I was pointing out that it was within the power and in the hands of this Legislature to clean this resolution up, and to place it in a position where we would be doing the right thing to forward it to the Government at Ottawa for their consideration. I still think it is unfortunate that we find ourselves, as citizens of Saskatchewan, in the position we find ourselves in at the moment; but I want to point out again that the members of this House have the power to do the right thing, and I want to challenge them again now to do the right thing. If anyone is going to stab the province of Saskatchewan, or the municipalities in the back, it is going to be those people who support this amendment which is now before us. I say that every person who supports this is stabbing the province of Saskatchewan and its people, and the municipalities and their people, in the back. They are making light of a very serious matter.

I have been accused of stabbing the province in the back because I attempted to outline some expenditures that were made by the Government of Canada on behalf of our province, and other provinces, too, throughout Canada. The test will soon be taken, I hope to see who is prepared to stab the people of this province in the back, and I am sure it is those

April 9, 1959

people who are prepared to do that here this evening. The people of the municipalities and of this province, and municipal officials are certainly going to long remember the people responsible for the placing of this Legislature in the ridiculous position in which it now finds itself.

I have no intention of prolonging this debate, only again to ask all members here this evening to set their political differences aside, and to do the right thing on behalf of this province of Saskatchewan. If we do that, then I am sure that every member of this House could go into a vote against the amendment, take it off the resolution, and then send the resolution in its proper form to the Government of Canada with the solid weight of the members of this Legislature and, I feel sure, the support of every citizen of Saskatchewan.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition seems to feel that if we were to pass the resolution with the proposed amendment added we would be putting the people of the province in something of a difficult or embarrassing position, and has suggested that it is somewhat embarrassing to the Legislature to have to vote on the resolution in this form. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to submit that the resolution with the proposed amended amendment is actually a stronger resolution plea, and a more adequate plea to the Federal Government for a fair deal to the provinces, than was the original resolution.

Let us just review the history of this much amended resolution for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker. The resolution as originally submitted by the member for Estevan (Mr. Thorson) was one which should have commended itself, as it stood, to the complete and unanimous endorsement of every member of this Legislature regardless of political party. The first step to amend this resolution came from a member of the Liberal Opposition, the member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy). I submit that it would have been quite improper for the Legislature to have submitted the resolution, amended in that form, to the Federal Government, because the amendment which he proposed was not one which had any reference whatsoever to matters of the Federal Government or to relationship between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government. It was, instead, a resolution which purported to direct the Provincial Government how to spend the various revenues which it has. It was, in a word, something of a suggestion to the Federal Government that they might interest themselves in how the Provincial Government was spending the money, and this is something which I think all members of the Legislature, again regardless of party, want to avoid. It, therefore, became essential to amend that resolution, and the amendment as it is now proposed, says this to the Federal Government: that we have been receiving aid through the medium of the tax-sharing agreements, and that, in the opinion of this Legislature that assistance is being well and properly spent by the Provincial Government. This is a stronger argument, I submit, to the Federal Government than was the original resolution.

The amendment does not ask the Legislature to say that, in its opinion, the various local governments are getting all the assistance

they need. The Government has never pretended that local governments are getting all of the assistance they need. The Government has consistently said that we realize the needs of local governments, and that has been one reason for our consistent approach to the Federal Government for a fairer deal under the Tax-Sharing Agreement. All that the amendment suggests is that a reasonable share of the money which has come through those agreements has been, in the past, passed on to local governments.

I think if the record is examined, and examined impartially, people will be impressed with the fact that the Government has never said to local governments, "You're getting all that you need." The best proof of that is that, each year, the Provincial Government has been adding to that support. If we examine the year 1958, for example, we find that some 30 per cent of all the money expended by rural municipalities on public works was provided by grants from the Provincial Government. We find that some 40 per cent of the expenditures of our school districts for education was provided from grants from the Provincial Government. We find that 75 per cent of their social aid cost was provided by grants from the Provincial Government. And, if we examine the situation as proposed, as outlined and as I will prove, for 1959, we find that in each of these fields the Provincial Government is prepared not only to increase the total amount of money made available for those various services, but to increase the proportion of the total cost of these services provided by Government Grants.

