LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session - Fifteenth Legislature
38th Day

Thursday, March 31, 1966

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. B. D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I would like through you to welcome a group of grade 12 students from Sacred Heart Academy in Yorkton. They are accompanied by Sister James, Sister Clement, and Sister Theresa. Sacred Heart Academy, of course, is the best school in the fastest growing city in Saskatchewan and I would hope that all members would be on their very best behaviour this afternoon because I am sure you don't want these girls to go back home with a bad impression of our legislators. I am sure that all members join with me, Mr. Speaker, in wishing the girls a most interesting and informative afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and the attention of the Assembly a group of 30 grade eight students from the Thomson School located in Regina East constituency. They are seated in the east gallery; they are accompanied by their principal, Miss Yaton. I'm sure that the members of this assembly would like to extend to them a happy stay during their period here this afternoon and also wish that their stay here today will be both educational and informative.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would as well, like to draw attention to visitors in the gallery and I don't want our students from Saskatoon to be misled by the — I know this is un-parliamentary language — by the misstatements. I was going to say lies, that the member from Yorkton was telling about the fastest growing city because our students from Saskatoon know for a fact that they come from the fastest growing city in Saskatchewan. We are delighted today to welcome Haultain School students who are seated in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Speaker, under the direction of Mrs. Hogg and Mrs. Morrison, their teachers. Also Queen Elizabeth School, is represented here today under the leadership of their teachers Mr. Clipp and Mr. Graham. these two schools are located in one section of the city of Saskatoon. I would like through you to extend a welcome and a wish for a very happy day.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Saskatoon members on this side of the house, I would like to join with the lady member from

Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) in welcoming the Saskatoon students. I believe there are 167 students from our city here today which must be a record. Hon. members who had the pleasure of sitting in the house with Art Stone will be interested in knowing that his granddaughter Allison is here with the Queen Elizabeth students. Art Stone had the distinction of representing Saskatoon for 20 years, longer than anyone in the history of our city.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I have recently taken note of the fact that 40 William Grayson students are supposed to be located in the east gallery. In case they happen to be located in some other part of the building I would like to extend to them a welcome on your behalf and on behalf of the legislature wherever they may be.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Well, we are two groups short because we had over 300 coming today and the galleries hold just about that so I think we are a couple of groups short so far. But they may get here later on.

QUESTION RE BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day can the government say whether with the bills announced today we have now seen all or heard of all the legislation to be introduced?

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that he believes that all bills are now, or will be in front of the house when the three he has introduced today have come in. I don't make this as an absolute commitment but as far as we know at the moment that is it.

Mr. Lloyd: — One further question, Mr. Speaker. Was the press statement last evening accurate with respect to the Redistribution bill not being available until Monday?

Mr. Thatcher: — I think that's right.

QUESTIONS RE LEASE LAND AND SEED GRAIN

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, there are two matters that I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher). First, in regard to the matter especially concerning the Minister of Agriculture, I have been informed that the Department of Agriculture has had standing offers to sell lease land to lessees in my constituency in the northeast part of the province. Also, I have been informed, I am not sure whether it's correct or not that these offers expire March 31st, 1966, which is today, that is, that any of the lessees who wish to purchase had to have their applications in my this time. Now, many lessees have not been able yet to take

advantage of this offer and there is certainly some concern about it. I think this opportunity to purchase should continue to be open to those lessees on Crown land practically without limit. Certainly it would be a good idea to give it another year any way because they have had very great difficulties in that part of the province during the past year.

The other matter I want to speak about is this. In regard to the seed grain situation in the Kelsey constituency — the same will apply to some other northern constituencies — this seed grain situation is not at all good. Very little grain was harvested last fall before the rain came. With the grain in the swatch being wet and frozen and dried, and wet and frozen, some of it got frost before it was cut. The germination has been destroyed so that practically none of this grain is fit for seed. Seed will have to be imported from other parts of the province. Now the crop looked like a good one, it was put in very late…

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — These questions are supposed to be short and to the point. We don't have to listen to a long speech before the member asks a question.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I'm just trying, Mr. Speaker, to bring to attention what I think to be a very important matter. I've heard ministers make three times the length of this statement and if the Premier isn't interested in the welfare of farmers in my constituency, I'm sure other people are.

Mr. Thatcher: — Ask your question and keep within the rules.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We'll settle the argument about ministerial statements. It has been customary for the ministers to make statements in this house when the house is in session and they would have been, I think, in contempt of the house had they made the statements outside thereof when the house was in session. When they make such statements it is proper for the member of the opposition to comment on them. But no statement of this nature of any of the subjects that the member has been discussing had been raised by any cabinet minister at the present time. What he discussed is leases on the one hand and I agree that they have a terminal date of the 31st day of March which the member says they have. If this is so then I would take it as a proper matter to ask a question now in view of the fact that the 31st day of March is here. And that question has been asked. The house has listened to the member. Perhaps the minister may wish to answer or may not. But the question of seed grain and the germination thereof which has been something that has been pretty well known throughout the winter is a matter that could either be asked shortly and succinctly or left for a substantive motion.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on it. But I was pointing out that first of all there is a great shortage of seed grain in that area. Second that due to the poor crops which yielded ten or fifteen bushels to the acre in a crop that looked like 30 bushels to the acre, and getting a low grade six or something like this, there are many of the farmers there that haven't got money to buy seed. So I want to urge the government to implement, and to let it be known to the municipalities in that area that they

will implement the Seed Grain and Supplies Act, so that the farmers there know they will be able, if necessary, to get credit for seed.

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. member that the Department of Agriculture has been aware for quite some time about the points he has raised and action is being taken.

QUESTION RE REDISTRIBUTION BILL

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, further with regard to the Redistribution bill, I am sure the government realizes the extent of analysis which is desirable before the bill is discussed. I ask if there is anything they can do to make the bill available prior to the weekend.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, it's simply a question of printing it. We are informed that we cannot have the printed copies ready until Monday. Now every effort is being made. If by some chance we can get it tomorrow, or Saturday, we'll bring it in but that is the way the matter stands.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, may I just add to that. If there are maps I trust they will be available also. I wonder if the government could consider the possibility of mimeographing enough copies for the members on this side if they can't be printed until Monday.

Mr. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, further to the statement of the hon. Premier, the difficulty is that the legislative counsel is working and giving top priority to the bill, I have asked him, he is doing the very best he can. He says Monday for sure and if he gets it on Friday or Saturday, so much the better. He is doing the very best he can with it.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. L. P. Coderre (Gravelbourg) that bill No. 79, **An Act to amend The Trade Union Act**, be now read a second time.

Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 79 is the only bill before us so far at this session of the legislature that considered the matter of people's conscience and beliefs. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the government and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) would have done well and should have examined their past beliefs, their past promises, yes, for that matter, their conscience before bringing this bill to us in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) reminded this house yesterday when he spoke on Bill No. 79, that the

Liberal party in its 1964 election platform promised the wage earners, the people of Saskatchewan, to maintain and improve trade union rights and security. This pledge was repeated over and over again on the hustings by the Premier and other Liberal candidates. It was featured in newspaper ads, in leaflets, in radio and television talks. Wage earners were assured that the right to form and belong to unions of their own choice and to bargain collectively with their employers in a free manner, they were told that the present union security provisions, if not improved, would at least be maintained by a Liberal government. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us does neither. It does not maintain trade union rights and security, nor does it improve them. It does the opposite. The bill severely curtails trade union rights and security. It denies them. It is opposed to every principle of freedom and justice. It goes against the grain of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of which article 23, section 4 states:

> Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interest.

The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, is a legal nightmare. It is a monstrosity, a Frankenstein. This is not just my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and that of the unions. It is an opinion of at least three eminent lawyers to whom this bill was referred for interpretation, who are well versed on the subject of labour laws. It will not serve in the interest of unions, union members, employees, employees or the general public. Mr. Speaker, this bill, if adopted in its present form, will not create industrial harmony, good labour management relations. It will do the opposition. It will, if the employers take advantage of it, thrust unions into the hands and mercies of the courts. There is no doubt that some employers will take advantage of the opportunity to harass unions in courts. A lawyer friend of mine described this bill, Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer's pension plan.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly analyse some of the features of this bill. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that my analysis and the analysis of the trade union movement are much different to the analysis that was presented to us by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) yesterday. It is, Mr. Speaker, I submit, a bill that will drastically weaken union security. It prohibits or will over-ride labour management negotiated union security provisions for example, the union shop. The bill establishes a modified, misnamed and notorious right-to-work provision. There is sufficient doubt that the bill, subject to court interpretation, may make unions legal entities and make union agreements binding or create sufficient doubt that such matters must go to the courts for determination. It opens the door wide, Mr. Speaker, for the use of injunctions in labour disputes. It will make union organization among employees much more difficult. It will encourage and permit employers to interfere with the employees' rights to freely select unions of their own choice.

The so-called Freedom of Speech Section will in fact become a Freedom to Coerce Section, to prevent union organization. It establishes a new majority rule of over 60 per cent for automatic certification. If the same rule were to apply to members of this house no one here would be able to take his seat in this Assembly. It establishes a new rule of 40 per cent for votes to conduct desertification procedures and only 25 per cent for raiding purposes. It provides for compulsory arbitration at least during the life of an agreement. It forces upon the parties to a collective bargaining agreement specific arbitration procedures which may not

be desirable, acceptable or even applicable to particular industries or institutions. Failing to comply will mean a violation of the law.

The bill is discriminatory in many respects. It discriminates between professional and non-professional employees. It gives special majority rights to professionals; for example, a simple majority of 50 per cent plus one will apply to professionals for automatic certification but a majority of over 60 per cent is required for certification of non-professional unions. It reduces penalties on corporations and increases them on the individual. The bill places needless compulsory features, prohibitions, penalties, and restrictions on workers. It places eight times as many unfair labour practices against union members, their officers and representatives than were previously in effect. The bill will no doubt encourage formation of company unions. It will encourage raiding and jurisdictional disputes not in the interest of industrial peace.

It interferes in the internal union administrative procedures. It will make it almost impossible for a union to know when it is within the law in taking a strike vote. It gives undue powers to the Labour Relations Board, a board which I submit is presently loaded against the workers. It is a bill loaded with contradictions. It is full of legal loopholes. The new sections contradict the old provisions and vice versa.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly direct my remarks to the Labour Management Legislative Review Committee Report. The report sheds no light and gives this assembly no explanation, no reasons with respect to the amendments appearing in the bill. In fact, I submit, that the committee did not write a report. They represented the government and this legislature with a suggested bill. This indeed is an unusual way, to say the least, of reporting on such important social and economic legislation. The committee gives us none of its reasons for its recommendations. One is no wiser in reading the bill than in reading the report of the committee. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that before this legislature deals with this bill we should insist on the committee giving us its reasons with respect to each of the amendments before us. We are entitled to have some value out of the committee's six months study and public expenditure. Mr. Speaker, the letter of transmittal contradicts sharply the so-called report. Let me point out, the committee states:

> The committee was of the opinion that so far as is possible labour negotiations should be left to management and to the trade unions to carry on with as little interference from the outside as possible.

I agree with this statement, Mr. Speaker. It is a correct statement. But what then does the committee do in this respect? Mr. Speaker, the committee does precisely the opposite. The present act, as the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour pointed out in its submission last October to the Review Committee, provides the necessary protection of rights by law to workers to form their own organizations and to bargain collectively. Once having formed this union, the law should allow workers to freely undertake their collective bargaining rights and duties with as little government interference as is possible. This concept is swept aside by a number of amendments which have been presented in this bill. It strengthens the power of employers and thus creates an imbalance in the area of employee-employer relations. It places undue barriers in the way of organizing efforts by unions and

encourages jurisdictional conflict among labour organizations. Further, it hedges with legal restrictions and rigidity the labour relations processes.

