

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session – Fifteenth Legislature

Wednesday, September 7th, 1966
11:00 o'clock a.m.

This being the day appointed by Proclamation of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, dated the Seventh day of September, 1966, for the meeting of the Third session of the Fifteenth Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, and the Assembly having met:

Mr. Speaker informed the Assembly that he had received a communication from the Private Secretary to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor stating that His Honour would open the session at eleven o'clock a.m. today, Wednesday, the Seventh day of September, 1966.

11:00 o'clock a.m.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber and having taken his seat upon the Throne, was pleased to open the Session with the following speech:

Mr. Speaker,

Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is my privilege to welcome you to the Third session of the Fifteenth Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

Last week the employees of the gas division of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation went on strike.

Therefore, you have been called to this session to give legislative effect to a bill to ensure the continuation of certain essential services.

I leave you now to the business of the session, with full confidence that you will favourably discharge your duties and responsibilities.

May Divine Providence continue to bless our province and guide this Legislature in all its deliberations.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

**QUESTION RE HOLIDAY PAY FOR SASKATCHEWAN
POWER CORPORATION EMPLOYEES**

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Is the government aware that the management of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation informed some union members in the head office that they could go home at noon on September 2nd (just before the strike started) and that they would get full pay for that day?

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — No. I doubt if the statement is correct.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Will the government investigate to find out if this was done?

September 7, 1966

Mr. Thatcher: — I shall be pleased to look into the matter.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Will the corporation give a full day's pay to all employees for September 2nd if it is so generous as to offer it to some?

Mr. Thatcher: — No. The government asked that the strike be postponed until Tuesday. The union refused and took the strikers out on Friday thereby depriving them of three days' holiday pay.

QUESTION RE NEGOTIATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS IN THE SASKATCHEWAN POWER CORPORATION

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — What is present stage of negotiations with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation?

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — What increase in wages has that union asked for?

Mr. Thatcher: — It has asked initially for 16 per cent.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — What has been offered by the corporation?

Mr. Thatcher: — No offer has yet been made by the corporation.

QUESTION RE INCREASE IN WAGES

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Since there has been no statement with respect to the amount of money representing the differences between the two parties, could the Premier inform me how many dollars is represented by each percentage increase in the wages of the employees currently on strike?

Mr. Thatcher: — I would suggest that this information be given when the bill is before the committee. I shall certainly make it available at that time.

QUESTION RE COPIES OF BILL NO. 2

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — I wonder if we may have the leave of the House to proceed without copies of the Bill.

Mr. Lloyd: — Under duress.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — I can assure the House that copies of the Bill will be here very shortly.

Mr. L.M. Larson (Pelly): — I object strenuously to the Legislature starting debate on second reading before a copy of the Bill is in the hands of the Members. I haven't seen the legislation and I would like to have it before me so that I know what we are talking about.

SECOND READING

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 2 — An Act Respecting the Continuation of Services Essential to the Public.

He said:

This special session of the Legislature has been called for one immediate and urgent purpose, to find an appropriate method of settling a serious strike at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation which threatens the economy of the province.

It has, however, a deeper, long-term purpose, the passing of legislation that will permit the Government to intervene in the future in any utility or hospital dispute which imperils Saskatchewan's economic health or the provision of necessary services to its people.

It is this Government's conviction that the uncalled-for strike of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers' Union against the Saskatchewan Power Corporation raises grave questions about the degree of public responsibility displayed by the leaders of that union. It also poses a distinct and growing threat to the welfare of the public.

I would remind any Member who doubts the validity of this statement to consider certain basic and inescapable facts. One hundred and eight thousand Saskatchewan families use natural gas to heat their homes. Schools, old-age homes, and hospitals depend on gas for heating or cooking, or both. Many of our vital industries, as well as our mines, depend on gas to operate turbines and supply steam. If that gas supply is shut off thousands of our citizens will be out of work. It must be obvious that, if by some chance the electrical workers took similar strike action, our whole economy would be at a standstill.

Today, management for a short time can keep the gas utility in operation and no one is suffering. This would not be true if such a strike took place in winter. This is the very real danger we face today. It is in acknowledgement of this danger that our Government, after most careful consideration, has concluded that this strike presents an intolerable risk to the people of Saskatchewan. We cannot, in the public interest, continue to accept that risk.

In reaching this conclusion, we have been acutely aware of the importance of preserving, within all reasonable limits, the rights of unions to exercise their own free judgments about their own affairs. However, it is our most careful judgement that, in this case, those limits have been flagrantly exceeded.

I ask you to remember how this strike came about. Negotiations between the union leadership and management were carried on

September 7, 1966

for the lengthy period of almost five months. The union's leaders, during this entire period, and despite the most persuasive evidence of the unreasonableness of their position, persisted wilfully in their demand for average increases of eight per cent. The corporation, taking into careful consideration its own debts and its public obligation, offered approximately four and one-half per cent, an increase that, by any reasonable standard, meets the test of equity or fairness to both sides. Then, the corporation went even further. In the interests of bringing about a speedy and congenial settlement, it hinted at its willingness to make additional, modest increases. The union leaders rebuffed this offer, demanded eight per cent or nothing, and then broke off negotiations after an abrupt and ill-conceived strike vote.

Now, what we must ask is, why did the company not accede to the union leaders' demands? There is, after all, the glittering precedent set by the Federal Government in its lavish settlements with the longshoremen, the grain handlers, railwaymen, and so on, settlements that have been extravagant as to raise the spectre of inflation throughout the country. Is this the sort of precedent that the people of Saskatchewan, who have always been notable for their practical judgment and their self-sufficiency, want to see their Government follow? We think not.

Is the federal example sufficient reason for this Government to brush aside any objection to what the union leadership has contended is a paltry eight per cent? We think not.

Are the people of Saskatchewan indifferent to whether their Government keeps its own house in order and manages the affairs of the province in a practical and economical way? We think not.

On the contrary, we who have the privilege and the responsibility of governing this province are altogether convinced that the provincial interest clearly dictates that excessive wage demands, patterned on extravagant settlements elsewhere, must be promptly and vigorously denied.

We take this attitude for several reasons of importance.

(1) It always must be borne in mind that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is a publicly-owned utility and the heavy burden of any excessive wage increases imposed upon that corporation will, inevitably, be borne by the public or the taxpayers generally.

(2) Careful and eminently just comparisons by our officials show that SPC office workers already are among the highest paid workers in this province. At the same time wages of the gas workers compare most favourably with the wages paid in other segments of industry. In other words, as we see it, these workers are conspicuously at no disadvantage as far as their fellow citizens are concerned.

(3) The overall financial position of the SPC is such that any uncalled-for invasion of its resources seriously weakens the position of this publicly-owned utility as a solvent, efficient business. In other words, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, despite what the union leadership may profess to believe, is not invulnerable to such attack. Surely, it is in the public interest that this utility, which has a staggering \$530,000,000 debt, should be strengthened and made more self-sufficient.

Let me remind the hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, that when this Government took office, 92 1/2 per cent of the Saskatchewan Power

Corporation was owned by bond-holders, many of them Americans, and only 7 1/2 per cent of the company was owned by the people. And it's only in recent years, indeed only since this Government took office that this public utility has been able to generate any real profits whatever. Even last year, even with the improvement in management, the return on capital investment was a meagre two per cent.

Now, this Government is determined through prudent management to improve the financial health of this utility. Our Government believes that it is absolutely essential that reasonable profits be used to increase the public's ownership of the corporation. Our Government does not believe that any unreasonable part of these profits should be dropped into any union's lap at the brusque demand of the union's leaders. On the contrary, I repeat, this utility is owned by the people of Saskatchewan, and they, the people, must pay the bill. It is the obligation of the Government to be, at all times, businesslike in the interests of the people.

(4) I want to remind this House of the significant fact that gas and electricity rates are already substantially higher in Saskatchewan than in neighboring provinces. For example, gas rates in Alberta today are from 30 to 50 per cent lower than they are in Saskatchewan. This is a very real concern to us . . .

An Hon. Member: — What about Manitoba?

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, if you want to talk about Manitoba, you have a further distance to go to transport it and it's a little higher. But Manitoba . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . Manitoba electricity rates are 70 per cent lower than they are in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now, this is of real concern to us because we, unlike our Socialist friends, want new industries to locate here and we want our gas and our electricity rates to be competitive. We know that, as we steadily improve the profit picture of SPC, we can do this by permitting our rates to come down and become more competitive.

(5) This Government, let me emphasize, is unalterably opposed to unreasonable pressures from those who fail to concede, as in this matter, that there is more at stake than their own immediate gain. This Government will resist now, and at any time, all such unreasonable pressures.

(6) In considering whether the demands of the union leadership are unreasonable, let us look at the agreements which other Government employees' organizations have signed for the coming year: the Civil Service signed for 4 per cent; the Telephone Union, about 3.5 per cent; the Brick Plant, about 3.2 per cent; the Bus Company, about 3.5 per cent; the Sodium Sulphate Plant, a much more profitable company than SPC, signed for 3.2 per cent;

September 7, 1966

the Insurance Company, for about 4 per cent. Now, compare those other increases with the 8 per cent which is being demanded today by the OCAW Union. We believe that in all fairness these agreements must be kept in mind when the present agreement with the Power employees is signed.

(7) Finally, there is the feeling throughout the country that the rash of strikes in the past year can only feed the fires of inflation. And inflation helps no one. Not even the wage earners. If pay increases are not related to a real increase in the value of goods produced, our very national prosperity will be jeopardized.

It is for these main reasons, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Saskatchewan firmly supports a Power Corporation decision to reject the demands of the OCAW. In taking this attitude, we are confident of province-wide support. We are confident of the good sense of the Saskatchewan public. We are confident of the public's desire for fair play. And we are especially confident of the farmers' support in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now, I would tell my hon. friend for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) that there is no group that has suffered so seriously in the last several years from strikes as has the farmer. The latest series really started I guess about a year ago, with the grain handlers' strike at Vancouver. A settlement was finally negotiated but many shipments were missed in the process.

A few weeks later, right in the middle of harvest, hundreds of oil workers decided to strike at the risk of depriving the farmers of motive power.

This spring it was the turn of the longshoremen of Montreal, Quebec, and Three Rivers, to walk out, and again seriously impede the free flow of grain to markets. Hundreds of ships were idle for days upon end waiting for grain cargoes. Surely the 30 per cent wage settlement which was used induce these men back to work was outrageous. As one federal Member said, it was like pouring gasoline on a fire.

Then the railroaders across Canada went on strike, again right in the middle of harvest. Congestion arose at virtually every elevator in the prairie provinces.

Mr. Speaker, in all of these strikes and in the present strike that we are discussing this morning, it is the farmer who pays a good portion of the bill when settlement is made. And I can tell my friends opposite that in my opinion the farmers generally are getting fed up with this prolonged serious of strikes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Certainly, the efforts of the CCF-NDF to convince him that he and labor should join hands politically in the Socialist party will be looked upon with even greater doubt.

Now, I turn to the Bill before us. Details can be discussed in committee but there are two main provisions I should like to refer to.

The first, of course, is to provide for an Arbitration Committee, if other measures fail in achieving a settlement. Under the Bill, both the union and the company are required to appoint one representative to sit on that Committee of Arbitration. They then will try and agree upon a chairman who must be a judge of one of the courts. If they cannot agree then the chairman will be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. That three-man committee, having made a decision, will in effect be giving a binding decision, a decision binding on the union, a decision binding on the company.

Now, the second major provision deals with a situation in which the employees covered by the Bill do not return to work within ten days after the date of settlement. Under such circumstances, and if the Government is satisfied that the union has not made every reasonable effort to have its members return to work, then that union may be decertified, and it will no longer be the legal bargaining agent of the employees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in passing, I would point out to the House that this legislation is not unique. The provinces of British Columbia and Ontario have legislation which is very much identical. The provinces of Alberta and Manitoba have provisions which achieve precisely the same objective. So we are not doing anything today that other provinces haven't for the most part done.

When my Socialist friends talk about compulsory arbitration I would remind the people of Saskatchewan that a similar crisis arose in 1955 under the CCF administration with the same union. The CCF Government of the day, under pressure, acted in almost precisely the same manner as we are doing today. They drafted a Bill providing for binding arbitration. They called the union leaders in and they said, "You'll settle or you'll have this Bill".

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, will the Premier accept a question?

Mr. Thatcher: — Certainly.

Mr. Lloyd: — Will he indicate the date on which that Bill was suggested to this Legislature?

Mr. Thatcher: — If you'll just wait one minute. You prepared the Bill and the union backed down so you did not bring it in. But you were prepared to bring it in.

And another thing, Mr. Speaker, I am sure in this debate we are going to hear a lot from my hon. friends opposite that this 4.5 per cent is woefully inadequate, that under today's conditions this is a paltry increase. Well, I ask the union members of this province to note the actions of a Socialist government in Great Britain under the same circumstances. Mr. Wilson and his Socialist friends haven't offered 4.5 per cent; they have frozen all wages for a six months' period, no increases.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

September 7, 1966

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — What about your big business men? Freeze them.

Mr. Thatcher: — My hon. friend (Mr. Kramer) couldn't read the Bill if we had given it to him so I don't know what he is chirping up for.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going through a period of widespread labor-management discord. People on this continent, in Canada and the United States and elsewhere, now realize that a single labor union, until its demands are met, can halt the country's railways, tie up its shipping, shut down its steel mills, silence the newspapers of a great city and bankrupt one of them in the process, walk out on patients suffering or dying hospitals, stop the export and marketing of farm products, ground 60 per cent of the nation's airlines, and prevent others from taking the jobs that its own members have refused to perform. The public have had to stand by, virtually helpless. We say that strikes of this nature can bring hardship and disruption to the economic fabric of the nation.

There are those, and I am one of them, who believe that, in its own interest, the country eventually is going to have to introduce legislation to solve socially crippling labor disputes. Perhaps some mechanism such as a 'labor court' would be the answer. This type of legislation is not new in the democratic world.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Hitler did it.

Mr. Thatcher: — I heard the hon. Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) chirping, "Hitler did it". Hitler didn't do it; Sweden did it and that's the country all my friends are always talking about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — And in Sweden it has been extremely beneficial in preventing dangerous economic dislocations. Labor itself in Sweden has grudgingly admitted to a better social atmosphere with the change. It is in recognition of the profound value of such legislation to a democratic society that this Government is today introducing an Act to forestall paralyzing strikes in vital fields.

In conclusion, I would like to make three things perfectly clear.

- (1) This legislation will never be used by our Government to bully, to oppress or intimidate any union that is engaged in legitimate negotiations to advance the reasonable interests of its members.
- (2) This legislation, moreover, will not be employed in the current dispute until this Government is assured that every other avenue of approach has been explored.
- (3) However, and I want to leave no doubt on this subject, this legislation most emphatically will be employed, in future, whenever the public interest is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) that an Act Respecting the Continuation of Services Essential to the Public be now read a second time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, after having listened to the Premier in what he suggested was to be an explanation of the Bill I think it becomes plain that not only did the Opposition Members not have an opportunity to read and study the Bill but the Premier did not have an opportunity to read and study it either. Certainly he made precious little attempt to explain what the Bill really says, what the Bill really will make possible, to this Legislature or to the public of Saskatchewan. He skated around making any definitive statement about the Bill itself. He did draw in some completely irrelevant matters with respect to Great Britain and Sweden. Either the Premier must know that the situations in those countries are different or else he chose to mislead the House and the public in suggesting that there is any similarity whatsoever between what this Bill proposes and the action taken and the action possible in those countries.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is indeed a strange title for this proposal which is put before us. It is called a Bill to ensure the continuation of certain essential services and I hope to demonstrate that this is indeed a misleading title for this particular legislation.

I suggest that the question before us is, in main, this. It is a question of the Government's failure to cope with the situation which led up to the strike which is now in effect in the province of Saskatchewan. The question is the Government's failure to remove any danger or possibility of Saskatchewan people being refused essential services because of the inability to deal adequately with their working force.

The Premier has suggested that the offers which the Power Corporation made met any tests of equity. If this is the case, if he is indeed confident that that is the situation, the obvious question for him to answer is, why then didn't it submit some other tests of equity? Why didn't they attempt some of the obvious moves of mediation or conciliation or voluntary arbitration rather than the kind of medicine it is now trying to shove down the throats, not just of the union concerned, but of many other people in the province of Saskatchewan. I think it became very evident, Mr. Speaker, as we listened to the Premier, that one of the reasons behind this Bill is one more attempt on the part of Members opposite to make divisions within our country. This is one more attempt to stir up animosity and suspicion and hatred between farm groups and other groups, an attempt to make political capital of this situation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier was quoted in the press sometime earlier as suggesting that this Bill would have teeth in it. May I say, Mr. Speaker, this Bill doesn't have teeth, it has fangs, dripping fangs, not pleasant to contemplate. This Bill asks the Legislature to put into the hands of the Government the right to

September 7, 1966

make compulsory arbitration applicable to a large number of Saskatchewan working people and Saskatchewan employers. In turn, it puts the Government in the position to determine wage levels and other benefits for a very considerable segment of the people of our province.

I submit this is not the power that ought to be put into the hands of any Government, and even more so it is not the power that ought to be in the hands of this Government that sits opposite. I am more convinced after having listened to the Premier's philosophy this morning.

Let it be noted, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is not confined to workers who are currently on strike in the province of Saskatchewan in one industry. Nor is this Bill confined to those plus other employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Nor is this Bill confined to those workers who are on strike plus the other workers in the Power Corporation alone, plus the hospital workers. This Bill includes workers in geriatric and mental health centres; certainly other employees of many municipalities are covered; certainly other employees of the Provincial Government are covered; certainly the situation is there that the Government could say janitors are covered and stationary engineers are covered. The Premier shakes his head. Let him read the Bill which I think he has not as yet done.

This Bill is wide, too wide, under any circumstances. It is wider even, I submit, than the Government perhaps believes it to be. The Bill isn't confined to those employees in those industries who may be actually out on strike any time now or in the future. Strike action, according to this Bill, is not necessary in order to trigger the Government's cannons supplied to them by this legislation. The Government can go into action whenever, and I quote, "in the opinion of" the Premier and his Cabinet a state of emergency exists. It is not necessary that there be a strike. It is necessary only that in the opinion of the Premier and his Cabinet a state of emergency shall exist.

A "strike" is defined to include "a slowdown or other concerted activity on the part of employees designed to restrict or limit output" in the opinion of the Premier and his Cabinet.

So the Bill is not confined to the specific workers who are at the moment on strike. The Bill is not confined, so far as future application is concerned, to people who may be on strike. It is applicable for other reasons as well.

The Bill has other objectionable fangs in addition to this. We find these when we look at some of the penalties for alleged wrongdoing and some of the definitions of wrongdoing. May I say this, Mr. Speaker, that if this Bill were applicable to the workforce on Canadian railways then every railway union in Canada today would stand in danger of being decertified. If this Bill were applicable to Canadian railways there isn't a railway union in Canada today which would not have its certification rights placed in jeopardy. Not only would they stand in danger of being decertified but they would stand in danger of being forever debarred from representing railway employees in the future.

I quote from the Act again:

The union, so decertified, shall no longer be eligible to represent any of the employees.

No longer. Permanently debarred. Decertified.

Mr. Thatcher: — By whom?

Mr. Lloyd: — Read the Bill, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Thatcher: — I helped write it.

Mr. Lloyd: — Well, that I can believe, Mr. Speaker, but like the Premier in so many instances he never bothered to read again what he had written in the first place.

The Act says the union so decertified shall no longer be eligible to represent any of the employees. Decertified by whom? By a Labor Relations Board? Not as I read the Bill. Decertified by the Government, decertified by the Government without any guaranteed right to argue the point, decertified by the Government without any opportunity for appeal. One can believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier wrote the Bill.

To proceed, this Bill provides penalties not only because of actions which have been taken. It provides that an injunction may be issued and again I quote from the Bill:

. . . if likely to act.

Injunctions may be taken without any opportunity for the union to state its case. “Big Brother”, the Government, can go around reading minds, interpreting intentions and applying penalties.

This Bill is compost heap of many of the most vicious, least democratic statutes in Canada. If it is not a contravention of the Canadian and Saskatchewan Bill of Rights, it is at least a total contradiction.

This is an unnecessary session at which the Government expects us to settle a problem which should not have arisen. The solution offered is the wrong proposal introduced at the wrong time. This Liberal government has wanted compulsory arbitration and has contrived a situation which it hoped would be conducive to acceptance of such legislation. It did not dare to introduce such a Bill this spring. It is now attempting to exploit the emotion of a strike to make palatable that which would be otherwise unpalatable.

On July 27, 1965, this Government appointed a Labour Management Review Committee. As recently as mid-March of 1966 this Committee’s report on the Trade Union Act was sent to the Government. Does it recommend compulsory arbitration? It does not. Does it recommend study of compulsory arbitration? It does not. It had, I am convinced, some urging to so recommend. But it did not. If there had been need for the drastic action now proposed by the Government, surely the Committee would have made some recommendation, or at least some reference. It did not. It made reference to arbitration only “when a collective bargaining agreement contains a provision for final settlement by arbitration”, in other words, where voluntary arbitration was agreed to by the bargaining parties. There is no relationship, no similarity here to the present proposals. On the contrary, in its express of basic philosophy the Committee, in my opinion, warned the Government against imposing compulsory arbitration by law.

September 7, 1966

The Committee approached its task of making recommendations for making amendments to the Act, bearing in mind what seemed to its members as being matters of fundamental importance. First, the Committee was of the opinion that so far as it is possible labor negotiations should be left to management and the trade union to carry on with as little interference from outside as possible. Members found themselves in full agreement with the statement of principle as set forth in the following from the brief of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour:

‘It is an expression in statutory form of the liberal view that, given the necessary protection of rights by the law, men should be free to work out their own affairs with government interfering as little as possible. In this respect, the Saskatchewan Act stands in marked contrast to other Canadian labour relations legislation, where the process of collective bargaining is hedged with a multitude of restrictions, and where government presumes the right to interfere in the process and subject the parties to advice and suggestions whether or not such interference, advice or suggestions are desired by either party’.

The Government’s own Committee said:

The Saskatchewan Act stands in marked contrast to other Canadian labour relations legislation.

The Committee applauded this contrast. Now this same Government proposes to remove some of the most significant features of that contrast. Even to the advice of its own Committee the Government turns a deaf ear, to advice scarcely six months old.

Now, the Government chooses the wrong time to do the wrong thing. It proposes compulsory arbitration, not just for gas and office employees of the SPC, also for hospital employees also for all other SPC employees, also for many others. It does so before insisting that normal attempts to settle the one existing problem be made. If there was need for a session, it should deal with one item, one only. That one is the current impasse between some employees of the SPC and the Corporation. If the Government wishes to propose more general legislation, withdrawing the right to strike for more employees in other occupations, let them do so at another time.

We are expecting another session November. A November session is soon enough. If there is no November session, the Government could restrain its eagerness to open its Pandora’s box of compulsory arbitration until the regular session. If it is never introduced it will be soon enough. If it is never introduced it will mean one less piece of legislation to be changed by the CCF when we return to office.

Or does the Government anticipate that its inability or unwillingness to deal with other employee groups will produce more problems for which it has no solution other than removal of rights by some strong-arm method?

I ask you to note that the union representing the remainder of power employees, “a much more sensible union”, quoting the Premier, has asked for a 16 per cent increase, sixteen per cent vs. eight per cent suggested by the union currently on strike.

If we pass this legislation now both the corporation and the union will ask for more, or cling more doggedly to present positions than if the process of free collective bargaining were not to be interfered with.

I also ask you to note that many agreements with hospital workers are due to expire by the end of the year. These situation should be faced using tested collective bargaining procedures, including as necessary all offices of mediation and conciliation and voluntary arbitration, before proposing the drastic remedy (a remedy by no means certain) of compulsory arbitration imposed by legislation. The Government's present legislative proposal, applicable to problems which have never occurred, to situations which have not arisen, interfere with traditional, hard-earned, highly respected rights of free collective bargaining.

Proposals of Government legislation should be reduced to deal with the one, current situation, that alone. That should have been the maximum request for authority to abridge rights of working people which even a Government as insensitive to personal rights as this one should ask of this Legislature.

