

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fourteenth Legislature
31st Day

Thursday, March 23, 1961.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

NEWSPAPER ITEM

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring attention to yourself and the Members of the Legislature an article in the 'Leader Post' this morning regarding the matter I brought up a few days ago in connection with a firm in Saskatoon, called Suburban Sanitation Supplies. The president of the company and one of the other officials of the company have made certain statements to the press. I have just, within the last half hour, come down from the office of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, and have perused the file, once again, of this particular company. I find there is no indication in the file and there are no documents in the file showing any transfer of stocks or shares of the company; no information in the file showing any change in the officials of the company. In fact, the only document that's in the file since the first of this year, is a receipt indicating that the \$10.00 fee has been paid for the annual company fee for 1961, and there is a notice from the 'Gazette' of March 3rd, on file, where the company has given notice for an Application of Change of Name from the Suburban Sanitation Supplies to the Suburban Industries Limited. The Annual Report for this company which should have been filed, I believe if my information is correct, at the 1st of March, is not on file; it hasn't yet been received.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm wondering under what provision this is being raised. A Minister wanted, yesterday, to raise this matter on the Orders of the Day, and I suggested to him that I thought it would be in contravention

March 23, 1961

to the rules of the House to raise this matter on the Orders of the Day, that the best place to raise it would probably be when we go back into Committee of Supply. We could revert to it tonight and it would allow us to discuss it, but I don't know how you could discuss it on the Orders of the Day unless it is a matter of personal privilege. If my friend is raising it on that point . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, Agriculture is past, how can you get it back into Agriculture?

Premier Douglas: — My suggestion to the Minister was, yesterday, when he wanted to raise it was, that when we go into Committee of Supply at sometime we could revert back and open an item in those estimates if that was agreeable, and discuss this item. But I think if we get into a debate on the Orders of the Day it is going to be very difficult, unless it's a matter of privilege. If my friend is correcting some mis-statement that reflects on him personally, of course it's quite in order.

Mr. Speaker: — Does the hon. Member wish to correct something in the paper, or did you have something of some personal implication in regard to this matter, or is it the matter simply of public business that you wish to discuss.

Mr. Barrie: — No, It's a matter of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — In what manner?

Mr. Barrie: — In this article in this paper these people more or less refute the statements that I made, and I claim the statements that I made were backed up by the official documents that are on file for this company.

Hon Mr. Walker: — Possibly you're both right. Possibly your telling the truth and so is he.

Mr. Barrie: — Well I take exception to the statements made in the press statement.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I will be making a statement . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Are you going to reply?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, I'm not replying I'm just saying to the House that I will be making a statement to the House at the first opportunity, in this connection, that I think will clear up this entire matter.

Premier Douglas: — With this explanation, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that my feeling was, and I think the House will agree, that if we are going to discuss this matter the Minister ought not to raise it on the Orders of the Day, but rather to raise it in Committee of Supply, where it can be discussed rather than have a statement made by the Minister which can't be questioned. This was my reason for suggesting it be left to the Committee for Supply.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that the matter can be satisfied best in that way.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Gordon T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call your attention to a group of fine young people in the Speaker's Gallery. They came to visit us today from the Moose Jaw Training School, accompanied by their councillors. These young people refer to themselves as the O.K. Club, which is an abbreviation for Opportunity Knocks, and I would just like to ask that the Assembly join with me in extending to them the wish that their stay here will be an informative and an interesting one.

ACOUSTICS IN CHAMBER

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the loud speakers that have been set up here. In the committee that was set up by the wish of this House in regard to services for Members, this matter of acoustics in the House was one of the matters which we discussed. It was decided that we would experiment in this way to see how this worked out, and I would like the hon. Members to pay particular attention to the results today. If they can hear better, or whatever the results are in the Chamber, will they give their findings to the Clerk? They may be able to tell whether this is of benefit or not.

March 23, 1961

RE ACOUSTICS IN THE CHAMBER

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I say that while I'm sure that all those hon. Members will congratulate you in putting in the loud speakers, I'm not sure that this is an improvement. I'm reminded that Sir Winston Churchill, when he was in the House of Commons, was asked by a Member why he didn't wear his hearing aid, and he said: "No man ought to deny himself his natural advantages."