May I say that this is being done at the expense of some projects which are properly in the line of government responsibility, which are very dear to the ears of this Government, and for which we have been criticized by the Opposition for not proceeding with them. We have made this decision, not to proceed with some of these, because we made what we felt to be the more urgent decision of assisting local governments more.

May I just repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution, if it is amended as proposed, is a stronger resolution in terms of getting a square deal from the Federal Government under the Tax-Sharing Agreement than was the original resolution, because it says not only do we (we would hope all parties in this Legislature) ask for another meeting, but that we are convinced that good and proper use has been made of the money to date, that we realize the problems of local governments, if the Opposition is looking for political credit – I am not suggesting for a moment that was in the mind of the member for Cannington when he raised his amendment, although at this moment I cannot think of any group or any political party in the province that needs political credit more than the Opposition; but if they are looking for political credit, they can best get that by supporting the resolution in the proposed amended form. I, in turn, can invite them not only to advance their own political welfare, but at the same time support the Government in its efforts to get a fair deal for the local governments, and the people of Saskatchewan, by supporting the amended resolution.

April 9, 1959

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that if we were looking for political credit, we certainly would not go to the members on your right to find out how to get it, because they have succeeded in discrediting themselves in the eyes of the people of Saskatchewan.

We were told, before the supper adjournment, by this hon. Premier that we were playing politics when we introduced the amendment. That was the most despicable thing to say about the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) who has been . . .

Government Members: He's a nice man, too!

Mrs. Batten: Yes, he is a nice man, which is more than I can say for you two!

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: He is a man who has been known throughout this province as a man who is dedicated to local government and to municipalities. He has devoted his life to it, and if you can get up on this floor and say that he is introducing a measure to get help from this Government merely for the purpose of making political capital, I think that is one of the most despicable accusations that has been hurled across the floor to any member on this side of the House.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and most sincerely, that that amendment was introduced for the purpose of asking something from this Government that these local governments need, and it was done in all sincerity. It was, furthermore, introduced to strengthen the motion. That is not funny. When you listen to the reasoning of the hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) who thinks that you are strengthening the motion by introducing a patched-up amendment to the amendment of the amendment, which is saying to the people in Ottawa, "You're not doing enough for the province, but we – we're wonderful people – we are doing great things for the municipalities, so give us some more money so we can get credit" – it is the most ridiculous thing that any Government of any stature or maturity has ever tried to send to a senior Government. I would be ashamed to be associated with such a false piece of goods.

I want to say, furthermore, that if the amendment had been passed, and if these people in this Government had had the courage to say that we do need money for our local governments, which the hon. Minister of Education has just said – but he refused to vote for it when it was an amendment because it was under the name of a member of the Opposition!

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: If you went to the Senior Government, and said, "We are asking you for more money, because we need more money for our local governments," I think you would have got a much better hearing than you are ever going to get from an amendment that says, "We're doing everything; we're simply wonderful; we spend the money well, but

you people don't know how to divide it up, so we are asking for more." That is just a fantastic way of asking a favour or even for a fair deal. You are arousing antagonism long before you will ever get anything. The fantastic part of it is that, this terrific majority that the members on your right have, Mr. Speaker, they have gotten themselves into this beautiful mess . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: We're not in a mess. It's you.

Mrs. Batten: . . . because the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who should from his experience know what the local government bodies are getting, introduced an amendment commending himself for giving municipalities "unconditional grants." And then his own colleagues had to amend that, because it was an obvious untruth – not even an arguable untruth, but just an obvious one. Even he did not dare have the gall (and you can't say the hon. members are lacking in gall at any time). This was such an obvious untruth that they had to amend their own amendment, and now after commending themselves and boasting of how wonderful they are, they are going to go and ask for more money from Ottawa in order that they can spread more propaganda about how much the C.C.F. government is doing! I, certainly knowing Mr. Diefenbaker, don't think he will consider this type of appeal for one moment.

The question being put on the amendment as further amended it was agreed to on recorded division by 27 votes against 15.

Mr. Speaker: The debate is now on the motion as amended.

Mr. Danielson: Mr. Speaker, would you please read the motion as it now stands.

Hon. Mr. Walker: That won't help you any!