But there is a prior question which must be asked. I have said this is an unnecessary session of the Legislature to attempt settlement of an unnecessary problem. To what extent has the Government tried the usual procedures to reach a settlement? The bare minimum of appearing at the negotiating table. To what extent has the Government exhausted the usual machinery, frequently successfully employed in reaching understanding and settlement, as to the sharing of responsibility and benefits of an industrial corporation? Not at all. Has conciliation been tried? No. Has mediation been tried? No. Has voluntary arbitration been suggested? No.

The record shows that this Government has made minimum use of minimum procedures and ignored available machinery to extend negotiation procedures to conciliation or mediation.

The record indicates more. Record: Negotiations began on March 18th. On August 16th management made its first wage offer, after five months of bargaining. Then in the short space of 15 days it improved its offer from zero to four per cent. Meanwhile, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool settled for 8 1/2 per cent in the first year, 4 1/2 per cent the next. Carpenters and joiners obtained ten per cent. Regina Board of Education (maintenance and caretaking), six per cent. Pioneer Electric, ten per cent.

Then without insisting on conciliation or mediation or attempting voluntary arbitration, the Government called the Legislature and proposed compulsory arbitration as a continuing law, not just for this group of employees but for several others.

I submit that this record is not accidental, it is deliberate. I submit it was part of the Government's contriving, in the hope that what is unpalatable in peace might become palatable in war, in the hope that the emotion of war would hide the Government's extension of authority into the area of innocent bystanders.

On Friday, the Premier was quoted to say:

Now they wish to test the Government's determination . . . and we are pleased to give them the chance.

September 7, 1966

The Premier is happy. Strange indeed are the springs of happiness from which some people drink, and drinking, become intoxicated from their chosen brew.

The record again is one of a vendetta against this group of employees, a conspiracy designed to destroy a union. One has only to recall the Basken case, where an official of this union, on orders direct from the Premier's desk was denied his civil and human rights. Then add to this months of near non-negotiation and provocation. The only reason the Premier is happy, as he said he was, is that he thinks the Government provocation has been successful in promoting a situation which he hopes will make the unpalatable palatable.

Somebody in the Government has been reading up on guerrilla warfare. Just as this Government chose in another instance to make an example of the City of Saskatoon and some of its staff, just as this Government castigated the United Church for daring to make some suggestions it did not like, just as this Government threatened the Prince Albert Indian-Métis Friendship Council if it did not replace an employee who wrote something the Government did not like, so this Government has centred its full political venom, its total anti-labor bias and its desire to be absolute monarch of all it surveys on this particular union.

That's the main reason why this Legislature is now in session. Fortunately the people of Saskatchewan have a deep desire to see fair play. Fortunately they distrust such misuse of political power under the guise of pressing necessity.

There is only one question this Legislature ought to face at this time: is it possible to arrange a resumption of work and services and at the same time preserve the principle of free collective bargaining? Quite clearly the Government Bill fails to provide an adequate or a considered reply. The Government's answer to this crucial question is that the question is unimportant. Its method is authoritarian; its effect is to contribute to more industrial strife; it diminishes the meaning and devastates the method of free collective bargaining. Not only should this Bill not pass this Legislature, it should never have been offered to this Legislature.

How important is this right to free collective bargaining? How important is the right to withdraw services? Let's call some witnesses. Hon. Paul Martin, a Liberal Federal Cabinet Minister said (Hansard, August 30, 1966, page 7799)

The right to strike is part of the Bill of Rights of this country.

For some groups the Government of Saskatchewan seeks to abrogate Canada's Bill of Rights. How drastic is the step proposed in the present Bill? Hon. Jean Marchand said in a recent by-election speech (La Presse, August 22nd, 1966) speaking of the pending railroad strike:

It is a serious thing, but let us not lose our heads. There are also human rights, and a government cannot do whatever it pleases. When one group is deprived of the right to strike who will say where it will stop? Today the railway employees, tomorrow the postal workers, and later, the right of association . . .

Where will it stop in Saskatchewan? Today SPC workers and hospital workers and others. Tomorrow teachers, telephone workers?

Rt. Hon. Louis St Laurent said:

. . . in our country arbitration is accepted, even in emergency, only with the greatest reluctance. It does not seem to be a satisfactory substitute for other regular processes of determining pay scales.

Hon. Mr. MacEachen (Globe Magazine, November 9, 1963) said:

When you provide for arbitration it seems to reduce the necessity or desire to settle disputes before the arbitration stage. In some cases compulsory arbitration is advocated where the public interest is involved. I don't think there is any need whatsoever in Canada to consider compulsory arbitration in the settlement of disputes at the present time, for no other reason than the rigidity it imposes on the settlement process.

Hon. Jean Marchand said:

When one group is deprived of the right to strike who will say where it will stop,

This Bill will deprive several groups.

Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent said:

It is not a satisfactory substitute for regular processes.

This Bill substitutes the less satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. MacEachen said:

There's no need in Canada to consider compulsory arbitration.

This Bill doesn't consider, it imposes, enshrines in law.

Let's call some more witnesses. A meeting of 15 experts appointed by ILO reached conclusions (November to December, 1963) on labor-management relations in the public service. The Canadian delegate was vice-chairman. The ILO unanimously refused to accept a system of compulsory arbitration because there was no guarantee either of its impartiality or of its efficiency. This Government has obviously read all the offensive statutes in Canada. It hasn't read recommendations of the International Labour Office. If read they were ignored.

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 to 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Lloyd: — When the 12:30 recess was called I was in the process of posing what seems to me to be another extremely important question that this Legislature ought to answer before it agrees to the passage of this Bill. That question was, is the method of compulsory arbitration successful in promoting good industrial relations? We, in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are certainly vitally and extremely interested in a good industrial climate. We should not forget, although I suggest that the Government seems to have

September 7, 1966

forgotten on this occasion and on others that one of the very basic needs for industrial development and production for good industrial climate is that of a good work force, a work force which is trained, experienced, secure, interested, confident in their rights, and enjoying the confidence of their employers. Production after all, Mr. Speaker, is more than resources and more than dollars. Production is people. And those people are a very important part of the industrial climate; they determine to a considerable extent the success of an industrial development. I submit that compulsory arbitration, in the way that it is outlined here before us, interferes with and militates against every one of those aids to sound, solid, secure industrial development.

The industry which comes most to mind in discussing this legislation is, of course, the power and gas industry in our province. These industries are particularly dependent on skilled and experienced personnel. Not only industrial development is at stake here but human life. The safety of personal property and of homes, these too are at stake. The industry is highly competitive, certainly it is becoming increasingly more competitive. The records show that already we have been and we are losing staff from these industries at a frightening rate, which will, in the end, jeopardize the success of these industries. One of the biggest factors I submit in this extraordinarily rapid rate of loss from these industries is the deterioration of morale in the staff, the erosion of good government-employee relationships.

I submit that that loss is really just beginning, unless we can stem it. In the province of British Columbia there are some very large hydro electric installations. This is invariably going to increase greatly the need for skilled workers in these industries, and more and more Saskatchewan workers are likely to follow that trail westward. This Bill handicaps employers generally in their search for skilled and experienced people in our work force.

The other group of people affected by this are the hospital workers. Everything I have said about the competition for skilled workers applies even more so to our hospital workers. There is across Canada a dramatic shortage of hospital workers; all of us should be painfully aware of it. If medicare comes across Canada – I regret that it is necessary to say “if” – but if it does then the demand is certainly going to be even that much greater, and we in Saskatchewan can even less afford the handicap which this kind of legislation will put upon us.

There is another question. Does compulsory arbitration really merit many of the songs which from time to time are sung in its praise? The Premier sang, although slightly off-key, some of those songs this morning. Well, let's take a look at some of the records and some of the opinions which are readily available with regard to the results, happy and otherwise, of compulsory arbitration.

Australia is frequently referred to by the exponents of widespread compulsory arbitration, yet in a very recent year in Australia 14.7 per cent of their non-agricultural workers were involved in strikes. That same year only 6.8 per cent were involved in strikes in the United States.

Now, it is true that the Australian strikes for the greater part were of shorter duration, but that wasn't true of all of them.

For example, there was in that country a strike in the copper industry beginning in 1964. It continued during the rest of 1964 and into 1965, spanning a period in all of some eight months. Here was an important national industry in which there was a strike lasting for a period of eight months, in a country where strikes are banned a illegal, where compulsory arbitration is the order of the day and has been for some time. They have more strikes, although many of them not as long as those in other countries. So, by the record of what happened in that country, compulsory arbitration is certainly not infallible.

Secondly, may I suggest that even many people who are not totally convinced that compulsory arbitration is really very bad do express many doubts and raise many questions about its effectiveness. Let me give to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, a series of quotations which are taken from the Royal Commission report on Compulsory Arbitration and Disputes Affecting Hospitals and their Employees in the province of Ontario, published in July of 1964. First they comment on Australia's experience, and let me read this from the report:

Although the record of strikes and lock-outs in Australia since the introduction of the arbitration system does not clearly indicate the system's contribution to industrial peace, the fact that a substantial amount of industrial conflict has occurred is at least sufficient to show that the highest hopes of the founders of arbitration may have been frustrated; industrial peace has certainly not been completely achieved.

Compulsory arbitration is no overall panacea.

Thirdly, the Commissioners themselves have this to say:

There is consensus in Canada and the United States that the application of compulsory arbitration to settle contract disputes between labor and management in industry generally is repugnant to our free enterprise system and our free democratic institutions.

Later the Commissioners add this:

Both management and labor are in general agreement that compulsorily imposing a decision upon the parties as to wages and working conditions is inconsistent with the principles of a free democratic society.

The Commission goes on to quote from a brief presented to it by the Ontario Federation of Labour. They quote words:

We are of the opinion that the principle of compulsory arbitration is an encroachment on our democratic freedom and we are therefore opposed to government legislation making arbitration compulsory in all hospital or any other labor disputes.

The Commission continued with these words, Mr. Speaker, saying that:

Briefs from the Canadian Manufacturers Association and the Ontario Hospital Association were to the same effect.

Later on the Commission adds:

September 7, 1966

In short compulsory arbitration competes with instead of supplementing the bargaining process.

I ask the Government to take note of that when they are considering what is going to happen to industrial relations as a result of this Bill, "compulsory arbitration competes with rather than supplementing the bargaining process".

This morning, Mr. Speaker, in introducing the Bill, the Premier referred us to the fact that British Columbia had some measures in some ways somewhat similar to this. And he seemed to feel that the fact that it had been passed in British Columbia gave some additional weight of argument in its favor. I suppose it is not unusual, Mr. Speaker, that a couple of people like the Premier of British Columbia and the Premier of Saskatchewan, a couple of old-time hucksters in the field of selling ice boxes and so on, should come to agreement with respect to matters like compulsory arbitration. But since he has raised the matter of British Columbia, may I quote an opinion from a source somewhat closer to home than those I have been reading. The Saskatchewan Teachers Federation presented a brief on April 4th, 1966. They commented under the headline there of "Fixed deadlines and compulsory arbitration". And to add to their comment they quoted an excerpt from a statement of an official of the British Columbia Teachers Federation and I read that excerpt:

Too frequently under British Columbia conditions the negotiation pattern is one of an obstinate group of teachers facing an obdurate school board, drifting through the mere passage of time into a hastily arranged hearing before a hurried and harried arbitration board which makes a poor best of a bad job under impossible conditions.

They add:

Such a procedure cannot solve the real problem. At best it postpones for a year the search for a solution.

Let me attempt to summarize, Mr. Speaker. First, I submit again that the Government has failed to give, in the particular situation which concerns us most at the moment, the kind of leadership which could have produced the kind of bargaining which could have resulted in a settlement. I submit that the Government prefers the use of power to dictate rather than of discussion to decide.

Secondly, the Government failed to insist that its corporation exhaust all the possibilities for a voluntary settlement before proposing interference by legislation. Conciliation, as I said earlier, was not used. Mediation was not used. There has been no attempt to persuade parties to use voluntary arbitration. There has been no attempt to introduce into the bargaining process some person or some group of persons, say three, nationally known for their skills in mediation, nationally respected for their impartiality and their integrity. These possibilities were neither tried nor explored. The Government prefers to rule rather than to govern.

Thirdly, the Government has, in my opinion, again deliberately prodded, goaded, harassed, annoyed this particular union. The resulting relationship and the resulted morale of the staff were such that rightly or wrongly a strike vote was only a question of time.

Fourthly, having succeeded in this the Government is misusing the situation to introduce legislation imposing compulsory arbitration on other groups as well. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this particular Government is allowed to remain in office it's only a question of time until other employees find their rights similarly abridged and restricted. What we see in this legislation today is opening by a crack the door which the Government seeks to throw wide open. The camel's nose is in the tent; close behind is the rest of the camel.

Fifth, if the Government insists on this type of legislation at this time, even though it hasn't completed the usual procedures to obtain settlement, the reference should be exclusively to the one situation in which there is an immediate problem.

Mr. Speaker, I don't say that those of us in this party would never agree to or would never make use of compulsory arbitration, but this I do say, we would not do so until every last solitary possibility of voluntary settlement to a problem seriously affecting the public welfare had been exhausted . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — And even then, Mr. Speaker, this should not be done at the whim of a little group of people sitting in the Cabinet office at the wish of the Government. This should be confined to action by the Legislature, and should not be done until after a meeting of this Legislature. The big exception which we take to this Bill is that it gives to the Government the power which governments should not have. It gives to the Government the right to act in this way in these cases on the basis of its own opinion, not on the basis of any facts.

To add to that may I point out that during 20 years of government by this party there was not a single situation in which efforts which I have outlined were not in the end effective. It is true there were some strikes, it's true there was very frequent use of conciliation, it's true there was use on more than one occasion of voluntary arbitration by an agreed arbiter, but there wasn't compulsory arbitration. There need not be at this time, of this we are convinced. The Government should not, as it is doing here, put handcuffs on others in order to keep its own hands from shaking.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is too inclusive as to people and it excludes too many of the rights of people This Bill is premature. The opportunities for bargaining and settlement have not been exhausted and they still exist. The penalties in this Bill are much too sweeping. This Bill will indeed provoke industrial uncertainty and unrest throughout the province. This Bill will interfere with our ability to recruit the necessary work force.

It is a Bill which restricts the freedom of employers and of employees alike. It puts the Government in a position to substantially control many wage levels and other benefits for many workers. It will encourage both employers and employees to take more extreme and more fixed positions during negotiations and consequently make settlements more difficult. There is no substantial evidence that such easy access to compulsory arbitration as proposed here has been successful any place. There is much evidence and much opinion that it is harmful, that at best it postpones problems.

September 7, 1966

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this Bill is not in the public interest. It is not in the interest of that part of our public which is employed in factories or in hospitals or in farms or in classrooms or in any other way. This Bill, as I intimated earlier, is evil.

The proposal which I make on behalf of the CCF group would, in our opinion, make possible an orderly return of services in the present strike. It would at the same time protect the rights of free and healthy collective bargaining. In order to outline our proposal, Mr. Speaker, I propose to move an amendment to the motion. I have a copy for the Premier, if we had had more time we might have had copies for all the Members.

Mr. Speaker, I move then:

That all the words after 'That' be struck out and the following substituted therefore:

This House not now proceed with the second reading of this Bill but request the Government to substitute therefore a bill to deal specifically with the single dispute referred to in His Honour's address, such bill to:

1. provide for the return to work of the Saskatchewan Power employees involved after the government has given consideration to the advisability of including in the bill provisions for interim wage increases retroactive to June, 1966;
2. order the resumption of negotiations on all remaining outstanding issues, including wage and other monetary benefits;
3. direct the parties to employ impartial mediation and conciliation procedures;
4. direct the parties in the event these measures fail to bring agreement in 60 days, to consider submission of remaining matters in dispute to an agreed arbitrator for a binding decision; and
5. if the parties fail to so agree that the matter then be submitted to arbitration within an additional ten days, direct that the dispute be referred to an arbitrator to be named by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to so move, seconded by my seatmate the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Under the Rules and Debate this qualifies as a reasoned amendment and I find it in order. It proposes an alternative proposition to that which is before the House and I quote from May, page 414:

The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability and to present to the House a different proposition as in alternative to the original question.

The later purpose may be effected by moving to omit all or most of the words of the question after the first word 'That' and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment but includes the purpose both of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the House as alternative propositions.

I think the Members will agree that this qualifies as an alternative proposition and the debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently.

Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in listening this morning and again this afternoon with a good deal of interest to both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) setting forth the views of their respective groups on the Bill that is before the House, although I wasn't prepared for the amendment that was introduced a moment ago, I would like to confine, because of that, my remarks chiefly to the Bill that is before the House rather than to the amendment. I will have a comment on the amendment at the conclusion of my address.

I did notice in the remarks of both of these gentlemen a skirting of the real cause of much of the labor unrest that we see in our own province and across Canada. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this cannot be ignored in the context of the decision that we are being asked to make here during this particular session. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the underlying causes for much of the demands of labor today is this very serious question of inflation. I have heard a good deal said lately both from the Government in Ottawa and various other governmental authorities about the seriousness of the inflationary trend in Canada and of the spiralling costs to the consumer and to the consuming public. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if there is one thing that the Premier of the province and the Prime Minister have in common, and I believe it is only one thing, it is that they talk about curbing spending, talk about cutting back and holding the line but fail to set an example themselves in government spending. It has struck me that in this present dispute the amount of increase that is being sought is not inconsistent with many of the increases that are being granted across this nation and it most certainly is small when you compare it to the drastic increases in spending that we have seen by this Government in the last two sessions that were announced through the budgets.

Mr. Thatcher: — How are you voting?

Mr. Pederson: — I am going to get to that in a moment, Mr. Premier. Patience is a virtue that the Premier seldom possesses.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that until the Government can set an example of holding the line it has very little right to ask others to take a similar position. The right to impose what I would call a "Do as I say, but not as I do" attitude on any section of the economy should, in my opinion, be forfeited by this Government if it is not prepared to act in a fashion that indicates its concern for this serious problem in the rise in costs, that I mentioned, to consumers.

Now basically, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to compulsory

September 7, 1966

arbitration in labor disputes as a broad basic principle. However, I must hasten to add, before some of my friends here to the right get too enthusiastic over that statement, that I am more strongly opposed to the present prospect of thousands of people in this province within the next few days perhaps of being unable to heat their homes, and of many industries being unable to operate all because of the absence of natural gas. This gives me a great deal of concern.

Compulsory arbitration I readily admit can be a vicious thing. It may solve an immediate crisis but its long term results could easily create more crises which could seriously undermine our economy and perhaps even destroy that traditional respect for the law which is such an important part of our democracy. After all, in my opinion, arbitrators are human beings and, whether they be appointed by the disputing employer and trade union or by the Government, their natural inclination will not be to make a finding which is just and proper, but rather to arrive at a decision which would be somewhere in between the union's last demand the company's last offer, and which hopefully will be relatively acceptable to both sides. By itself and on the surface of things this may seem like a reasonable solution to the problem and may not be too serious, but I notice that it has been said many times by people on both sides in this recent railway dispute that compulsory arbitration can only mean that there will be no real and genuine negotiations since both parties will refuse to make their real positions known because those real positions would be simply stepping stones which would ultimately be used by the compulsory arbitrator.

In the present dispute between the OCAW and the SPC my understanding is that there is only four per cent between what the union demands and what the corporation offers. Both the union and the corporation management have known beforehand that their negotiations would end up in compulsory arbitration and we can bet our last dollar that rather than being just a four per cent difference at this time there will probably be at least a 14 per cent difference.

The union knows beforehand that compulsory arbitration lies at the end of the row and rather than commence negotiations by asking for eight per cent or ten percent increase in wages and then gradually cutting them down during the course of negotiations it would commence by asking for 20 or 25 per cent and then flatly refuse to change its position during negotiations so that when it came to final and compulsory arbitration it would have a greater figure on balance. Union leaders, Mr. Speaker, don't have to be mathematical geniuses to be able to figure out that they would do far better under compulsory arbitration if the arbitrator is faced with the union demand of say 25 or 30 per cent and a company offer of three or four per cent than they would do if the union demand under normal arbitration was say, as in this dispute, eight per cent and the company offer four per cent. If this proposed legislation does become law and the present OCAW-SPC dispute ends up before a compulsory arbitrator, then I think we can all safely assume that the settlement will be something on the order of six per cent. Somewhere in between the union demand of eight and the company's offer of four per cent, and, of course, that may be a perfectly fair and equitable award in this particular dispute. I am not arguing about that. But what will the situation be two months from now or six months from now if negotiations between the electrical workers of the SPC also end up before a compulsory arbitrator. A six per cent increase in that case may be both

unreasonable and unjust, I don't know that. But if the compulsory arbitrator makes an award in the present dispute of six per cent and then makes a different one dealing with the electrical workers later on, we're going to hear screams of justifiable rage and indignation and cries of injustice from either one side or the other, perhaps from both.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot apply the situation in one particular case against another, but I think that one of the dangers of compulsory arbitration is that the tendency is to level and to strike an average which is used as a yardstick in future decisions. Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this type of situation if repeated often enough must have a very serious effect on the remaining free collective bargaining agreements, until we arrive at the point where in effect the Government through its compulsory arbitrator fixes wages for all segments of the economy. I have heard a good deal of talk from my friends on this side that this might be a good idea, not perhaps in union matters but in general, to fix the prices that various people will get for their commodities. Some of my farmer friends on this side waxed very vehemently about the prices for farm machinery and they suggested they should be fixed. Well, this may suit the ideal of this party on this side but it certainly doesn't suit the ideals of the Conservative party.

The other and equally serious danger, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that can result from this type of legislation is a rather shocking thing that we have seen in Canada for the past week or so where thousands of railway workers have either refused or have failed to return to work in open violation of the law of this country. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians have witnessed and have been witnessing in other cases a tremendous breakdown of the laws of our land. The ordinary man and woman is brought up to respect the law and to accept it. It's a well known fact that no law can please everyone. It is equally true that whether you agree with the law of the land or not it must be obeyed, and yet, as I have stated many times, there must be justice in order to expect compliance with the law. That is something, Mr. Speaker, the Government when introducing bills must at all times bear in mind. There must be justice and there must be the type of deterrent that will compel if necessary adherence to the law. I have noticed in this Bill the deterrent of decertification. This may in fact be a sufficient threat to bring about enforcement of the Act, but I want to warn the Government what it is letting itself in for. It must be prepared to act if the deterrent that has been put in the Act is not effective. In other words, the Government has to take some extremely drastic action if its orders through the arbitrator that is appointed are flouted and the law is broken.

I don't have a perfect answer to this problem, I don't believe anybody has, certainly not as far as I have been able to determine. But I would strongly urge this Government to limit its present legislation to solving this present dispute that we are facing at the present time rather than having it apply to any number of disputes which may arise in the future.

I believe that a special session was necessary, contrary to what some of my friends think. I believe that the situation is of an emergency nature and had to be attended to very quickly. Then, Mr. Speaker, let us deal with the emergency and not other proposals which may or may not arise in the future. I would urge

September 7, 1966

this Government to consider as well as not only dealing with this particular dispute at the present time but following this up by the establishment of an all-party commission with representatives from labor and management who would sit down over the next few months to take a hard look at this entire problem and to come forward if possible with recommendations which can be the basis at some future session for sensible and realistic legislation and which will not have the inherent dangers that I have mentioned in the presently proposed legislation.

I have heard that the State of Massachusetts has a plan supported by legislation which largely avoids these dangers that I have outlined. We hear much as we have done today about the absence of serious labor management disputes in Sweden. These are areas, Mr. Speaker, which could be studied by such a commission. Doubtless there are many others that could and would be studied and reported on to the ultimate benefit of this province. Here in Saskatchewan only a few months ago we saw what I consider a truly remarkable thing when labor and management arrived at a consensus, granted not a complete agreement, but certainly a consensus as to amendments to our Trade Union Act. Surely it is not impossible that the same sort of consensus could be arrived at as the solution to the very serious sort of problem we are presently facing. And Surely, Mr. Speaker, we owe it to both labor and management and to all of the people of this province to make an attempt to arrive at that sort of consensus. But having said all those things, I want to deal with the other side of the coin as well, because I have been equally disturbed by what I consider are some of the irresponsible activities in which unions have found themselves engaged.

The right to strike I wish to remind unions carries with it a responsibility to the nation and to its citizens. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when that responsibility is ignored, as I believe it has been in many cases recently, then the right to strike must be removed. It is the only weapon left to the ordinary man and woman in the street and the people who pay the bill for this nation. In the opinion of many people, and I certainly count myself as one of them, strikes are more and more being waged against the innocent bystander rather than against management as claimed.