The record of peaceful labour relations in Saskatchewan since the passage of the Trade Union Act in 1944 has been good. As the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour stated:

> In the more than 20 years that have since elapsed, it can be asserted with confidence that there has been less and less serious industrial unrest, both absolutely and relatively, in Saskatchewan than in any other province.

Based on estimates, man days of work lost due to industrial disputes is .01, approximately one-half of the national average.

Any legislative changes which are calculated to change the balanced relations in the labour relations field, and, as a corollary, create conditions which would lead to a deterioration of employer —employee relations will be a retrograde step.

The point of view of employers and their attitudes toward union organization of their employees is usually well known. Those employers who have a 20th century concept of labour management relations realize from practical experience that orderly union management relations offer the best hopes for developing mutual benefits in an industrial enterprise. Those employers with enlightened views welcome the orderly and responsible relations that can flow from good labour-management relations. It is unfortunate but true that there still are some employers who try to thwart attempts at union organizations of their employees in a naïve belief that in some way will be to their advantage.

The proposed bill will give legal sanction to what will become in fact anti-union campaigns on the part of some employers. We shall be replacing the furtive coercion that sometimes now is undertaken by a few misguided employers with some sort of sanction for this behaviour under the law. If anyone thinks that the proposed bill will effectively prevent coercion, let him consider the effects that an employer can have in private individual interviews with the employees as he holds out vague promises of promotion or alternatively discusses the possibility of transfer to a distant and inconvenient job location to those employees who are known to have expressed their interest in a union. the private carrot stick technique is not unknown. It shall be encouraged if this bill is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to draw attention of the house to some most current events that are taking place since this bill was presented to the house last Friday. Just a few days ago this happened to an organization of which I am a member, in an attempt to assist workers in organizing in a particular shop. Just last Saturday, the employees in this particular shop were subjected to this kind of intimidation and this kind of pressure. May I quote part of the letter that was circulated by an employer to the employees when he called a meeting. In his letter calling the meeting he states this:

> The reason for holding this meeting is that management is becoming very concerned over the deteriorating relationship between some of the employees over the issue of whether or not the employees should organize a union.
>
> Management sees this meeting as being a frank, open

> discussion of your concerns regarding the organization of a union. At our round of staff meetings last fall we were somewhat reluctant to give you information and answer your questions regarding unions, as we felt that was a decision you people have to make on your own. This time, however, we are prepared to give you all of the information and answer any of your questions regarding unions. Three hours of overtime pay bill be paid for those attending this meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that already since this bill was introduced, we have given encouragement to employers to use this so-called freedom of speech provision against the workers, against the wishes of the working people. If we accept, Mr. Speaker, the premise that orderly labour management relations are desirable and that unions are the instruments chosen by workers to represent them, then our laws should facilitate and not inhibit the formation and functions of unions.

The bill proposed would make both the automatic procedures for certifications more difficult as well as making easier the intervention and splitting up and weakening bargaining units. It would well herald a move from the relatively peaceful and orderly union and inter-union relations we have experienced in Saskatchewan in the past to a turmoil of jurisdictional disputes and raidings. I question, Mr. Speaker, whether this is the intent of the government. I am sure, at least I hope, that it is not but it must be clearly understood that these are some of the unfortunate consequences that can flow from this bill. The public interest will inevitably suffer as a result of this.

An area which will cause great concern to all those who believe in the development of organizations of working people are those provisions of the bill which will bring further legal encroachments upon the operations of unions. The referral of labour-management matters to the courts can do nothing else but make rigid relations between the parties. Labour relations are based on a large element of goodwill and good faith, Mr. Speaker. This is true in the consummation of collective bargaining agreements and in adherence to their terms. To intrude upon this type of relationship, a legalistic or judicial rigidity may be a good think in terms of the employment of lawyers and judges but I submit it will do little to improve labour-management relations.

I cannot refrain from expressing the thought that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. I think that few of the members in this house would accuse me of conservatism or of wanting to retain untouched the instruments and institutions of the past merely because they are there, but I am convinced that having had practical day-to-day experience of the operation of the Trade Union Act for some years, with all of its flaws, Mr. Speaker, I see the bill as one which would replace in some of its provisions sound legislation with unsound legislation, a well-regulated and effective set of guide lines for labour relations with an unsatisfactory and ineffective set.

Mr. Speaker, let me discuss in some detail one of the most retrograde features of this bill. I refer to the question of union security; it appears in several places in this bill. I have already said that the bill establishes a modified norm of “right to work” provision. In checking old newspaper clippings I find that in the September 24th issue of 1959 of the Leader post under the heading “Delegates Fix Labour Policy” for the following statement appears:

> The Saskatchewan Liberal labour policy, including the "right to work" clause was passed with little discussion by the Leadership Convention in Regina Wednesday afternoon.

In reading the whole article, it would appear that the lead paragraph which I have just quoted would be extreme. The following statement follows:

> The Liberal Party proposes to guarantee security of unions by providing that all workers in a bargaining unit, whether members of the union or not, shall pay union dues to the unions certified as bargaining agent for that unit since all workers benefit by the activities of the union.

This policy, if reported properly by the newspaper, is what is commonly known as the "Rand Formula". It may be described by some as a form of "right to work" but I feel that the "right to work" advocates would not consider this to be such.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by some of my Liberal friends that this is till the policy of the Liberal Party, or at least the rank and file members of the Liberal Party believe it to be so. Maybe the Premier can tell us whether he or his cabinet or the Liberal members of the legislature or the Provincial Executive have amended this policy. I am informed it has not been amended by succeeding conventions. Certainly it was not amended at the 1965 Liberal convention, not according to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). He states in a letter:

> I was co-chairman of the labour panel and there were no resolutions brought down which dealt in any way with labour matters.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that policies adopted by Liberal rank and file delegates at conventions are not played around with and changed by the leadership of the party. I would also hope that pledges made during election campaigns are pledges that are intended to be fulfilled and not held out as carrot sticks for voter-catching purposes, never intended to be fulfilled or completely reversed when elected to government. The bill before us takes away union security in many different forms in different ways.

First, there is the splitting of the professional units. The bill will encourage professional groups, wherever they may exist, to flout the wishes of the majority and get out from the bargaining unit at any time. Members here will observe from the letter of transmittal of the Review Committee that only a few professional bodies made representations to the committee. I believe that only two professional groups listed in the bill are concerned or requested an exclusion from the bargaining unit of their professions. We all know that the numbers of professional employees are on the increase; with technological changes taking place; with more education opportunities their numbers will increase sharply in the next few years. In other provinces, Mr. Speaker, bargaining rights heretofore denied professional groups are now being extended. Quebec is a good example. In the province of Ontario a study is in progress on the matter of granting bargaining rights to professional people. But a few months ago a conference was held in the province of Ontario, attended by some 250 representatives of professional groups, for the purpose of considering bargaining rights. John Crisp, Director of the Centre for Industrial Relations at the University of Toronto, in a foreword to the

proceedings of the conference asserts that the interest in bargaining rights among professional employees is on the increase. May I quote:

> Only recently, for example, the Canadian Medical Association announced a full-scale study of the appropriateness of collective bargaining in the medical profession. In many other professions such as nursing and engineering it is the increasing trend toward paid employees which has doubtless provided the spark. Regardless of the cause, more and more professional employees are showing an interest in collective bargaining.
>
> In a few professions the debate has ended and the right to bargain collectively is being vigorously pursued or practised. Prominent examples include nursing and teaching professions.
>
> Collective bargaining by professions does indeed raise many questions, not the least of which is what we mean by a professional.

Mr. Speaker, government have a responsibility to aid this interest. They do not have a right to thwart, by legislation, this kind of desirous action on the part of professional employees. Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the question of exclusion from the union on the grounds of conscience, based on religious training or beliefs? First, Mr. Speaker, may I submit that it is completely contradictory and opposed to the policy adopted by the Liberal Party in 1959 and which, according to my information, is still the policy. In this respect I might ask the government whether it is their intent to include this kind of a provision in respect of each of the professional acts. If not, then why is the trade union movement being singled out? May I bring to the attention of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that this provision, if adopted, would be the first such provision in Canada - a dubious and unnecessary first, I submit.

Mr. Speaker, under the Trade Union Act, as it presently exists, we have what has been commonly known as a maintenance of membership formula. In other words, everyone who joins the union must maintain his membership. Persons who initially did not join the union when organized do not have to, but all new employees must joint the organization. this procedure has worked well over the years.

I admit that there may have been a few cases where unions have questioned the admission to membership or considered suspension; but, in fact, Mr. Speaker, not one case in the last 20 years has ever materialized. I challenge the government to produce one case where, under the terms of The Trade Union Act, any person was denied the right to a job, the right to earn a livelihood. Trade unions use the union security provisions under the act with fairness, with temperance, without discrimination. Trade unions are designed to protect workers, to benefit workers, not to discriminate and deny workers' rights.

A further amendment to the bill, Mr. Speaker, provides that so long as a person pays union dues, he cannot be disciplined, he cannot be suspended, he has no further obligation to a union. All other membership obligations are being nullified. No organization that I am aware of allows people into membership just on the basis of payment of dues. Membership requires obligation and responsibility. It is not enough just to pay dues. The dangerous feature

of this proposal is that a person who refuses to abide by the rules, but agrees to pay dues only, will under the law be entitled to all rights and benefits as others who accept responsibility. He can do anything he wishes to undermine, or anything that would be detrimental to the union and the union cannot do anything about it.

It is interesting to note that the government, in this bill, acknowledges a different set of rules in respect of professional associations. It recognizes that in professional groups membership is more than just the payment of fees. Let me refer you to section 2, clause 2:

> Membership of the professional association means a person who is subject to restrictions of that association respecting discipline and conduct.

Why not the same right to unions? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Why the discrimination?

Another very bad feature of this bill, as I pointed out earlier, is it will prohibit labour and management from negotiating their own — a security — provision which would be acceptable to them which they desire. This I submit flies in the face of the freedom of the right to bargain.

Mr. Speaker, members on both sides of the house have heard a great deal about the so-called right to work laws. May I say that right to work laws have not produced one job. They have not given one ounce of security to any worker. Right to work laws are a piece of shameful deception designed to destroy security on the job. They are laws designed for the busting of unions and no other purpose.

Under the date of March 22nd, all members, I presume, received a letter from a Mr. Ralph J. Purdy, signing himself as Secretary-Manager of the Employers Association of Saskatchewan. enclosed with the letter was a bulletin entitled "Right to Work News". I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that members treat this letter and the bulletin with some doubt and suspicion as being a view representative of Saskatchewan employers. Let me tall you why. Last week I placed a question on whether the Employers Association of Saskatchewan was registered under The Societies Act and whether it is still registered and, if not, when it was struck off the register. The answer received last Friday is that the organization was struck off the register on December 10th, 1965. The Societies Act clearly states that anyone who continues to use the name of an organization which no longer is incorporated is violating the law and subject to a summary conviction of not more than $100. I suggest to the Attorney General to do some investigating on this matter.

Mr. Purdy is a well know, self styled right to work advocate. I use these words advisedly. He has no organization, he has no supporters. He has few, if any, people backing his proposal for right to work legislation. For the last several years, in the province, he has been a sponsor, a promoter of every reactionary and extreme proposition — right to work laws, so-called Free Citizen's Association. K.O.D., and what have you.He is now apparently refusing to pay his medical and hospital fee. Everyone of his extreme proposals has been rejected and has ended up in complete failure. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the modified right to work formula that is contained in this bill will equally be rejected by the

government, by the members of this house.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this bill is in complete contradiction in another way to the philosophy of the government, if it does have a philosophy. This government proclaims itself to be the staunchest proponent of free enterprise and individual liberties, untrammelled by the interference of the state. Yet we find here, in this bill the highest possible degree of interference in the process of collective bargaining.

I ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and the Premier to examine the restrictive legislation that exists in some other parts of Canada, in other parts of the world. They will soon discover that wherever restrictions were placed they produced nothing but conflict. Let me refer you to the province of British Columbia or the province of Newfoundland. Let us refer to the most current situation which produced many headlines in recent months. I refer to the New York Transit strike. The New York State law prohibits workers in public utilities to take strike action. The workers rebelled. The oppressive law did not stop them.

Let me refer you to the province of British Columbia. This province has some of the most restrictive provisions in its Labour Relations Act. It was only the government's wise counsel and action which prevented a general strike from materializing a few weeks ago. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it was the law itself that created this very bad situation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the government to delay action on this bill. This suggestion has already been made and suggested by former speakers. Certainly in our province industrial relations, labour-management relations for the past 20 years have been good. They have been excellent. There is no good cause for hasty action. Twenty odd years of industrial peace and harmony is the envy of all reasonable people in other parts of Canada. This was possible because of a fair and good law. For this reason I suggest that the bill be withdrawn and that it be studied in the next year. A study might consist of, or should be undertaken by all interested parties, labour, management, government and the public, to make sure that every implication of the present bill is well understood. If there is cause, if there is justification for some form of amendment, if there is, I will be the first to support them, providing they enhance industrial peace and workers' rights. I submit it is unfair to bring in a bill with so many legal and technical implications at an eleventh hour and expect members on this side of the house to give it any kind of support or expect the wage-earners not to protest, not to rebel against it.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the statement "Freedom is a thing that has no ending, it needs to be fought for, it needs defending". All over the world, Mr. Speaker, people are rising, people are demanding freedom. Let us not, in this legislature, take action to oppress freedom and the rights of people. Let us not place a yoke of oppression around the necks of the wage earners of this province. I will not, I cannot support the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to make any comment about

preceding speeches in this house in dealing with this bill, but in listening to my friend from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) I felt there were some comments that should be made so as to make certain that it was understood in this house what the position of the party that I represent is. I noticed that he made some passing remark to the effect that no one, he was sure, would accuse him of being a Conservative. Well, I want to doubly assure him that after listening to his remarks this afternoon, there is never any chance in the world of that happening.

I want to deal with just two or three of the points that he raised dealing specifically with this bill that is before us. I am rather disturbed, Mr. Speaker, by the way positive stand that is taken on only one side of the fence in this question by the member who has just sat down. I believe that changes in our labour act and changes for the better for all people concerned cannot be approached with a strong speech designed merely to support one position. I found, and I listened carefully to his comments, that he gave virtually no argument or concession to any side except that of labour. I believe that a one-sided approach such as this does nothing but establish the fact that you approach the entire problem of labour-management, conciliation, and getting along, with an attitude that you are dealing only with the enemy. I don't think that this is so. I most certainly, although I am not a member of a trade union, don't look on the members of that group as being my enemy. I would hope that members who speak, as the member who just sat down, obviously on behalf of trade unions, would take the same type of conciliatory approach when you are dealing with a complex bill such as we have before the house.

I was also struck by the fact that he had much to make of the question of people making submissions to the committee. I have looked down the list and I have failed to find either himself or the union that he represents having made any of these suggestions to the committee when the opportunity was presented to them. And that rather surprises me. I would have thought that, in listening to what he had to say, he would have taken some time to have done that if he had some very strong views, and he obviously has. I want people to understand that our party's attitude, in dealing with matters such as this, attempts to be one of trying to work out what is best for both sides, not merely what is best for one side. I find, as many members in this house I am sure will find, that these amendments in themselves are complex enough without trying to talk about the Trade Union Act as a whole. I am quite well aware that members, such as the member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) and several more members in this house who have had years of experience, probably could find loopholes that the average member cannot find in the act. But I want to say that in dealing with this I hope that the members in this house will take my comments as being those of someone who is neither a friend of management nor of labour, but one who looks at the entire proposals that are placed before us with a view to promoting good relations in our province, of promoting the future welfare of our province. When we've seen so many instances in recent years of Royal Commissions, Judicial Enquiries and Parliamentary Legislative Committees being appointed to report on various matters, and sometimes taking years to complete and file their reports. I think it is indeed encouraging to find the situation we have here, where the Labour-Management Legislative Review Committee, which was appointed on the 27th of July, 1965, in a period of less than eight months completed and submitted its report.

There was a comment made about a committee from the House of

Commons which has been sitting for years to the tune of several million dollars. I believe this is something that this committee should be congratulated over. It is even more encouraging to see, as I have noted, that all members of the committee with representation from both management and the trade union movement have seen fit to sign their names to the report of the committee. I want to express my congratulations to the committee and my appreciation for their very difficult and substantial contribution.

As I understand it, the recommendations of the committee, as contained in Bill No. 79, do not grant all of the wishes either of management or the unions. The fact that the members of the committee, representing such widely separated views on this subject, managed to reach agreement on most recommendations and a consensus on the remainder, I hope, is an indication of a new era in labour-management relations in this province, an era where, for the good of the employer, the employee and the trade union, but, Mr. Speaker, more particularly for the good of the province as a whole, representatives of labour and management will make the necessary compromises in order to reach agreement, thus furthering our provincial economy, and thus avoiding major disputes and resulting work stoppages which can only have the effect of hurting the province.

When key and responsible members of both management and the trade union movement, together with the chairman and vice-chairman, all of whom made up this committee, have reached agreement on amendments which should be made to the Trade Union Act, far be it from me to criticize the recommendations which they have made. The parties these people represent are the ones who will be the most vitally affected by the proposed changes in the Trade Union Act, and, acting in good faith, as I am sure they did, they are the best people to determine the changes which should be made in the Trade Union Act, which is so vital to our economy.

For many years the trade unions have made an invaluable contribution to our provincial economy and there is no doubt in my mind that in the future their contribution will be of increasing importance. In its report, the committee set forth its two major considerations in making recommendations which it did. The first consideration was that matters relating to industrial relations should be left to the parties involved to work out with as little interference as possible from government or outside sources, and with this view I wholeheartedly concur. The committee stated that its second major consideration was to provide maximum protection and freedom to the individual worker, and with this view as well I am in full agreement and accord.

If the Trade Union Act or any other piece of legislation has the effect of furthering the cause of employers or of the trade unions, but to the detriment of the employees involved, then such legislation has no place in our Statute Books. We find too many examples of labour and management disputes from which both the employer and the trade union emerge with no significant loss of strength or income but with the individual employees affected being the only ones to suffer and to take it in the neck. Time and again we see this happen. As I stated, a little earlier on in my remarks, I don’t propose to criticize the amendments contained in this bill. However, I have some comments, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to make and some questions that I want to ask. Many of these will be suggestions that I will bring up again in Committee of the Whole if the bill proceeds that far, but I believe that they are applicable at this moment in dealing with the general principle of the bill.

The first thing that I want to touch on is sub-section two of section two of bill No. 79, and the new definition therein of the words "trade dispute". I am informed, and I hope accurately so, that nowhere in the Trade Union Act, except perhaps once, I believe it's section 25 of the existing act, or in the amendments in this proposed bill are the words "trade dispute" used. The words "labour dispute" are used in section 9 and the word "dispute" in section 21. Also in section 45 of The Queen's Bench Act, there is a definition of the words "labour dispute" which is very similar to the definition in the proposed bill No. 79. But in view of this, and to avoid confusion, I wonder if it wouldn't be desirable in the proposed sub-section to have the definition for "labour dispute" extended to include "trade dispute", and so on, so that this is clear. I found that it was rather confusing because, not being accustomed to these technical terms, it seemed to me that you were referring to different things in different places.

The second thing I want to deal with is the sub-section four of section three of bill No. 79, which adds a new paragraph to the section of the act dealing with when the board may rescind or amend one of its certification orders. I am concerned here particularly with sub-paragraph two of the proposed paragraph K which gives the board power to rescind or amend a certification order when no collective agreement is in existence. They have this power only in a 30 to 60 day period prior to, as you know, the anniversary date of the certification order. Keeping in mind the second consideration of the committee to provide the maximum protection and freedom to the individual worker, it would seem to be that after a union has been certified and has failed for a period of ten months that the employees affected should not be restricted to a mere 30 day period during which they can apply for rescission of the certification order.

I mentioned a while ago my concern for the employees of the province perhaps more so than for the actual trade union and its officers and managers. I find, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, that time and again in the past, strife and struggle that go on between management and labour, it is the employee who suffers. I think the point I have made is an implication of what I am getting at, where in this particular section, there is a degree of restriction surrounding the worker. I believe they should be able to apply for such rescission at any time after the expiry of ten months from the date of the certification order. I believe that a majority of the employees of an employer should have the unquestioned right to withdraw from that trade union if they so wish. This proposed amendment, as it now reads, would give the employees the right to withdraw from the trade union only during the 30 to 60 day period prior to each anniversary date of the certification order. In other words, they would have to wait that extra 10 months before they could do it again. This, I feel, is unduly restrictive of the rights and freedoms of the employees because, if they read but fail to understand this amendment, or fail to get the proper advice, then when the 30 to 60 day period has gone by, they have to wait a further full year before they again have the right to apply for desertification. This could bring up many complications; it could bring up an almost eternal postponement if the union affected was to do so. I, therefore, propose that the last three lines of this sub-paragraph two I am referring to, be deleted and the following substituted:

> That after the expiration of the period of ten months from the date of the order to be rescinded or amended

In other words put that in as a clause.

Now the third point I want to deal with is section 8 (a) of Bill No. 79 which deals with the professional associations.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that while we are all very interested in what the member is saying, these are properly matters for house amendment in Committee of the Whole rather than a debate on the principle of the second reading.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, let me say that I think in the past little while we have allowed much more latitude in the debate in the last few sessions of the house than had been the case previously. If one interprets the rules strictly, then one should not discuss clauses or sections of a bill on second reading. It is the principle of the bill that is the subject of debate and not the clauses thereof. I think that is a reasonable regulation because it would lead to the waste of the time of the house by having a second discussion on matters that should be discussed in committee and should not be discussed on second reading, although I say we have taken a much broader view of this recently than we have in the past.

Mr. Pederson: — Mr. Speaker, I realize I was skirting very close to the border of the rule brought up by the member from Hanley, but I thought I had clarified my position at the start in explaining that in order to deal with these principles I would have to deal with certain sections in order to give examples and I did attempt to do that. I will try to delete some of these suggestions I am making.

I would like to turn, then Mr. Speaker, if I may, to Section 8 (a) of Bill No. 79 which deals with professional associations. I think that the proposal there dealing with the professional associations again leaves them in the unwieldy position of being denied the rights that I mentioned earlier on, or just a few moments ago insofar as for ordinary members of unions being unable to ask for desertification, I am going to make some suggestions in that regard as well.

Further on, in Section 7 of the bill it provides that there can be no stroke until the vote has been taken by secret ballot of the employees affected and until the majority of those affected have voted in favour of the stroke. This is something, Mr. Speaker, that has been a cause of argument amongst labour and management and amongst the public in general for a long time. What exactly constitutes a secret vote amongst union members? I looked in vain in the proposed amendments for a method of defining how this is to be carried out. I found, or at least it seemed to me, that the proposal does not state who is going to direct the vote. It does not lay down any rules as to the method by which the vote shall be taken. If there is one area where there has been tremendous argument arising over the years regarding the strike action of unions, it has been in this area. Charges and counter-charges have been made over the years about the domination of the union heads over the union; there have been charges, unsubstantiated, I frankly admit, that the union heads have dictated to the membership how they shall vote because the inference is that they could see how they voted. I believe that this is one area where we need to take a hard look. As I see it there are some loopholes in this section that do not specifically spell out either the methods or by whom these particular votes shall be conducted. There is a section five that deals with votes directed by the Labour Relations Board but not in the normal course of strike votes. It seems to me that unless this provision is made more specific we might find the situation where

the trade union involved conducts the vote, or where the employer conducts the vote, or where perhaps any number of employees might conduct the vote — a strike vote. I believe that there has to be some type of provision in the Trade Union Act, I can see some merit in it, that would specifically provide the method by which a vote is to be taken.