Mr. Speaker: I will read the motion as amended:

"That this Assembly requests the Government of Saskatchewan to again urge the Government of Canada to convene a Dominion-Provincial Conference at which special attention will be given to establishing a policy whereby the Provinces receive a larger share and a more equitable distribution of funds from the Government of Canada within the framework of the Tax-Rental Agreements.

And we commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government under the Tax-Rental Agreements in the form of additional financial assistance to local governments, and urge that representatives of the latter be invited to attend the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference."

The question being put on the motion as amended, it was agreed to.

DENTAL PROFESSION BILL

Moved by Mr. Willis (Elrose), seconded by Mr. Dewhurst (Wadena):

“That the Fourth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers be now concurred in.”

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, this particular Report has to do with the Dental question. I was not a member of the Law Amendments Committee and I am not too conversant with all the discussion that went on in that Committee; but I understand the Dental Profession has asked that The Dental Professional Act to be revised. This Act was submitted to the Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers. Once it was in the hands of the Committee individuals and organizations were then free to present briefs in support of the bill or in opposition to it.

Then the Committee, after due consideration, recommended that the bill be not proceeded with. I don't question that right at all; no one questions the right of the Committee to make such a recommendation. I do feel, however, that the reasons stated in the recommendation of the Committee to this Assembly are not sufficient in themselves to warrant the Legislature concurring in these recommendations. Briefly, the report states: That the Dental Technicians will submit a Bill of Incorporation at the next session; that the Bill of Incorporation will be complementary to The Dental Profession Act, and for this reason the Committee recommended that Bill No. 90 be not further proceeded with at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Committee erred. I believe it erred in taking into consideration a proposal which may or may not materialized. The dental technicians may or may not present a Bill before the Committee at the next Session. The dental technicians, in their brief submitted to the Committee, stated that a draft Dental Technicians Act had been submitted by their Association. The dental technicians declared their organization in full support of the proposed division of the dental profession.

I think the Committee erred in bringing in to the Assembly whether or not they should proceed with this Bill, on the grounds that the dental technicians have before the Department of Public Health a Bill which, I understand, was submitted too late to be considered this Session but which may come up next year. Since the two Bills are complementary, they say they might better be considered together next year. I say I don't think that is sufficient reason for not proceeding with the Bill at this time.

I believe that, in every Committee, each Bill that is submitted to that Committee for discussion should be judged on the merits of that Bill and on its merits only, not in regard to what may or may not happen a year hence; and in that, too, I think the Committee erred. It should not take into consideration some proposal that may come forward at some

future date. That should have no bearing on the Bill, as such, because it is not before the Committee. I don't think the Committee should consider anything that is not actually before it for consideration, and they took into consideration the prospects of a proposal from the dental technicians at the next Session.

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I think that we, as responsible members of the Legislature, should exercise that responsibility, I feel that, unless we do, both in the Legislature and in the Committee, we fall into the possibility of leaving an impression that we are hedging, that we are dodging the particular issue, and that we are, to some extent, putting off an issue because it may or may not be controversial. I would not like that impression to get abroad, and I think, in view of that, this recommendation should be made – that it be sent back to the Committee, and the Committee bring in its findings on the merits of the Bill as presented, not in relationship to some proposal that may be presented to the Committee at some future date. For that reason I move, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

“That all the words after ‘That’ be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

‘the Fourth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the said Committee with instructions that it have power to reconsider Bill No. 90 – An Act respecting the Dental Profession of Saskatchewan – and to amend its Report thereon’.”

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

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Committee and, therefore, I would like to add just a few words to what has been said by the mover of the amendment.

I agree with him that this Bill is something that should be considered and that some decision should be made by the Committee on it for the reason, first of all, it is a Bill that is submitted by a professional group. We have just had a long talk about unions and the right of workers to organize. This is a professional group that is in exactly that same type of category. These people, as organized group, in order to preserve their professional status and their professional standards, have submitted a Bill, and whether we agree with the Bill or not is not the question here. These people, as a profession, are saying to the Legislature through its Committee that they want certain amendments to their Act to preserve their professional status and regulations. They are saying furthermore, that it is in the interest of the public that this Bill should pass in its form. I think we are doing them a very grave injustice, and we are doing a very grave injustice to the public which we represent and whose health we are to look after. When this group, which has a primary knowledge of the situation, says it is essential that it be dealt with immediately, then I think it should be dealt with.