MOTION ON ASSISTANCE TO A PROGRAM OF DRIVER EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, before I make this motion, I would like to read it to the House:

"That in view of the rising toll of death and injury on our highways and the consequent appalling loss of human life, this Assembly recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan give consideration to further encouragement and assistance to a comprehensive program of driver education."

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to bring to the attention of this House, a problem that is facing this province. It's a problem that has gouged a hole in many homes and communities in this province this year. It's a problem that has left children without parents and parents without children, and many of them crippled for life. Some of you might wonder what I'm talking about. What I'm trying to explain is the unnecessary loss of human life due to traffic accidents. We are told that perhaps 90% of these accidents could have been avoided. There is nothing more depressing than to go to a funeral and see the parents being laid to rest and the little ones left behind to mourn the loss of their dearest friends.

In my opinion the judge in the court room is a very poor teacher or instructor for driver education. I believe that a lot can be done about this situation if a proper driving program or driver training was brought about. A set-up such as has been carried out in the past makes just as much sense at times as leaving a loaded shotgun in the hands of little children. This

appalling waste of human life represents a serious moral problem and a serious moral responsibility to the Members of this Legislature. If we don't want to spend more money on driver training, we will have to spend it on higher insurance rates and hospital bills. I believe that we should approach this problem in a constructive manner. I believe that academic training could start at a very early age in the primary grades, and practical training at the age of 15 and 16, a temporary license could be issued during that time but no permanent license should be issued before the age of 17. This would give the new driver a fair chance to know what driving is all about, and I am sure that we would develop a driver with a different attitude.

I don't see too much common sense in issuing a learner's license for a few weeks and then after a few minutes driving test, issuing an operator's license for a person to get behind a 250 horsepower motor and start aiming two tons of steel down the highway. We are only asking for trouble and the records prove that we are getting plenty of it.

In my Constituency this year there have been ten traffic fatalities which occurred, and I am told that for the province it's somewhere around one hundred and sixty. I might be wrong on those figures, but they are supposed to be right. So, as far as my Constituency is concerned these figures are correct. I am sure that driver training would cut down on the appalling waste of human life on our roads, and would mean a great deal towards saving on property damage. And in order to prove some of my points, I would like to quote from a few booklets that I have gathered. This is a little book that I got from Medicine Hat. Many of you have heard about the city's wonderful record as far as driving safety is concerned, and I want to quote a few paragraphs from the book that I got from that city.

“The safety council realized from the outset that safety education was the greatest asset it could use, but that there was no way to reach more than a small fraction of the adult population, so they concentrated on the schools, talking to the students, showing them films and organizing safety patrols. Sgt. McKenzie, head of the City Police Traffic Squad, which was formed in 1957, had this to say: ‘Education is the key word to Medicine Hat, to effect the prolonged safety record. Emphasis is placed on the very young and

March 23, 1961

carried through all school grades. To those who are above school age, and who do not want to take advantage of safety teaching — enforcement’.”

So, Mr. Speaker, we all know that in driving there are the 3 E’s, which are education, engineering and enforcement.

Now, we have got to give credit to the Department of Highways and municipalities for reasonably good engineering of our roads. And the question of enforcement I suppose we could argue one way or the other, depending on whether we have a blue license or a red one. But as far as education is concerned, I think that a great deal can be done.

Now I want to quote another paragraph from the same book.

“All service clubs are safety conscience, and have delegates on either the Safety Council or the Traffic Safety Committee, and it is up to them. The officials owe much to their safety campaign. The Kiwanis Club who sponsors the Pedal Pushers, the Jaycee’s who sponsors the Local Safety Council, the Jaycee’s who sponsor the Child Safety Campaign, all are playing special parts in Medicine Hat, and Medicine Hat is grateful.”

In another paragraph:

“Through our visit to the schools children are very friendly toward the police.”

Now, I want to comment on this. We have too many of our youngsters today who look upon the police officer as just a big bully. Well, I think if the police officers were brought into our schools, and let the little children know that he is just not that, I think we could develop a much better attitude toward them.

In continuing to quote from this book, and it is evident everywhere, they are treated with as much if not more respect than are the adults. They are our motorists of tomorrow.

Further on here, quoting Sgt. McKenzie:

“We catch up with the young bad attitude fellows, they are the ones who we want particularly and they are the ones we are getting.”