When the railways went on strike a few weeks ago it was claimed they were striking against the railway. Well, let's examine that. Who are the railways? Paid employees to a large extent exactly like the fellows who went on strike. Who were the sufferers? The railroads? Most certainly not. Government subsidies provided by the taxpayers of the nation will pick up the shot. The sufferers were people like myself, the farmers, who had the fear of not being able to move their grain held over their heads; the fruit growers, struck at a time when they had to move their fruit; the potash industry, which would be tied up in a matter of days.

What about the hospital strike in Quebec of recent months? Was it against the hospitals? What type of punishment was levied by the workers against the hospitals? Absolutely none, Mr. Speaker. Their strike was directed against those who were sick requiring the aid and assistance that a hospital could give them.

What about the SPC today? Who are the SPC? Paid employees of the people of this province, and the unions are striking against not the management but against you and me who are the consumers of natural gas. These are the things, Mr. Speaker, that must be

borne in mind and must be analyzed in talk about the responsible action on the part of unions.

Are unions going to be allowed to continue to strike against everyone in the economy, those completely unable to defend themselves? Farmers over and over again, over the period of the last ten to fifteen years, have had to sit by and take it in the neck, when the grain handlers struck, when the Great Lakes went on strike, when the railways strike. Every time you sit out there in your combine you wonder how in heaven's name you are going to meet your gas bill while these fellows are parading up and down and holding up the works. Are they striking against the railroads or are they striking against me?

I have heard a good deal of talk, some of my friends on this side are great boys as holding this up, about the power of big business as a horrible example of the misuse of power. And in many cases it is correct, their statements are correct. There have been misuses and many of them.

But how often do we hear someone that has the courage to stand up and tackle this monolithic monster of irresponsible union activity? Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, there are literally hundreds of responsible, proper-run unions in this country, which are doing the job that they were designed to do, protecting their workers from undue influence, from discrimination and soon. But for everyone of them or perhaps I should amend that to every five of them there are one or two unions which don't care if they bring the nation to its knees as long as their demands are met. These are the things that have to be taken into consideration when we talk about responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

I want to talk about the action of the SPC employees who are now on strike when I hear on the radio this morning, coming down, that they are picketing the power plants, an entirely separate organization, an entirely separate setup. Why are they doing that? Do they want to cut my power off too? That's all they are trying to do. What are they doing picketing the banks? Do they want to prohibit people from using the services of the banks? The answer is that they are picketing the banks because some people paid power bills at the banks. This type of irresponsibility, Mr. Speaker, does nothing to enhance the stature of unions and it does in fact, Mr. Speaker, lead to the type of legislation that has been placed before us today. I believe that the great weapon that is being used by unions today, many unions today, is the weapon of fear. Frighten the people and the nation badly enough and your demands will be met.

I've mentioned some of these types of frightening tactics that have been used by railway workers, by hospital workers in Quebec, in the grain handlers' strike and so on. I could name them by the dozen, where the people of the nation became so aroused and frightened because of the dire effects of the economy that they had to back down and demand of the government that they settle. In fact they remind me very much of the story of the very naughty little boy who went to school and was taken there on the first day by this mother who was very indulgent. When she had a talk with the teacher she said, "Well now, my little boy is very sensitive. You mustn't raise your voice to him, you mustn't be mean to him, you mustn't do anything, but if he does misbehave just by chance, just slap the boy next to him and that will so frighten him and he will behave for the rest of the day". That's

September 7, 1966

what unions are doing. They hope that if they slap the farmers and the ordinary people hard enough governments will take notice. Again I come back to make my point that I am talking about the type of irresponsible action by unions that strike not against those people that they are trying to strike against but those who are innocent bystanders in the fashion that I mentioned just a moment ago.

I protest, Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for thousands of people when I voice that protest of union disputes invading the private lives of our citizens. Over and over again these sorts of things have happened and I believe that the time has come to cry 'Halt' to that type of a situation.

I have had a look at the amendment that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) introduced. I only had a moment to read it while he was giving it to the House and I find that this amendment deals also with too many aspects of the whole problem to be entertained seriously at this time. If he had stopped his amendment with a suggestion that this Bill be set aside and we deal only with the present dispute, I would support, but I cannot support it, Mr. Speaker, on those grounds and I will, with those reservations that I have made, support the main Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR, HEAR!

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks I would just like to extend my congratulations to the last speaker for his remarks in this debate. I believe that he has indicated to us all the seriousness of the position that we find ourselves in. This is a time when we have a responsibility as Members of this House to take into account the effect of the action that we are undertaking today on every man, woman, and child in the province of Saskatchewan. I want to express my appreciation and I am sure of the Government for the understanding way in which the hon. Member (Mr. Pederson) has accepted his position in this House and has offered his support of the Bill that is being presented to you today. I do want to say . . .

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — You have a change of plan.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . Mr. Speaker, that I don't think there is anyone in this House, in spite of the levity of the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) who is very happy about the prospect of bringing in the legislation. I am going to state here that we are forced to bring in this legislation today because of the irresponsible activities of a very few individuals in our province and, I think, in our country generally.

We have been somewhat late, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this particular matter, much later than most of the provinces in this country of ours. When anyone speaks about the Government taking irresponsible action, surely when we have the example that can be placed before this House of at least five other provinces in Canada having somewhat similar legislation on their statute books and one other province which has taken this action in a single instance, then for members of this House to say that this is an irresponsible action, one that has not been given serious

consideration, to make that charge in this House as a reason for not putting through the legislation I think is a false argument. The people of most of the provinces in Canada have accepted the fact that in certain instances the general public must be defended from abuse from not only labor but from labor and management. I don't think that this Act today is being levelled any more at the working people of our province than it is being pointed at management as well. Both management and labor have to accept their responsibilities in this province and in this nation, have to accept their responsibility to the men and women that make up our country as citizens of Canada. And so I say today that I am proud of the remarks that were made by the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) in this debate, indicating for once that surely we as members of the Legislature should be willing to give serious consideration to the needs of the average citizen in our province and also to defend his rights. After all, I feel that the people of our province have rights to have the gas that is provided in their homes; they have rights to have the electricity that has been provided in their homes and in the factories and in the places of business in this province. They have the right to turn on their taps and have the health-giving waters that flow from those taps at any day without those rights being challenged by a few individuals, as has taken place within the last two weeks. And so I say actually what we are doing today is recognizing the rights of Mr. and Mrs. Saskatchewan when we pass this measure.

You know, when I look at the statute books of the Province of Saskatchewan, I find that on at least 20 occasions there have been references made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) to the restriction of the rights of the workers in the unions by this measure. I want to indicate here that we already have 20 pieces of legislation on the statute books of this province which restricted the rights of some individuals in order to give advantages to the laboring man and the worker in this province. Surely just once we should be able to bring into this House a measure which will give some protection to the average person in this province when we have on 20 occasions all of us voted that rights be taken away from individuals in this province so that labor might have certain opportunities.

I am going to read them to you because every one of them has restricted the rights of someone in this province. In fact, almost every piece of that legislation has restricted ordinary conciliation and labor disputes; it has settled in almost every instance one which would be an ordinary argument point between management and labor when they went to the conciliation table. And so the Government of our province and the Government of most provinces have in their wisdom decided that legislation like this throughout the years has been necessary in order to protect the working man from abuses that might be brought on by his employer.

We find that we have the Annual Holidays Act, the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act which might not be termed in that sense, Blind Workmen's Compensation Act, the Department of Labour Act, in which there are many provisions, Employees' Wage Act, Employment Agencies Act, Equal Pay Act, Factories Act, Fair Employment Practices Act, Female Employment Act, Hours of Work Act, Industrial Standards Act, Minimum Wage Act, One Day's Rest in Seven Act, Trade Schools Regulation Act, the Trade Union Act itself, the Wages Recovery Act, Weekly Half-Holiday Act and the Workmen's Compensation Act. Everyone of these pieces of legislation has restricted the rights and the freedom of someone in our

September 7, 1966

province in order to provide benefits to our working people. I say there is no one on this side of the House and certainly no one in this Legislature that would state that these Acts should not be on the statute books of this province. But I do say that the time has come to place on the statute books legislation which will protect the average person in this province from the abuses of both labor and management in labor disputes.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in opening his remarks made reference to the fact that the Government had been unable to meet the problem that had been placed before us. I am going to state here that the Government has proven that it is prepared to take the steps to meet the problem that we face today. We are doing that in this Legislature. We are not waiting until the problem gets to the extent where the squeeze the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said that this Act would provide, where the squeeze might be on the other foot, and the corporation or the Government of the people of this province would be forced, because of the fact that winter was upon us, to satisfy the demands that the union would make in order to make certain that the people of this province would be protected during the winter months. And of course, that is what would have happened had the Government taken the action that has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) here this afternoon. This is exactly what would have happened. It was not the Government that ended the negotiations in this instance, it was not the Power Corporation, it was not management. Management was prepared to remain at the negotiation table, it was prepared to talk for the next two months if necessary at the negotiation table. It was the union officials that ended negotiations very summarily. The Power Corporation hadn't agreed that things had come to the point where they had to ask the Department of Labour for labor conciliation or for a conciliator to come into this problem.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) himself indicated that it had been a very short period in which negotiations had taken place and I agree with him. I agree with him that the union had not been prepared to sit down long enough with management in order to solve this problem. Instead they went out on strike very summarily just about two weeks after negotiations had actually started on the matter of salary. I want to mention here that, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) referred to this fact and stated that the corporation had not made an offer with regard to wages to the employees until August 12th, this was under the usual practice that had been followed since about 1961 in the negotiations between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the union involved. The practice had been that the union presented its brief at the beginning of negotiations; but from there on the brief was covered, various items were considered and it was almost automatic that it was usually towards the end of the negotiations before the offer was made to the Power Corporation as far as salary was concerned. On August 12th, it was felt that this position had been arrived at and other points in the agreement had been discussed and covered. So the matter of wages was brought forward and offer was made by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to the union at that time.

I think what was missed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was the fact that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was the only party to the negotiations that had attempted, between then and the time that the strike was called, to alter its position in any way, shape or form in order to state that you had had some consideration to conciliation provided by the union as well

as management. And so, all of a sudden the union decided that there were to be no further negotiations and it came in to a meeting and presented the Power Corporation with demands, stating that its members were to go out on strike and with the demands of what they wanted the Power Corporation to do in order to make this possible. When anyone states that the Power Corporation was not asked to close down its operation, which would have meant no gas for the people of this province 24 hours after this document has been delivered and the strike had begun, all he has to do is read this document that I have in my hand which gave orders. Someone has said, "Read it", and I am prepared to do this.

The union undertakes:

- (1) to provide the company with all union personnel for the purpose of effecting an expeditious, orderly and safe shutdown of the company's operations excepting such personnel as may be absent from work through union business;

Anyone that says the union did not suggest shutting down the operations of the corporation is making a false statement.

- (2) to allow the company a period of 24 hours, from the time strike notice has been served upon the company in which to effect an orderly and safe shutdown of its operations;
- (3) to agree to permit free and unobstructed entrance to company premises and locations to personnel of the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires employed for the sole purpose of maintaining a safety vigil of the premises of the company in those locations where they are so employed as of this date.

And when the provisions that the company was to undertake. This is what the union was going to do.

The company was:

- (a) to commence procedures for an expeditious, orderly and safe shutdown of operations at a time specified by the union in accordance with section 2 (b);

This was the 2(b) at the top of the letter.

- (b) to retain all employees on the payroll for a period of 24 hours from the time strike notice has been served upon the company by the union and to pay to such employees their regular rates of pay plus any overtime rates for any overtime that may be required in the 24 hours period for the sole purpose only of effecting a safe and orderly shutdown;
- (c) that in the shutdown operations all employees will be employed only in their respective classifications, departments and job locations;
- (d) to use no contract labor in the shutdown of its operations or during the strike of the union against the company;
- (e) to pay all employees their accrued earning due them

as of the effective time and date of strike action within seven days following such time and date of strike action;

(f) to extend the following option to employees who still have unused vacation credits:

- (i) leave such credits undisturbed for the period of the strike;
- (ii) upon written request by registered mail to pay to any employee who may be eligible and who so requests any and all vacation pay in respect of any unused vacation credit still outstanding . . .

And, of course, they are supposed to do this with no staff, because the staff is all on strike.

. . . such payment to be mailed to the employee within five days of the receipt of the request of the same. The vacation and seniority credits shall continue to accrue to all employees for the duration of the strike of the union against the company and to maintain the status of and guarantee the continue accumulation of all superannuation rights and credits of all employees in the bargaining unit for the duration of the strike and to collect from such employees after the strike by means of increased payroll deductions in easy instalments, all monies paid on behalf of such employees during the strike, to pay all premiums that fall due during the strike in respect of all things as the present group insurance plan covering those employees in the bargaining unit and to collect from such employees after the strike by means of increased payroll deductions all monies paid on behalf of such employees in respect to the employee portion of contribution.

These are the demands the union made. Of course, it was contradicted in the press when the union stated that it had never intended to see the shutdown of operations of the gas operations of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. This definitely gives the lie to this report that appeared in the press on behalf of the union that was concerned. It had every intention of the Power Corporation having to shut down all its operations and deprive the people of this province of the gas that they need to heat their homes, to help operate their businesses, to operate industries. Then, of course, the result of this strike, if allowed to continue by our Government, would be eventually to also shut down the electrical operations of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation which would have even more damaging results than those that will be effected through the shutdown of gas operations in our province. This, Mr. Speaker, is the intention of the union concerned in this particular labor dispute. I contend here today that the action of that union is summarily and very quickly ending negotiations and precipitating a strike of its employees has been against the best interests of the workers concerned themselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I believe quite sincerely that the first duty of each of us as members of this Legislature is to protect the life, health and property of the people of our province. When these facets of our province are in danger it becomes our

responsibility to take action to protect them. We are all aware that the cessation or an impending stoppage of services in the field of water, heat, or electricity or gas or hospital services could endanger life, health and property. Mr. Speaker, a government is elected to assume responsibilities. Today we are assuming our responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan by asking the Members of this House to support legislation which is aimed at one thing, the protection of the people from serious jeopardy by reason of a labor dispute which cannot be settled due to the stubborn attitude of bargaining agents on behalf of both labor and management. I believe we must place responsibility at both levels. I believe we must place much of the blame itself on the machinery of negotiations.

The history of bargaining, particularly in the past number of years, does not leave a very good impression on anyone who has followed negotiations. It has finally come to the point in our day and age in labor disputes where it is a silly game and not a serious effort to sit down and determine what industry or management can pay and what effect the decision will have on the general good. One side picks a ridiculously high figure and the other a ridiculously low figure, hoping eventually to end up some place in the centre. Why management and labor cannot start by working together throughout the year to realize the best possible return for the worker, I do not know. This, of course, would not serve the interests of those on both sides who desire to ferment distrust between worker and management to promote their own peculiar ends and desires.

In proposing the legislation before you, the Government is preparing to take on itself a duty which is rightly theirs. That duty is to determine when a labor dispute might place in serious jeopardy the people of our province. If the judgement of the Government is wrong in the use of such legislation, then this will be indicated by the people at the next election, in this province or wherever that government might be.

This legislation, as any other, need never be used. I am prepared to suggest that it will never be used. In fact, if we look at our neighboring province of Alberta, very little has been said about their labor legislation, and yet the major part of the legislation that has been placed before you comes from the Alberta Act and not from B.C., and not from any other province but the province of Alberta.

We have heard very little in the past, at least I have heard very little, about labor difficulties in Alberta. In fact, I understand that this Act has never had to be used because I think it works in spite of what some people here have said. I think it brings about more understanding a willingness of labor and management to try to solve their problems on a voluntary basis before they get into the spot where government has to come in and invoke compulsory arbitration. And I think today as we meet here that we may never see the day, any of us, when this legislation will be used, but it will be here to protect the interests of the people of this province in case an emergency arises. Some people say we should just confine it to this one labor dispute, but what if another one arose two months and we had to call Members back for that? Another one six months hence and had to pass another Bill. Why not place the responsibility in the hands of the people where it should be, the elected people of the province. Their people back home have elected them to accept responsibilities like this, to protect their interest as individuals in

this province. So I say, we as Members have a right and a responsibility to accept some responsibilities for the health, life and the property of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. This is exactly what this Bill indicates. I believe this Bill will go a long way to freeing the individual from fear, not only the non-union person, but also the person who is a member of a union in this province because he will know that he has a final recourse which will actually cost him nothing, that will not result in a strike, no loss of pay. He has a recourse through the legislation passed by this Legislature in order to get a just result to his demands for increased pay. So I say, I don't think the working man has anything to fear from this legislation. I think he has much in the long run to gain.

This Act, I suspect, will bring quicker settlements in the future, will not work as a weapon against the worker but as a weapon for both sides. In the past, as I indicated earlier, lip service has been given to voluntary conciliation, only to have both parties or one refuse the results of such conciliation. If we had undertaken voluntary conciliation in this instance and gone on for six to eight weeks with conciliations and then neither party, or one of the parties had refused to accept, we would have found ourselves in the middle of the month of November when no one here can estimate what the weather conditions might be like. The stoppage of gas service at that time of the year for one day might have caused untold harm to many people in the province of Saskatchewan. That is one reason why the Government felt that if it was going to take this action, this was the time to take it, not at a time of the year when the people of this province might be seriously harmed because of actions and because of a strike held at that particular time.

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Should have done this last April.

Mr. Gardiner: — The dispute which has resulted in our being called together today has resulted from an attempt to have opposites meet. There has been an attitude of distrust between the union and management involved for over two years, not so much on the part of management but on the part of unions. With statements by the leaders of this union and their friends to the effect that they were going to take political action to see the end of the Government that is now in power, what else could you call it but a threat by that particular union against the Government of the day? So I say that there is every reason why today there is difficulty between the union and management and it was started originally by the leaders of the union concerned. From the beginning union representatives let it be known they were starting from eight per cent and would not move from that point.

As I have already pointed out, negotiations commenced March 18th, 1966, and between that date and September 1st, 27 meetings were held between the union and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, many of which were all-day meetings. No meetings were held in the period between April 26, 1966 and June 22, 1966, not at the request of management but at the request of the union, which was fighting for its own rights against a raid by an opposite union. So it took two months off from negotiation at its own request in order to try to save their own necks as union leaders in this province. During all this time up to September 1st, no serious effort has been made by the union to bargain at any time. In the same period

management has made three concessions in the salary negotiations offers and intimated at the final meeting a further desire to continue negotiations with the prospect of still further changes on the part of management if the union would show any sincere desire to negotiate.

If the union truly was interested in using the present voluntary methods of conciliation it did not so indicate. Surely if the present measures in the Trade Union Act are so sacred to the union movement in this province, why was it that the union before accepting strike as a weapon against the people of this province didn't itself ask for these conciliation proceedings under the Trade Union Act?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Instead of calling for a voluntary conciliation board under the Act of this province, it ceased negotiations, made unreasonable demands which I have already read to you on the management, and then went on strike. This placed the company in an impossible position. It could only take conciliation proceedings itself under the Trade Union Act. What would this have accomplished? From its actions during negotiations the union has not shown any real desire to bargain. Any conciliation would have used up possibly six to eight weeks and, if both sides did not agree with the result, brought us to winter time when a gas strike for even one day might present serious problems.

Who would have a club then? The union, of course. Who will have a club if this legislation is passed? The people of this province through its elected Government. Had the Government not done this it would have been open to serious criticism for anything that might have happened during the winter months in the months that lie ahead.

What will happen now and from this time on if this legislation is passed is to guarantee protection to the people in case of reckless action of a few against the welfare of all? Personally I feel the workers in this instance will get much the same pay under any system used. However, the legislation will say to the people of Saskatchewan that they need not fear the result in this case because if the worst comes to the worst, the Government will not allow the public at large to suffer the consequences.

One wonders if there has been a sincere wish to settle. Last year the settlement was made without a strike in November, not August or September. I don't know what the rush was about a strike. Last year the union was quite happy to settle negotiations in the month of November. All of a sudden it becomes a big rush and it must be settled in the month of August or it is going to go on strike. There is every reason to suspect that a reasonable settlement could have been reached by November again with proper negotiation systems used. Let me remind Members that in this instance it was not management again that broke off negotiations to use the big stick of a strike but the union, so that it could use the strike weapon at a time when it might not serious repercussions to upset the public. I think this was the reason. It felt at the present time the public might not get incensed by its actions because the weather is rather warm; problems would not become as serious as they would in the winter months. So it picked this time to do it hoping to scare management because of the prospect of the upcoming winter months. Now no one need

September 7, 1966

be scared and management and labor can sit down at the table and make a serious attempt at negotiations.

Why do I claim there is no threat to anyone of the parties? I say that because of the procedure which constitutes a board very similar to the present Voluntary Board that we have in the Trade Union Act in this province. The only difference is that the decision of this Board must be binding on both parties. However both parties have first recourse to a Voluntary Board still if they desire to use the particular Act that we have on the statute books at the moment under the Trade Union Act of this province. If conciliation means anything the use of this Board, with the passage of this Act, should make the more extensive use of the present measures possible in order to settle disputes between management and labor. This legislation chooses only those aspects of business which might most closely involve the health, life and property of the people of this province. The machinery is much the same as that already approved by labor and management through the present Trade Union Act.

Any legislation to be meaningful must have penalty clauses. We have seen the ridiculous example in the last two weeks of unions and individuals defying the laws of the land, the government unable to enforce the laws. This session would be a waste of time if we were to pass legislation which people could feel they could flout and no action would be taken against them. Anyone that is law-abiding has nothing to fear from this legislation. Anyone who wishes to flout the law should have fear as to the consequences of his actions.

I believe it is worthwhile to look at the position of the workers in the SPC to determine how just the demands are. Because of recent labor demands, the request of the SPC workers might be adjudged fair. But I think that we must take into account, when we look at all the settlements that have been made in the last 12 months in various industries in Canada that there is no relationship whatsoever between the amount that one industry has received and the amount that another industry has received. We must look at the actual salaries received by the individuals in a particular working group, we must look at the circumstances and think of the possibility of that industry being able to pay the salaries and still operate, because, surely if a business had to close because of salaries that were too high, those workers would be out of work completely and it would be no help to the workers concerned.

When one compares wages of SPC personnel with others in Saskatchewan and other provinces, our rates are as high as, if not higher than, the best. The rates offered at the moment will place clerical staff in SPC much above similar people in public service and ahead by a large amount of those in other corporations and businesses in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would just like for a moment in order to bear out my argument in this regard to read to you the statistics of salaries paid in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in comparison with the Saskatchewan Public Service, Saskatchewan Government Telephones, and the Government Insurance. I will take here a junior clerk steno as one position. The starting wage under the last offer made by the Power Corporation, under a new arrangement would be \$246 a month. The Saskatchewan Public Service is an equivalent position is \$218 a month; Saskatchewan Government Telephones is

an equivalent position, \$210 a month; Government Insurance, exactly the same at \$246 a month. So there is only one of those four organizations that has a salary as high as a junior clerk steno would have under the last offer made by the Power Corporation.

Then we have the key punch operator as another example. The offer of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation would place the starting salary at \$281 a month; in the Saskatchewan Public Service a similar position is \$249 a month; Saskatchewan Government Telephones, \$210 a month; and the Government Insurance, \$254 a month. In other words, the offer places the employees of the Power Corporation in the highest paid bracket as far as that particular position is concerned.

Then we come down to the final one that I will use as far as the clerical positions are concerned, pay group five of clerks. A starting wage under the last offer by the corporation would be \$348 a month; Saskatchewan Public Service is \$309 a month; Saskatchewan Government Telephones, \$306 a month; Saskatchewan Government Insurance, \$313 a month. And the low and high categories relate pretty well as you go through these various brackets of jobs in the Power Corporation and the other organizations.

How many Members in this House feel that it would be fair for us to be paying in one of the operations that the Government has something to do with a salary which is much above that of any of the others doing equivalent work, in other positions in the Government service. That is what the union has been asking of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. That indicates the fairness or the justice of the demands that they have made on management in this case.