I looked through the report to see what the views of the committee were on it. They didn't seem to spell out any views in this particular area at all. So I have an amendment which I shall bring forward in Committee of the Whole that I think might help to simplify this and remove this area of contention. I believe that there was in fact a Queen's Bench case just recently where it was decided that where a collective agreement provides for a Board of Arbitration, but does not provide that a majority of the board, or in the absence of a majority, the Board Chairman, can make a decision of the board, if there were to be any binding board decision it must be unanimous. I am dealing now with section 23 (a) and the question of arbitration under collective agreements. I found that time and again there is a Board of Arbitration, there is a Conciliation Board, but nothing comes of it. Speaking now as a member of the general public we often wonder why there isn't some method, when after a suitable period of time, agreement has been reached through an Arbitration Board or through other methods, why the two sides cannot accept these types of decisions. It seems to me a ridiculous situation. I have been told, as I mentioned about this court case just recently, that unless it spells out in the agreement that the majority, or the chairman, in the absence of a majority, can make a decision and it would be binding, then, of course, there can be no decision that is binding. You can find situations where a Board of Arbitration could come to a conclusion but unless all members of the board agreed and signed that agreement, this work would be wasted. I think that this is another area where there has to be some strengthening of the various sections under the Labour act that we are discussing this afternoon.

I noticed there was some reference made by the member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) in dealing with the question of the employer being allowed the opportunity to coerce the employee. I hold with him, in that employers should not be allowed by law to be given any leeway to bring undue pressure on an employee in order to break the hold or the strength of the union. I do believe that it should also be the prerogative of the management to state without fear of reprisal their position in any question of dispute. After all, the union and its representative are given this right, why shouldn't the management also be given the opportunity in an open meeting to state its position? I believe that there is a section — I have forgotten the exact part of it — that is dealing with this question of the management being allowed to do this. I think, if I interpret section 23 (a) that deals with it correctly, that there is adequate safeguard in that the management will not be allowed, while a collective agreement is being disputed, to offer wage increases, as an example, and various incentives in order to break the back of the union. I understand that there was a case in Regina recently where, while a dispute was going on, management was able to offer to the employees two or three wage increases which, of course, completely wiped out the effectiveness of those who were responsible for the union in their bargaining with management.

I have several other items but I think that I should rather bow to the suggestion of the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) and reserve them for Committee of the whole. Most of them that I have

are now in the form of various amendments that I think would help to strengthen the act. I can only conclude by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I hope that all members of this house will attempt to take a hard impartial look at the Trade Union Act and the amendments that are being proposed. I hope they will take the attitude and approach that this is not only good, being designed so that it is good for the trade union, being designed that it is good for management, but primarily that it is being designed to be good for the union employee and more specifically the people of this province. That is the approach, Mr. Speaker, that I hope all members will take. For that reason and in the hope that I can get some amendments before the house when they come up in the Committee of the Whole, I will support the second reading of the bill.

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I only want to make a few comments on this bill for the reason that I consider the amendments to the Trade Union Act are of vital importance not only to the members of this house, but also to the people of Saskatchewan and to the province as a whole. It could very well be in the years ahead that the industrial progress and industrial peace of our province may well depend upon the decisions made in this house. Therefore, for once, I agree very heartily with the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) particularly when he referred to the comments of the member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek). I can very sincerely say that in my judgment his only contribution to this debate was that he once again emphasized his personal bias. This is a subject which to me goes beyond personal bias and should take in the attention of the members of this house for many reasons, from the aspect of the Trade Union movement, from the aspect of the employee and from the aspect of the employer.

For that reason, to start, I want to emphasize the approach taken by this government in bringing forth this bill. After discussions that went on with the suggested amendments to the Trade Union Act of one year ago in this house, this government decided that this problem was of such a serious nature that it went beyond the realm or scope of one party or one government, and that before any decision should be made, we should consult those people who are most vitally and intimately concerned. I speak, of course, of management and labour. Therefore, a committee was set up. This committee spent eight months in study, in consultation, before bringing forth the recommendations that eventually led to the presentation of this bill. As I have listened to the debate I have found that there have been two or three principles which are contained in this bill that have received very little attention from members opposite. Therefore, I felt that these were of such an important nature in the bill that I wanted to pass a comment or two. However, there are one or two things I would like to say about some of the comments of the members opposite.

First of all, I want to emphasize again that this bill and the amendments contained in this bill are the recommendations of the committee and not the recommendations of this government. We have brought them forth because the Committee of Management and of Labour have sat down together and discussed this problem and then made the following recommendations.

Also, I want to comment on the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) with respect to his suggestion that we hesitate in taking action on this bill, to give the public time to study and to analyse its implications. I would remind him that we deliberately delayed bringing forth any emendments to the Trade Union Act for one year; that this committee has taken eight months

of serious and dedicated study on this bill. I also want to point out that this committee is composed of members of management and of labour and that this report was unanimously signed by every member of both management and labour. I feel that because there was no minority report, it speaks very loudly in favour of the bill itself because surely those members representing labour on that committee had a duty and a responsibility first of all, not only to express a minority report if they had any fears or doubts, but it was their duty and obligation to express them in a minority report. This they did not do.

Secondly, if there were any specific clauses or sections of the bill, surely it was their duty and their obligation to bring these to the attention of every member of the house and to the general public as well. This also they did not do and, therefore, by their actions it would suggest that this was the agreement of both management and labour after eight months of study and consultation.

I also want to comment on the remarks of the members opposite that this bill makes trade unions a legal entity. I certainly am not a trade union expert. I am a schoolteacher; I come from a rural seat; but I have not been able to find this interpretation in the bill. Nor have any of the lawyers or legal minds with whom I have discussed it. Certainly, it was not the intention of the committee, nor is it the intention of the government, nor the intention of the Liberal Party to make trade unions a legal entity. Therefore, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) has assured me that if the opposition can demonstrate in committee where this is so, he would certainly listen to any amendment s to solve the problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two or three principles in this bill which I think deserve mention at this time. I would like to bring them to your attention and to the attention of the house. The first one is in relation to professional employees. Most Canadian legislation excludes categories of professional employees from their labour statutes. Thus, they do not grant to them the rights of organizing and bargaining collectively that are granted to ordinary employees. I speak of many of the provinces in Canada. As far as Saskatchewan itself is concerned, our legislation at the present time makes no distinction between professional employees and other employees as such. I would like to point out that professional employees are really a special category and cannot be dealt with in exactly the same way as ordinary employees. I think this is true for two reasons. On the one hand is the fact that they have a high degree of training. They are frequently in a better position to achieve a better deal from their employer by individual bargaining than they could as a bargaining unit. I think this is obvious from the shortage of professional people in the province of Saskatchewan and in Canada as a whole. There is a real demand from the professions. The second reason is that many professionals are subject to a code of ethics or discipline which would conflict with a membership in an industrial union containing non-professional employees. But, on the other hand, despite this fact, more and more professional employees are taking employment with non-professional employers, such as the government of Saskatchewan, the government of Canada and large private businesses at the expense of private practice. Experience has shown that these professionals in institutionalised practice have a real need for some machinery of collective bargaining to maintain some control over their conditions of employment. This bill presents a reasonable and a rational solution to this problem.

First, it recognized that professional employees have the right to organize and bargain collectively and thus have some control over their working conditions. Secondly, it recognized that professional employees cannot be grouped together with non-professional employees and I think that this is a progressive departure from our present act. I also believe that the members of the opposition have seemed to imply that the Saskatchewan Labour Act is their private domain and is untouchable. For some reason I don't agree with this because I don't believe that any statute or any law is perfect, and changing times and conditions and particularly in the industrial field, demand periodic review. I think the approach that the government has taken in bringing about this review is a sound one.

The second point or principle I would like to mention and emphasize in the bill that has received little attention to this moment is the right of individual employees. As I listened to the member for Arm River I could not help but agree with him. In other words present legislation today adequately protects labour organization's rights, and I submit that employers by their very nature can take care of themselves. They, of course, have the capital, they are in the management position and they can, of course, take care of themselves with any problems that arise. However, the employee, as an individual, is not always in this same advantageous position. He can often be caught in a squeeze. Now, there was an example right in our own act, under the present section 32 — membership in a trade union may be made a condition of employment. The trade union can by dismissing an employee from the union in effect have him fired. I know that most trade union people, and I think this is to their credit, act with wisdom and temperance in this regard. However, there are many examples in the law books of employees being dismissed from unions because of either differences with union policy or because of discrimination because of individual, political or social beliefs. With the combination of labour and politics that the present NDP opposition now holds, I think that this in itself demands that individual employees be guaranteed this type of protection. We believe that an employee should be protected from this type of discriminatory action. This bill would have this protection granted to an individual. The principle was well stated by a judge in British Columbia when he stated that every person has a right to practice his occupation. If, in order to do this, he must belong to a union, it necessarily follows that he has the right to belong to that union.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I will support the bill.

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Would the hon. member permit a question before he takes his seat? You made mention of professional people. Would they not be better off if they were not organized in a union. Would the hon. member recognize teachers as a professional group belonging to a teacher's organization which, in every sense of the words, is a union?

Mr. Macdonald: — Yes, it is an association for collective bargaining, which is exactly what the principle of this bill gives.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, as a farmer, I would like to take a look at this question. When I stop to think about it, there is a good deal of similarity between the situation that the farmer finds himself in today and the situation in which labour people find themselves today. Both groups have to have some legal or artificial protection

and assistance. This has been very necessary. There is some difference, of course. The farmer, to a great extent, owns his plant and equipment. It may be heavily mortgaged, Mr. Speaker, but he is, at least for the time being, in control of that plant and equipment. So, he can make decisions as to how much he works, what he is going to produce, what he is going to try to produce. The farmer enjoys a good deal of independence until he reaches the market place. Then, when he reaches the market place, Mr. Speaker, he finds that his is completely without protection. Somebody else says how much to pay for the farmer's goods and somebody else says how much the farmer will pay for the goods he wants to buy. Now, after the coming of the Industrial Revolution, the development of the factories and the development of very large groups of labouring people in these plants and factories, we found a different situation, where large groups of people did not control either the place they worked, nor the tools they worked with. Now, it is true that in some trades, some of the small tools were owned by the worker, but the labouring man then had lost the right to make the decision as to whether or not he was going to work. He had no choice in the decision as to what he was going to make. This was all taken out of his hands. He only had his labour of his hand and brain to sell. So, he had lost control completely. Of course, there were long decades of bitter struggle, during which there was much suffering, during which time the employers took the most cruel advantages of labour and it was by very tough struggle and tough fighting that labour people built the beginnings of their trade unions. It is only in relatively recent times that they have received the protection of law. Now, it is still true that the working man who goes to work in a plant cannot make the decision as to whether he works or not. That decision is made by somebody else. He does not make the decision as to what he produces; that decision is made for him by somebody else. He has no control over the place where he works, the tools he works with nor the product he makes. He is still in the position where he has only his labour of hand and brain to sell.

The Liberal party and the Liberal government often talk about fairness and equality. They talk about the same law for the rich and the poor. Sure, it is legal, Mr. Speaker, for the rich as well as the poor to sleep on park benches but the circumstances are very different in each case. So when we approach this whole question of labour laws we must remember the differences in circumstances, on the one side the man who controls neither his tools, the place he works, nor his products; on the other hand the owners who control all of those things. In addition, in this modern age, very often by some means to control the market, because we know that prices today are not arrived at by competition. They are arrived at by administration. So to try to make a law equal for the one who has no power of control and the other who has all control is completely ridiculous.