He said:

“However, we are just as anxious to catch the young driver before he develops that attitude. It is our job that has taken him into every school in the city. The response has been 100% he reported. Before we started giving talks and showing films in the schools, you could sense the antagonism the kids felt towards us. Now we cannot drive down the street without kiddies waving to us from all directions.”

Now, as I said a while ago, this is the type of attitude I would like to see developed in our provinces.

Now, I'm going to go to another Journal, 'The Saskatchewan Teachers Federation Bulletin' of January 1961.

“Fifty years ago a great moment in a boy's life was when dad gave him the reins of the family's best team. It was perhaps only a historic development that when the motor car replaced the horse boys would derive prestige from driving the family car and would be taught to drive by their father. But today, with 250 horsepower under the hood, and no horse-sense, the car is literally in the hands of many beginners.”

Now, in quoting again from the same article by Ron Kenyon.

“William White the Kitchener Driver Training Instructor reports that of 1,200 students trained, only 1% had violations or accidents, and those have been ruled out as not the fault of the students.

In Vancouver when driver training is carried out in all city secondary schools, a survey of 800 students with two year driver experience shows an accident violation rate of about one-third that of the over-all average.

W. Main, Director of St. John New Brunswick Vocational School, has been interested in driver education since 1933. Records have been kept over the years and he says it indicates that serious accidents are practically an unknown quantity as far as the graduates of this type of reading are concerned.”

March 23, 1961

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we should take a serious look at this whole problem. I know that we have a considerable amount of machinery set up in this province at this time for driver education, but I think that we should have more promotion to the program. I have the information here that for 1961 the enrolment is approximately 1,600 students for the province, which is a clear indication that there is not enough emphasis for such a program.

Therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Thiessen:

“That in view of the rising toll of death and injury on our highways and the consequent appalling loss of human life, this Assembly recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan give consideration to further encouragement and assistance to a comprehensive program of driver education.”

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is high time the legislatures of our country took a good look at the problem of safe driving. It seems to me also that it is imperative that in this day of the mobile vehicle, when teenagers and old age pensioners all spend a greater part of their life behind the wheel of a car or truck, that we should interest ourselves in this problem of safety. Be it on the farm or on the way to school or to work, or for recreation, we find individuals and families travelling the roads and highways and byways of our vast province and country.

Now many of these vehicles, Mr. Speaker, are actually death traps. I noticed an advertisement yesterday in one of the magazines which offered a certain car to the public. It is guaranteed in this advertisement that the car would do 150 miles per hour, and not only that, there was a statement in that same advertisement that upon testing this car it did all of 180 miles an hour. Now, Mr. Speaker, one can imagine some rich, money-padded, dumb-cluck purchasing such a car, and travelling up or down the grid roads of this province, or turning it over to his son who may have little concern for the welfare of his neighbors, and imagining what he would try to do. Buying a car with that kind of a power potential he'd want to see if it would go 150 or 180 miles an hour, and the result of course is very likely to be either death to himself

or death and injury to somebody else.

Now accidents and death are also found to be quite a common occurrence among people who drive ordinary cars, people like ourselves, and one of the reasons for this I think is the fact that in this large province of ours, we have so many miles of roads and most of them are two lane highways. There is only one way that I can describe them and with all due deference to the Minister of Highways and to the highway system that we have, and it is that they are killer roads, that's all they are! I find from reading that four out of five deaths on highways on this continent occur on two-lane highways, and the other one in five is on the super highways found mostly in the United States. Though we can't do very much about highways (we're doing the best that we can) but we can do something with the people who drive cars on these highways.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the risk of fatal accidents is also about six times greater on these ordinary dirt, gravel, and two-lane roads that we have to live with, as compared to the incidence of accidents on super highways. And the reason for this is that there simply isn't enough room to permit two 80 inch cars to pass safely within a reasonable distance of each others. Supposing a person is found driving one of these cars at say 60 miles per hour, and there is another car coming in his direction at the same speed, say it's an 18 foot or 20 foot top, grid road, these cars are then actually travelling towards each other at the rate of about 176 feet per second, and there is actually very little room for these cars to pass, particularly if you are going to take care that you don't land in the ditch, and don't cross the shoulder of the road.