And now to go to the matter of wage comparisons with regard to laboring classifications: caretaker, the offer by the SPC of \$332 starting wage per month; Saskatchewan Public Service is \$285 a month; Saskatchewan Government Telephones, \$315 a month; Government Insurance, \$296 a month. The storeman, the latest offer of the Power Corporation starting wage again is \$332; Saskatchewan Public Service, \$260; Saskatchewan Government Telephones, \$299; and Government Insurance, \$313, again indicating that in the laboring classifications the employees of the Power Corporation are the highest paid employees that we have any place in our Public Service in the province of Saskatchewan. I ask you as Members whether you feel that this is just, that a man doing exactly the same type of work today should be demanding more than our public service has already agreed to next year in spite of the fact he is much higher at the present moment.

And then when we get into these specialist classifications for gas employees; for a gas meter repairman, the rates offered by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation are much higher than in the Alberta utilities, \$406 a month, starting wage; Alberta Utilities, \$361 a month; Greater Winnipeg gas is a bit higher at \$428 a month. For a gas fitter serviceman, as the starting wage the Power corporation offers \$532; starting wage in the Greater Winnipeg Gas System is \$487 a month; in Alberta Utilities, \$446 a month. And you can go through the rest of the items on this sheet and you will find in almost every instance that employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation today are as well paid as, if not better paid than, employees doing the same work in the province of Manitoba and Alberta and much better paid than for similar jobs here in the province of Saskatchewan. So I say that

September 7, 1966

when you consider matters of importance to labor you cannot take a position that because one industry manages to get 30 per cent then everybody should have 30 per cent. This is foolish. It is ridiculous and I think it's an argument that all of us must get away from in labor disputes if we are to control the inflation that has been spoken of on both sides of the House during this present debate.

Mr. Speaker, in the first place it is the responsibility of men themselves to regulate mutual labor relations. Only in the event that interested parties are unwilling or unable to fulfil their functions does it devolve upon the state to intervene and to deal with labor equitably, safeguarding the standards and aims that the common good, properly understood, demands.

This position we have attained. The Government is acting. We ask the support of the Members of this Legislature. We ask your support in hope that our actions today might in the end prove good for both labor and management and give freedom of mind to the general public in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I think all of us are concerned that we are here today. We are concerned because the task upon which we are engaged is a task which I am sure is distasteful to many of us and perhaps to all of us in this House. We all recognize, I think, that Legislature is an inappropriate place to settle a dispute between management and employees.

Our purpose, I think, was reasonably put by the Premier in his opening address in introducing this Bill when he said that our job was to find an appropriate method of settling the strike at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. That I suggest is what we are here for and I think that all of the other accoutrements which have been added to this Bill are matters which would have been best left out of the Bill.

I am not here to deny that problems of this nature can arise again, but I think it is worthwhile to note that it is 20 or 25 years since we have had a serious strike in a public utility or in an area of our activity where life, health or property might be endangered, seriously endangered. Therefore, it is unlikely I think that we are going to be met with a rash of these strikes which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) postulated as the basis for this blanket or shotgun legislature.

I certainly take the view that this is a highly isolated experience, a highly isolated incident and that if we deal with this one we probably will never have to deal with one again in the legislative lifetime of any of us here. I may be wrong but I think that on the record in the past I would be right. This is why I think that I will find myself supporting the amendment which asks the Government to settle the power dispute, to establish the machinery which will for certain settle the present dispute, and not go farther into other areas of activity. In this regard I think the words of the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) were particularly well taken. He felt that if we were going to expand our area of compulsory arbitration the matter was not an emergent one and it could be the subject of further study by a committee such as the one which reviewed the Trade Union Act or by some

other body which we might wish to be set up, which the Government might wish to set up to inquire into this problem.

I think that there are two essentials. First, and I don't want to be misunderstood on this, the employees of the gas division of the Power Corporation have to be got back to work. And secondly, we have to find a way to get a fair settlement, fair to the employees, fair to the corporation.

A reference was made to the fact that Members on this side don't think this session was necessary. What we meant to say – perhaps it's a little difficult to get across to the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) any idea as complicated as this.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — That doesn't keep him from interrupting, if I may so, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald).

It is this, we agree that given the circumstances which have arisen since last Friday, this session is necessary, or at least I agree and I believe my colleagues will agree with me. There is no alternative if there is a strike in an essential public utility to finding a way around it. Now, It may well bet hat a crash program of negotiations could have solved this. That is always a possibility. But I think the Government was not wrong in assuming that this would not come to pass and therefore convening the session.

Our criticism is that from March when these negotiations started to September when they broke down, the actions on the part of the Government were such that reasonable action would have made this session unnecessary. In that sense of the word the session is unnecessary. In the sense of the word that we have an emergent problem that must be dealt with, then of course, the session is necessary.

Now, I want, before turning to the bulk of my remarks, to just comment on a few of the remarks of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner), the Member for Melville. He is engaged in the relatively age-old operation of picking classifications and categories and making comparisons. Anyone who has been doing a bit of union negotiating knows – I see from the smile that flickers over the face of the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Trapp) that he has done a bit of this – that you can easily pick out categories bearing the same name in union contracts and establish that almost any employer is paying more than almost any other employer, if you are carefully selective in your categories and pick the names carefully, and if, of course, you don't mention some other matters which might be very germane. You will note and I will have noted that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) didn't mention some matters which were very germane. He did not mention, for example, that when comparing the Power Corporation with the SGEA, Saskatchewan Government Employees Association, that the one group worked 36 1/4 hours a week and the other group worked 40 hours a week. This might well have a considerable effect on the wage comparisons. This one got overlooked in his review of the comparisons.

An Hon. Member: — I believe, . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, that period of time

would justify, if you were paying on a straight time basis, SPC wages on the average of over ten percent higher than SGEA wages.

I am not here going to enter into a discussion of this category or that category. I think from a review of those by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) it is reasonably obvious that the key punch operator in one utility who is making almost \$100 less than the key punch operator in the other is not performing the same function. There must be some variant in function because in point of fact these wages for the work that has been done have kept more or less pace over the last 15 or 20 years because the comparisons are naturally very apt comparisons, comparisons which will be made readily.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, our purpose here today is to find a way of settling the Power Corporation dispute and Members on both sides agree that this dispute can only be settled at this point by compulsory arbitration. But I want to point out to this House that when we agree to this we are legislating away the right of a group of people to withdraw their services, not to work for someone you don't want to work for. The Common Law of England, hundreds of years ago, established the proposition that no one had to work for an employer he did not want to work for except under penal sentence. Now then, sometime later, perhaps a hundred years ago, the principle developed that labor could combine to withdraw their services. This development of the law of trade unions was such that at least 50 years ago it was well established that in ordinary circumstances any group of employees had the right to join together to withdraw their services. As Paul Martin calls it, the right to strike is a basic civil right. But as other Members have pointed out, basic civil rights of employees are not their only rights around. Citizens have rights too and citizens have a right to more or less continuous service in essential public services. They have no right to ask management to spend huge sums of money so there won't be a momentary interruption. They have no right to ask labor to give up all sorts of rights so there won't be a momentary interruption. But basically they have the right to continued services of an essential public nature.

This means that it may be necessary for us to take away private rights to accommodate this public right and we have well recognized this in times of war. We have recognized it with respect to police. We have recognized it with respect to firemen and I am prepared to say that under extreme circumstance we must recognize it with respect to power workers or gas workers. All I am saying is that before we invoke this principle we should not do that unless it is necessary. We should only do it to the extent necessary and we should do it in the fairest way possible to the person whose rights were taken away.

I think that most Members would agree with that proposition. We start out with a proposition that the right to strike is a basic public right, a basic civil right developed over a couple of hundred years. We find that we have to take it away for good and sufficient reasons. But we believe that we should not take it away to any greater extent than the situation demands. With that background we have to ask ourselves: is this Bill necessary? And I have already indicated that when all else has failed, when we have an interruption in an essential public service, then a strike must be terminated and fair and equitable arbitration procedures are then justified.

I want to direct my remarks to two questions. Has the Government done everything reasonable possible, and those who have read the Bill will recognize that phrase, to prevent the strike? Secondly, are the provisions of the Bill fair and reasonable?

Let's turn to the question of whether the Government has done everything reasonably possible to prevent the strike. Has the Government seen to it that its agency, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, has made reasonable and fair wage offers and made them without protracted haggling. This involves, perhaps, a greater analysis of the facts that this House is able to carry on at this time but a few bare bones will raise some very serious questions. The contract was to expire on May 31st. Negotiations commenced on March 18th. The corporation had made no wage offer by the end of March, by the end of April, by the end of May, by the end of June, by the end of July. There were certainly meetings in April, in July and June . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — None in June.

Mr. Blakeney: — None in June, April, May, July . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — End of April and . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, at any rate, there were, prior to the first offer by the corporation, perhaps 20 meetings, perhaps 20 meetings prior to the first offer. Now that is a very substantial number of meetings to drag one's feet. One can concede that there may well have been discussions on general terms, but I don't think it would have taken any great skill on the part of the corporation's negotiators to realize that the union and more particularly its negotiators to realize that the union and more particularly its members were becoming very restive at what they regarded as undue reluctance on the part of the corporation to put forward any wage offer.

We have got to ask ourselves: is that the conduct of a reasonable employer to sit tight from March until mid-August? Mind you, no wage offer was made until the employees recessed the proceedings, consulted their members and, as will have been known to the corporation, got some pretty direct instructions to get down to getting an offer.

There followed some offers by the corporation in the dying days of August. The question we have to ask ourselves is: is this responsible conduct on the part of the corporation? The maximum offer that was arrived at, and that I think within 24 or 48 hours of the strike, was four percent with some fringes.

The union had put forward a proposal for eight per cent. Now in some circumstances the union proposal for eight per cent would be unreasonable. In some circumstances a corporation attitude of no offer for five months would be reasonable. We have to ask ourselves whether either of those positions was such in 1966. In 1965 or 1965 or any other year, what are some of the basic ingredients of union negotiations? Well, there are two recurrent things. How much has the cost of living increased and what recent wage settlements are other unions getting? These are the perennial stuff of union negotiations.

Now, I think it will be generally conceded by most people that employees are entitled to increases which cover the cost of

September 7, 1966

living, which offer the employees some share of the increase in productivity, both of their industry and of the nation as a whole, and possibly some adjustments, up or down, to cover obvious inequities. These, I think, are generally conceded to be the framework in which union negotiations might proceed.

Frequently there are other factors. These are almost invariably present.

What was the climate with respect to the cost of living when these negotiations were carried on? Well, all of us know that there has been a spiralling cost of living during the last year. Certainly if we don't know, all we need to do is ask our wives. There is hardly a housewife in Regina who isn't appalled and just a little bit afraid of the rate at which the cost of living is increasing. All of us reflect this fear when we talk about inflation, unreasonable or ridiculous wage increases, or whatever else. Wage increases are just one price you know, the price of labor, the price of food, the price of clothing. Lots of things are going up rather rapidly and when a person has to pay a lot of his essentials he would like to raise the price of his product.

Let's look at the increases in the cost of food and the cost of clothing. I could give a good number but I think these two will illustrate the background and the framework in which these negotiations were being carried on.

Now, I am going to quote from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics consumer price index which we are all so familiar with. We all know that the index is based upon a figure for 1949 equalling 100. In April, 1965, the food index stood at 133.4. In 16 years, from 1949 to 1965, it had gone up 33.4 points. Thirty three points in 16 years, just about two points a year. By April, 1966, one year later, it was up to 143.7. In one year . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Is my hon. friend opposed to the fact that food prices have gone up a little last year?

Mr. Blakeney: — No, indeed I am not. I think that food prices ought to go up. I think that the wages of persons who have to buy food ought to go up commensurately. No, indeed, I am not here to oppose these increases in food prices any more than I am going to oppose the increases in clothing prices in a moment or two. I would like to think that we could get a grip on our economy. I would like to think that the Government in Ottawa would show a little more leadership in planning an economy so that we would not be faced with runaway inflation, but I have no real prospect that this will come about. Under these circumstances all I can do is say that I can't object to this segment of the economy trying to get their share and I resent, or at least do not agree with, the views of others across the way to want to prevent another segment of the economy from getting a somewhat commensurate share.

I want to say again, if I might use the Premier's phrase, that the price of food went up ten points in one year. I have already illustrated that the average increase from 1949 was two points, so that food prices increased from 1965 to 1966 at a rate five times as fast as in the period from 1949 onward. Increase in food prices alone was seven or eight per cent. In the face of this, was a stand by the corporation of no offer for five months a reasonable stand?

Let's turn to clothing. April, 1965, the clothing index stood at 121.2. For those 16 years from 1949 to 1965, the clothing index had increased 21 points. That's about 1 1/2 points a year, a little under that. In April, 1966 it was up to 125.3. In 12 months it had increased 4.1 points. That is an increase of a rate about three times as fast as in the period from 1949 to 1965. These figures show what we all know, what the corporation knew, what the employees knew. The cost of living is rising faster now than it has for 25 years.

No, it won't have been missed, I think, that not only are prices going up but corporate profits are going up. The Premier, in his opening remarks, was demanding that wage increases be curtailed so that the financial position of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation would not be endangered. I want to know whether he has demanded that the prices charged by Canadian Westinghouse or Canadian General Electric be similarly curtailed so that the financial stability of the corporation will not be imperilled.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I wonder if he has, and if so, when. You know the corporation has other expenses other than its wage bill. It has other suppliers of essential services and I wonder to what extent they are being asked to contribute to the health, the financial health of the corporation.

A reference has been made to Trans Canada Pipeline. I wonder if they have been asked to lower their prices a bit to improve the health of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. My bet is that they have enjoyed an increase in their rate or price or wage, as you wish, very much greater than four per cent or indeed, eight per cent.

Now, according to the Financial Times for August 1, 1966, profits for the first quarter of 1966 were up seven per cent over 1965. It's worth noting, I think, that the margin of profits in power, gas and water was nine per cent and the margin for the oil companies was ten per cent. I don't quote these figures to prove anything very specific except to say that prices are rising, profits are rising, and that it would be fair to expect that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was enjoying the same measure of prosperity as people in the power and gas business with which it competes or at least carries on its activities in the same economic climate.

Mind you, there were many, many more impressive profit increases than that. A little selection from the Financial Post of August 6 shows Asbestos Corporation up 77 per cent; CIL, 18 per cent; Lafarge Cement, 76 per cent; Husky Oil, 24 per cent; R.L. Crane Limited, 14 per cent, and so on. My point, Mr. Speaker, is this, we are in a period of sharply rising prices and sharply rising profits and under these circumstances I think any reasonable employer would expect that his employees would be pressing for substantial increases. In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, a union proposal of eight per cent must be considered reasonable and moderate. One would be hard pressed to find a union which made an initial proposal of less than eight per cent in the last year.

The IBEW are asking for 16 per cent. They may be perfectly right. I am certainly not criticizing them. Any other unions

that I can see are asking 20, 25, not necessarily expecting to get it, but they are certainly not coming in for a request for eight per cent.

What have other settlements been? We all know what the settlements have been in Eastern Canada. Seaway workers, 20 per cent and 10 per cent; longshoremen, 30 per cent; — these figures are not easy to quote sometimes because they are usually two and three year agreements — newspapermen at Oshawa, for the benefit of the people in the press gallery, 15 per cent to a 30 per cent; construction workers, 40 or 50 per cent; Air Canada, 15 per cent; B. C. longshoremen, 15 per cent; Quebec hospital workers, 11 per cent.

Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River): — Farmers minus . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Maybe. I know that it's easy to say that these increases are far too high and it's particularly easy for us, because we are in Saskatchewan and those people are in B.C. or Ontario. The job of the grandstand quarterback is always particularly easy, you know, even when they are attending football games when they might have been preparing legislation . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It's far too easy to say that these increases are just too large, far too easy to second guess some of the best men in Canada, far too easy to say that Senator MacKenzie doesn't know what he is talking about when he recommends 20 per cent for the Seaway workers; that Judge Rene Lippe has got holes in his head when he recommends 25 or 30 per cent for the longshoremen; or that Judge Craig Munroe when he comes in with a Conciliation Board report of 18 per cent for the railways doesn't know what he is talking about; that Labor Minister Nicholson isn't doing his job when he agrees with him; that Mr. MacEachen doesn't know what he is doing; that everybody is wrong; that Parliament is wrong; that everybody is out of step but Johnny, but good old Johnny here in Saskatchewan is right in step.

But this is just a little easy and a little too facile. I am sure that you were just as taken aback by some of these increases as I was about but I doubt whether we can write them off as being unreasonable quite so easily. We certainly can't when we look at our own local settlement. Let's look at a few of these: Police In Moose Jaw, five per cent to seven per cent; Regina General Hospital, eight per cent to twenty per cent; Pioneer Electric, 10 per cent plus a reduction in hours; Transit workers in Regina, 13 percent over two years; plumbers and sheet metal workers, 37 per cent over three years; carpenters, seven or eight per cent; dairy workers, at least seven per cent; Safeway and Dominion stores, 20 or 25 per cent over three years; Board of Education, six per cent; Saskatchewan Wheat pool, 8 1/2 per cent. These are settlements.

I don't know what these unions asked for but you can rest assured that in every case they asked for something more. In the light of this sort of a climate of sharply rising prices, rising profits and fairly substantial settlements all across the board, was the eight per cent request a reasonable proposal? I think the answer is Yes. I am not saying they should get eight per cent but certainly it is no evidence of being unreasonable that a

union asks eight per cent when settlements like these are in the wind. Was the corporation's position of offering nothing for five months reasonable and then offering two per cent and three per cent? You make your own judgement on that. I think the corporation has yet to make its case. In particular, was the Government's pose of doing nothing to urge a reasonable position on the part of the corporation, not even to introduce its mediation services as it would with a private employer, fair or reasonable? Did the Government do all that could have been done? In short, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the facts establish that the possibility of real and realistic negotiations have not been exhausted, indeed they have hardly yet been touched. In this I gather there is some measure of agreement. But as I say it takes two to tango. What we need is a resumption of work and a resumption of negotiation.

I invite Members to study this motion with some care because this is precisely what it does and it provides that when negotiations fail there shall be compulsory arbitration. Our proposal would fully protect the public, it would provide that all the possibilities of direct negotiation, mediation and conciliation be exhausted. It would provide that there be a try at voluntary arbitration and it would provide that if all else failed there be compulsory arbitration. We are taking away a basic human right as Paul Martin calls it. If this must be done so be it, but it ought to be done after all of the alternatives are explored.

The Government, Mr. Speaker, appears to know only two voices, that of dead silence or deafening shouts. It is time they found a lighter touch, it's time they brought to this dispute and to a good number of other disputes in which they are engaged the voice of calm and the voice of reason. Mr. Speaker, the motion which we proposed will get the mend back to work, will allow a resumption of negotiations, would give the Government an opportunity to use all of its available resources and in a calm and dispassionate way arrive at a reasonable settlement with this group of employees. Mr. Speaker, that is the proper solution. The Bill which was offered to us, extreme in its terms, radical in its scope, is clearly the wrong way to solve this problem.

I now turn, Mr. Speaker, to the second general question. Are the provisions of the Bill fair and reasonable? I have already said that in my opinion it was quite unnecessary to include tens of thousands of Saskatchewan workers who have never been on strike in their lives, who are working in plants or hospitals or for civic governments where there has never been a strike in the history of the institution, where there have never been any problems, acute otherwise, endangering public health or safety. Indeed, why is it necessary to say everybody who works for a civic waterworks in this province must have his right to strike withdrawn? Why is it necessary to apply this legislation to some tens of thousands of workers who have in no way provoked this loss of their rights?

All of us will recall that a few years ago there was another event that caused some public apprehension, the withdrawal of medical services for a given period. In the light of this medicare dispute there was no legislation to attempt to force people back to work, nor was there any attack on the legal status of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, no effort to do the equivalent of decertifying. The reason for this is perfectly clear, that relations between any group of people are a continuing thing. It

is all very well to use the sledge hammer but after that the relations get a little strained, and in every possible situation where you can avoid it the type of provisions which are in this Bill certainly ought to be avoided. There is simply no call for section after section which are in this Bill. As my leader has described it, it is a compost heap of the most onerous clauses of legislation that may be found in the legislation and the regulations of Canada, Ontario, Alberta and Saskatchewan, with a few clauses so onerous that no other province has ever found it necessary to adopt them.

Now I want to give you one or two examples. I wonder whether some Members opposite are aware of some of the provisions in this Bill. Suppose a union clearly represents a majority of the employees, say at the Regina Geriatric Centre and suppose that in the course of the dispute this Act is invoked, and suppose that one employee of that union is tardy in complying with the Act. I indeed have read the Act. It provided that where one employee of a trade union fails to do all that he reasonable can to comply with the Act and if the Premier and his colleagues think this is so, they don't want to have to establish it in the mind of anybody but their own, if they think mind you, just think that any employee – one and only one is enough however lowly, indeed it can be a stenographer under this Bill – has not done and these are the words 'everything reasonably possible' whatever that may mean, to end the strike then the union can by a simple Order in Council be forever decertified. That is what Section 10 says.

Now, this provision pays no attention whatever to the wishes of the employees as to what union they want to belong to: it allows the most arbitrary decisions by the Government; it can act on evidence which it doesn't have to disclose, or it can act on no evidence at all. There can be no appeal to any court, even to a Labor Relations Board. In short, any union in any field covered by this Act is at the complete mercy of the Government. The Government can say No to every and any wage request and if the union takes strike action the Government can promptly decertify it. Note this, if it decertifies it, any arbitration board that may come down in favor of those employees is nullified.

Suppose in selecting a judge to be chairman of one of these arbitration boards, one got a judge that was as ill-informed as Judge Craig Munroe of the British Columbia Court, who brought in the proposal for 18 per cent for the railway workers, or one as ill-informed as Judge Lippe who brought in the proposal for the longshoremen. Suppose one got one those and knew that the award was going to be much higher than you wanted, the simple thing then is to decertify the union; you don't need any evidence. You can by that little device nullify the arbitration board award. Now you may say that this is drawing a long bow; I would like you to read that Section 10 and whether you do not think that the principle in that section is thoroughly pernicious. I say that Canada has no before seen labor legislation so arbitrary and so unfair to tens of thousands of decent honest citizens in hospital or wherever they may be.

Mr. Speaker, I could point to some other reprehensible principles contained in the Bill. Section 9 provides that every employee of the union, every stenographer, every file clerk can be fined up to \$1,000 a day if her superiors do not send out some notices in proper form. Section 14 introduces into Saskatchewan the interim injunction which has been the subject of so much labor unrest elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, last week I was attending the annual meeting of the Canadian Bar Association in Winnipeg. That group is not noticeable anti-management in its orientation and, yet even there, there was a recognition that the device of the ex parte interim injunction should be avoided wherever possible because it has led in the past and can gain lead to strife and bitterness. All of us I think know of the strife that has been going on in Ontario over this everything and it leads to the disrespect of the law which the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) so properly deplored. There is a very, very strong feeling among many trade unionists that ex parte interim injunctions are given too freely and they are given so freely that indeed they ought not to obey them. I don't necessarily commend this view; I just say that it is very widespread and that since we have got along successfully without ex parte injunctions in Saskatchewan for some very considerable number of years, I wonder why at this point it is necessary to introduce this device which has been so very divisive elsewhere in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take too much time of the House. I have given my general views. I feel that the Government has failed to demonstrate that it acted reasonably under the circumstances and it has very materially failed to illustrate and to demonstrate that this Bill with its very onerous and unfair terms is necessary. I feel that it is established that we will have done our job as legislators if we can end this strike and get the negotiations, possibly ending in arbitration, on the road again at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I think there is no call for us to attempt to spread our net into every municipality in this province, to very hospital or nursing home and to intrude ourselves into the bargaining situation there. I feel that when we do this we demonstrate a lack of appreciation of the real needs of labor-management relations in this province. And I think that this Bill just demonstrates that on the part of the Government. I think the Bill is a confession of failure, it is a confession of the Government's belief that coercion is the way of the world. It is a declaration to all the employees of this province who bargain for their salaries, whether they are power workers or hospital workers or teachers or nurses or whatever, that the Government has no particular sympathy or concern for their positions. It reveals that the Government opposite is wedded to pressure, to coercion, to force. It's a Bill which does far too much and does it badly. It's a bad Bill, it should be defeated by this House. I invite the House to support the amendment, thereby solving the problem, and defeat the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — By leave of the House I would ask that we revert to Orders of the Day for moment or two so that a motion might be presented for sittings tonight.

Mr. Speaker: — Hon. Members ask leave to revert to Orders of the Day. Leave granted.