Our labour law in the province of Saskatchewan has been good law. We have had a very excellent record in regard to labour disputes. I was interested in what was said by the member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) — "Industrial peace may very well depend on decisions made in this house." That's right, Mr. Speaker. We made decisions in the house in years gone by that have resulted in industrial peace.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — We have had industry in this province, too. The labour

laws that we have on the books at the present time are not going to keep industry away. Those are not the things that have prevented industry from coming to this province. The member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) also said "The bill is the recommendation of the committee and not of this government." Well, if the bill isn't recommended by the government why did the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) introduce it? Why didn't a private member introduce it? The government has to take responsibility for this bill. I doesn't matter who recommended it or who didn't recommend it. This is a government bill for which they much take responsibility.

Much is made of the plea for professional employees. Just because somebody gets an education and becomes an engineer doesn't give him special privileges in the way of human rights. It is just as sensible, Mr. Speaker, to say that all dishwashers should have the right to be outside of unions as that all engineers or some other profession should be outside of unions. Dishwashers have ethics too. They talk about ethics. This is, of course, one of the ways that certain people try to make it difficult for unions to organize and to operate. in the early days of unions, of course, they were organized on the trade or craft basis but with modern methods of production it was soon found that this wasn't satisfactory. So we have the industrial union which takes in all of the employees in an industry or in a plant, whether they are white-collared clerical employees or whether they are labourers or whether they are skilled labourers or whether they may be engineers or technicians, all in the same union. This is the only effective way in our modern industry to have a union. I would look with grave doubt upon this question of making special classes out of the professions. The member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) said, speaking of himself and his own party, "We tried to work out what is best for both sides, not what is best for one side." I don't think that is the right approach because you can't have what is best for both sides. What will be best for the employer will be to pass this bill, but what will be best for labour will be to turn this bill down. What we want is not to try to get what is best for both sides. You can't have that. but what we want to have is what is fairest for both sides, taking into consideration the circumstances on each side. So I hope that the house will turn down this bill because I don't think it's going to make one bit of a contribution towards either the development of industry in this province nor to industrial peace in this province in the future. If you have had labour laws you are certainly going to have more trouble, more strikes, and many more difficulties. I will have to opposite this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, the amendment that have been proposed by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) would appear to have some great degree of urgency at this time. The haste is emphasized, I believe, by the fact that the Labour Management Review Communities had barely placed their recommendations in the hands of the government before legislation apparently was drafted very quickly and presented to the legislature. Bill No. 79 as it is known, was introduced for first reading last week. It was not until the end of the week that the bill appeared in its printed form on members' desks. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that this legislation will affect, in a varying degree, every wage earner in the provincial of Saskatchewan that bargains collectively with his or her employer. Undoubtedly many employees will be affected who do not enjoy that privilege. Because of the wide application of the

act and the large number of people that are involved, I suggest, that it is quite unfortunate that the intent of the amendments and the contents of the bill have not had the opportunity to be more carefully studied, more fully examined by these large numbers of people who will be affected by it. Had this been the case, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that a great number of interested groups and individuals would want to be making representation to the government. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the value of Saskatchewan's Trade Union Act as presently constituted, is recognized by the majority of employer organizations as well as employee groups across the province.

Across Canada, Saskatchewan's Trade Union Act has been recognized as the device which has been instrumental in achieving a good working relationship between management and labour, mutual trust and an outstanding record for industrial peach which is unequalled in any other province in Canada. I was interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), the leader of the Conservative party in this house. He in his remarks suggested that this may be a new era with respect to labour relation. With respect to the remark made by the member I would only say that situations in recent years have been rather excellent when we consider the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the records show that between the years 1945 to 1961 in the province of Saskatchewan the time lost as a result of strokes or walkouts on a percentage basis was about half the national average. I think this is a rather exceptional record with respect to industrial peace in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I expect by now, Mr. Speaker, members will be aware of the fact that I am opposed to the amendments which are proposed in this piece of legislation. The trade union to which I belong, Mr. Speaker, operates under a Dominion charter and as such does not feel the same direct effect as those organized groups who will be under the jurisdiction of provincial statutes. However, I want to state quite emphatically at this time that the amendments which are before us are symptomatic of the wishes of those members of our society who would turn back the clock to the day when the employee came hat in hand to his employer, rather than bargaining with him as an equal, bargaining with him collectively and in good faith. In fairness, I do want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has probably used more restraint than many of us would have given him credit for when we recall that period of time when he was serving as the opposition labour critic in this legislature. A perusal of his speeches that are recorded in this house during that period of time, I believe, served to breed distrust and apprehension with respect to the intentions of him and his Liberal colleagues. I think the minister would be perhaps the first to agree that his 22 months as Minister of Labour have provided him with a deeper and perhaps a greater understanding of labour's problems than was the case previously. I think also, Mr. Speaker, that the minister, if the choice were his, would gladly have deleted from the record some of the many extreme statements made by him in that period prior to 1964. I think the minister's associations in recent months have made him increasingly aware that the progress which has been made by wage earners has been slow and tedious over the years and that it has been a difficult task for the trade union movement to properly discharge their responsibility in the face of the constant attacks by those who are dedicated to the erosion, to the weakening, or to the total destruction of the trade union movement.

I am well aware also, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the fact that the minister may have mellowed somewhat in recent months that the pressures from reactionary quarters are still factors with which he must reckon. I would hazard the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the views expressed in recent statements by such notables as Mr. Ralph Purdy are not in keeping with the main stream of thinking of the majority of employers in the province of Saskatchewan. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of those people who employ men and women in the course of their business activities are not only willing but anxious to provide their employees with an adequate wage scale and other legitimate benefits. There are exceptions, however, Mr. Speaker, exceptions which make laws necessary which will adequately protect wage earners. These exceptions to which I refer, Mr. Speaker, often exercise undue influence, exercise an influence out of all proportion to their actual numbers. In numerous cases these people occupy a position of influence from which they are able to shape public opinion to the detriment of organized labour.

The various media of communication have also played a role in this connection either consciously or other wise. I draw attention only to the fact that the sins and the indiscretions of such notables as Hal Banks and Jimmy Hoffa have been presented by the press on many occasions in such a way as to cast a dark shadow over all honest and legitimate trade union members. Frequently in this legislative chamber also, Mr. Speaker, we have been witness to the attempt of certain members in this legislature to discredit those who are officers in the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour or in the Canadian Labour Congress or like bodies by slurring references to them as labour bosses in an attempt to portray an image of someone dishonest or evil. I think I can say quite truly, Mr. Speaker, that in my associations with a number of these people that among them are some of the finest, some of the most honest and most conscientious people with which I have had the opportunity to associate.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those people who have had the opportunity to study the bill closely will concede that the amendments which we are considering this afternoon have been couched in very cunning and very clever language. The attempt has been made to give the appearance, Mr. Speaker, that an equal privilege is being bestowed on employer and employee alike. The mention of this was also made by the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). I just want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a program purporting to give equal rights to two different groups can be extremely misleading and requires careful examination. For instance, the rich and the poor have equal rights to own yachts and to sleep on park benches. There are other distinguishing factors which determine who it is that is likely to take advantage of these rights.

At the close of World War II, Mr. Speaker, when price controls were lifted and when the excess profits tax was abolished, the steel companies immediately took that opportunity to exercise their right to increase the price of steel by 12 1/2 per cent overnight. Not because of wage increases, not as a result of negotiations which were conducted with their employees or with anyone else but simply because it was considered at that time that conditions were opportune to increase the margin of profits to be enjoyed by their shareholders.

These changes in the price structures, Mr. Speaker, can take place very quietly, sometimes in the dead of night with little fanfare and little publicity. But when these price institution are felt in other industries and affect other innumerable consumer commodities resulting in an increase in the cost of living, the wage

earner then finds that he has sustained a loss. Well, Mr. Speaker, when the wage earner tries to correct the condition which was brought about in that fashion, he cannot bring about his wage increase by the same methods as the steel companies used in raising the price of steel. He must bargain collectively with his employer. He must bargain or negotiate with his employer. If his requests are rejected by the employer and the wage earner finally decides that there is no other alternative and decides to withhold his product from the market, it is almost certain that the action which is taken at that time will be met by sever criticism from a variety of critics.

In the post-war years, Mr. Speaker, we have experienced this inflationary spiralling, the effect of which has penetrated every aspect of modern life. There are no signs that these conditions are abating. Milk and bread are among the most recent items to be affected. I only want to emphasize in passing, once more, Mr. Speaker, that these conditions originated not because of wage increases but because at the end of World War II there was an accumulation of savings and a backlog of unfilled wants and some people decided that the time was ripe to make a financial cleanup. I don't intend at this time, Mr. Speaker, to go into the record of corporation profits following the post-war era. I think these are well known to most members. Investigations have indicated quite clearly that in most cases price increases were excessive and in many cases could not be justified at all.

The inflationary spiral, Mr. Speaker, was not started by wage increases. From the beginning wages have been chasing the cost of living index with the majority of cases seeing wage increases followed quickly by another round of increase in consumer products, usually following on the heels of the wage increases to further strengthen the argument that labour has been the villain in the scheme of things. This attempt to portray organized wage earners in an unfavourable light has assisted, I suggest in some measure in conditioning the minds of an uninformed public to a move towards regressive legislation, such as the legislation which we are considering in this chamber this afternoon. This, Mr. Speaker, is regrettable when it is recognized that existing legislation to this time has no more than provided that the right of the wage earner will be protected in seeking a just reward for his labours.

Of the many objections which have been raised to this point, and undoubtedly will be raised in opposition to the proposed amendments, the proposed free speech amendment is probably the most innocuous looking on the surface and yet carries with it a great many far-reaching ramifications. It carries with it the provision that "an employer may" and I quote from the act:

> express his views to his employees as long as in the board's opinion the expression of view does not in itself amount to a threat, a promise or undue influence.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this particular amendment opens the door wide for a possible intimidation of employees either individually or collectively. The suggestion has been made that there is nothing, if the amendment is accepted, to prevent the employer from inviting his employees into his office one by one, and talking to them in whatever fashion he wishes. If it is the wish of the employer to have his employees refrain from joining a trade union, he no longer needs fear the reprisal which may be taken in the manner of charging him with an unfair labour practice. He may threaten, he may coerce, almost at will; this so-called freedom of speech amendment is sufficiently broad that it

would be virtually impossible to prove that an employee had been threatened or intimidated. We are not all made of the same kind of cloth, Mr. Speaker. Among us are the strong and the weak, the timid and the brave. I can give you an example, an actual case, Mr. Speaker, of an employee who was called into the office of his employer. He was merely asked, Mr. Speaker, whether he enjoyed working for that particular company in a tone of voice that was somewhat menacing, and the employee — this isn't a laughing matter, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner). If you choose to laugh at this, then you give support to intimidation of the worst sort. If you think this isn't intimidation then you have another think coming and it's about time you got used to some of the realities of life.

Mr. Speaker, as I have suggested, there are people who are made of different types of cloth. Some people are easily intimidated and some are not. I think you only need to use your own imagination to see how effectively this intimidate device can be used by an employer who will use these unscrupulous methods.

In the main, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the changes contemplated in this piece of legislation represent a backward step, a step that is coming at a time when a number of other provinces in the Dominion of Canada are making a move to bring the provisions of their act more in line with the provisions of Saskatchewan's act. I think this is ill conceived, Mr. Speaker, that, following a good many years of satisfactory operation, that extensive changes should be proposed. Among these changes is the provision that certification moves will be made more difficult, that desertification moves will be made easier thus weakening union security in this respect. The proposed changes in this act will have the general effect of weakening the structure of Saskatchewan's organized labour movement, a move which I am convinced is not in the best interests of the province of Saskatchewan or its people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be obliged to vote against the bill on second reading. I will reserve the right to comment more specifically when the bill reaches the committee stage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): —Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make very many remarks with respect to this particular bill. I was interested in the remarks of the member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). He pointed out that he was a teacher. I would like to quote a brief editorial opinion from the Teacher's Bulletin, February, 1966, issue which makes this statement with respect to an editorial entitled "In Defence of the Trade Union Act. The evidence we have examined indicates that this act has served Saskatchewan well."