I think that is one reason why in this province of Saskatchewan (when we consider that last year we had some 15,500 people in the hospitals because of accidents) that we find about 2,000 people committed to the hospitals with injuries from accidents. This is a result of careless travelling in vehicles, partly due to the kind of roads we have, but more particularly due to the fact that many of our drivers are not properly trained. They just don't know how to drive these vehicles! Therefore, we have to face this particular question of driving habits, and decide how we can develop good habits so that our people would be able to have the proper training to be say mechanically subtle on the roads I have mentioned. We have got to face the dangers of people walking on the wrong side of the road, of cattle crossing, of people that drive in the centre

March 23, 1961

of the road, and recognizing they have to be able to adjust themselves in a matter of seconds, whether it's during the day time or during the night, and to see that they neither injure themselves or hurt anyone else.

I was interested in reading the report that was referred to by the hon. Member who is my colleague here, from Swift Current, because of page 8, it has reference to one kind of an individual who drives a car, and I don't know if you can do very much with such individuals. A letter is sent into the police office saying, "Why is so and so allowed to drive a car, when I see him coming to an intersection do I cross on the green light? Oh no, I do not, I back into a grocery store on the corner and start counting my beads." Well I don't know whether you can train that kind of an individual, but I do think, Mr. Speaker, that we have come to the time when we must put some accent on youth and for two simple reasons. Firstly, because it is when one is young and when he begins to drive a motor vehicle that he is most flexible, that he is able to learn quite quickly and secondly, because there are many avenues open to the training of young people at that time, which are not open or possible for older people who have to maintain homes and keep a family.

And so I'm very pleased with the program that we have in our high schools. I noticed in my community, close to where I live in Prince Albert, there were only sixty-three students who partook of the program last year, and I'm pleased with it, but I agree with the hon. Member who brought in the resolution that instead of sixty-three we should have had 630. If possible, every student that is attending high school, who is in that age group, who will be driving a car, or is driving a car, should get that kind of training. As I have said, I think it's the proper time for each of them when they're young, when they've got the time, to take the opportunity to learn the basic facts of driving and rules of the road.

Vancouver statistics for example, show that where they have had this kind of driver training that the violation rate of those who have received this training is only one-third of the over-all average, and I think that it is a very interesting statement because this is only one-third of the over-all average of car accidents.

Now, therefore, this kind of training must mean something! It must mean something even in the form of statistics! Not only that, I understand that the insurance companies and particularly our own Saskatchewan Government Insurance Company is not only contributing money towards this kind of a program, but is prepared to give insurance at a discount of some 10% to those who will receive this kind of training. In

other words, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to point out to the House today, is that this is a worthwhile program from whatever point of view you want to look at it.

Now of course I have met people who have said that we should leave schools alone, and that they should only be concerned with academic training and that this kind of training should be left to the parents of the young people. Now, I don't know whether all parents are capable of giving that kind of training to their children, but I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that there are many parents that haven't got the time — they may not have the ability — but they certainly haven't got the time to devote to that kind of a training of the young people. I can teach my sons, and maybe somebody else can do it for his, but many are occupied day after day and they come home tired and they just don't find that kind of time to give the proper kind of training to the young people. Personally, I can't see anything wrong with giving any kind of training in the schools — that's what schools are for. We not only give youngsters an academic training; we have come to the point where we give them vocational training, and isn't this knowledge of knowing how to operate a vehicle and knowing how to drive a vehicle, knowing the laws that are necessary to know in order to protect life and property? Isn't that also education? Therefore, I say by all means let's have it in our schools! It doesn't take a long time, two weeks or so, and you have a person fairly well informed. This doesn't mean the student is going to be a good driver, but he will at least digest some basic knowledge with which to go out and operate a vehicle.

Also, I think schools should do it because of the simple fact that many of our young people today who are unemployed, who are leaving the schools at an early age, are interested in either driving trucks, which is becoming an important industry in this country, or are interested in driving livery cars, as well as driving other vehicles for the purpose of making a living. Who are we to deny them that kind of an education? I therefore submit, Mr. Speaker, that I think it's very urgent, as a matter of fact imperative, that we expand the program that's being initiated in our schools to cover every individual that we possibly can interest, to take on that kind of training. Some of course won't want it, but for those who do I think the opportunity should be open to them. I don't think it should be left to the parents entirely that is why I think it should be done in the schools.

March 23, 1961

Now of course the home and the church and the community organizations can help us in this particular problem of trying to get young people trained, because of one other fact and that's right: We have no right as Christians and we have no right as human beings, to slaughter or kill other human beings, and according to our own belief we always say "thou shalt not kill". If for no other reason, that alone should be sufficient to say that not only in the schools but in the homes and the churches we should interest themselves in the young people so they don't become unintentional road murderers or slaughterers of other human beings.