MOTION RE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to move, seconded

September 7, 1966

by the Hon. Mr. Heald that the adjournment of the House today, Wednesday, September 7th, 1966, be set at 10 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed.

QUESTION RE EMPLOYEES GOING BACK TO WORK

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, while we are on Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Government a question. Has the Government any assurance at all that if this Bill is passed that the employees will go back to work? We've seen the problem in Canada and there is no doubt looking back now, that if the original Bill introduced in the House of Commons had been passed as it was, the employees would not have gone back to work. A lot of them hesitated after the improvement in the Bill. Now has the Government any assurance that this Bill will be effective?

Mr. Thatcher: — We are quite certain that the great majority of the employees of the power union are law-abiding. I am quite certain that if this Legislature passes a law that most of them will wish to abide by it. In case there should be the odd one who does not feel that way inclined there are certain provisions in the Bill to take care of the circumstances as they arise.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Now, a supplementary question. Has the Premier discussed this with any of the labor leaders in the province to get their opinion or point of view on it?

Mr. Thatcher: — As individuals we have discussed it with some labor leaders.

SECOND READINGS

The debate resumed on second reading of Bill No. 2 — An Act Respecting the Continuation of Services Essential to the Public.

Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — In rising to take part in this debate I do so with some hesitation having to follow such a group of eloquent speakers. However, I do feel that as a farmer and a member of this Legislature representing a rural area it is about time that somebody spoke on behalf of our farm population.

Some may say, what does the effect of strikes on agriculture have to do with the Bill before us? We have heard a great deal this afternoon about the individual rights and freedom to the people. They say the individual rights and freedoms of people are being curtailed in this Bill. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the individual rights and freedoms of people should be a two-way street. The strikes that we have had in the past couple of years and in recent months are infringing on the individual rights and privileges of farmers. I think farmers should have the rights and the privilege and the freedom of delivering their produce to the market. This I suggest hasn't been given us in the last number of years.

I would just like to take a moment and read of a few of the

strikes that have affected agriculture in the last two years. First, Canada Packers, Toronto, 2,397 people on strike from July 18th and it's not finished yet in 1966; the Shipping Federation in Canada, various St. Lawrence ports in Quebec, 4,250, May 9th to June 14th; CNR, Montreal, 2,391, May 24th to May 26th; the Teamsters in Ontario, 7,000, January 19th to April 30th, 1966; the National Harbor Board, Montreal longshoremen, 3,500, April 19th to 22nd in 1966; the Massey-Ferguson Company of Canada, 1,600, August 11th to August 13th, 1965; the Albert Wheat Pool, Vancouver, 118 men, June 2nd to August 16th, 1965; the International Harvester Company, 2,100, May 14th to 17th, 1965; the Shipping Federation, St. Lawrence River ports, 3,500, November 9th and 10th, 1964. Now, we also know that in the operation of farming it becomes necessary at times to have farm trucks. During this time we had the Chrysler Corporation of Canada, 6,000 men, January 28th to March 8th, 1965; Massey Ferguson, Brantford, Toronto and Woodstock, 4,000.

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Better back up . . . Dodge.

Mr. Hooker: — And Ford Motors of Ontario, 10,000; General Motors, 24,000. These are the people that have been on strike in the last two years and I would like to suggest that this directly and indirectly affects agriculture in this province.

We all know that farming today is a risky business. We always have drought, we have the dangers of frost, we have the dangers of rust, we have the dangers of one thing or another to contend with and today that risk has been added to with the danger of not being able to get your crop to market. I think that the farmers in this country are getting sick and tired of the threat of strikes. I know the people in the rural area that I represent will be very happy to see some type of Bill passed whereby strikes are prohibited. I know that any time that the strikes prohibit the movement of grain it always seems to be called at the most opportune time. When we have a good crop and we have a change to get markets there is always strike at one coast or the other, the railroads or the Seaway.

Now I hope the people in this province would realize what would happen if we had enough strikes so that we wouldn't be able to meet our commitments to get our grain to market in the foreign countries. These countries would cease to come to us for their grain, they would go where else they could get it. I happened to note also, and I stand to be corrected in this, that I think that most of the labor unions that have called their men out and restricted the movement of grain in this country have been unions who have their parent organizations in the United States. I just stopped to think that, while these ships are sitting idly by in the harbors when we can't load them, after awhile they move on and fill with American grain. I just wonder if this happens to be a preconceived plan whereby they know that they can get some of the grain out of their own country. I notice there aren't any sympathy strikes in the United States along this time to keep those ships from being loaded. I also wonder when we hear so many people in this country complaining the American capital coming into this province to help industrialize Saskatchewan — that I haven't heard anybody complaining about some of the union fees that have been collected from the union members in this province being funnelled over into the United States to help these parent organizations.

September 7, 1966

I think today that Canada, a country the size it is, with the resources that we have, should be looking forward to running our own unions. I, for one, think that unions are very necessary. I think that . . .

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Tell us about corporations too.

Mr. Hooker: — Well, we'll do that also, I think that it would be very drastic if anything should happen that we couldn't have our labor organized in this country. But I don't see why we are not capable of operating our own businesses. If we can operate our own business elsewhere there is no reason in the world why we can't operate our own unions.

I also have heard much today of the right to strike. I think people should have the right to strike in some cases but I don't think that they should have the right to strike provided that by striking they are infringing on the very livelihood of others. When we think of striking in a utility, if they have that right, gives them the equivalent of an atomic bomb in one hand to probably a club to somebody striking in a small industry. I would hesitate to think what would happen in our province, especially in the rural areas if the electrical union had failed to step over the picket line put up by the gas union. If our electricity went out — I think most of us know that possibly this couldn't happen — what would happen to our rural areas along with our cities? We have many people in rural areas who have power, who have deepfreezers, who have all their own vegetables and meat. Ho long would this last?

An Hon. Member: — It would just be like when the had the Liberal Government last time, no electricity at all.

Mr. Hooker: — We had meat. I hesitate to think as I said before what could happen if this was allowed to pass. I know that the people in rural Saskatchewan will be happy if they know that their utilities will not be cut off. I know that the people in rural Saskatchewan would . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Who put up the power line? The managers?

Mr. Hooker: — They are still going up Toby. But speaking of strikes, a few years ago I read an article by somebody who said he had a method of ending all strikes. At the time it sounded fantastic to me; when I read his reasoning today it is even more fantastic. He said the way to stop al strikes is for everybody to strike. This means that everybody would refuse to go to their jobs for two or three days. We know what kind of chaos this would be; it would be impossible. It is even so far-fetched that we can't think of it. But if this were to happen I think in possibly two or three days or less than that, in tow or three hours, or ten hours or twelve hours, we would find out how dependent we are upon one another. I think in this country an all over, especially in pour province in the Dominion of Canada, it is about time we started thinking as Canadians rather than individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up any more time in this

House but I did feel that I should say something on behalf of the rural people and the farmers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I also am a farmer. This morning when I washed my hair I still found some chaff from the combine. And I know that in order to get a haircut all I need to do is to take one swath around the field and I've got it all.

But in listening to the debate I say that most of the points were covered quite well. Some remarks that were made on this side of the House I agree with. Some that were made on the other side I also agree with, even some of the remarks made by the Member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). But I just wonder what really led up to this situation that we have a strike in the Power Corporation. From all I have heard I feel that the Premier wanted this thing in order to try to find a way to cover up for the bad deal he got in Saskatoon at the Liberal Convention.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Thibault: — He wanted to pull the attention away from the real problem and by getting a strike going in the Power Corporation it would be pretty good.

But now when we look at what the boys in the Power Corporation ask for, it was an eight per cent request. I have a whole list of requests that were made in recent years and what they were settled for but a log of them were touched upon by the previous speakers so I will just pass over this. I want to point out that some of the increases that were made in the last while we have not heard very much about. As a farmer I know about the price of machinery, especially combines. This year, a very common increase is \$1,000 per machine. Now, do we hear anything across the way about the machinery company? Should we not do something about price control? Should we not have had a special session to deal with this outrageous increase in the price of machinery? Oh no. It's a different bunch of people that are doing it. It's these boys' little friends that fill up the campaign fund that are doing it. So we don't say anything about it.

Now, if this situation had been handled properly, I am sure that we wouldn't have a strike today. We can look back at what the Government across did just a few years ago. In order to raise the indemnity of their backbenchers they found a way of giving them an extra 25 per cent. They did it in a sneaky way but they did it anyway. They want to point out at these other boys so that they shouldn't get eight per cent, but 25 per cent was OK for them.

Let's look at Ottawa. They got some increase there too. Try and tell the farmer that the MPs should get an 80 per cent increase and he has got to pay an extra \$1,000 for his combine. You are going to tell the power boys that eight per cent, even six per cent is too much. And what did these boys at Ottawa do besides arguing about the flag debate, Mr. Spender and Mr. Rivard? Finally they had a heck of a fight over Mrs. Munsinger. But they got an 80 per cent increase for this stuff. Eighty per cent.

The power boys have got to work at a dangerous job and can't even ask for eight per cent. We are going to kick them out and say, "Now, you go to work. You have no right to ask for this much". I want to say that they certainly have used good sense. They have assured the people, their customers, that they would not be inconvenienced by shortage of gas. They stayed on the job. They did not walk off. So you have got to give them credit for having done their part in a very civilized manner. They did not come into this House and try to kick some of the doors down when they were not getting what they wanted as you know. Some of you might not know who this boy was, but he became the Premier of this province. But as for now the power boys, you haven't heard anybody knocking anything down yet. The gas is coming through the pipelines as before.

Now, there is another thing that disturbs me, the freedom of these boys. A few years ago they were told, "Now, you stay out of politics or you will lose your job". Very pleasant atmosphere to work under. And if you want to run as mayor of the town you've got to ask permission of Daddy because you can't be a mayor unless we OK it. And on and on this goes. Is this a good atmosphere? Are you doing your part in providing freedom to these boys and saying, "You go out and do your job. That's what we are concerned about". Oh no. Doing your job is not enough. You have got to be careful what you say about our political party and when they come along and ask for eight per cent we have got to check. I think they must have given a blood check to the union boys and said, "Well, this is one outfit we've got to get rid of, so we'll pass legislation to put them out of business".

Now, what are you doing is working to put a group of people into chains. But chaining people will not work. It may work temporarily but the time is going to come when they are going to break their chains. What has been done in the last while is just a promotion of hatred, trying to put farmer against labor. Now, my wife and I have got five kids . . .

An Hon. Member: — There's a lot of labor there, Art.

Mr. Thibault: — . . . three boys and two girls. I know very well that they are not all going to be farmers. Do you suppose I have got to teach them that go into the labor force that these farm boys are going to have to hate them, and vice versa. You can't work together. This is what has been promoted by the Liberal party in this province, get hatred going. You think you can win, but I am going to tell you this is not going to happen because I think they are just a little better informed than you people expect them to be.

I don't want to take any more time. I want to congratulate the power workers for the sensible, the high degrees of responsibility with which they have conducted themselves. If the Premier of this province had assumed his responsibilities the way he pretends to have done we wouldn't be here today trying to sort this thing out. I want to say that if we want to control one group let us work for price control to stop the increased price of farm machinery. We are talking about this great big crop we are going to get. Well you know, it's going to be swallowed up before we can lay our hands on it because most of it will have to be paid out on loans of money that is already borrowed.

Now, I don't want to take too much time but as a farmer I say let us see that everybody gets fair treatment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on an Act Respecting the Continuation of Services Essential to the Public, I have a few remarks to make in this respect. But First I would like to say a few words in regard to the motion that was put in by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd).

The five clauses of his motion are dealt with adequately in the Bill that is being proposed to the House. They are (1) to provide for the return of workers to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation which is provided in the Bill. (2) to order the resumption of negotiations on all remaining outstanding issues. Actually negotiations are still continuing though the operations are not as such. (3) to direct the parties to employ impartial mediation and conciliation procedures.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The Bill doesn't provide that.

Mr. Coderre: — I said, "Direct the parties to employ impartial mediation and conciliation services". Under the present terms of the Trade Union Act any parties in negotiations may apply to the Minister of Labour for conciliation and mediation services. Nowhere to this point has any of the parties officially asked the Minister of Labour, or unofficially for that matter, for any conciliation services. These provisions are there. They have not been used by either party. (4) to direct the parties, in the event these measures fail, to bring an agreement in 60 days. Everyone in this House knows what would happen in 60 days with respect to the weather. The Government feels at this time that it is too late in the season to take chances of definite breakdowns at this particular time. (5) No, in the case of all parties agree that the matter be submitted to arbitration and these procedures are set down in the Act.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be quite in order at this time to deal with the question of rights to strike. The right to strike derives its validity from the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In other words, it derives from the fact that man is essentially a rational animal endowed with the free will by which he can achieve dignity and self-fulfilment on a basis that gives meaning and purpose, based on justifying values, to life and living.

Any law or legislation designed to control strikes must recognize and respect the human, social, psychological and economic realities that are relevant to any strike situation.

One basic reality is that the first essential of a good law is that it must be enforceable.

A second reality is that recognition of unions and the right to strike came only through the ordeal of breaking the laws forbidding unions and the right to strike. These errors, I believe, should not be repeated.

The right of workers to strike and the right of employers to lock workers out are generally considered, subject to certain

restrictions, as necessary for the unimpeded operation of the collective bargaining process. If employees and employers disagree on a matter of wages or working conditions, the employees may refuse to work, or the employers may refuse to offer employment, on the grounds that the terms offered are not acceptable. The right to strike may be considered as an extension of the right of an individual worker to withdraw his labor if he regards conditions of work unacceptable to him. When a number of employees act together and withdraw their labor, such as going on strike they are actually exercising their individual rights simultaneously.

But, add a big but, since we have chosen the democratic process of government as the most appropriate form for our particular society, and since our democratic constitution guarantees us certain freedoms of religion, association, education, speech, and so on, the right to strike appears to be consistent with our true national ideals. In most instances this is so.

When however, circumstances are such that the freedoms of a majority of citizens are endangered by the exercise, on the part of a small minority, of their freedoms, it is the duty and responsibility of the Government to take action to protect the welfare of the majority. I am not saying that at this moment there is a danger but the possibilities are there if things continue. This implies a restriction of the right to strike by means of compulsory arbitration. Thus, in times of apparent emergencies, strikes and lock-outs may be made illegal, because all sections of the community, including labor unions and employers' organizations, consider work stoppages, which are acceptable at some time, to be intolerable at some other time.

In many jurisdictions, it has been found necessary to implement legislative provision for compulsory arbitration in the case of essential services. There is no need to dwell on the precedents which exist in Canada today, on the question of compulsory arbitration. Since the first element of compulsion in this country, in principle and in practice was introduced in the Railway Labor Disputes Act of 1903, passed by Parliament following a long drawn-out strike of trackmen on the CPR, this action has, since then, been taken many times.

In a number of cases, compulsory arbitration is operative for certain public utility undertakings, particularly those for the supply of water, gas and electricity. In Saskatchewan, it has not been necessary to date to introduce such provisions but the necessity is here now. However, action has become imperative. These services are essential for the health and well-being of our citizens. The interruption or impairment of these services would pose a grave danger to the community, depending on how long it lasts, not to speak of the inconvenience which would result.

The real solution to the problem of strikes is to solve the disputes leading to strikes before they reach that crucial stage. To a marked extent, this characterizes the disposition of industrial disputes in Saskatchewan. Despite the many problems associated with the rapid growth of the non-agricultural sector of our economy and the accompanying increase in the industrial labor force, the number of disputes which result in strikes in Saskatchewan is a small fraction of the total number of disputes. The amount of working time lost through strikes in Saskatchewan in 1965 was only 48 minutes per non-agricultural wage earner. This

compares with 192 minutes for Canada as a whole. In percentage terms, Saskatchewan's time loss represented 0.04 per cent of the total working time available. The corresponding percentage for Canada as a whole was 0.17 per cent, or more than four times the Saskatchewan figure. It can thus be said, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan's industrial relations climate is a relatively peaceful one and for the sake of all our people we must not allow it to be otherwise.

The settlement of disputes before they reach the strike stage requires mutual understanding, respect and responsibility to the common good of each individual person who can be affected by the implications of the dispute, that is the collective public interest.

Mutual understanding, Mr. Speaker, is possible only on the basis of mutual values and this is dependent on the understanding and appreciation of what is meant by the dignity of the human person.

Experience has proven that laws governing or regulating the process of negotiation can be fair, effective and fruitful. The same experience has proven that the effectiveness of the laws has depended on the attitudes of those involved in disputes. It can be demonstrated, for example, that respect for authority and the mutual respect of those involved in disputes have declined to the point that the participants have no respect left for the dignity of the individual. It can also be demonstrated that the social integrity of any organization suffers in that it becomes estranged and insulated against the recognition of the dignity, worth and interdependence of the human person.

The negotiating component of the collective bargaining process implies that the differences between the parties involved can be reconciled by compromise and concession. I understand in some cases there have been no concessions in the present strike, with a view to concluding an agreement. It goes without saying that if one side or the other does nothing but make demands or stipulations when they meet, negotiations soon breakdown. However, in the overwhelming majority of cases, willingness to give and take, in the spirit of the mutual respect which I have mentioned, made the negotiating procedure successful.

Consideration of the problem of strikes requires a realistic appreciation of all the facts mentioned above. It is necessary that the meaning of the right to strike be fully understood.

A strike is an instrument or weapon of economic dispute or conflict involving the ultimate use of peaceful economic strength to correct conditions of injustice or social abuse. I fail to see, in this particular case with which we are dealing any injustices or abuse of the corporation toward its employees. Rules regulating a strike must be carefully defined to ensure that they can be observed to forestall their extending into violence and destruction, and this is always a danger of strikes.

Social moralists, Mr. Speaker, are agreed on four conditions that can justify a strike. The four conditions, Mr. Speaker, justifying them are namely:

- (1) The cause for which a strike is imposed must be just.

(2) There must be sufficient hope of success. It is morally wrong to involve workers in a strike where there is little chance of success, resulting in their being worse off when the strike is over than they were before. In this connection, it may be pointed out that it will take the average machinist for example, involved in the recent airlines strike in the United States 16 months to make up the pay he lost during the strike. With regard to the employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation currently on strike even if the additional four per cent salary increase which they are not asking had been granted, it would take an employee six months to make up his pay if the strike were to last one week, and a year if the strike were to continue for two weeks. If it should turn out that an extra two per cent were provided, that is over and above the four per cent now offered, it would take a year to recover the lost pay in the case of a one week strike and two years for a two week strike. You can see for yourself the tremendous loss of revenue to the individual worker and no gain, no personal gain for having been on strike. I think it's essential that legislation be brought in so that the workers can get back to work. Very often the loss of pay has never been recovered. I wonder how many employees considered this very important economic factor when the strike vote was taken. This does not mean that losing a strike necessarily nullifies benefits or that it had to be without purpose. There are rumors around the city as the moment that the percentage of strike votes was around 50 to 55 per cent as compared to the 86 per cent that appeared in the press the other day. It appears that the majority of the employees are not necessarily in favor but that they would sooner work than not.

(3) The benefit to be gained must be greater than the measure of harm that can be done.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Would the Minister permit a question?

Mr. Coderre: — Yes.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — That rumor about the strike vote, is that something like the car you saw?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — We'll just leave it at that. However, there is no way for any party to know very specifically the percentage of the membership of a union that wishes to go on strike.

However, as I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, the benefit to be gained must be greater than the measure of harm that can be done. This imposes on those who decide to go on strike the responsibility for the rights of those who are not directly involved. That means, Mr. Speaker, the common good, or what is termed as the public interest.

(4) Every effort, Mr. Speaker, must have been made to arrive at a peaceful solution by way of negotiation, conciliation, mediation, or other methods. And I do believe that this effort has been maintained insofar as the corporation, which is a crown corporation, is concerned. They haven't walked out of a meeting. It is a fact that the union negotiators have walked out on it. This is why they have a strike. Otherwise, the negotiations, as I said, have

already been continuing and no requests have been made to the Department of Labour for conciliation services.

Human nature, Mr. Speaker, being what it is, there can be times and occasions when the exercise of the public authority is desirable and even unavoidable. This is one of those times.

By its nature, democratic government is delegated to protect and promote the common good of all individual persons making up the community. This means that the public interest is the first criterion for evaluating the justification of a strike on a basis of justice and charity. The public interest is more directly involved when it is a question of public services established for the good of a community or state for supplying common needs to life and living. Some services, Mr. Speaker, can be so essential as to defy any justification of strike action such as fire, police, health, utilities. This requires of the public authority a specific concern and consideration for the rights and well-being of those who cannot lawfully resort to strike measures. And that is the consumers.

Now, as for control and prevention, the first means to control and prevention of abusive or destructive strike action — it is destructive because the working man is not earning his pay at that time — must be the basic education needed to establish a respect and appreciation of human rights and the common good.

The second step or means should be a body of just laws and/or regulations. This should include provisions for fair and impartial arbitration. This is being provided for in this Bill.

It has been said that compulsory arbitration of labor disputes is as consistent with democracy as is compulsory education or taxation, especially when the welfare of the province is at stake. It was mentioned a moment ago that Australia and New Zealand have had compulsory arbitration since the early 1900's. It was introduced there with the general support of employers and the workers who desired a new and sounder method of settling disputes without recourse to costly strikes and lock-outs. Both workers and employers actively support the system in New Zealand and Australia, which obviously they would not continue to do if they were not happy with it or if they felt it to be unfair. It has been proven in many cases where demands have been made by the unions and management has denied them and where there has been arbitration that the worker has always had more out of the pot. Experience in other countries as well indicates that arbitration tribunals have been able to gain and maintain a reputation of the highest standards of impartiality.

Arbitration has been called a solemn process and is not a game to be won or lost by manipulating the rules. At the same time it is not so official and impersonally legal a technique that it does not take into account the rights and aspiration of the individual, both the employees and the public. While it cannot completely do away with disagreement, because there is still bound to be disagreements after arbitration has taken place, at the same time it can keep it within bounds and can play a very important role in the maintenance of just and harmonious industrial relations.

With these words, Mr. Speaker, showing the pros in some ways and the cons and the reasons why arbitration is being brought in in this case, it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I will

support the Bill and not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, permit me at the outset to extend my congratulations to the hon. Member for Milestone on his recent appointment as Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wish him success in that new post. He is a member of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, a teachers' union, and I invite him as such to join Members on this side of the House in supporting the amendment and defeating the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!!

Mr. Smishek: — This would be in keeping with the policy of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation which, as he knows, is strenuously opposed to compulsory arbitration as are most trade unionists as are we in this party. I would like to warn him that the axe might fall next on the teaching profession.

Mr. Speaker, from the first day the Government opposite took office its policy has been that of attempting to destroy the public confidence in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation through attacking its management and that the SPC was an unprofitable enterprise. Secondly, they have attempted to destroy the union representing the employees. There are a great many examples that can be cited, some of them have already been mentioned today. Speakers on this side of the House have already pointed out that the bargaining proposals of the union are indeed reasonable.

Several years ago I had the opportunity of attending two meetings of the National Productivity Council, an agency of the Federal Government. At these meetings were present the top business people of our country, labor leaders and government officials. During the course of discussions at these meetings with regard to wages and improvements in working conditions I found that there was a large measure of agreement that industry has an obligation to improve wages to meet rising costs of living and share with the employees the benefits of increased national production and company profits.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can call it 5:30 o'clock and resume at 7:30 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 o'clock to 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at 5:30 I made reference to meetings that I had attended several years ago of the National Productivity Council.

There can be no argument that the cost of living to SPC employees, as to all consumers, has increased sharply in the last year. The increase in the gross national production in 1965 over that in 1964 in Canada rose by 8.7 per cent and is 11.6 per cent greater in the first quarter of this year compared to that of last. The SPC profit picture as reported to this Legislature earlier this year is good, \$400,000 in 1965. Wage increases in recent months in a great many cases in this province and throughout Canada are greater than those proposed by the Saskatchewan power and gas workers.

The Premier, as he has already been reminded, is reported in the press to have said last week:

I think the second union is a much more sensible one,

in reference to IBEW, the union representing the electrical workers. This union has asked the SPC for a wage increase of 16 per cent, exactly double what the OCAW has requested. One might assume from the Premier's remarks that had this OCAW union asked for twice the amount they proposed they would have been a more sensible organization.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refresh the memories of the Members opposite. I want to quote a statement made by the Minister in charge of SPC. The Minister at the spring session was replying to a question by the Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) as to the reasons why 417 employees had left the SPC last year. The Minister said that one of the reasons was wages, that private industries and corporations in Saskatchewan are offering higher wages and that B.C. had an active recruitment program offering employees more money. He is reported in the press as saying:

All that can be done when drains in certain areas are noted is to try to improve working conditions and wages so that any dissatisfaction can be rectified.