Secondly, I think we are doing the dental technicians a grave injustice, when they submit to us a brief and say that their Bill is complementary; they submit a brief in favour of this Dental Bill which, they say, should be implemented immediately. We are using the argument to say that we should give it a hoist, which is deliberately misusing what they have presented to us.

I don't think there was ever any idea in the minds of those people who presented the brief on behalf of the technicians that they were doing so in support of a hoist. They were doing so in support of the Bill itself, and for that reason they presented their Bill as complementary to the professional Bill before us. Therefore, I do not think that is any justification for a hoist; in fact, it is just the opposite. That is a reason for considering it immediately, because, if this Bill is going to be changed, no doubt the profession of the dental technicians would have to change their Bill before it is presented to us again, next year.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): May I ask the hon. member a question? You are a member of the Committee and I understand the recommendation of the Committee was unanimous.

Mrs. Batten: Yes, I am, but I don't think there is such a thing as a unanimous recommendation; I don't believe it was unanimous.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, like the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), I am not a member of the Law Amendments Committee, therefore I am not too familiar with the nature of the presentations which were made to the Committee or the discussions which took place there.

When I saw the report of the Committee I took it for granted that it was a report which represented the views of all members of the Committee. I was not aware that any of the Committee members had objected at all to the decision which the Committee made. The information that I have is that all of the members concurred in the report which is now before the House. Maybe the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has changed her mind, which is her prerogative, I expect . . .

Mrs. Batten: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't think that has anything to do with it. I am respecting the rights of the Committee and the members therein, when they were in camera . . .

Premier Douglas: But, Mr. Speaker, it was only in camera to the public. It was not in camera as far as the members of the Legislature were concerned.

Certainly the information which I received, and which I got from the report of the Committee, was that the 12 members of the Committee who were present concurred in the report. I want to make it abundantly clear that, as far as I am concerned, from the beginning I have favoured the idea of The Dental Profession Act. I still think there is a case for the public having direct access to dental technicians for the purpose of repair and alternations and things of that sort. The dentists are extremely busy and in order to put a tooth back on a plate or repair a break, it is pretty difficult for a patient to wait until he can have the work done through his dentist. I think perhaps a good deal of that work could be done directly by a technician. I do think, however, that the would question of working in people's mouths ought to be in the hands of highly trained professionals.

I understand from the Committee's report that the dental technicians submitted a brief stating that they would like professional dignity and professional statue. This might also take care of the whole question of denture repairs because, if there was professional status for dental technicians, we could then have a board who could say that all people who are going to practise in the province making dentures and repairing dentures, etc., would have to meet the specifications met by that board. This would prevent 'bootlegging' in dentistry, and it would prevent people working in that field who were not fully qualified.

I take it the Committee felt that they were going to draft such an Act. It is not a matter of saying they may or may not present a Bill. They already have drafted such a Bill. It is in the hands of the Department of Public Health, and the Department of Public Health is working on that Bill at the present time. I take it that the Committee felt that, if they passed this Bill now, it might be amended next year. I did not follow the discussions of the meetings too closely, but I think it was the general feeling of the Committee that the dental profession has to be protected insofar as doing an effective job in a professional capacity, including working in people's mouths and doing work which is vital to the health of the public. I think the Committee felt there ought to be a standard set for dental technicians, with the area prescribed within which they may operate, with certain fields prescribed where the public may have direct access to them.

Now if that is going to be done I think it makes a lot of sense that the two Acts ought to be passed at the same time so that one dovetails with the other. On the other hand, maybe the House feels that this Act should be passed and later amended so the two would fit in together. This can be done if the House so wishes. If the members of the House wish to put it back and have the Committee go over it, certainly I, for one, would have no objection. Of course, the members of the Committee will have to make up their minds about it, as to whether or not it would be practical and feasible. Therefore, I would be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to vote to send this back to the Committee and give them an opportunity to have another look at it.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken I think this is an important enough matter, in view of the discussion that has taken place on it over the last few days, that all the members of the Legislature should have an opportunity to discuss the bill and say whether or not the Bill, as it is now constituted, should be presented and passed by this Legislature.