I think that when one considers the public good that would result from giving this kind of education that it certainly would be worthwhile. And I would like to suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that we can from the point of education go one step further, why not do the same thing as we are doing for vocational training? Why can't we take these unemployed young people or old people for that matter, today, who have nothing to do; why can't we offer them an opportunity to take a course of two weeks, three weeks or a month or whatever is necessary, it depends on the kind of course you are going to give not only driving lessons but you could teach them something about the mechanics of these vehicles; why not give them that kind of a course when they can't get jobs, even if we have to feed them and keep them during the period that they are getting this kind of education? I'm not only thinking of giving this kind of training to the young people in the high schools, I'm also thinking of giving this kind of training through special courses, and I don't care whether these courses are in Regina or Saskatoon or in my home town Meath Park, I'm sure that wherever you would have them there would be a great number of young people and older people who would be more than interested to partake and to learn.

I think that I would like to quote at this time, also from the Teachers Federation booklet, on page 17, referred to by my hon. colleague, and it says this:

"Officials of the Saskatchewan Highway Safety Council feel that their biggest problem in battling traffic accidents is to develop good driver attitudes. From psychologists they have learnt that it is easier to teach a good attitude than to unlearn a bad one. Therefore, when they were given \$100,000 by the Provincial Government Insurance,"

I don't know if this figure is correct, it

must be correct I thought it was only \$25,000 and here it says \$100,000.

“To spend on driver training, they decided to start where attitudes were still unformed in the schools.”

And that only backs up the argument that I have proposed to this House. It goes on to say:

“Most schools where driver training has been introduced there has been a compromise between public need and school tradition, of course there is some opposition, but it's offered as an extra in spare periods or after hours.”

It goes on to say that in Ontario the Department of Education has approved driver training courses for secondary schools, if given outside of regular hours. Some thirty-five Ontario secondary schools provide training on this basis.

As I have said I don't think it matters so much whether we do it during the school hours or after hours. I think if we are interested enough to promote this kind of program we will find that nearly every young person will become interested. I know that the young people that I come in contact with are most anxious to learn. They wait until that day when they can get their license and it means so much to them that they are more than prepared to train themselves if given an opportunity.

Now of course a program such as I have in mind, Mr. Speaker, which has been proposed to the House, is as I have said educational, but it's also moral and social. It will require considerable money to implement fully, but if our aims are to encourage safe driving, to stop accidents, and protect human life, then the cost of such a program should be the least of our considerations. We find money for a great many things, surely we can find an extra few hundred thousand dollars if necessary for this kind of program which I think is so important.

Now, I would like to point out at this time — it's not a criticism — but I would like to point out that I listen to the T.V. occasionally and I see that we spend money on such programs as Highway Patrol, and some of them are very excellent programs, but they are in the main either detective stories or stories of other than covering safety features. And I'm just wondering why

March 23, 1961

a government agency or a government can't divert the money to a more valuable safety program which would deal directly with the aims that we have in mind. It's the same thing with our publicity, we produce pamphlets which have to do with insurance, which have to do with the regulations, and they are good, but cannot we devote another one or two pages and put them down at the beginning, something dealing with this safety factor with which we are discussing today? Of course that again will take a little extra money. I think also that our publicity should be directed to the point of morality, and I have said, in line with the Fifth Commandment, which says, "Thou shalt not kill."

I will say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that whether it's in the home, or the church, or the school, or in the government, every citizen of this country should be fully concerned with the problem of safe driving. I will say that the Government should give a lead in this direction through the kind of publicity or any publicity in advertising safety courses. And I say we should do as the city of Swift Current did and the way the city of Prince Albert tried to do, in making people more conscience of their responsibility towards others. And if after all we have done, all that can be done, only a hand-full of lives are saved through our efforts, through our expenditures of money, then I will say that our effort will be well worthwhile.

I certainly will support this motion, and I hope we will get unanimous support from all the Members of the Legislature.

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. Members who have moved this motion. I believe it's a good motion and I intend to support it. However, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the last speaker has introduced into the discussion on the motion, some matters which I believe are not dealt with in the motion itself, and I would on that basis beg leave to adjourn the debate on this motion.