What did the Minister in charge do to rectify this problem? For 5 1/2 months he sat on his hands. In fact what the Minister did last spring was to ask the SPC or ask the union to request of the SPC substantial wage increases to meet this problem. The union did ask for an increase of eight per cent. What were they offered in return after five months of negotiations as at August 16th? A pittance, Mr. Speaker, a pittance, two per cent was offered for office employees and three per cent for technical and non-office employees. This offer was then increased to three per cent across the board and under pressure of a possible strike, raised to four per cent, plus some adjustments to certain classifications which amount to between 1/4 and 1/2 of one per cent, this with the Federal Government in the background approving wage increases anywhere from 18 to 30 per cent. What the Government said to the office and gas workers of SPC was that we invite you to strike so that we can have an excuse to pass this notorious compulsory legislation. The workers were deliberately provoked into strike action through insults and provocation. There was no effort on the part of the Government — and this is admitted — to mediate, conciliate or even arbitrate by impartial people.

The Premier and his Ministers in the last two years through their propaganda have helped to foment industrial strife throughout this province. They have been saying over and over again that there is a large labor shortage in Saskatchewan and that wages are rising rapidly. Just two weeks ago the Premier, appearing on a television broadcast, said that we had a labor shortage of 12,000. Well, a check with the National Employment Service offices in the province shows that some 9,000 persons were registered as seeking employment, were unemployed, not to mention the thousands who for one reason or another do not register. You may recall that one year ago the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) speaking at a labor convention said that the nonagricultural labor force in Saskatchewan had increased by 20,000. Well, when the Saskatchewan Economic Review was handed down about one-half hour before the last session prorogued, we learned that the nonagricultural labor force in 1965 had increased only by 3,000. Some

September 7, 1966

workers have concluded that if things are so good, let us get in on part of this bonanza. The result, a new militancy has developed among workers. They see no benefits passed on to them at the initiative of the Government, so they fight for what the Government has said is the right and proper thing to do. Workers know that in periods of economic prosperity they then made gains, not in periods of economic depression. The Government's foolish propaganda is beginning to catch up with them. Now, I am uncertain whether or not some of this propaganda and misinformation was an intentional prelude to this obnoxious legislation that is before us today. There are reasons to be suspicious.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the Bill before us several times — I am at a loss for words to describe it. What the Government has done is to take the worst features of similar legislation in other provinces and incorporate them into this Bill and add many of its own new reactionary and vicious thoughts. The anti-labor legislation enacted by Joey Smallwood in regard to the loggers' strike a few years ago and the bad labor laws passed by the Duplessis Regime in Quebec put them among the angels beside what is contained in this Bill.

Joey Smallwood gave unto himself the power to outlaw a single union in a single dispute. The law here is all embracive. It will apply to any number of unions the Government wishes to bring under proclamation. Duplessis gave unto himself the power to decertify a union under certain conditions, but not because of a strike, under circumstances envisaged in this Bill.

One has to ask himself, in the light of the excellent free-strike record in the Saskatchewan hospitals, gas, power and other institutions and industries that may be brought under this law by the Government, why the punitive measures? Why the dictatorial powers? Why this denial of rights and freedom? I cannot help but conclude that this is vindictiveness. The Premier and the Minister in charge of SPC, over the months have shown nothing but contempt for the power and gas workers' union and the hospital workers' unions in this province. They say this is the way we will fix them. Let me remind the Government of their promise before the 1964 election — they promised the wage earners and the people of Saskatchewan —and let me quote their particular election plank:

To maintain and improve trade union rights and security.

Let me remind the Premier of this answer. I note that he is not in his seat but maybe some of the other Members can pass on to him this particular bit of information the he should be reminded of. In Answer to a promise, or in answer to a letter that was written to the Premier by the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association in 1960, they asked where the Liberal party stood in regard to collective bargaining rights in respect of public employees? The Premier, then the Leader of the Opposition, replied this way, and I quote:

I have your letter which states that your Association naturally feels some concern about the attitude of the opposition parties. You have therefore decided to seek a statement in writing from the leaders of the four political parties, the CCF, the Liberal party, the Progressive Conservative party, and the Social Credit party, setting out their positions on the maintenance of the right

by law of the Provincial Government employees in Saskatchewan to bargain collectively.

The recent convention of the Saskatchewan Liberal party made this statement of policy:

‘To promote justice and harmony in the economy we propose to maintain the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively. This general statement applies equally to employees of the Provincial Government and others.’

No suggestion here of compulsory arbitration. Every suggestion and every implication that employees of the public and all employees of the province will have the free collective bargaining rights that they had in the past.

You may recall that during the spring session of the Legislature when the Bill to amend the Trade Union Act was considered, Members on this side of the House expressed concern that the Act may be interpreted in a way to make unions legal entitles. The Premier tried to assure us that his was not the case and said to the effect that he did not believe that this should be the case. But now in this Bill the heavy hand of the law comes down, not only making unions sue-able, but also its officers and members. It imposes heavy penalties. It provides for dissolving unions by government decree. It enslaves the workers; they shall no longer be free. It is opposed to every principle of our Bill of Rights — the Canadian Bill of Rights — the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the Conventions of the International Labor Organization of which Canada is a member.

I have been a member of a labor organization for 20 years. I know something of the dangers of this type of legislation. I have never thought that in this province, in this period of our Canadian history, when we are about to celebrate our 100th birthday, such ruthless and dictatorial legislation could be introduced in what is a free nation. Only those who have no respect for freedom and rights of people would conceive this kind of arbitrary legislation.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are members here who are interested in having this session adjourned as quickly as possible. They have crops to harvest, and I am interested that they take advantage of the good weather we are presently enjoying to reap the bountiful harvest. I will, therefore, not discuss the many iniquitous, the many bad provisions in this Bill. I shall point them out and their dangers when we meet in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to direct part of my remarks in this debate to the problem of staff dislocation and job elimination caused by technological, automation and work-method changes. All wage earners including the employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation interpret the introduction of automated equipment and changes in work methods as a threat to their job security. This is a serious problem in this company, particularly since the change of government and changes in senior management. Let me point out the seriousness of the problem. If you examine the 1964 report of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation which was laid before this Legislature you will note on page 12 the report states:

At the end of the year the staff totalled 2,789, a reduction of 114 compared with the total at the end of 1963.

September 7, 1966

The 1965 report tabled in this House also on page 12 states:

At the end of the year the staff totalled 2,770. This is a reduction of 19 compared with the total at the end of 1964, notwithstanding the addition in May of 204 employees from the City of Regina Light and Power System.

Had the same complement of staff at the end of 1965 been retained as in 1963 and adding the 204 employees of the Regina Light and Power System then we would have had in the staff of the SPC 3,107 employees; instead we have 2,770 or 337 employees less. The staff reduction in this two year period was 11 per cent.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that the 11 per cent reduction was not all due to automation. Some of it is due to the SPC contracting out some of its operations and construction to private contractors, on which the contractors make a profit and for which the consumers must pay, but this is the way the Liberal Government satisfies its friends. However, part of this job dislocation is due to automation. Late in the 1964 a computer system was installed to do data processing, billing and so on. How many jobs disappeared due to the computer system being installed, I do not know. No doubt the corporation spokesmen will say that no employees lost their jobs as a result of this, and this may be true to a point. But the problem goes much deeper, for which unions are expressing great concern. We must keep in mind that automation is not only displacing people directly but also indirectly due to what has become known a 'silent firing', with regard to workers who would have been hired but for jobs that were eliminated by automation.

The union proposed that a new article be written into the agreement to cope with the problem of automation, with the changes in work methods and retraining. The union's bargaining proposal was as follows and let me quote:

With regard to dislocations and the need for retraining of employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation due to changes in work methods, technology and automation, the following shall apply:

1. There shall be a notification to the union on the above mentioned matters as soon as they become known but, in any case, at least 18 months before any change takes place.
2. The corporation undertakes full responsibility for any training necessary for employees to fill new positions created by changes mentioned above.
3. The corporation undertakes full responsibility for retraining those employees whose positions are affected and who are unable, for any reason, to secure new positions created by changes mentioned above.
4. The corporation undertakes to provide a minimum severance pay, based on three weeks' pay for each year of service, for all employees who do not elect for retraining and whose positions become redundant due to changes mentioned above.

With that they made two notes:

1. This article does not prevent employees from exercising their bumping rights as set out in the agreement between the local union and Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Any limitation on bumping rights shall only be made by mutual agreement between Saskatchewan Power and Gas Local 9-649, OCAW and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

2. This article may be revised . . .

I want you to take note of this,

. . . at any time by mutual agreement between the union and the corporation as a result of proposals for revisions initiated by either part.

Management may have had reasons to question the time period in effecting changes or the amount of severance pay proposed. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the principle of giving adequate notice of technological change and establishing a program retraining of dislocated employees is one that no reasonable person could argue against, but the corporation was adamant. It refused to consider any proposition put forth by the union. As at August 3rd, the union finally withdrew its proposal and in its place suggested that a joint company and union committee be established to study and discuss the problems posed by automation or new work method changes. But again the company refused to consider this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, may I bring to the attention of this Assembly some important information. In March, 1964, a Federal-Provincial conference was convened by the former Federal Minister of Labour to consider the problem of industrial technology and make recommendations to governments and employers. The March 11, 1964 issue of the Regina Leader Post in part states:

Federal and Provincial Ministers of Labour have set the stage for a new partnership in tackling the problem of the technological solution in Canada. This appears to be the chief result of a two day conference of Provincial Labour Ministers meeting with Allan J. MacEachen.

In summing up the results of the conference Mr. MacEachen said there were five areas of agreement. One reads this way:

A promise of provincial support for the new manpower consultive service in its pioneering program of encouraging labor-management studies of potential technological problem spots.

Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, that the present Minister of Labour was not at that meeting and I do not know what his position would have been. The significant fact is that all Provinces and the Federal Government agreed to encourage labor-management study of the problems posed by automation and technological changes. I suppose that one can assume that had the Premier attended that conference he might have threatened to secede, as he did at the August Federal-Provincial Conference.

Another fact to remember, Mr. Speaker, is the recommendation of the Saskatchewan Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) on this important matter when the BA Oil refineries were on strike last

winter. His recommendation was, and I bring it to the attention of the hon. Members opposite:

In view of the interest and concern by the parties in the impact on manpower and conditions of employment resulting from technological changes and automation, it is recommended that the parties utilize to the best advantage of the company and the employees all scientific improvements and establish a committee to be known as a Committee on Automation consisting of equal representation by the employer and union.

Pending the implementation of recommendation made by the above Committee on Automation, the following provisions shall apply:

(a) The company shall notify the union six months in advance of intent to institute changes in working methods or facilities which will involve the discharge or lay-off of any person who was employed by the company on the 31st day of August, 1965.

(b) The company in cooperation with government agrees to participate in every way possible in training and retraining any employee.

(c) Any employee who is discharged or laid off because of technological change or automation shall be entitled to severance pay equivalent to one week's pay for each year of service in the employ of the company to a maximum of 26 weeks.

There is a reason to believe that the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) goes along with developing training and retraining programs as a result of redundancy caused by automation. In announcing the increases in living allowances for trainees at technical and vocational schools on August 24 he reports in the press as saying:

We recognize the urgency of adequate training programs. We intend to do everything possible to assist and encourage upgrading and skill training for those who desire it to enable them to take advantage of the new employment opportunities in the rapidly changing economy.

I do not know whether the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) spoke for himself or for the Government. It would appear he spoke for himself, since it looks as if the Government does not want to apply this same rule to itself, its agencies and corporations. It would appear that the Premier and the general manager of SPC need more than encouragement to deal with the problems of automation. I might suggest to the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) that he consider the purchase of a sharp object and apply it to that part of their anatomy on which they sit. They need some rude awakening from the irresponsible positions that they have taken. I agree with the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) that our economy and conditions at the work-place are changing very rapidly. Many people in Canada agree on this point, labor agrees and so do many employers and governments, economists and engineers, and so do many of our farm people since in recent years they have experienced many changes resulting in a reduction of persons employed in the farm industry.

In the last few weeks we have heard a good deal of discussion and debate with reference to the problems of automation in our railway industry in Canada. We have heard about the report from the Federal Industrial Inquiry Commission relating to the Canadian National Railway Run Through. This commission is more commonly known as the Freedman Commission. Members know that Mr. Justice Freedman was appointed by the Federal Government as a commissioner to investigate and report on the problems of Run Throughs and technological changes in the railway industry. What does Justice Freedman recommend as some solutions in dealing with this problem of automation? Well, here are some of his recommendations:

1. The Commission is of the view that an obligation rests upon the company to take reasonable steps towards minimizing adverse effects . . . upon its employees. That obligation has its roots in the principle that when a technological change is introduced, the cost of reasonable proposals to protect employees from its adverse consequences is a proper charge against its benefits and savings.
2. The Commission recommends that any employee who is required to change his place of residence as a result . . . should be compensated by the company for financial losses suffered in the sale of this home for less than its fair value.
3. An employee who has served the company for at least one year and loses his employment with the company . . . should be entitled to receive severance pay.
4. Dieselization and other technological changes have been contributing to the decline in railway employment. Those are the consequences in human terms and to eliminate or reduce their effect is the task to which cooperative efforts of management, labor and government must be directed.
5. The present situation which permits management to make unilateral changes in working conditions during contract period is the manifest inequity which clamors for attention and correction. The Commission believes that the company give . . . 30 days' notice . . . as a prelude to the negotiations thereon.
6. The Commission recommends that legislation is required, either by amending the Railway Act or the Industrial Relations and Dispute Investigation Act 'that technological innovation development or change proposed by the employer which would materially and adversely affect the working conditions of the employees should either be deferred for negotiations at the next open period or be dealt with in the same way, as if it were a provision falling within the scope of Subsection 2 of Section 22 of the Act. That particular Section provides that the parties may by their collective agreement reserve a particular issue for later consideration and still retain the right to strike or walk-out with respect to the settlement on that issue'.

Let me restate, Mr. Speaker, the position of the union as at August 3 on this important question. They asked that a joint labor-management committee be established with or without the services

September 7, 1966

of the Federal Manpower Consultative Services Division of the Federal Government of Labour. Back in 1964 the Federal and Provincial Ministers of Labour agreed that there should be consultation and study between labor and management on the problem of automation. The Saskatchewan Minister of Labour made such a recommendation in respect of the Oil Industry Dispute. The Minister of Education for the province of Saskatchewan agrees that training, retraining workers displaced by automation is an important and serious problem. Labor and management throughout the length and breadth of this nation in many instances are sitting together and are working out the problems of automation. The Federal Government in establishing the Freedman Commission recognized that there was a problem in this area. The Freedman Commission has agreed that there should be joint collaboration and negotiations and agreements to deal with the serious problems of automation. But what do the Premier of Saskatchewan and the General Manager of the SPC say? They say No, we will not meet with the union to consider these problems on a joint basis.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, that governments have a responsibility, they have a duty to give leadership and pave the road for labor and management study and negotiation of these problems facing our economy and our working force.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this Bill proposing compulsory arbitration. There is no question but there are many, many people who have given this matter study who are equally opposed. I noticed in the September 1st issue of the Regina Leader Post the position taken by the Canadian Bar Association. My colleague from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) pointed out the position of the Bar in respect to the ex parte injunction. Here is the position that they took in respect to arbitration or compulsory arbitration. Let me quote:

A resolution proposing compulsory binding arbitration of strikes or lock-outs which threaten public, health, safety or essential services was defeated by the Labor Relations Section of the Canadian Bar Association on Wednesday.

This appears in the September 1st issue of the Regina Leader Post.

Students and researchers of these types of laws have found that such laws do not resolve industrial strife, they encourage it. But more important, Mr. Speaker, this proposal seriously denies freedom and rights of people.

One year ago my youngsters bought me a record for my birthday. It is a transcript of a speech or a series of speeches and program of the Washington March held on August 23, 1963. The main speaker at this huge meeting which was attended by some half a million people was Dr. Martin Luther King, a Civil Rights leader. In his address to this throng of people he talked about the need for justice, he talked about the need for recognizing and ensuring rights of people. He concluded his remarks by saying:

Let freedom ring, and when that happens we will all be able to sing together, free at last, free at last. Thank God we are free at last.

Mr. Speaker, if this legislation is passed the workers, the citizens of this province will say, "Free no more, free no more. Dear God, we are free no more".

I will support the amendment. I will oppose the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to say but a few words in this debate in reference to this Bill because I do not feel that passing it in its present form would solve the problems of this strike or other strikes that might arise. I take exception to forcing workers to accept working conditions and wages which have been enforced or imposed upon them by arbitration until at least both parties concerned have exhausted entirely, and I might emphasize entirely, their rights and their privileges to bargain and to bargain freely with out hindrance or imposition.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we as Members of the Legislature should be taking a much deeper and perhaps more serious look into the rising cost of living or what the worker has to pay for a say a new car, or what the farmer has to pay to the implement dealer for a combine or tractor. These are the things that the farmers are concerned with. If we were to take some action in this line and to its curtailment in prices then I feel we would automatically eliminate to a great extent strikes and the causes of them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Pepper: — And might I suggest to the Government, Mr. Speaker, that if this strike is settled, I hope it will be very soon, that I still do not feel that we have eliminated the cause of strikes unless some measure is taken to face up to the facts that this good fortune in our so-called affluent society must be shared by all people of our community. So until this is done I cannot see why we should take steps or even consider taking steps to eliminate the rights of some of our citizens to protect themselves, if we are not prepared to make it possible for them to enjoy the affluency enjoyed by others. In passing this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we are not only taking away from our workers the right to express their wishes in regard to the working conditions and their wages but we are taking away from them the right to say what condition and what terms of their wages that they would like to go back to work to.

In further examination of the Bill, I find that it covers a very large scope of workers. Coming from the constituency of Weyburn where we have several hospitals I find that it will affect the workers and the staff in these hospitals. These hospitals, whether it is the unions, whether it is privately operated, or a mental hospital, they have not to my knowledge ever had any trouble in negotiating or bargaining as to the salaries or working conditions or any other benefit that they might so desire. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is definitely unfair to include hospital workers at this time in a Bill when they have given no reason why they should be included in it. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one way and one way only to grapple with the problems of strikes and that is by bringing wages, prices and profits into some proper relationship with human justice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the amendment which was presented so ably by our Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) is a good amendment which suggests that we specifically deal with the

September 7, 1966

single dispute referred to. It provides for the return to work of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation employees involved. It calls for the continuation of negotiations and employment of impartial and conciliation procedures. And if, after a period of time, this fails it should be referred to an arbitrator, one named by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan. This, Mr. Speaker, to my way of thinking, is a fair and a just way to deal with this situation and I take much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a only a few comments on this Bill, largely because I think it is a manifestation of many other problems that will require a good deal of discussion not only in this province but in this country in the future.

This year we have witnessed in this country one of the worst years of many of labor-management unrest. One of the results of this, Mr. Speaker, is the settlements in favor of increased wages which have not followed the generally accepted guide lines of increases of wages to cover the cost of living and an increase in productivity. I am continually amazed, Mr. Speaker, at how the Members opposite look with such great disfavor on increases of vie or six per cent an greater, while many people in this country, I am sure, particularly in rural areas, people employed in service stations, cafes, farmers, people privately employed across this country, would look upon wage increases of that nature on an annual basis as being exceptionally favorable.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of collective bargaining between management and labor is not one which is undertaken a very great deal of the time in our society in good faith. It has now resolved itself into demands by unions of how much can I get. The concept of cooperation in our society has run on to foul ground. In many cases the corporations or the companies accept these large wage increases and simply pass them on to the consumer in increased prices. This is the way they maintain their margin of profit. There is quite ample evidence today in the economy that is depressing. The result is increased inflation resulting in a deteriorating standard of living for all of us.

The Seaway workers, the railway workers have been able to extract from the economy simply by use of sheer power unfair increases that will be passed on to the rest of us in increase in prices. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we are all in favor of what is reasonable increases to the working man. I am also amazed, Mr. Speaker, how often the Members opposite speak about controlling corporation profits. It is quite true that each year that the profit picture of many companies increases, but they always fail to mention the investment that is put in by that company. It would be a strange thing if a company like Steel of Canada which last year invested over \$200,000,000 in new capital facilities didn't have a higher profit this year. I would suggest that if they didn't then labor and all of us in this country are in a very poor situation indeed. High prices to labor or extravagant demands must be controlled and become somewhat reasonable. Once these are reasonable then the increased prices passed on to the consumer through the various companies, I am sure, can be given a much tougher look.

But I am greatly concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the people

who cannot share in those wage increases that we have seen. There are many people in our society who have fixed incomes. Many of them I have already mentioned, the small independent operators, businessmen, barbershop operators and many nonunionized people also who are not able to bargain for the large increases that we have witnessed. I think that the current dispute between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the OCAW is only a sign of the times in this country which indeed illustrates to us that we have lost the spirit of cooperation and that too many of us have decided to go it alone and get everything that we can. The attitude has already resulted in unrealistic gains for some people and increased costs that will jeopardize the position of our country in export markets. I am convinced at this time that this is a situation requiring strong leadership from the governments across this country in the interests of people who are not able to protect themselves.

I was very pleased this afternoon to listen to the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) who adequately outlined the need of protection for people who were not able to protect themselves in this power struggle.

I think the second important point is that today we are continually seeing complete disregard for the law. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is great concern in this regard. For better or worse we Members of this Assembly and indeed of the legislatures and the parliaments of this country are elected to pass in our wisdom or poor judgement, the laws of this country. Yet we are continually seeing people who disregard these laws, and a very adequate example is the recent railroad strike. There is provision that if we don't like a law in the next election we can change the members who have made it and I think that this is a fairly realistic approach. But if as individuals we all wish to take the law in our own hands and more or less what we like, if we think what we are being offered is unfair, then the governmental system as we know it is beginning to break down. A continued trend in this direction is almost certain to lead to increased violence and anarchy. Government itself must reassume its roll of strong leadership and it must insist that the laws as passed by legislature or parliament are obeyed and upheld. If they are not then we in effect have no government at all.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, because I am anxious to expedite the proceedings here as quickly as possible, I support this legislation although I do not believe that compulsory arbitration is the solution to all of our problems. I believe that at this point in time it is absolutely necessary that we bring about at least certain wage settlements that are somewhat realistic. I do not believe that other industries can be compared. I believe there is only one basis for a new agreement between management and the employees and that is an agreement which is based upon the productivity and cost of living index. Other areas of course are certainly open to negotiation but I believe that this is the only arrangement which can be arrived at which is realistic as far as Canadian economy is concerned. I feel that in this case the Government is doing its very best and is doing the proper thing in attempting to set some guide lines for what are realistic increases where the working people are concerned.

Also I believe that some of the provisions in this Act, while they may appear to be somewhat strict, are necessary for the provision of decertification and to make the union a legal entity and I feel these are necessary largely because I think at this

September 7, 1966

time that governments can no longer tolerate disregard for the law as it is passed. I think it wrong to allow groups in our society to disregard the law and more or less dictate what they think is good, or whatever their power is able to take from society as a whole. I think that the Government is doing the proper thing in passing legislation which is tough enough that we can legally and morally expect it to be upheld. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the Bill as it is presented and do not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, there are a few observations I would like to make. I know that we are called here today on a serious and important matter. Certainly many of us have reservations about legislation of this nature that would take from the working man any of the rights and privileges and freedoms which he enjoys today. Yet in the interest of the economy and of the people of Saskatchewan, the time has arrived when we must muster the courage and the intestinal fortitude to take the action that the serious of events today demands.

Having been around this Legislature for quite considerable time I can recall some ten years ago the Power Corporation and the Government of that day were having some considerable difficulty in negotiating a new contract. It wasn't the Opposition of the day that were using obstructionist tactics to prevent the Government from negotiating a fair and equitable contract while at the same time being conscious of the fights and privileges of the people of Saskatchewan.

I know today that many accusations have been made against the Government. I think it was termed that this was a political vendetta against this particular union. I think it was said the Government had been contriving for some time to bring about these precise conditions in order that it could set the stage for this precise, vicious legislation which we are having today. It condemned the Government for not taking a direct hand and taking the negotiations out of the hands of management into the hands of the Government. The Government was condemned for dragging its feet for five months when a settlement could have been made. Someone said, I think the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), "They sat tight from March to mid-August".

