

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
38th Day

Thursday, April 9, 1970.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day I would like to introduce the following groups of students situated in the galleries: 46 students from the W.C. How school from the constituency of Regina South West represented by the Hon. Minister of Public Health, Mr. Grant. They are under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Hill; 26 students from Connaught school from the constituency of Regina South West represented by Mr. McPherson.

I am sure all Members of the Legislature would wish to extend to each and everyone of these students and their teachers a very warm welcome and to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here enjoyable and educational and to wish to each and everyone of them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 11 — FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT GRAINHANDLERS' STRIKES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):

That the Legislature of Saskatchewan requests the Government of Canada to immediately enact legislation declaring longshoremen, terminal workers and others involved in the off-loading of Prairie grain to be performing essential services, and that the said legislation prohibit strikes in such essential services and provide for compulsory binding arbitration.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I have the good fortune to be able to speak this afternoon. I am apparently unlike some Members opposite.

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that I have spoken on this Resolution briefly before, following the remarks of the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch. When I took my seat on that occasion I indicated that I would be moving a resolution which in effect adopted some of the recommendations contained in the Task Force on Labour Relations, commonly known as the Woods Report. This Report was published in December of 1968. I propose, Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment and to indicate why I feel that the proposals set out in the amendment are a better solution to the problem raised by the Hon. Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch than his proposal.

The amendment which I will be moving is in the following terms:

That all the words after the word "Canada" in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

be urged to immediately consider, especially for grain handling and associated operations where continuous services are important in the public interest, application of the positive recommendations of the Federal Task Force on Labour Relations (the Woods commission) including:

(a) expansion and development of:

- (i) conciliation procedures
- (ii) mediation procedures
- (iii) fact finding industrial enquiries

(b) voluntary impartial arbitration

(c) where essential seizure, trusteeship and full operation by the government of enterprises where a strike or lockout is in effect.

Mr. Speaker, the Woods Commission Report is a report that I strongly recommend to all Hon. Members. It outlines in a good deal of detail and basic problems in industrial relations. It makes the point which I think should be obvious to all that there are no easy and simple solutions to many of these problems. It is very, very easy to propound theoretical solutions particularly easy for people who have no extensive experience in the field of labour relations. Superficially, it seems easy for any person to say that a government can and should legislate against work stoppages in a particular area. The difficulty with this proposal is that unless government action in so legislating can command a very wide measure of public support, and public support where the work stoppage takes place, then there is every likelihood that the law is likely to be ignored by the employees and employers who are sought to be regulated by it. You will say, "How can this be?" And I ask you to turn your mind to a place as near geographically as the United States to see what happens when you try to prohibit strikes by law. Nor need we go back farther in time than a week or two. In the United States in the last couple of weeks we have had two strikes each of which was prohibited by law, each of which proceeded and caused very substantial disruption. I refer to the mail-handlers' strike in New York which spread to Chicago and other major population centres in the United States, and we will remember that it required to use of the U.S. Army to get the mails rolling again. As far as I understand it, a settlement has been reached and also so far as I understand it, a settlement which involves no sanctions against the strikers. So what did the law prohibiting the strikes achieve? Did it prohibit the strike? It did not. Did it ensure that the mails moved? It did not. It required the use of the army to get the mails moving. Did it effectively apply any penalties to those people who struck against the law? It did not. Well, if the United States Government with the full power of the United States army is not able to legislate against mail carriers, what hope has the Canadian Government got against some other people?

There must be a very substantial measure of public support where the work stoppage takes place for the compulsory ending of the work stoppage to be effective. I ask you to look at the United States in the last couple of days. We have seen a strike of air traffic controllers. There is a court injunction stopping

air traffic controllers from striking, but does this stop the strike? It does not. We have had air traffic controllers consistently booking off work as they call it. Whatever it is called, they are not on the job and the planes are not flying. As I deliver these remarks I am not aware of what settlement is about to take place but I think we can all be assured that the settlement will not involve any sanctions against those who took part in the so-called illegal strike. The U.S. Government has full power to apply penalties. The courts of the United States have the full power to apply penalties, but they know that what they want are not penalized workers but planes flying; and if they want planes flying, then they have to have air traffic controllers not in jail but in control towers. And if you want grain load, you want grain loaders not in jail but loading grain ships. Just keep that idea in mind.