Mr. Speaker: — Do you infer there's a point of order raised that we should deal with at this time?

Mr. Foley: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion in itself does not spell out the manner

in which further encouragement and assistance can be given, and I think the hon. Member from Cumberland has dealt with that quite extensively and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get leave to adjourn the debate and consult on some of the matters that he has raised.

Mr. Speaker: — I feel that the hon. Member was quoting his remarks on the motion to quite an extent, but if the hon. Member wishes to adjourn the debate . . .

The debate, on the motion of Mr. Foley, was adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 53 — An Act to amend The Trade Union Act

Hon Mr. Davies (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Minister I would like to make a brief explanation of this Bill. Several amendments are intended to the Trade Union Act, which deal with various matters.

Section 2 of the Bill amends the definition of bargaining collectively by including in its meaning the negotiating of grievances of employees who are members of a trade union which represents the majority of employees in an appropriate bargaining unit. At the present time, the definition includes only the negotiation of grievances of employees that are covered by agreement. The effect of the amendment in this respect is to include the negotiation of grievances, not only while an agreement is in force, but also between the time that the union first becomes the bargaining agent and the conclusion of a first agreement; and also too, between the expiry of an agreement and the conclusion of a newly negotiated agreement.

Section 3 of the Bill provides for a simple oath of office to be taken by members of the board.

Section 4 of the Bill clarifies the powers of the board respecting rescission in amending any of its orders. Also, it is empowered in certain limited circumstances to amend certification orders while an agreement is in effect.

March 23, 1961

Finally under Section 6, Mr. Speaker, of the Bill, the board would be empowered to facilitate the processing of applications that are before the board, by enabling the board to make certain amendments to the applications, or to other proceedings when they are before the board. This last amendment refers to occasions where laymen appearing before the board have made an incorrect statement of the name of their trade union, or in some other respect of not naming properly the appropriate company or corporation. The board in this instance would be empowered to make a simple correction of the application.

Now, with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 53 be now read a second time.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in this Bill there are some points that I believe should be brought out and clarified, and probably discussed more fully in Committee of the Whole.

One of the points that I would like to bring out, and I think this one is worthy of note, is the fact that it deals with someone in the Labour Relations Board, and it has been mentioned in this House oftentimes of the board being biased. We noticed according to the Annual Report of the Department of Labour of the number of meetings, say the previous year, that the Labour Relations Board has had, and the number of decisions that they have handed down. One thing that is worthy of note, it has been said as I said before, that the Labour Relations Board have handed decisions down that have been at times inclined to be biased. And to prove the point, Mr. Speaker, you will note that in the last years that out of nineteen cases that were brought to the courts of the land, seventeen of these cases, Mr. Speaker, the decisions of the Board were reversed and the reason given in every one of these cases is that it was a reason of bias on the part of the board. That is the reasons that the courts have actually reversed.

One particular case for example, is one that is mentioned in the report. It is the one of J.M. Patrick Co., in Saskatoon, and there are many more that you could take. I thought I'd mention this in this respect at this point, Mr. Speaker, because it's very important. I believe that the Labour Relations Board is a board that should be established to rule or hand down decisions

that are fair, fair to labour, fair to management, and fair to everyone. And I think it's further substantiated that we should have a good look while this Bill is open, we should have a good look at the formations of the Labour Relations Board. And I think in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, as I said, out of nineteen cases that have been brought into the courts of the land, seventeen have been handed down from the courts that they were for reasons of bias on the part of the board. I think that we can deal with that very thoroughly in the Committee of the Whole and see what we can do with it.

Hon Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, May I ask the hon. Member a question? Would mind giving me the names and the citations of these cases.

Mr. Coderre: — I can't give you the names. I could certainly show you that in the report here.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — In the Labour Report?

Mr. Coderre: — In the Labour Report page 22, that's the Labour Report of March 30th, 1960. That's one particular case, there are others I don't know them all.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — But that only mentions one, what about the other eighteen?

Mr. Coderre: — Good gosh, I don't know, but there have been eighteen or nineteen actually through the courts.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I'm wondering Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Coderre: — I'm not in a position to name them all. I could get that information.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Would the Member mind giving us the information as to what authority he has for saying that there are nineteen. This is the first time I have heard that there were that number.

Mr. Coderre: — Another one is Perini Limited.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. Minister has asked for your authority for saying nineteen. Can you give him that authority?