These are some of the accusations that are being made today. I thought it would be of interest to this session, particularly to the younger members, to realize that there was a time in history when a former Government's hands did not look so lily white, when they too were having some unkind things said about them. I want to read some of those unkind things that were said in that day when that Government faced this same particular union over the bargaining table. I looked up the annual report of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for 1955. It said that the Power Corporation began negotiations with the union on April 29, 1954 and carried on these negotiations for nine months in 1954 and a settlement was finally reached in May, 1955, one year and one and a half months.

Now, I ask who were dragging their feet at the table at that time? I want to read to you from press reports what I have read in going

back over the papers, some of the comments made in that dispute. These comments were made by officials of the union and it is interesting to note that in November, 1954 . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — You should hear what they say about you.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . Local 649:

Oil Workers International Union passed an emergency resolution at the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour meeting in Prince Albert and they said, “After having dragged their feet for seven months this is an emergency which we can no longer tolerate”.

And the resolution charged the Government of the day, the Provincial Government with nullifying the rights of free collective bargaining . . .

An Hon. Member: — Shame.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . by restricting its management groups that they had no power to bargain on wages. Today the Opposition says we should have stepped in and taken the bargaining out of the hands of management. In that day they were condemned for not having left the bargaining in the hands of management. Here are some further charges by the union of the day. It says:

Personnel men in employers’ organizations are attempting to scuttle security rights, affecting promotion and layoffs, and rehiring . . .

An Hon. Member: — No strike.

Mr. Cameron: — That was the atmosphere that prevailed. After that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, which I understand by tonight’s paper, are to pay us a visit tomorrow, likewise got into the act in 1955 and met in convention. They had some words that weren’t very gentle too. I want to read a few of those as reported in their convention:

The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour charged the Government’s wage freeze had brought a deadlock in negotiations between Government employees and management of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Saskatchewan Government Telephones, Saskatchewan Government Insurance, and other crown corporations and all government agencies.

There was a wage freeze where the Government had stated,

We do not intend to give any considerations to wage increases this year.

The Federation condemned the Government’s action again as

. . . nullifying the rights of the free collective bargaining.

And this is interesting. They termed it:

anti-labor, reactionary and completely dictatorial.

September 7, 1966

This was the friend of labor in those days. And the Federation went so far as to demand that the Government rescind its decree and restore to all its employees free, unrestricted and realistic collective bargaining. Where had their rights and privileges gone during those nine months? Labor people felt it anyway. They had been washed down the drain. And then the Saskatchewan Federation followed up with a brief to the Government and I read that brief with some interest. In this brief the Federation of Labour linked the CCF, which touts its labor legislation the most advanced in Canada, with anti-labor employers. Now they ask, why did the Government not interfere? Saskatchewan Federation of Labour in that day said:

Labor unions feel that the so-called right to collective bargaining with the Government which the Government has held as unique in this country because the Trade Union Act applies to the provincial civil servants and crown corporations staff, is actually a sham.

Because managements of crown corporations have been told by the administration that they cannot bargain on wages.

An Hon. Member: — They can put a freeze on them.

Mr. Cameron: — Note at this time, no long the Power Corporation but the Saskatchewan Government Insurance employees had ceased negotiations in November. Discussions were discontinued. Employees of Saskatchewan Government Telephones had suspended negotiations with management. They were no longer at the bargaining table and the employees of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company had adjourned negotiations to await the outcome of the dispute between the Power Corporation and the Government. So here we had a condition existing not only in the Power Corporation, but in the civil service, in the crown corporations, in telephone in buses, and power, where there had been an order, a wage freeze order had been issued, and they refused to change that particular stand. This was the spirit of labor unrest in the province in 1955.

Then I notice, in early 1955, in fact in February, the local of the OWIU stated that “strike preparation is continuing in full force and strike action is almost of certain consequence if early settlement is not obtained”.

And that went on from February until May before a settlement was obtained. I don't think it is mere rumor that consideration was being given to calling a session of the House such as was called yesterday, that legislation had been prepared which would at that time compel the unions to go back to work and to have compulsory arbitration.

An Hon. Member: — Jekyll and Hyde.

Mr. Cameron: — When the union capitulated it wasn't brought in and I understand an order was issued for it to be destroyed.

We have heard a lot about this Government being anti-labor. I want to review the atmosphere of labor in Saskatchewan today in the civil service and in the crown corporations. I happen to be the Minister in charge of the two of them. I want to state here on behalf of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company the first

time in the company's history a new contract was signed before the old contract expired and negotiations with the Saskatchewan Transportation Company lasted a mere two and a half days and set a record for the shortest negotiations in the history of the company.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I would say that was a responsible and a prudent union and the new contract, signed in two and a half days on December 15, 1965, provided with salary increases of 3.6 per cent for 1966 and 3.1 per cent for 1967. Coming to the Saskatchewan Government Telephones that employs about as many people as does the Power Corporation, we met with the union that represents the employees of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. We sat down with the union to negotiate a new contract on September 13th and concluded negotiations on October 28th, 1965. Negotiations lasted 18 days with a total of 26 meetings which established here again a record as the shortest period of negotiations in the history of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — The contract was signed in December, 1965. The new contract provided for wage increases of 3.6 per cent for 1966 and 3.24 per cent for 1967.

While these negotiations were going on in the crown corporations for which I am the Minister responsible, negotiations were going on with the employees of the Sodium Sulphate Plant, with employees of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. They too reached a mutually satisfactory agreement, Sodium Sulphate a settlement of 3.2 per cent; Insurance, 4 per cent. These are men and women in the employ of various phases of Government activity. They are each represented by their own union. No doubt these unions too had considered the increase in the cost of living that was mentioned here today. They had looked to the overall economy of the province. They had considered what in their judgement was fair and equitable for the ensuing year and the coming year.

Now, we find the position where some people in the Opposition say, well, they are only asking for eight per cent. It's a modest increase. Probably it should have been granted, they will say. Thus this legislation is a mere excuse to shackle and put in chains this particular union. I ask you to consider this. The union which represented the employees of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones has almost three times the number of employees of this union, those unions which represented and negotiated on behalf of the other crown corporations settled for what they considered was a fair and equitable adjustment in salaries. Now, I ask you this, why should one very small segment of labor say, "I am entitled to more than the others negotiated for? Our judgement is correct, theirs was wrong. We don't care what they settled for. We are out to get our own demands." I wonder how the people of Saskatchewan, yes, and the people in the other crown corporations and the other unions, who have acted with such responsibility, view the actions of this particular union when they are asking for twice the amount of the settlement that these unions agreed to work under.

In the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, after the contract

September 7, 1966

was signed, both the company officials and the union representatives commented on the cordial and friendly relations that existed during the term of the negotiations. These parties to the bargaining in these public utilities recognized that they had an obligation that goes beyond those imposed by law, obligations rooted in the character of the service to the community. They were aware that the existence of these obligations were such as to impel those representing the employer and those representing the employees to develop a relationship marked by mutual confidence and respect. Relationships of this kind do result in agreements and understanding that will be beneficial to the employees, to the institution which they serve and to the people of Saskatchewan.

I wish to pay a compliment to the unions and the employees in Government service in general, particularly my own two in the Telephone Corporation and in the Bus company, for assuming a responsible attitude, for being conscious not only of their own rights and privileges but of their obligations to the institution that employs them and to the people of the province and as members of society and as citizens of the province, to work for what is fair and just to us and that does not ample on the rights and privileges and worthiness of others. I ask you, if you look at this in this light and ask yourselves, wherein is there injustice? Where does it lie when a union, after a mere five months, compared to fourteen months before, gets up, closes its briefcases and leaves the bargaining table and goes on to the street to announce, "We're going on strike"? Who ceased negotiations and why? And this type of legislation which we have? And surely to goodness, if we were to keep faith with those other unions and those other employees who have kept faith with us, we cannot shudder or capitulate in the face of this which in turn would be a kick in the teeth to them. That we do not propose to do.

I support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, the time interval that has been involved since the employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation withdrew their services has been scant and with the calling of a special session within a few days of that time and the lateness of receipt of the printed Bill, the opportunity to properly prepare for this debate has been somewhat limited. However, there are a few brief comments which I wish to make at this time with respect to the Bill which is before us.

Compulsory arbitration, Mr. Speaker, I believe, is regarded by most people as a very distasteful business and it is generally accepted that it should be used as a final measure only when all other methods of settling disputes have failed and a situation results where peril, extreme hardship or danger to the economy of the country materializes. I suggest to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, that there is a little evidence to indicate that such a situation exists in Saskatchewan today. I believe it is evident to most people who have been close to the matter that the differences separating management and the employees are not so sufficiently great that a solution could not have been reached if a more flexible attitude had been assumed by management.

As late as 3 p.m. on September 1st, management stated that

it was not prepared to move in any direction on any of the outstanding proposals put forth by the employees in spite of the fact that it had been made clear by the union that it would be available to continue bargaining. But, Mr. Speaker, instead of attempting to arrive at a mutually agreeable solution the Premier saw fit to call a press conference for 4 o'clock, he had called the conference — incidentally even before the 3 p.m. meeting — for the purpose I expect for announcing that a special session of the Legislature would be called. At that time the impression was left that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation customers would be left without gas service in spite of the fact that it had been made clear that this would not be the case. The experience since the work stoppage occurred would seem to indicate that the Premier and his colleagues were attempting to use scare tactics in order to gain support for this kind of legislative action., The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that supervisory personnel are in charge of gas distribution and the union membership stands by ready to meet emergency measures which may arise involving the health and the safety of the public — including gas leaks — and the needs of institutions caring for the sick and the aged. With these considerations in mind, Mr. Speaker, then it is not surprising, if I say once again, that it is felt in some quarters that the Government welcomed this opportunity of the work stoppage as an excuse to take the course of action which is under considerations at this moment. It has been said in this House, and I repeat again, that no attempt was made by the Government to undertake the legitimate steps of collective bargaining. No attempt was made to set up mediation proceedings, no attempt was made at conciliation nor was there an attempt made at voluntary arbitration with an arbitrator being appointed who was mutually agreeable to the disputants in this particular case.

I believe this suspicion would seem to be borne out by the fact that Saskatchewan Power Corporation employees are not singled out at this time for attention. The Bill ranges far and wide, Mr. Speaker. At the outset it was suggested that employees of Saskatchewan Government Telephones might also be included. It was later announced that these employees were not to be included at this time, leaving the inference that they too would be rolled into the package if they should dare provoke this particular Government.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that without provocation other workers including hospital workers have been tried and sentenced in advance. This leads us to believe that the hard line may be expected with these employees with the Department of Health holding a tight rein on the demands of the hospital boards with the ultimate result that wages for these hospital workers will likely be met with a good deal of resistance. I say that this is particularly unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because a large number of the people referred to in this particular legislation are people who are at the lower end of the wage scale, unless doctors are to be regarded as hospital workers and I rather suspect, Mr. Speaker, that they are not for purposes of this legislation.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that according to the annual survey of the Income Tax Department which takes note of earnings by occupation that doctors are at the top of the heap as far as income across Canada is concerned, that farm labor invariably year after year is at the bottom of the heap and that hospital workers and people in that job category are next to the bottom. I think it is unfortunate and it is also to be expected

September 7, 1966

that future requests for an upward adjustment for the wages of these employees will meet with a minimum of success with the knowledge that their group, their bargaining group has been made impotent by this particular piece of legislation. These are workers, Mr. Speaker, who have a fine record for tolerance and for responsibility and they are not deserving of the kind of arbitrary action which the Government has taken. Hospital employees in Saskatchewan have never been on strike, Mr. Speaker, in fact no strike vote to my knowledge has ever been taken among these employees. It is extremely doubtful that strike action would ever be used by these employees but I make this point and attempt to add emphasis to what I have already said in saying that it is now clear that for these employees with the option to withdraw their service now gone their power to bargain has been nullified and the union representing hospital workers has been relegated to a position little better than that of a debating society.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, as other speakers have noted, that the Government may see the error of their ways only when it is too late to stop the flow of trained personnel which have been named in this legislation to other parts of Canada. Concern has already been expressed at the exodus of large numbers of people to other provinces and I suggest to you today that the Government may be sure that this trend will continue and it will be accelerated.

Mr. Speaker, the dispute between the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers and the Power Corporation cannot be regarded as a single special case in this country at the present time. It stems from conditions that are not only well known by Canadian citizens but they are conditions which are causing grave concern among those who are presently in the ranks of labor. Job security and automation, the rising cost of living, are not matters which will be disposed of by unfounded claims that high wages are causing inflation and that labor in Canada is pricing itself out of the world market. One can only suspect that these claims are being made by some people who know better and are using this as a smoke screen.

To go to a rather authoritative source, Mr. Speaker, I go to the United States Bureau of Labour statistics in a survey of average yearly increases in wages, salaries and labor benefits in manufacturing from 1957 to 1964, the latest data which are available. Canada lags behind in wage gains compared with eight other countries. These other countries, Mr. Speaker, are the United States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, the Netherlands, France, Italy, West Germany and Japan. I think this makes it relatively clear, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian labor is not pricing itself out of the world market.

From the United States Department of Commerce data the comparison of percentage increases in labor costs per unit of output in manufacturing for the same industrial countries gives us also a rather interesting text. It shows Canada 3 per cent, France 42 per cent, Mr. Speaker, the United States 5 per cent, Germany 23 per cent, Japan 11 per cent, the Netherlands 26, Sweden 16, the United Kingdom 16 per cent, Italy 17 per cent. I think it may be seen once again, Mr. Speaker, that Canada's unit labor cost in manufacturing was the lowest of all those countries which were studied. In 1960 for some further evidence, Mr. Speaker, the average hourly income in Canadian manufacturing was \$1.78 per hour; last year it was \$2.11; the increase is 19 per cent.

But let's not talk exclusively of manufacturing. If we examine the total, the entire labor income across Canada, the increase during this period of time was 43 per cent, but I think to gain the proper prospective while examining this issue, Mr. Speaker, an examination of corporate profits by comparison should also be in order. In 1960 corporate profits before income tax totalled \$3,338,000,000. Last year, 1965, these had risen to \$4,199,000,000, for an increase, Mr. Speaker, of some 56 per cent.

Well, I think most people would agree, Mr. Speaker, that a double standard would seem to exist in our society when labor gains must be justified by increase profits or by increased productivity. They must be justified while increased profits go largely unnoticed. Unions are required to justify their demands in terms of increased productivity in the public interests. The actions of trade unions are examined closely and are exposed to public scrutiny while the decisions which are made by the industrial community are made quietly, Mr. Speaker, without fanfare. Workers are expected as a public duty to exercise the necessary restraint to prevent inflation, but what about profit rates, Mr. Speaker? What about capital cost allowance for income tax purposes? Why not salary rates for business executives and management with the full family listed on the payroll as employees?

Mr. Speaker, I was interested earlier in the day to hear a few remarks which the Premier had to pass with respect to inflation. I believe I had some notes on it here somewhere but I believe it might be a fitting time perhaps to have a look at some of the causes of inflation which the Premier might have missed in his examination of the problem. Members I believe will recall that at the end of World War II there had been created a brand new flock of war-made millionaires who were not satisfied to continue playing the game under existing rules and in a short time they were successful in having the excess profits tax and price controls lifted. But with an accumulation, Mr. Speaker, of wartime savings and backlog of consumer needs to be filled and with the debts cleared, the steel companies did not go on strike, Mr. Speaker; they simply raised the price of steel by 12 1/2 per cent overnight, Mr. Speaker, not because of wage increases but simply because they regarded this as good business practice. Other industries that were affected directly by the price of steel followed this example and this caused an immediate increase in the prices of stoves, refrigerators, automobiles, farm trucks and farm machinery and so on. This caused the wage spiral with wages chasing the cost of living ever since. I think it must be agreed also that an important factor in this situation has also been administered prices by large firms in determining the price level of their product without regard for the demand side of the market.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier had a few words to say also earlier in the day with respect to the Swedish example in regard to the labor relations picture in that country. I trust that some Members may have also taken note of an editorial which appeared in the August 29th issue of the Regina Leader Post which was entitled "Sweden Points the Way". This particular editorial draws attention to Sweden's rather enviable record with respect to time lost as a result of labor disputes. The editorial points out that from 1954 to 1963 the number of days lost annually per hundred persons employed never exceeded 5.1, and twice the figure dropped to .1. It is interesting to note also that the low figure in Canada was in 1960 when that figure dropped to 15.6, that is days lost with respect to each one

September 7, 1966

hundred workers in the labor force and the record in Canada was 15.6 in 1960 with days lost ranging up as high as 57.8. I think it is especially appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that this particular editorial states that this enviable record in Sweden, which I expect the Premier was drawing attention to and which was mentioned in this editorial, points out quite conclusively that the enviable condition which was seen in Sweden was not, and I repeat, was not achieved through compulsory arbitration. I believe also that it is well known that the economics of these two countries, Mr. Speaker, rest upon entirely different foundations. I suggest to you at this time that, if some of those who in the past have shown a preference for the anarchy of production and the planlessness with which production is undertaken in the capitalist jungle and who wish to reap the benefits of a socialist economy, they will also manifest their willingness to make the necessary adjustments.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has given recognition to the rising cost of living at least as it applies to his own operation. He saw fit I believe to raise his own per diem allowance for \$25 a day to \$50 a day as he travels hither and yon. He seems to suffer no remorse when he accepts his present remuneration as Premier in addition to the \$2,700 a year approximately that he receives rain or shine by virtue of his services a former Member of Parliament for Moose Jaw Lake Centre. The Premier also seems to favor comfortable living if the \$17,000 renovation to his office and Executive council chambers can be regarded a guide. The purchase of an executive type aircraft for the Cabinet and himself to fly about in would seem to add further to the belief that some luxuries are to be expected in this affluent society of ours.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it might be most appropriate at this time to examine the wage scale of the employees who are involved in this current work stoppage, beginning at the bottom of the wage scale with group one up to approximately group six to bring this thing into proper perspective. The Minister of Public works (Mr. Gardiner) when he spoke a short while ago was extremely selective in his choice of job categories. I want to begin with a group one, Mr. Speaker, quickly up to group six. Group one shows a junior blue print operator at a handsome salary of \$206 a month, a junior clerk \$214, a junior clerk Typist \$224. We come to group two, Mr. Speaker, where an accountant clerk earns \$237 a month, a clerk typist \$245, a commercial artist's helper \$253, a file and records clerk \$270, a junior audit clerk \$286. In group three, Mr. Speaker, this range finally comes into the \$300 a month category. Group four, Mr. Speaker, is in the mid-\$300 a month category and group five ranges between \$335 to \$385. Finally when we reach group six the top of that particular group shows \$420.

Mr. Speaker, one might expect that the Premier with his own taste for lavish living might recognize the need for an upward adjustment for these employees. However, Mr. Speaker, from his ivory tower, this 20th century Marie Antoinette, regards this \$206 to \$420 a month range as ample to raise, to feed, to clothe, and to educate a family. It must be apparent to most people that over half of that monthly figure which I have quoted, Mr. Speaker, will be absorbed by a payment on a very modest NHA home and the grocery bill. Over half of that figure will be dissolved by that particular payment of those two features. I expect that had the Premier lived in the days of the French Revolution that he instead of Marie Antoinette might very well have been the author of that now famous expression, "Let them eat cake".

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to vote against this Bill on second reading for three reasons in particular. First because I am convinced that the differences between management and the employees of the SPC are not so great but that they could have been easily resolved through the normal process of collective bargaining. Secondly it must be recognized that the compulsory settlement of this particular work stoppage does nothing to solve a very serious inflationary problem which is affecting the entire Canadian economy, a problem, Mr. Speaker, which had its roots in action which was taken by government over 20 years ago, a problem which will be solved only by government action on the national level. The Premier, I suggest, would do well to use whatever influence he may have with his colleagues in Ottawa to convince them to show the necessary courage and good judgement to apply necessary and evident remedial measures before an already critical problem becomes more acute. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out a fundamental principle. I oppose compulsory arbitration except where all other methods of settlement have been exhausted and an emergency situation exists. I feel quite sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that such is not the case in this dispute and I will be obliged to vote against the motion and I will be supporting the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few comments on statements made by the Premier, the hon. Member for Morse, when he introduced the Bill this morning. He said and I quote his directly:

Only since this Government took office has the Power Corporation had reasonable profits.

He implies, Mr. Speaker, that this is due to more efficient operation of Saskatchewan Power because Saskatchewan now has a Liberal Government. The Premier may not know it but intelligent people know that this implication is idiotically inaccurate. Improvement in Saskatchewan Power profits anticipated in 1966 compared with the some \$8,500,000 realized in 1965 will be directly due, in the main, to the increased proportion of generated power which is hydro power and to the inclusion of the utility previously owned by the city of Regina within the general operations of Saskatchewan Power. The Premier in introducing the bill this morning said and I quote him again directly:

It is the duty of the Government to manage the affairs of the province in a practical and responsible manner. Any uncalled-for invasion of the resources of Saskatchewan Power will have to be borne by Saskatchewan Power and therefore indirectly by the people of this province.

He made a remark about a debt in excess of \$530,000,000 and a net return of something in the neighborhood of two per cent on the investment in Saskatchewan Power. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasury of this province is still borrowing money for Saskatchewan Power. In fact, less than one week ago the Provincial Treasury borrowed \$15,000,000 maturing on October 1st, 1986. At a price of \$97.75, to yield 6.45 per cent. This is indeed interesting, Mr. Speaker. It is general knowledge in the investment community across this country that the Province of Saskatchewan was ready to come to market with a bond floatation of between \$10,000,000 and \$15,000,000 in late June or early July. On the same day that the Saskatchewan issue was to come to market

an issue of Toronto Metro municipal corporation, came to market at a cost to that municipal corporation of 6.09 per cent. The Saskatchewan bond issue was withdrawn. It is also generally common knowledge in the investment industry in this country that the withdrawal occurred because of the decision, I suggest in a rather intemperate mode, of the Provincial Treasurer of this province. He was not going to pay a rate in the market place equal to the rate Toronto Metro had to pay and this was the reason for the withdrawal. Mr. Speaker, two months later the Saskatchewan issue came to market at a cost to this province not of 6.09 but of 6.45. The difference of .36 per cent means an additional cost on the \$15,000,000 issue of \$54,000 per annum and for the next 20 years a total of \$1,080,000. That is an invasion of the potential earnings of Saskatchewan Power and will have to be paid for by the people of this province.

I recall that a once prominent Liberal, now departed, derisively commented in a rather flippant reply to an inquiry in the House of Commons, "What's a million?" Well, it's \$80,000 less than the additional cost which Saskatchewan Power must now bear because of the intemperance and incompetence of the present Provincial Treasurer. Is this not an uncalled-for invasion of the resources of Saskatchewan Power? Will this cost not have to be borne by Saskatchewan Power and, therefore, indirectly by the people of this province? Is this businesslike? Is this efficient? I'll admit the market is difficult to gauge but surely the Treasury officials and the Provincial Treasurer of this province are aware of the fact that we were in a tightening money situation and could quite logically have come to market in the initial stages rather than wait for the two month delay. Mr. Speaker, if it were not for this type of incompetence I suggest that Saskatchewan Power might well have been in a position to make a more generous offer to its employees and carried out proper negotiations which might well have led to a satisfactory settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and oppose the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking in this debate until I listened to the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) who did not stay on the Bill at all so my speech will probably be in tune with his.

On rising to speak in this debate I submit it is significant that this is the second special session that has had to be called in recent weeks to deal with a labor dispute which could not be solved by any other means. It would appear that labor relations are at a low ebb across Canada and the main reason for this situation appears to lie with the actions of certain labor leaders. The question we must ask is whether Canada is to be governed by its elected representatives or by labor unions who for the most part are controlled from outside of our own country. I cannot help but continue to be amazed at the strong opposition by the NDP to American capital to develop our economy while at the same time they have an overwhelming desire to use American labor leaders to destroy our economy prior to the next election.

Across the country there is a growing concern that labor unions feel they are above the law of the land and in Saskatchewan they are aided and abetted by a political party that a few

years ago ignored the please of the small businessman and the farmer and hitched their wagon to the labor star, only to find that they have lost their identity as a farmer organization; and instead of the dog wagging its tail, the tail is now wagging the dog.