Mr. Speaker, I said that I did not intend to spend very much time in discussion of this particular piece of legislation but I would like to make comments with respect to the principle involved in one particular section of this particular bill. This particular portion deals with the right of the employer or his representative to express his views to his employees as long as the expression of that view does not in itself amount to a threat, a promise, or any attempt to influence. Mr. Speaker, this government is naïve indeed if they believe that influence will not be utilized to prevent individuals from freely participating on a group basis in the organization of a union in order to bargain collectively. I speak of this from personal experience.

Some 20 years ago in the place where I was employed rumours

were prevalent that a union was going to be organized. I was approached by a number of people in that particular organization who expressed the view that we required a union . I bluntly said that insofar as I could see it was not necessary but I certainly felt, nevertheless, that employees should have the right to organize a union if they desired one. Shortly after I expressed this opinion a meeting was called by the general manager in which he sent his emissary to a meeting. This meeting was called one-half hour before closing time. This person stated that rumours had been heard that there was going to be a union organized in this particular organization and that they wished to get the views, of the various employees. Not one single person in that room uttered one word for at least five minutes, and I am sure that there were 75 to 80 people gathered there. After this period had elapsed I made the remark that I knew nothing about whether or not a union was being organized but that in my opinion, if employees desired and wished a union they certainly should have the right do form one.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, no one else uttered a single word. The person who had been sent by the general manager in this particular instance thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and adjourned it. The next month I had my salary reduced $25 per month. Now, Mr. Speaker, I had absolutely nothing to do with organization of a union in that plant. I had certainly heard rumours the same as other persons but it was assumed by the people responsible that I did have some responsibility here and they deliberately reduced my pay for that reason. At least I could not come to any other logical conclusion. I had been married two months prior to this event and at first I thought perhaps the individual felt that two could live cheaper than one and this was the reason, but this didn't seem to meet the demands of reason. I can readily admit that I was pretty timid about approaching the individual concerned, but I did approach him and I asked him why this situation arose. He made the comment that an individual who had been employed by this organization and had enlisted and gone overseas would be returning shortly and that he would have occupied this position had this situation not occurred. I told him I certainly had no complaint, whatsoever, with that approach and went back feeling somewhat better, quite frankly, after this discussion. However, the individual concerned did return to work for that organization and four months later had neither come near me in terms of the work I was doing — I was doing identically the same job — and there was no indication that he was going to be trained for this particular position. Again, a bit upset about the situation, and I think, Mr. Speaker, members of this Assembly could readily understand why I would be, I went back and approached the individual concerned. I commented "In my opinion there was only one reason for the reduction in my salary, and it was solely because I had expressed my opinion".

Mr. Speaker, I would ask members of this Assembly to note that we were asked to freely express our opinions and after being asked to freely express an opinion — and I was the only one that expressed any opinion — I was penalized for it. I frankly think that this particular section of the bill is an inexcusable section in terms of the fact that it will be utilized wrongly even with the best of intentions. It will be utilized to prevent organization of unions and prevent employees from bargaining collectively.

I believe it was the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) who made a statement with respect to prices. His reference was

that prices were not set by competition, they were set by administration. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would describe administration as the art of making arrangements. I contend the art of making arrangements is much more readily available to an employer than it is to a single employee, or to any given group of employees. The employer is always in the preferred position in such a situation. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking specifically against this particular principle in the bill, with respect to the so-called freedom of speech for the employer, because I believe it is extremely dangerous. It is subject, in all probability, to considerable abuse and intimidation, therefore, I cannot support this bill on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate and if anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to some of the previous speakers in debate on this bill. I would just like to make a short comment about some of the things that were said. The hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) following the hon. member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) made a statement of words to this effect that if the member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) were so sincere and had so many suggestions to offer, why didn't he offer them to the Labour Management Review Committee? Well, there were suggestions offered to the Labour Management Review Committee. The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour submitted a brief to the committee. This is a copy of the brief and if the hon. member had read the brief he would know that there was a wealth of research information and documentation in this particular brief and I am sure that the member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) concurs fully with that brief. The member from Arm River also attempted to leave the impression, as did the member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) that the Labour Management Review Committee Report was a unanimous report. The fact of the matter is that the report was not unanimous. I would just read a section of the letter of transmission, which every member has at his disposal. It says:

> Those amendments on which unanimity could not be achieved represent the consensus of the committee members' views.

There is only one thing I disagree with in that sentence and it is the use of the word "consensus". I think it is an abuse of the English language to use the word "consensus" in that because, although there may have been some unanimity on some parts of the Labour Management Review Committee Report, the remainder does not necessarily represent a consensus, in my estimation anyway.

With regard to the remarks of the member from Milestone, he started his remarks I think, by creating a straw man. He said "There were problems of such magnitude and such scope" or words to that effect, that the government felt they had to do something about it. Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, there were no problems of any magnitude; no evidence is offered and no evidence can be offered to back up that statement that there were problems of such magnitude that the act should be revised. He was also quite concerned about protection of politically active employees and I am also concerned with protection of politically active employees.

It is very deal to my heart. I would suggest to the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) that when Bill No. 30, a bill to amend the Saskatchewan bill of Rights is next discussed in this house that he stand in his place and make those remarks and that he positively support the amendments to the Saskatchewan bill of Rights that the Leader of the Opposition has presented to this house. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in as many years we have had amendments offered to the Trade Union Act. Last year it was bill No. 86, drafted in obvious haste, without consultation of the people that would be involved, regressive in nature. This year, we have bill No. 79, drafted following the Labour Management Review Committee Report. Insufficient consultation after the drafting with the parties that are concerned; again, regressive in nature. It is my sincere hope that bill No. 79 will last only as long as bill No. 86 did in 1965. The actions of the Liberal government in the area of labour relations have been characterized by haste and expedience.

It is interesting to note that a resolution in this house this year discussing a matter of far less importance to the people of Saskatchewan should be amended by the government to call for the widest possible consultation and debate so as to permit the opinion of all interested groups and individuals to be solicited and obtained before passage, whereas this bill will, if it is passed, show that the government's bill receives the minimum of consideration. Bill No. 79, if it is passed will eliminate major sections of the Trade Union Act that have admirably assisted unionised and non-unionised workers alike for 20 years. That the act has been good legislation is a matter of record. Statistics show, as other member's have alluded to, that our record of lost time because of strikes is one-half of the national record. The Labour Relations Board which is bound to reflect the worth of labour law shows that of approximately 3,000 cases heard between 1945 and 1964, 30 were taken before the court for review and of the 30 only two decisions were found to be at odds with the law of the land — two decisions out of approximately 3,000.

A great deal of generalization has been done about the Trade Union Act by its opponents. For example, legal entities is a matter that receives an abundance of generalization. There is an attempt to create the impression that (a) corporations are the same as (b) unions, and, therefore, should be equal before the law. Mr. Speaker, this is more mischievous than comparing apples to oranges. The comparison of corporations to unions is either done out of ignorance or with deception in mind, and I suspect it's the latter. Corporations are entities designed to limit liability, created for the purpose of making profit. Unions are associations of employees, banded together by mutual consent for the purpose of their common welfare. This Bill No. 79 seeks to put unions in the untenable position of being responsible for acts, contrary to the law, and possibly instigated by someone not even a member of that union. It also seeks to make unions responsible for acts of its members when in fact the union has no more control over individual members than those individuals choose to accept.

This Bill No. 79, if passed, will discriminate against those workers who choose, by democratic means, to associate with one another in a common cause. I have been a member of a union for many years. During that time I have occupied responsible positions within the union and I can say from practical experience that the amendments proposed will unjustifiably weaken the desirable understanding that now exists because of the Trade Union Act. I have

received representations from my constituency and I am gong to, on behalf of my constituents, oppose the passage of this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended saying anything in this debate and I don't intend to take the time of the house in saying a great deal but I find it very difficult to understand the attitude of some members across the way who desire to restrict the freedom of speech of certain individuals while providing freedom to others. I have heard two or three speakers on the other side this afternoon state they want to restrict the freedom of speech of people in our country. Now, I am quite certain there is no one here who will state that it is a democratic approach in this land and in our nation today to restrict the freedom and right of any individual. I say that when members in this legislature stand up and state that the freedom of two individuals to sit down and discuss their problems together that that freedom should not be provided then I say my friends across the way are showing the true spirit of an organization which they come very close to supporting at times which restricts the freedom of everyone in the particular country in which the radical type of feeling that they have in Socialism is in control of the affairs.

I regret very much to have to sit in a democratic Assembly and hear members, elected members of the legislature, stand up and speak about restricting the right of anyone to freedom of speech, or the right of anyone to join together to discuss their problems and try to solve their problems in a peaceful way as between man and man. I want to state here that all I have heard during this debate is suspicion. There has been nothing concrete by my friends across the way to prove that anything is being done in this legislation to restrict the rights of the workingman and the individual worker in our province. I defy any one of them to point out anything in this act that does restrict the rights of the individual worker in our province at the present time. No one across the way has proven that in any way does this act do this. So I say that when members stand up across the way and speak in this debate, they are actually stating that they don't want the individual to have increased rights. They say that for some reason they think there is something suspicious in this bill. They haven't found anything concrete but they say there must be something wrong with it or it certainly couldn't be brought in by the Liberals just to help the individual working man. There must be something suspicious hidden in the words in the bill. Well, certainly I think for once hon. members across the way could just believe that there is proper legislation and fair legislation being brought into this house. There is nothing hidden in it. It's legislation which a group, that have sat down in this province for eight months and discussed the issues, have come up with and suggested would be a reasonable solution to changes that they fell should be brought in with regard to this act. I say that after eight months of consideration I would think that they would be willing to accept the judgment of those that represented the working people in this province, those that represent management, in trying to bring about a solution to some of our problems. I know they have tried to create the impression that the act, as it now stands, has been a good one for this province. I am not going to say here today that I believe that it hasn't been necessarily good but there has been no industry in this province to speak of in the past.

They are not comparing, under fair circumstances, the undertakings of this act with legislation in other parts of Canada where there have been large industries, where there have been labour problems because of the size of the working force and the size of industry. Today we are looking forward to the day when we are going to have industry in our province. We are going to have large industries in our province. We are going to have a large labour force. I think anyone will admit that under changing conditions, the laws of our province from time to time must be changed in order to meet changing conditions. So I say, knowing that representatives of the labour unions of this province sat down with representatives of management and drew up suggestions for the members of the legislature, that I don't think there has been any legislation brought into this house that I might be aware of, that has been given a more understanding study by representatives of both groups concerned in this province then has been brought in and presented to the members of this legislature in this bill. I say it wasn't done in the way of holding a big public meeting with somebody getting up and trying to influence people by the use of words to go along with them and to raise difficulties for the government because there is something in a bill that they don't like. It wasn't done in this way. It was done in sensible consultation, listening to views of many organizations in this province. Then sensible leaders of labour and management came up with conclusions that we don't all agree with.