March 23, 1961

Mr. Coderre: — On page 24 of the Report.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You were saying that it says there were nineteen in one year, are you?

Mr. Coderre: — Not nineteen in one year. No I'm speaking of nineteen, not in one year, but of nineteen decisions that have had to go to the courts, but not in one year.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I'm sorry I misunderstood.

Mr. Coderre: — I'm sorry if I've said one year, it's not in one year.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Member — I haven't had an opportunity of perusing all the paragraphs, but do you say that the Report reveals the information in the manner that you have stated it.

Mr. Coderre: — Will you repeat that please.

Hon Mr. Davies: — Do you say that the departmental report on page 24, gives all this information?

Mr. Coderre: — No, I mean I misunderstood the question which he asked me in the first place. I said nineteen of the cases had been brought to the courts. I quoted nineteen. I wasn't any too sure where I got that information.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The Report just refers to two does it?

Mr. Coderre: — That's right . . . the year of the review of the courts.

Mr. Dewhurst:— Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question on procedure or order, you might call it. The Member from Gravelbourg has mentioned the different cases that he would like to discuss in Committee of the Whole. I believe it's correct that if he wants to discuss the principle of the Bill it must be discussed on second reading and I cannot permit it in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: — There is a point there that I was wondering about myself. I'm not familiar with what is involved in these amendments, and

it's a little hard to follow with the explanation that is given. I must make it clear that any discussion of the principle of the Bill must be now. If the discussion is in regard to the clauses themselves it could be in Committee of the Whole, but the Bill is now before the House in regard to principle.

Mr. Cameron: — I think, Mr. Speaker, in regards to what the Member said, he was speaking on the principle of the Bill, in that he used the opportunity of a debate in principle to point out that in his opinion something was wrong, either with the personnel of the board or with directives issued by the board in that some nineteen cases and seventeen of the nineteen would be indicated from press reports and other places that the decision was made on the basis that the board had been biased in handing down their decision. I think he's correcting that to try to say to the Members that that is revealed on page 24 of the Report, but of course it isn't. But it doesn't say that the information which he has given is not correct. And it would seem from that, that we must look into the position of the board or the personnel of the board, to see where this fault does lie. I think that's the point the Member has attempted to establish here.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, all I think we were asking the Member was whether or not he had a list of the nineteen cases that had been referred to the courts and the seventeen which he claimed had been reversed by the courts. I noticed when he quoted from the Annual Report, that he referred to a case in which the court had reversed the decision of the board. He didn't cite the fact that there were three cases and of the three one was reversed and the other two were upheld. I don't know who is biased in this matter, but certainly if someone is reporting on three cases and only tells of the court case that was reversed and doesn't tell of the two that were upheld, that looks like pretty biased reporting too.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this constant attempt to attack the objectivity and impartiality of the board, has come from certain sources in the province ever since the board was set up. I would point out that it it's true that nineteen cases have been referred to the courts and seventeen of them have been reversed (and this I would not want to accept until I've had an opportunity to check it myself) out of the hundreds of cases which

March 23, 1961

have been handled by the board since it was set up sixteen years ago, if only nineteen of these cases have been taken to the court, I think this is a very enviable record. I think that any board which is handling cases month after month on as controversial a subject as labour-management relations, and only has nineteen of its decisions taken to the courts for adjudication, this is a very good record indeed. The mere fact that a court reverses it doesn't necessarily mean the board was wrong. It might mean that there was some technical flaw, or some question of law in which the board erred. It may not always be a reversal on a matter of fact or opinion, and even in that case I'm not prepared to say that courts must always be sacrosanct in the matter of having opinions. They too, of course, sometimes have their decisions reversed when they go up to a higher court. I want to take very strong exception to the constant attacks upon the objectivity of the Labour Relations Board.

The hon. Members know the employees are represented on the board, the employers are represented on the board and the general public is represented on the board. No Board can adjudicate in as sensitive an area as this board, without at times having complaints regarding their decisions. The Government has had complaints from both trade unions and from employers regarding some of their decisions. But I would say that on the whole they have done an admirable job. I think industrial relations are better in the province today than they were before the board was set up. I think that today there is a greater measure of trade union security than there was before the board was set up. I think the Board have done an excellent job, and if all the cases that have had been referred to the courts is nineteen out of the many many hundreds they have handled, I think they are to be congratulated.