The labor union movement must be recognized as one of the most important segments of our society and well they should be, but as such they must be expected to act responsibly. I want to compliment the Member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) for his remarks this afternoon concerning the responsibility of unions, because they are only too true. It is true also that the majority of our unions do have responsible leaders and do act in a responsible manner. For this the country can be thankful. Unfortunately there are a few unions that fall into the clutches of the irresponsible labor leader and other subversive elements who are concerned only with their own power and glory rather than for the benefit of their members or for the benefit of society to which they belong.

This appears to be the case in the present situation. Surely to goodness responsible leaders with the best interests of their members at heart would not have called a strike at a time which would cost their members three days' holiday pay. Surely the leaders, if they had been responsible, would not instruct their members to picket illegally in such a way that the police force had to be called on several occasions throughout the province to bring about legal picketing. Yet these were the action of the leaders of the OCAW. One is not really to surprised, however, when one realizes that the international representative of this union is the same one that used such bad judgement in several other situations in the last year. The OCAW has unfortunately been coerced and duped into playing politics for the benefit of our NDP friends opposite. Their knowledge of politics leaves a great deal to be desired. This combined vendetta against the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan is the real reason that the strike was called before conciliation, mediation or voluntary arbitration could be adopted, and don't ever let the people of Saskatchewan think any different.

The situation that exists in Saskatchewan today did not begin with the strike of the Power Corporation, but it had its birth in a back room when our CCF-NDF friends opposite convinced the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to pass a resolution a their 1964 convention not to rest until the new Liberal Government was defeated. This action directed no doubt by the two SFL executive members sitting opposite was the greatest disservice that any so-called responsible organization could have done to the union or labor movement in this province. Fortunately most of the unions in the province have placed responsibility to their members and the public ahead of politics, and it was only the power-hungry, selfish leaders of the OCAW who proved to be the offspring of the SFL resolution.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has suggested that this Bill is an attempt to stir up animosity between various groups of the province but I would remind his and Members opposite that this animosity was created a few years ago when the CCF went through an ill-conceived and ill-advised wedding with the labor union movement. I said then and I say again now, if labor wants to be respected by government regardless of the political party in power, they had better forget political partisanship and concern themselves with their responsibility to their members and to the public.

September 7, 1966

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) also said that there is no need in Canada for compulsory legislation. This may be debatable but it is also true that there is no province in Canada where the Federation of Labour and its supporting unions have massed such a concerted attempt to overthrow a government as here in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) referred to the Liberal promise in the last election campaign that we would maintain and improve relations with labor. I want to remind him that this we have done under difficult circumstances brought about by that Member and his friends. Did the SFL by which he is employed wait to see whether the Liberal Government's attitude towards labor was favorable? They did not. Before the ink was dry on the oaths of office of our Cabinet Ministers the SFL passed a resolution to defeat the Liberal Government at all costs. They dared not wait but had to resort to immediate distortion of facts and creation of fear to try and turn the unions against us before we could create a favorable atmosphere for labor in this province. The Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) and his senior colleague from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davis), another executive member of the SFL, have done more to destroy relations between this Government and labor than any other two people in Saskatchewan today. They have sacrificed the welfare of many of the people who elected them to chase the sacred cow of labor as they believe it to be. In the same way other Members opposite have sacrificed the farmers who are responsible for their success for 20 long years.

It will be interesting to see Members sit and squirm when the vote on this Bill is taken because no matter how they vote they are destroying themselves. It will be interesting to see if the farmer Members will succumb to the wishes of labor or vice versa. No matter which way it goes the final wedge has been driven between farmer and labor and it is nobody's fault but their own. They alone are responsible for being on the horns of a dilemma. Any political party who are willing to put all their eggs in one basket, who are willing to overlook principles for political expediency, and who are willing to sell out the people of the province they represent for the benefit of international labor unions deserve no sympathy and their obliteration at the polls at the next election will justly deserved.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment and support the motion, which due to the actions of Members opposite is the only possible solution under the circumstances prevailing in the province at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, I've been very disappointed in this kind of debate on this particular matter in this House today. I had assumed that the Members had come to the Legislature for the purpose of settling not only this immediate labor dispute, but of taking steps that would at least direct attention towards finding a solution to the rash of labor strikes that we have had throughout Canada, not only this year, in the past and that will occur in the future. We must find a solution. My chief objection, Mr. Speaker, to this Bill is that it does not provide a solution and it goes far beyond the immediate strike facing the Power

Corporation at the moment. It is extended to other workers who haven't struck, who probably don't intend to strike at all.

I have in my hand here a wire from Lloydminster and the Premier knows something about that area. It's an area in which he prefers to carry on his discrimination in the matter of Homeowner Grant and other things. His reputation is really high in that particular area of the province. The wire reads:

As provincial workers we have sent our protest to Premier Thatcher. We strongly oppose his taking away our bargaining rights. We, as a local, feel and know you will do all possible to fortify this.

Well, I certainly will. There is no good justification for having extended this legislation to include hospital workers, to include workers in other public utilities, with the threat that there is a possibility we will be extended to the good telephone workers and other good workers, with no regard, Mr. Speaker, to whether the cost of living continues to go up or not. It is with deep regret that I heard very few, if any, except on this side of the House, refer to the needs of people as individuals, their needs and their families' needs, Mr. Speaker. It was nothing but a chorus of condemnation of trade unionism as such, holding out dire consequences of what will happen to the poor, poor public and to the poor, poor farmers as a result of their final resort to strike action.

I don't like strikes. No one likes strikes. But we do need to find a solution. It has all been over-simplified, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier starts to cry about the farmers. For what reason, Mr. Speaker? He hopes they will forget because it is bad administration, bad handling of this case, when he was taking his trips to Europe, flying over to the United States to see his millionaire friends, when he probably should have been at home attending to business and attending to the affairs of the citizens of this province. May I remind him and others that it was the laboring people that built the power line, it wasn't management. It was the labor people that moved the grain to the seaboards, not management. It's peculiar that when things go well the railways get all the credit for moving the grain but these workers moved the grain. They are the ones that did it. And if they were driven by virtue of economic circumstances to take the action they did in their own defence and in defence of their families they had every legitimate right to do so, Mr. Speaker. Everyone recognizes that. Church organizations including the hierarchy in my own church recognize the responsibility of Legislature, the responsibility of businessmen to human beings, to society as a whole.

It emerged in the course of the debates in the House of Commons that these railway workers were getting an average salary of some \$4,200 a year. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that sum of money adequate to keep a family? Everyone knows this is not the case at all, Mr. Speaker. So let's think a little bit more about people. Think a little bit more about finding a lasting solution between the conflicts that tear our people apart, that make declarations of war between labor and management. And I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that it will take cooperation, it will take sensible government, reasonable government, not shouting and not making fantastic charges and attributing blame to just one segment, to labor alone. Maybe we are all to blame, Mr. Speaker, and as a Member here of the Legislature probably I have neglected my responsibility in not keeping pounding at finding a solution to

September 7, 1966

the problem. This is what concerns me more than anything else. This Bill does not provide a solution. It will aggravate the problem. The Premier's speech will aggravate the problem too if he has done it for political purposes. Bringing the farmers into it too was merely to find justification and support for this own neglect of this important segment of our society.

May I remind him too that while he is talking about farming that it is farmers' daughters and sons who are unable to stay on the farm because there isn't enough income there, who come to the city, who work for the Power Corporation, who work on the highways, who work for private enterprise. Are we not now to accept the statement then that when these farmers' sons and daughters find it necessary to resort to strike action that somehow this is offensive to their parents who still remain on the farm? I think the fathers and mothers at home if they could be standing right alongside with them. And what's more if these farmers had someone to strike against they would be on the picket line too. May I remind the Premier and Members opposite, farm strikes have occurred in the province of Quebec. They have occurred in the province of Ontario and they are talking about strikes here too. That is a reflection on our inability to find a solution to the farm problem too.

Well, if I may take a look, Mr. Speaker, at my typed notes. I certainly overlooked entirely the remarks made by the hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) because I considered the source. They are completely irresponsible and similarly, I can only say this to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that as usual he works around and builds a mole hill into a mountain. Oh what difficulties we had with trade unions. And in the next breath he says we are too pro-labor and in this argument we were supposed to be anti-labor. Sure there are things said in the course of negotiations it is true, but never, never would we have brought down legislation of this kind that would encompass workers other than those who are on strike and probably jeopardizing the public. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we all have a responsibility for the public interests and we should not be so irresponsible as to aggravate a situation that will make any effect on the public worse.

Everyone, Mr. Speaker, is now asking why this sudden rash of strike explosions throughout Canada. If we are to achieve a lasting solution to this problem we must of necessity in a reasoned and sensible way first of all determine the basic cause of this unhappy situation. The rash of current strike explosions in Canada can no longer be solely attributed to labor's unreasoned demands and disregard for the public good or its irresponsible, selfish attitude regardless of consequences. This is just a little too flimsy and a simple excuse that is not palatable to farmers any more either. It's getting to be old hat.

This Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) mentioned that trade unionists have lost money as a result of strike action which indicates to me that this is a deterrent. This too is of great discomfort to them. And so I suggest that if this is correct, they are compelled to take this kind of action as a last resort since there is no other settlement on the horizon.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, farmers and laborers, as well as consumers generally, face a desperate struggle to maintain reasonable living standards in the face of escalating profits and sharp increases in living costs, which the hon. Member for Cannington

(Mr. Weatherald) glibly throws to one side. That isn't important at all. Every family head and housewife will bear witness to this fact of life. Recently a housewife showed me a bit of pork spareribs for which she had paid 90 cents. I asked her how she was going to use this food to feed a family of six. She replied, "Put it into soup, I guess, to give it a flavor". Now, I swear, Mr. Speaker, that there wasn't enough meat on these spareribs to properly feed a family of chickadees for a day, Mr. Speaker. Still 90 cents for it.

Now, I suppose the Premier will get up and say, "Toby, don't you favor higher food prices?" Well, let me tell the Premier it might have been 90 cents for this little bit of pork spareribs, but what did the farmer get for it? He certainly did not get enough to keep in the pig business or you wouldn't be so worried about farmers going out of pig production in Saskatchewan, and out of sheep production too in Saskatchewan. And may I tell the Premier that his gesture of getting 12 sheep on this farm isn't going to improve the economics of sheep raising in Saskatchewan. Maybe he should go back and shear those sheep and help his kid look after those 12 sheep. Great encouragement to the sheep industry in Saskatchewan! From cattle rancher to sheep. By gum, in my days of ranching this was considered to be quite a comedown, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, the price of bread is reaching the price pastry used to be. It is significant to note that the price went up when the price of wheat to the farmer went down and his costs were reaching new record highs. Still I heard no protest from you people across the way but I have witnessed you people across the way, led by your Premier, turning down a motion on this side of the House asking for a guaranteed price of \$2 for wheat. I can recall the Premier of this province now when he was in the House of Commons saying that the farmers shouldn't get an increase in floor prices which were already low for farm commodities. This is his love for the farmers. The destruction of the Agricultural Machinery Testing organization is another good demonstration of his great feeling for farm people. But when it becomes convenient to try to divide farmer and labor for political reasons and to support his bad administration, then he tries the old trick of saying these wicked workmen have hurt you grievously. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that if the farmers were to organize a Producer Marketing Board tomorrow and ask to be able to bargain with the processors and the rest of it for decent prices, he would oppose it too. He can't support that and at the same time support his 19th century concepts of private enterprise and labor relations. This man, Mr. Speaker, is trying to sweep us back to the 19th century in all respects.

In statistics, Mr. Speaker, it is revealed in the period 1961 to 1965, business profits rose by 65 per cent while wages went up only 16 per cent in this same period of time. These are pure, hard statistics. It is clear that demands for increased wages and salaries did not precede huge profit-taking and result in inflation but after this had already occurred well in advance. It is estimated that in this scramble for survival wages are now running from two to four years behind schedule. That's quite a bit behind, much further behind than the railways tin getting caught up with the freight pile-up.

People with set incomes particularly those retired on old age pensions have been most completely forgotten. I heard no one mention them. I can recall the former Minister of Agriculture,

September 7, 1966

now Senator McDonald, saying that society didn't owe even the old people a living, an increase in their pension, when we were talking about \$125 a month for the old age pensioners. We need to start to think in this light, Mr. Speaker.

The farmer, as usual, is of course also out of the race and has always been far behind in terms of his prices in real income in relationship to inflationary costs. As a result we helplessly view with alarm the liquidation of some 50,000 farmers in Saskatchewan during the postwar period, and their sons and daughters going to the urban centres to eke out a living. If they dared to join a trade union in order to make life liveable and keep up with costs, they are condemned for doing so by saying they are doing their parents a disservice. I can't understand greater nonsense than this and the sill illogic that I have heard emanating from the hon. Members opposite in this particular debate.

Mr. Speaker, despite booming prosperity and profits in the business sector farm prices in the year of Our Lord 1966 continue a downward trend. I have some figures here. I will just quote a few of them. These are comparative figures for June and July this year, and June this year, and June a year ago. In every case there is a drop in the price index to farmers. I don't hear the Premier talking about that at all. I don't hear him talking about a federal-provincial conference to do something about falling farm prices, escalating farm costs, or to do something constructive to find an answer to the problem of differences between labor and management. No, he shouts his head off until he is blue in the face hoping that he is going to stir up a favorable political wind. This is cheap politics, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and the general public in Canada are getting sick and tired of it.

I was going to say something to the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) but he is not in his seat. I was disappointed with him too. He got on the band wagon of blaming labor for everything. He did not like this Bill at all, at all, but he is going to vote for it. Now, what kind of play is this? Turning their sails to the political winds, I say, Mr. Speaker.

To go back now to these comparative figures. For Saskatchewan, May indexes are in brackets and the June index is by provinces. For June compared to May the index of farm prices went down in this province and down from 8.6 per cent from what it was a year ago in June, Mr. Speaker. There is an interesting item that appears in this, namely that Saskatchewan is at the bottom of the rung in farm prices. When you look at Quebec there is 331.3 for June and 326.4 for May. Manitoba pretty much similar. Saskatchewan, 221.5 for June and 220.7 for May. We are the lowest. Our price index in farm products for June is 221.5; for New Brunswick, 265; Quebec, 331; Ontario, 318. We are the lowest and the Premier, I suggest, should do something about it.

Fortunately, nature is much more kind than the governments are to the farmers. We are blessed with a good crop this year. This will help a little bit, Mr. Speaker, but it will not offset the tremendous economic difficulties facing the farm industry in this province.

Little wonder we also have farm strike demonstrations, as I said, in Quebec and Ontario, with threats of similar strikes here. And little wonder, Mr. Speaker, too that we have so much unrest

and turbulent labor difficulties throughout Canada, Mr. Speaker,. As I stated before, no one likes strikes. We don't like strikes neither on this side of the House. We do want to find a solution. We have proposed an amendment that we feel will solve this immediate problem without involving workers who are not now involved in the strike at all and who are very concerned about the destruction of their union rights.

The principle point at issue is not this immediate strike, as I have said, but a solution to strikes in the future. Some suggestions have been made. How do we know what a proper wage scale should be? May I suggest, and I agree with some hon. Members opposite, that the cost of living index must be utilized. It seems to me that we could have a national labor code for Canada in which job classifications with appropriate wages opposite them could be established for Canada, based on the cost of living index. And if the cost of living index goes up, then right across the board, in my view, there ought to be wage and salary increases to keep up with these increased costs and forget entirely about this talk and nonsense about productivity. Our productivity has never been as high in the history of Canada. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, by virtue of necessity we must distribute income back into the hands of our consumers if we are to have an effective and a pliable and stable economy.

These are scientific facts, Mr. Speaker. So may I suggest to hon. Members, particularly on the Government side of the House that when another conference is called this entire matter of labor-management difficulties be brought to the forefront, that consumer problems be discussed because they are caught in the vice, particularly the pensioners and those retired on fixed incomes. We need an all-out war on poverty; and the only way that I can see as an answer to the problem is to do some sensible economic and social planning in cooperation with industry and in cooperation with labor on the basis of reason and understanding and not condemnation of one side or the other in the question.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the motion and vote for the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, having come over 300 miles to this session, which I don't think should have been necessary had the Government carried out its duty and prerogative, I must say a few words and particularly after one or two members, the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) wanted to know how the farmers are going to vote and what stand they are going to take on this Bill. Well, I can assure him that when it comes down to principle and liberty this Bill is incompatible with the freedom people are accustomed to, and I certainly will vote against the Bill; but I will vote for the amendment, although I would rather not have to do that.

The reason I said that, Mr. Speaker, is this. I don't think as others have said, that compulsory arbitration is going to resolve anything. As a matter of fact, I happened to get a hold of the manufactures' annual report and I noticed that the Premier happened to be there. There is a picture of him with the vice-president — he is always in good company of that nature — and at that time the president made a statement; two or three statements were made. I think he agrees although he is the president of the Manufacturers' Association that, as he said,

September 7, 1966

Every fairminded person will recognize that when they negotiations fail, then the man providing the services has the right to withdraw his services.

Which just means simply this, that at all costs negotiations must be carried on. It was mentioned by the Member for Maple Creek, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) that there was a situation in 1954, which I recall quite well, in the city of Prince Albert and it took a long time until the matter was settled. But the previous Government, the previous CCF Government, saw to it that negotiations went on and on until the problem was settled without bringing in this kind of vicious legislation which we have before us.

Now the president, as I said, of the Manufacturers' Association said this:

While employees certainly have the right to withhold their labor if they must, employers have an equal right to keep their business going to get along without striking employees, if they can.

In other words, he simply said that government should not interfere. This is a matter between labor and management. Yet here the Government is taking upon itself the prerogative to interfere by legislating an Act which has been pointed out to be evil and vicious.

I would like to say — I think it was the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) who mentioned something about the strike being a tool or sword or a weapon with which labor can fight — Mr. Speaker, a strike is a tool. It is something that the working man must depend upon in this age to protect himself and his family so that he can make a decent living in an unstable economy. It can also be a sword when a working man who provides services cannot get justice and he must use the strike weapon as his sword. I do not think that government should interfere with that particular right, if we believe in freedom in a democracy.

I will say this, if compulsory arbitration is good, if it works, and is desirable — as it has been mentioned it does work in some other countries like Australia and New Zealand, I know nothing about it — certainly the least that this Government could have done is to have appointed a committee or commission, if you like, to have studies what goes on in other countries, what results have been obtained from compulsory arbitration, and bring the recommendations into this Legislature and give the Legislators of this province a chance to analyze and make up their minds whether this is good for the public welfare or not. And I say this in all sincerity because we, the Legislators, are only servants of the people, and as such we must see that we do nothing it is going to jeopardize the democratic functioning of this country or of this province.

It must also be remembered, as has been pointed out by the Member from Regina, that the strike weapon is a human right. It has been obtained over a long period of time. If you read the history of labor in trying to obtain economic justice you will find that they evolved this weapon, and sword if you like, to obtain their ends. And in most countries even today it is recognized as a right. Just because people work for the Government doesn't put them in a different position than if they work for private industry. The right should be the same. Certainly in this

particular case there is very little need to go to the extent that this Government has gone in calling this special session.

As it has been pointed out by two or three members, it is very obvious that the only reason — there may have been another reason — the main reason has been because this Government is carrying on a vendetta with a particular union and the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) made that very clear as well as did others.

I am very glad that the speaker who preceded me mentioned the real cause of the unrest among the labor forces in Canada. I as a farmer would be the last one to blame labor for the unstable and unjust situation that exists in our country today. I recall quite well, Mr. Speaker, that we could have faced the same kind of situation during the war years whether the Government at that time had the courage or not, when necessity required that the Government set up certain controls. It's during that part of the history of Canada that we find that farmers made some of the greatest progress economically — and this cannot be denied — in the 1940's. Many of my friends who are submarginal and marginal land farmers in the north were able to set themselves up with more land and machinery because of price controls. Yet even this may not be palatable to everyone. But it's the same thing, Mr. Speaker, that if a man has a family and he has a loaf of bread which is sliced up, you cannot give that loaf to one child. You must divide it among all of them as fairly as it is possible to divide. Some may deserve more than others but you cannot deny people what they are entitled to.

I would like to point out that one of the real causes of inflation, which means too much money in the country, is that workers and people like myself on smaller farms haven't too much of that money or very little of it. There is too much money in the country. There is inflation; but where is it? It's in the hands of 20 or so per cent of the people of Canada who have been taxing the people, the consumers, and the producers and labor in this country under the guise of legitimate profits. But on the other scale you have got 20 per cent living in poverty, and that is what governments are becoming concerned about today. That is what this Government should have been concerned about, the 20 per cent that are living in complete poverty. This Government has chosen to pick on a small group of people in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Premier has said this is one way that we are going to curb inflation in our country. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker. If the real intent of this Government and of any government is to curb inflation, they must hit at the roots of the system as has been pointed out by the previous speaker, with whom I agree entirely. This session should have been called for that purpose and not for the purpose of interfering with negotiations which could have been carried on quite successfully, I am sure, between the Power Corporation and its employees.

One of the hon. Members opposite tried to blame the strikers in different parts of Canada, the grainhandlers and others, for the reason why farmers wouldn't be able to deliver their grain. I remember quite well telling the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) about a year ago, when he boasted about the grain that was being sold and so forth, that that wasn't the answer to the farmer's problem. The answer was a decent price. And whether you penalize the power employees or anybody else or set up stringent regulations, you are not going to resolve the farm situation until you hit at the root of the thing and see to it the farmer gets a decent price for this product.

September 7, 1966

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members who don't know, particularly the Premier who probably doesn't know these things, I saw hundreds of dozens of eggs sold in my community for eight cents a dozen last spring. It costs the farmers 35 cents a dozen last spring according to the university to produce a dozen eggs. Yet they were selling them for eight cents because they had to and they had to be satisfied with that pittance. Can you imagine how many dozen eggs you would have to get to get a pound of bacon at \$1.19 today?

And Mr. Speaker, when you blame labor for costs why don't you look at the picture. Take the case of bread. I could tell you quite a bit about what has been happening in the bread industry. Who decided to raise the price of bread two, three, four and five cents, all across the country? As it has been pointed out it wasn't the price of wheat; it wasn't because they took on more labor. Machines are producing the bread today more than machines ever did before, and yet it was decided by not one corporation but a combine of corporations right across the country that they would raise the price of bread to 25 and 26 cents, bread that was formerly sold for 21 cents, Mr. Speaker. Here is an increase in profits of 20 and more per cent. This Government did nothing about it. But when labor demands a small pittance in order that they can meet the costs of living then you must shackle labor; you must attack them in every possible way and try to play politics with the hearts and souls of people of this province. This is what I object to. As Legislators we were elected to sit here in the House to find some of the answers, to sincerely sit down and produce answers if at all possible instead of playing politics. But on every occasion he plays politics and I think it's a shameful attitude. It's disgraceful and I, certainly for one, don't want to have a part of that kind of philosophy.

In the meantime, I am going to appeal to the Government not to take the stand that they cannot back down because they brought in this legislation. I am sure that everyone opposite must realize if they are fair and I think they are fair men, that this legislation is evil, it is bad. Let us compromise on something that is good, such as we find in the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). It goes halfway. Let us deal with the situation that we think is before us. As I said, I would rather not have to deal with it, but I am prepared to deal with it. But let's not tie in hospital workers and all of these other people. I don't want to see the hospital workers in the position that they were in about a year ago, when they went to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) complaining that the boards would not give consideration to their representation for better wages; and they are, Mr. Speaker, some of the lowest paid people in this province.

Mr. Thatcher: — Under your Government they were.

Mr. Berezowsky: — And they are now. What did the Minister of Public Health

(Mr. Steuart) do? He referred them back to the boards, hospital boards, and there they stand between the devil and the deep sea. And you are going to shackle them some more because if they dare to strike you are going to tie their hands completely. I think this is wrong. I think that negotiations should be made possible. I think these hospital workers should be in a position where the boards know that they must give them a proper and decent wage so that they can carry on with at least a fair standard of living in this province.

As I said, there is much that can be said, most of it has been said. I am very unhappy to be here but I am here. I don't mind my combine standing there for a week if necessary. It will be a good contribution to a worthy cause to fight for a principle that I believe in and that principle is the freedom and liberty for which our fathers fought for a long time, Mr. Speaker. I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — I beg leave of the Assembly to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m. on the motion of the Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works).