I am quite certain that all of us realize that the matter with which it deals is of extreme importance to every one of us, and I think the Premier has mentioned that some people, because of the lack of dentists in the province, find it necessary to have work done; and they find difficulty, for instance, having their dentures fixed from time to time because of the lack of dentists. I think a lot of that responsibility must lie at the door of the Government of this province, who, for 15 years, continued to ignore the field of dental health in the way they have, and not providing, as we have insisted when going over the Health estimates of the province, a proper dental health program in this province. So I say they must accept some of the responsibility for the position we find ourselves in at the present time.

When we are asked by the profession which is concerned to pass measures which they feel are going to be for the benefit of the people of this province in a health matter, I think that we, as members of the Legislature, should accept that responsibility; we should deal with the question and should decide it now. We have heard testimony, and have seen it in the press, that there are people in this province working in this province in an illegal fashion, and nothing has been done about it. I think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that we accept our responsibility and take some action in this regard, dealing with the dental health of the people of the province.

Premier Douglas: May I ask the hon. member if he is aware that there never was a dental health branch of the government prior to the present Government?

Mr. Gardiner: I mentioned the fact . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee, I think I should say that the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) who has spoken today, was the only member who was not present when the Committee made its final decision.

Mrs. Batten: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I was absent for approximately 12 minutes when this Bill was rammed through; it was rammed through deliberately while I was absent.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, that is a reflection on the Committee. Nobody in this House is so afraid of the member for Humboldt that they have to get something through while she is absent. I want to make that clear. You over estimate your ability.

Mrs. Batten: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mrs. Batten: . . . was absent for approximately 12 minutes, and I don't think there is any member on that Committee who attended more faithfully than I did.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would like to point out that the member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) has the floor.

Mr. Willis: The report of the Law Amendments Committee was unanimous.

Mr. Barrie (Pelly): I was a member of the Committee and I don't recall any vote being taken.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Oh yes, there was. The Chairman asked for those in favour and those opposed, and everyone voted in favour of the report. There was not a single vote opposing it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: He asked if there were any members who were opposed.

Mr. McCarthy: I think probably nearly everybody was in favour of it, but there was no opportunity to oppose it. There was actually no vote taken.

Hon. Mr. Walker: That, of course, isn't so.

Mr. McCarthy: Well, all right; are you doubting what I say? I make this statement on my own responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. McCarthy: I was there, and I can only say what I saw and what I heard.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is saying what he believes to be true.

Mr. McCarthy: I have been in this House quite a while and there is nobody who can accuse me of saying something that isn't true.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) has cast a reflection on the Chairman of the Committee when he says that the meeting to which he refers was not properly conducted by the Chairman.

Mr. McCarthy: I said no such thing.

April 9, 1959

Mr. Brown (Bengough): He knows what he can do if he wants to question the conduct of the Chairman of any Committee.

Mr. McCarthy: Mr. Speaker, I cast no reflection on the Chairman. It was not the Chairman's fault; everybody was up fooling around. I certainly did not cast any reflection on the Chairman; I cast no reflection on anyone, but that is actually what happened.

Mrs. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Committee either, but I was very much interested, and so I sat in and listened to all of the meetings; and I recall very distinctly the motion being moved and seconded and duly carried. It was voted on.

Mrs. Batten: May I ask the hon. member a question? Who moved and seconded it?

Mrs. Cooper: I can't remember.

Mrs. Batten: Well, if you don't remember . . .

Premier Douglas: There were no lawyers present . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mrs. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I could ask you who moved and seconded a great many motions and I am sure you could not tell me. I am just saying I was present at that meeting and the motion was voted on. I am not questioning the member who says she did not see it that way, but I am saying that I did.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! It seems to me that this discussion isn't of any particular concern to the amendment.

Mr. Danielson: I think we have spent too much time on this. I know . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: Tell us the next thing you said, too.

Mr. Danielson: What about?

Hon. Mr. Fines: About the Chinaman.

Mr. Danielson: Oh yes, yes . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

The amendment (Mr. Cameron) was agreed to. The motion as amended was then agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m. without question put.