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would permit a question? He mentioned that the board has a representative from the employers and from the employees and from the public at large. I'd like to know who is responsible, or who picks the representative on the labour relations board, from the public at large:

Premier Douglas: — The Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Mr. Speaker: — I must inform the House that the hon. Minister is about to close the debate.

Hon Mr. Davies (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a few words beyond what the hon. Premier has already said, that is with reference to the membership of the Labour Relations Board. As the hon. Premier has said, the Board is chosen by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and on the instance of sections that are concerned; the employer, the employee sections and the public. I think an examination of the names of the members of the board, will readily determine that they certainly do represent the sections that they come from.

On this question of bias, just looking very briefly at the last Department of Labour Report, the current one that was tabled in the House for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1960, one can observe that certainly not in all cases has there been a unanimity in decisions by the board. I notice that under certification cases, there were in the year under review 132 applications granted, 7 dismissed and 12 withdrawn. For unfair labour practices, which of course usually implies alleged violations on the part of the employers, 5 applications were granted, 1 was dismissed and 14 were withdrawn; in the case of reinstatements of employees allegedly discharged unfairly by reason of union activity and associated causes, under section 5, clause (f), 5 of the applications were granted, 3 were dismissed and 7 withdrawn. Now this sort of record doesn't indicate an overwhelming kind of biased decision by the Labour Relations Board. I notice too, that only dealing with applications under section 5, the fifteen-year figure for applications that were dismissed is almost 250. Again, it seems to me that the Labour Relations Board can hardly, in the presence of figures like that, be termed biased.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 54 — An Act respecting the Registration and Disclosure of Employee Pension Plans.

Hon Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, again may I speak on behalf of the hon. Minister. Bill No 54 of course, is an Act respecting the Registration and Disclosure of Employee Pension Plans. I want to give a brief description of the principle.

March 23, 1961

The Act provides for the registration and the publishing of employee pension plans and for the annual filing of reports in connection with the plans. The purpose of the Bill is first, to enable the gathering of data required to assess the necessity or the feasibility of a scheme that would provide for portability of employee pension plans for the legislation that would ensure the security of the employee pension plans.

Another purpose is to ensure that all employer and all employee participants in any pension plan, would be adequately informed in respect of a particular plan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the need for portability legislation has been demonstrated by informed authorities who have claimed that only about 12% of employees that are covered by pension plans can expect to secure their full benefits. Of course, this is due to a variety of factors and causes, including the movement of employees from job to job, coupled with the fact that the employer's contribution is frequently not payable until the employee reaches retirement, or at least until he has achieved a very considerable length of service. Even where an employee, Mr. Speaker, has vesting rights, he can't as a rule transfer his pension rights from one plan to another, but is paid in cash each time he moves from one employer to another, thus the whole basis of a pension plan is defeated.

I think the need for disclosure of information concerning employee pension plans and any possible need for supervision of employee pension plan administration, may be indicated by the experience and the investigations in the United States of malpractices in pension fund administration. As some Members may recall, there was a subsequent enactment of reporting and disclosure legislation by five of the states of the American Union, and indeed by the United States Government. In our own country the province of Ontario has enacted legislation guaranteeing security of employee pension plans.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I think that we can study the details in Committee, and I would now like to move that Bill No. 54 be read a second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 57 — An Act to amend The Wages Recovery Act, 1957.

Hon Mr. Davies: — For the hon. Minister Mr. Speaker, I submit Bill No. 57, an Act to amend the Wages Recovery Act. There isn't a great deal to this Bill. Section 2 and section 4 are simply designed to bring the wording of the affected provisions in line with the reorganization of the district courts. This I believe occurred in 1958, and the amendments at the time didn't of course originate in the Department of Labour. The Legislative Council thinks we should take advantage of the fact that another section of the Act is to be amended by making these technical corrections.

Now, section 3 of the Bill, provides for a definite procedure for the enforcement of an order of the magistrate in case of a default in the payment of wages that have been ordered to be paid by a magistrate under section 7 of the Wages Recovery Act. The amendment, Mr. Speaker, would have the effect of providing the same means for the enforcement of the order as is provided for the enforcement of a judgment of the district court. The provision which is being replaced by this amendment fails to provide any procedure for enforcement of the magistrate's order in cases of default.

Mr. Speaker, I think with that explanation I would move that Bill No. 57 be now read a second time.

The question being put it was agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.