I am quite certain that members on this side don't completely agree with every recommendation in this bill. I am quite certain that there are members on the other side that can't agree with every recommendation. But I think most of them and I think all of us will agree that the men on this committee were honourable men; that they did give serious consideration to these problems and they have a right to have the government give consideration to those representations and lace them in legislation in this province. That is what the minister has done and I want to give him credit. I want to give those that were members of the committee credit for spending the time to bring to the attention of members of the legislature and the government what they feel might be improvements for legislation in the labour field in this province.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): —Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to say a great deal. But I do want to say a few words and I will try to make my remarks as brief and, hopefully, as constructive as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't entirely happy with the form of the report of the Labour Management Review Committee. It seemed to me to set out some general principles and then to attach a draft of possible changes in the Trade Union Act. I wasn't really able to see the connection between the principles and the draft at all stages of the game. Frankly, in a number of instances, I don't understand the rationale of the changes and I don't think the committee have explained the rationale of the changes. I am sure that the committee simply used this device of attaching a draft in order to put its recommendations in summary form. I don't think that the committee envisaged the draft being introduced into the legislature in substantially the form in which they drew it. I say this because I think that the draftsmanship in some cases is not adequate. This is not to reflect upon Legislative Counsel of this legislature. The Legislative Counsel had the bill for only a couple of days, only a very few days, and it can hardly be expected that legislative Counsel would be able to come up with a first class draft in a very complicated field of law in that short a time.

Now, let me give you a few examples, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to dwell upon the sections in order to discuss the sections but in order to point out what I think is a general weakness in the draftmanship that runs through this bill. I want members to turn to section seven, subsection one, where the words "or any other person" are added to the bill. I want them to take the act, put the new definition in, and read what the act will read if this bill is passed. It will, for example, make it, if it is read in its literal sense, an offence for any other person to contribute to a trade union, for any other person to have anything to do with the organization of a trade union. Now, this is clearly a conclusion which simply can't be meant, and must be a drafting error.

Other sections appear to be rather hurriedly put together. Section 15 of the bill is designed, as it seems to me, to protect trade union members. It does this by maintaining membership in trade unions but I think what was intended was that membership be maintained for the purposes of the section. Membership in trade unions confers all sorts of benefits. They have death benefits, and sick plans, and all the rest of it. As I read this act, it is quite possible for a person to rob the union treasury, to be expelled from the union on that account and to have his death benefits and sick pay benefits cancelled because of being expelled, and for him being able to rely on section 15 and say "No, I intend to keep paying my dues and it is deemed that I am a member of this union". Now, I'm sure this wasn't meant but I'm sure that it what it says.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is this, and I could go on mentioning other instances. I think the bill was hurriedly drafted. In fairness to the committee, I don't think they intended their report to be converted into statutory form without analysis. They were dealing with a specific labour-management problem and I think that the bill would be the better for a little more study by Legislative Counsel and a few more opportunities for representations to be made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the committee themselves say that labour-management relations in Saskatchewan are good. That is a definite fact. We haven't had a record of strikes. There is no urgency about changing the Trade Union Act, certainly not an urgency based upon bad labour -management relations which need to be corrected by a bill. If there is no urgency about a change and if, as I submit, the act is hurriedly drafted and could use a little more study, I would suggest that the best course of action for the government would be to allow this bill to stand on the order paper and to introduce it at the next session with such appropriate changes as they feel might be merited after a full study has been given, full representations have been received and after they have given their lawyers a chance to do a rather more complete job of drafting.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment very briefly on a couple of other principles which are in the bill. I don't want to take a great deal of time but let me consider first, the idea of professional association units. This bill, for example, says that all lawyers, or land surveyors, working for a particular employer can opt out of a bargaining unit. Members of the Law Society, a separate bargaining unit simply because they are members of the Law Society. The clear inference to be drawn from this bill is that professional organizations such as the Law Society are appropriate bargaining units to protect the economic interests of lawyers; economic interests of lawyers who are working for an employer.

Well, I would say more emphatically, Mr. Speaker, that I think that is wrong in principle. Professional organizations are established by the legislature and given compulsory powers to license and discipline simply for the protection of the public. These compulsory powers of license and discipline weren't conferred upon the lawyers in order to enhance their economic status. They are well able to look after themselves in the economic area. They weren't given these powers — quasi-legal powers — by the legislature in order to enhance their economic interests. The lawyers have another body, the Canadian Bar Association, which speaks for them on economic and political subjects, and it's no part of the function of the Law Society of Saskatchewan to bargain on behalf of lawyers. I don't think, in the same way, that when a legislature sets up all these other professional bodies that it has in mind that they are creating some kind of super trade unions with compulsory membership with powers of license and discipline, powers to fine, powers to expel, for such conduct in the case of the Legal Professions Act as "conduct unbecoming of a solicitor".

Now, I hardly think that when the legislature gave these powers to these professional bodies the legislature thought that it was creating a trade union and that these powers could be used to advance the economic interest of the members of these professional bodies. These bodies were set up for quite different purposes. They are set up to protect the public, to license people, to pass upon their professional qualifications, and thus to protect the public. The bill shouldn't confuse, as it does, the status of these organizations in their obligation to license and to protect the public and their apparent status as a bargaining unit or a trade union. The bill confuses these two functions and, I think, quite wrongly.

You may say, Oh well, teachers bargain collectively and they are a professional body. But they have given up their powers to license. Teachers don't have powers to license. Teachers have only limited powers of discipline and this was thought appropriate. If they were going to be a trade union they weren't to have substantial legal powers in order to advance their economic interests. I think that was sound in principle. I don't see why it should be deviated from in this bill, as I think it is.

If we are going to single out some of these professional groups as bargaining units it seems to me it ought to be done by the legislature and not by the Labour Relations Board. I submit that the draft as it stands allowed the Labour Relations Board to add different professional bodies, one right after the other.

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Suspicious.

Mr. Blakeney: — No, no. I'm suspicious of the English language when it says "includes". If the list was designed to be a restricted list the simple word would have been "means". If you mean this list to be an exhaustive list, say so. If you mean that it will be part of a list then you use the word "includes". that, Mr. Minister, is the one you have used.

Mr. Speaker, referring to the so-called conscience clause, I don't have the same objections to this clause as some others do. I think there are groups who have a genuine belief that they don't want to belong to any association. I don't understand the

basis of this belief but I accept their right to have this belief. But these people have the same belief with respect to any organization and they have quoted at you the same bits of scripture they have quoted at me, from the Second Book of Corinthians. If we are to apply this principle with respect to trade unions we have got to apply it with respect to every body which this legislature says a person must belong to. And if we want to apply the idea, fine. But it is not fair to apply it to trade unions and not to the Law Society or the Teachers' Federation or like organizations. If there is a conscience clause that ought to be applied it ought to be applied across the board. I personally don't object to this. I think it would have to be applied in a very restricted way, but I think that there is in fact only a small group of people who take the position of opposition to belonging to an organization. But I think, in fair plan, we ought to apply the principle across the board if we are going to apply it. If a printer can opt out of his organization on religious scruples, well then so can a physician; and if a teacher can, so can a tinsmith; and if a baker can so can a barrister.

Turning to section seven of the bill, I think as I have already indicated that that subsection one is pretty unhappily drafted. I will refer, in committee, to that more fully and I don't want to deal exhaustively with it now.

Dealing with the clause which allows an employer to attempt to influence his employees with respect to the formation of a trade, the one which the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) I'm sure unwittingly, was misconstruing in the house a moment ago. This clause flies in the face of a quarter of a century of experience with trade union organizations. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) pointed out that there has been general agreement among judges in the United States and among students of trade union matters that for the employer to speak is for the employer to coerce. With all the enormous power which the employer brings to bear necessarily because of his position as an employer in an unorganised shop, everything he does will have the character, or can potentially have the character, of a threat or a promise.

I return now, and I hurry along because I don't want to take too much time of the house, to the reverse onus clause. I am baffled by this change. The clause as it stands now is a simple statement of the law. If I am discharged and I show that I have a contract of indefinite duration, and show that I am discharged, then the onus is on the employer to show that he discharged me for cause. This is true whatever reason I'm discharged for. I don't have to prove anything if I'm suing for wrongful dismissal except that I had an indefinite contract of employment and that I was discharged. The onus then shifts. If the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) doubts this he can look up the leading case on it in Saskatchewan. It's a judgment of Mr. Justice Gordon of the Court of Appeal, and it is Butler vs. CNR. "It is only necessary for the employee to establish that he was employed for an indefinite time and that he was dismissed without notice. The onus then shifts to the defendant to prove that the dismissal was justified." Now, this is what the law not says with respect to a dismissal on an allegation that he was dismissed because of labour activities. But somehow the government wants to make it tougher for the employee to prove wrongful dismissal, if he is alleging that he was wrongfully dismissed because of union activity than when he was wrongfully dismissed because of some other activity. I don't know why else they would change it. Now the employee has to prove something else, "that he was exercising some right given

to him by the act", whatever those words may mean. And I wish the minister would elucidate on that particular phrase when he closes the debate.

The secret strike vote idea is unobjectionable in principle. However, as presently drafted it is pretty unfair. It could make every employee who participates in a strike guilty of an unfair labour practice and liable to a fine if after the vote, which everyone conducted in good faith, the Labour Relations Board finds in the vote some defect and they call it not a secret vote and so the fellow is somehow guilty retroactively of an unfair labour practice. By the way, at this point the Labour Relations Board has the power to order him to cease to breach the order; it in effect has the power to order him back to work, which is a pretty extreme power. We have throughout 100 or 200 yeas of English law said that no court can order a man back to work. They can't force him into any particular employment.

Tough too is the provision in section seven, subsection four which requires a union to show that an employer knew that the trade union represented a majority of employees. If you have ever tried to prove in court that someone else knew something, you will find it next to impossible. You can prove that he had reasonable grounds for knowing, and you can prove that any reasonable person would have known. But to prove that the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) knew something, might be a pretty difficult task even for the talents of his seatmate.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — You don't want to listen to your neighbours all the time.

Mr. Blakeney: — I think the maintenance of membership section, this is the last major section in the bill — and the last principle I want to comment on — has some merit. Certainly an employee should be protected against arbitrary action by trade union but I think this clause throws out the baby with the bathwater. What does it do? The clause removes from a union all power to discipline a member. They can't fine him. They can't expel him. Now that is alright if that is the way the ball bounces. But if you do that you can't then say to a union that they ought to do something about wildcat strikes. You can't say to a union that they ought to discipline their picket lines. You can't say to a union that they ought to live up to their agreements. A union which cannot discipline its members by fine or dismissal or some other way, cannot be expected to live up to obligations which those members have to discharge. If you want it that way, fine. But I think our labour relations would be better if you provided that a trade union does have some power of discipline over its employees. If you want to say that an employee ought to have an appeal from an arbitrary decision of a union committee, fine. If you want to put safeguards in to protect the employee, fine. But once you remove all powers of discipline you remove the basis for unions having responsibility. I think that is an unwise move in labour relations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with all of the subjects I wanted to cover. I have indicated that while there are some good things in the bill — and I'm not here to say that everything in the bill is bad, in fact some of the things are good — there are a sufficient number of principles which I think are bad, bad for labour-management relations in Saskatchewan and which on reflection members opposite will think bad, so that I find myself unable to support the bill. I had indicated that in committee I will be

moving some amendments which I hope will cure some of the defects which I have mentioned. I hope members opposite will look at them and see whether or not they are consistent with the objectives which they want to achieve. I don't imagine they are wedded to this particular draftsmanship. It's not theirs but somebody else's and if we can make some changes which will improve the bill and will not destroy the objectives which the government wants to achieve, I think members opposite ought to look at them fairly. That I think, Mr. Speaker, is all I want to say. As I have already indicated, I find myself unable to support the bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: —I draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I could answer all the questions that have been asked. Some of my friends across the way have generally indicated or tried to indicate that they are standard bearers of the rights of people and they are prepared to fight for the right of something at the expense of the individual employee.

I noticed that, as they have been speaking, that one person is expendable somewhere. I say to this house, Mr. Speaker, and everywhere I can that no group of people, no employer or no association, in our society should enjoy anything at the expense of the rights of one single human being.

I will try and deal with some of the points that were mentioned. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was mentioning that the Liberal platform said that it would maintain the union rights and security. Nowhere in this act does this deny the union rights or their security. If there is, you can bring it up in Committee of the Whole where you will have the opportunity but nowhere in that act does this deny the union rights.

Then, of course, he went on to say that many people disagree with the amendments. Well, I can turn around and say that many people do agree with the amendments. Does the hon. member want an election on this alone to find out whether they agree or disagree? The hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) when he was Attorney General made a bobble of the time question. I wonder is this the type of mishandling that you want to have? We are bound to have differences here.

The Leader of the Opposition was mentioning a moment ago as well, the history of the government in order to labour. He said "Last year they introduced a Labour bill; and the opposition and labour unions fought it, and it was not presented." Nowhere at any time was the labour bill brought in last year did the opposition have the opportunity to say anything in this house. It was only through the efforts of the Federation of Labour who met the government that it was withdrawn.

Then he went on to criticize the Labour Relations Board, the deputy of the department, and so on and so forth. I think this is true to Socialist principles to try and undermine the institutions of government and some of the staff. Of course, I will agree

with him on one thing that he said. He said the industrial peace is good for the economy. I can say to members of this house that you cannot legislate industrial peace.

Some mention was made by an hon. member in regard to conscientious objectors. There was mention that there was no place where conscientious objectors were refused admission to a union. this is so. But he is denied the right not to join as a conscientious objector. Whoever mentioned that, I would just like to ask him "Are you the type of person that would deny a person his religious rights?" It seems to be that way.

I believed that when I introduced the bill, Mr. Speaker, I gave all the reasons necessary why the bill was to be introduced and all the reasons why every section was brought in. Now, I don't think that any person has strayed more from the facts than the hon. member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek). What I found rather despicable — if I may use this word — of attacking a person outside this house who has no opportunity to answer questions in this house. I think that this is most unfair by any member of this legislature. Not that I have any particular love for anyone in particular, but I think this is a despicable attitude on the part of anyone.

Mr. Walker: — Who was it? Hal Banks, is that it? Somebody criticize Jimmy Hoffa? Your buddies.

Mr. Coderre: — The hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) did mention something that he did not like to see in the act. It was the question of "trade dispute"; it's just a question of wording and I am sure that many matters of the bill that people do not agree with can possibly be resolved in committee much better than they can here.

Also there was some mention about section four, subsection three, which I won't go into detail about decisions of the board. This government felt, and the committee felt, and I concurred with the committee, that when a contract was entered into by two parties that the contract should be maintained as such until the expiry date allowed within the contract. Regardless of what we may think, I don't think that the Labour Relations Board or the government should have any authority to change and not recognize this contract which was entered in good faith.

Some question was mentioned about arbitration procedure and I think that that can be dealt with much better in committee. I think that I explained it quite clearly, what was meant, what was the intent, what was the purpose, so without repeating myself I think we can leave it that way.

Now the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) mentioned something in regard to the amendments. The committee did intend to bring it as it was drafted, otherwise I am sure the committee would not have brought in amendments as such. They could easily have written out a report outlining the procedure, but they brought this report in as amendments. Now the hon. member knows full well that these amendments, when they are brought in, may not conform specifically or exactly to the present term or type phraseology that is used in the legislature. This is where the changes have been. But if anywhere throughout the bill, there are areas that don't seem to conform, when we get into Committee of the Whole, if it doesn't seem to conform to the intent of the committee, I am sure

the government would be more than happy to have a good look at it. Sure there are bound to be drafting errors to be corrected. This has happened from time to time and I don't believe that there is one bill that is brought into the house where amendments are not corrected by the committee.

I would just like to say another few words about what has been said yesterday. As every person knows labour legislation is economic legislation. Under the Collective Bargaining Agreement the employer and the agent and his employees set rates of pay, hours of work, holidays and other conditions of employment. These are factors that determine the cost of labour in any given industry or business. It is frequently considered desirable by either management or the union or both that when they enter into an agreement for a period of two or three years, this type of agreement usually allows management to escalate its labour costs over a reasonable period of time. It affords stability in labour-management relations for a much longer period of time. In asking their employees to enter into contracts for terms exceeding one year employers at times must grant concessions. The hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) knows that this often happens in wages and other matters that they would not make if they were signing a one-year agreement. You will find that there is more leeway given in long-term agreements. but this is part of the give and take of a collective bargaining agreement. We must give these concessions to receive concessions.

Under our present legislation an employer will always take a risk in granting contract concessions in order to receive a term of agreement for more than one year and the hon. member from Moose Jaw knows that. Under provisions of section 30, subsection three, a trade union can open up such an agreement and demand negotiations say ten months after an agreement was entered into. For the same reason my hon. friend from Moose Jaw knows this and has mentioned that 80 per cent of the collective bargaining agreements in this province contain a clause whereby arbitration shall be the terminal process of any grievance or dispute arising out of a contract. This type of clause arises as a result of bargaining and in many cases definite concessions are granted before it is included in the contract. Under the present legislation this clause arrived at by collective agreement can be ignored by either party if they don't care to apply it in a dispute. That's right. Surely it is in the best interest of industrial peace and stability for firm principles to be established: (1) Where the parties have agreed to a three year contract that contract should be abided by; (2) that where the parties provide for arbitration, in their agreements, they should live up to that contract. I might point out that in every other jurisdiction of this country, parties must arbitrate grievances, grievance disputes, whether they agree to do so or not. I believe we have much better faith in the process of bargaining agreement than probably our neighbouring provinces. We feel that the parties can decide whether arbitration or some other types of grievance procedure is better suited to the purpose. All I can say and all we can say to this is that if you agree to arbitration then you must arbitrate.

I would like to add in conclusion, that collective bargaining agreements have been going on for a long time with and without acts. These amendments will not affect in the least labour-management bargaining agreements or the bargaining process. Not in the least. I challenge any member across to show me where any clause brings legal entities into effect. If there is I can assure this house that these things will be rectified. Many smoke screens have been put

up this afternoon. This government has the guts to do what it is doing in this respect, we are doing it in a fair and objective way that will give the employee the maximum rights that he has. I can assure you that if you have any criticism to be made it can be made in Committee of the Whole, and if you want to then, you will have an opportunity to earn your pay.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The motion was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 31

Thatcher	MacDougall	Romuld
Howes	Grant	Weatherald
McFarlane	Coderre	MacLennan
Boldt	Bjarnason	Larochelle
Cameron	Trapp	Hooker
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Coupland
Heald	MacDonald	Gardner (Moosomin)
Gardiner (Melville)	Gallagher	Mitchell
Guy	Breker	Pederson
Merchant (Mrs.)	Leith	Loken
Radloff		

NAYS — 25

Lloyd	Willis	Baker
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Snyder
Wood	Nicholson	Broten
Nollet	Kramer	Larson
Walker	Dewhurst	Robbins
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Pepper
Blakeney	Michayluk	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Davies	Smishek	Thibault
Link		

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. D. G. MacLennan, for second reading of Bill No. 88, **An Act to amend The Liquor Licensing Act**.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I asked to have this debate adjourned for two reasons. I wanted to have a little more time to study the bill and I wanted to get a little further information.

I have spent a little time studying the bill and I have got a little further information. I am opposed to this bill in principle for several reasons. There are some parts of the bill which I would agree with. There are other parts which I take exception to. I am not going to speak at length tonight. I can say something more about these when we come to committee. I find it rather intriguing that the member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) seems to be such an eager beaver when it comes to providing more commercial outlets. Here he is providing for cocktail lounges in auditoria which do not exist, may never exist, but he was in a

terrific hurry to see that they have cocktail lounges. I think not even the member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) would suggest that this type of an outlet would not increase consumption.

I note that there was provision for those under 21 to enter the cocktail lounge and remain there. It doesn't say how young they can be. I can see no reason for this. He mentioned something about the plans of the auditoria that necessitate having to go through the cocktail lounge. Well, plans can be changed. I can see no reason why a cocktail lounge, if such is to be, should be placed in such a position that everyone has to be in there and can remain there. But the main thing I wanted to mention at this point deals with the change in principle regarding aircraft. I got in touch with the Manager of Air Canada to find out exactly the situation in regard to liquor on aeroplanes. I got this following information. No liquor is served on aeroplanes, either in economy class or first class in Canada, with the exception of the Toronto-New York run and the Montreal-New York run, and, of course, the North Atlantic run and the Caribbean. He tells me that they do not wish to serve liquor on the planes unless all the provinces are in agreement because they don't want to have to be opening and closing the bar. He tells me that they are not pushing this, that no other province, as far as he knows, is suggesting this. This would be a first for Saskatchewan. This would be a lever for other provinces to follow. I can see no reason why we should be the province that would ask for this when no one that I know of is pushing it and when the other provinces are not concerned about it. According to the Manager of Air Canada, as far as he knows, they are not asking for it.

I certainly will oppose this section of the bill, I don't want to take up any more time tonight because I know we are pressed for time but I will not vote for second reading of this bill.

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Before we put the second reading to a vote, there was an inquiry made a number of years ago, a legislative committee was set up to examine new liquor outlets and the recommendations were made to the legislature by this committee and the recommendations I think, were pretty well implemented. The purpose was to endeavour to bring about a more dignified and more refined atmosphere in liquor licensing outlets. This objective has been pretty well achieved. Now under this act which permits the introduction of juke boxes and the next step, I suppose will be slot machines, you will have a bedlam in these drinking establishments rather than a quiet dignified atmosphere. We will have a whole lot of hoop-la and "Downtown" and all the rest of it. I think it doesn't develop the same kind of atmosphere, certainly it detracts from the objective we had in mind in improving the atmosphere of liquor outlets previously.

In that respect I am certainly opposed to the provisions of the bill. I can recall back in the thirties — I hope we never come to slot machines — that certain under-world characters in the States made millions of dollars out of these devices. They were to entice the public to spend their money, whether it is on liquor or whether it is through jukeboxes, or whether it is slot machines. I think it is undesirable, particularly, when we would like to improve the general atmosphere of liquor establishments.

Mr. D. G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, I have just a few comments. I am sure the remarks and the conscientious examination of this bill by the member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) are

greatly appreciated by all concerned with this very major and I am sure, serious bill as it affects all in the province.

Now, as in the past, the member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) is certainly familiar with liquor legislation. The greatest changes brought about regarding liquor and the consumption of liquor were brought about a few years ago by the party opposite when they were in power, it is my feeling these changes were for the best. One of these great changes dealt with mixed drinking. I think it has improved the atmosphere and the conduct in all points in the province that enjoy beverage room facilities as opposed to the previous facilities of the beer parlour. The décor, the cleanliness and the conduct in all beverage rooms became a great improvement over the previous facilities. Under the former government licensed dining rooms were made possible. Again, the eating establishments of the province have been vastly improved over the former eating establishments that we knew in the province of Saskatchewan.

Cocktail lounges also were introduced by the party opposite when they were in power. This certainly brought in the most subdued form of drinking that this province has witnessed. Again, in comments on her questioning of the aeroplane licenses, I point out that ours are only for interprovincial flights, Trans Canada by nature. This legislation was suggested for our consideration by air companies that are interested and concerned in interprovincial traffic. I may point out the former government brought in legislation much similar to this when it brought in legislation approving the consumption of alcoholic beverages on trains. This is a very similar type of legislation.

Now, as far as the member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) and I expected him to comment on this particular bill in light of the fact that he had a message a few minutes ago. I am in agreement possibly with the member for Cutknife and the lady member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) when she mentioned in preliminary remarks that she was all for juke boxes in licensed establishments because it might drive people away. Well, I have my opinion and it might be in agreement with hers on that. This particular type of legislation is in existence in possibly the most conservative province of Canada, Alberta.

Now, as far as slot machines, this is not contemplated. As a matter of fact they are prohibited by law. This bill will not affect the existing laws governing gambling devices. This bill permits only games such as shuffleboard. This is not a innovation, but is in use in the province of Alberta. So in my opinion, this legislation is progressive and good legislation in every sense of the word. I commend its adoption.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart, the Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o’clock p.m.