In each of the foregoing cases there was a very substantial measure of public sympathy and support for the letter carriers and for the air traffic controllers. This meant that it was either not possible or not expedient — and you may make your own judgment as to which — for the Government of the United States, the most powerful Government of the world, to take severe punitive action against the persons engaged in work stoppages. Surely the lesson to be learned from this is that work stoppages are not solved simply by passing laws. The problem is much more complex than this and requires a much more sophisticated approach.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And this is what the Woods Commission concluded and so, I submit, has everybody who has done any substantial study on the problems of industrial disputes. I invite anyone — and there are some exceptions — and I hope Members opposite will, to give us the findings of other tribunals, other commissions, and other task forces who have looked into this and who have recommended compulsory arbitration. They will hunt a long time before they find many of those. They may well refer to a proposal by Judge Ivan Rand in Ontario where he did in fact propose compulsory arbitration for certain types of disputes. I ask who endorsed his proposal. Was it the Ontario Federation of Labour? They rejected his proposal. Was it the Canadian Manufacturers' Association? They rejected his proposal. In fact employers and employees rejected his proposal and so far as I am aware no consumer group spoke in favour of it. So it was pretty difficult to find out who was in favour of this proposal, who believed it would work; certainly not the employers, certainly not the employees, apparently not the public. And that sort of covers the field.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to contend that there will never be instances where the State should intervene in a work stoppage. It is possible to think of circumstances under which a government would need to use powers open to it to maintain an essential service. However, I am on the side, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), of the Task Force on Labour Relations and I invite you to read it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And you will find that in this study the decision of that Task Force was that it was not all back and white and

April 9, 1970

that the problem could not be solved by simply saying, "Whose side are you on?" It was a problem which required some analysis and therefore I can understand why this escaped the attention of some Members opposite.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Woods Commission held — and I believe correctly — that if the weapon of compulsory state action or state action to stop a work stoppage is to be effective, it must be used only in an extremity and only after all other methods have failed, and only when it could command a substantial measure of public support. So it must be used sparingly, only after all other measures have failed, and only when it commands a substantial measure of public support.

The Woods Commission considered this problem in some detail and I refer you particularly to their conclusion contained in their paragraph 587 on page 172 of their report. Their conclusion is that if this extreme measure is necessary it should be done by Act of Parliament. The matter we are talking about here - I refer to the Woods Commission which was a Federal report and the Resolution of the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch — raises a problem having to do with Federal Industrial relations. Therefore, I think it is particularly true, and the Woods Commission took the position that, if there are to be laws imposing settlements in labour disputes, they should be passed individually by Act of Parliament.

The Woods Commission felt that an Act of Parliament taken after a public review and after a full debate of the range of interests to be reconciled and of the alternative methods of solution would be more conducive to acceptability than any order by a Cabinet. The Woods Commission went on to say:

We favour the retention of this reserve power in the sovereign authority of Parliament. In our view only Parliament can have the authority to impose an end to a strike or a lockout.

Now that is their considered opinion.

The amendment which I will be making asks that all steps be taken to avoid industrial disputes escalating into a position of strike or lockout. In this regard it asks for a n expansion and development of conciliation procedures, of mediation procedures, and of fact-finding industrial inquiries. I invite Members opposite to consider this matter of fact-finding industrial inquiries. Surely all of us have been frustrated when we have seen industrial disputes which appear to revolve around minor questions or around facts which are disputed, the employer giving one version and the employees given another. It has been my experience that, when there is a work stoppage and when it is said to be caused by a trivial matter, the trivial matter is just the trigger which starts the work stoppage, but the real basic reasons are other than those which appear on the surface.

I have participated as an official of struck companies in three or four industrial disputes which apparently were caused by such minor matters and which in fact were caused by other more underlining problems.

Conciliation and mediation procedures are very effective in defusing these situations. Fact-finding industrial inquiries, under the aegis of an independent third party, usually a

government agency, charged with the responsibility of investigating the grounds of the dispute and publishing what they believe are the true facts in an impartial statement; these can do a great deal to inform the public and to enable the public to put pressure on managements and unions to avoid industrial disputes.

Many trade unions in Canada have agreed to voluntary impartial arbitration and this area needs to be expanded in Canada. We have far too small a number of people who are expert in the field and who are available to act as arbitrators and who can command the confidence of both management and labour. The very frequency with which two or three men in this country are used, and I instance Carl Goldenberg for one, in industrial disputes indicates that our core of skilled arbitrators is far too small. I feel that there is a considerable area here that could be expanded to avoid the consequences of work stoppage.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the amendment I am about to move goes on to recognize that there could be instances where a government might have to step in and continue an operation where there is a strike or lockout in effect. I feel, however, that the amendment offers a fairer and more impartial method of doing this than the proposal put forward by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker).

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is significant that the mover of the Resolution in his Resolution lays all the blame for industrial disputes at the door of labour and none at the door management. In his remarks he indicated that there are times when labour might be at fault. But when it comes to his Resolution, Mr. Speaker, he asked for legislation to prohibit strikes but he didn't ask for any legislation to prohibit lockouts; - not the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch. He just wants to come down on the backs of labour but he thinks that management never is responsible for work stoppages. He should read the papers today and find out that in British Columbia some thousands of employees of some hundreds of contractors have been given simultaneous lockout notices. But his Resolution has specifically excluded from his Resolution anything which would allow the Government to prohibit a lockout. This reveals, I suggest, all too clearly that the Member feels that all the blame lies with labour, that labour must be punished by punitive legislation but that management is never at fault, and that accordingly no legislation to deal with lockouts is necessary or desirable. This myopic view that all the blame lies on the side of labour and none at the side of management, this view is not shared by many people who are independent observers. Certainly it is not shared by Labour Minister Mackasey. Certainly it is not shared by Agriculture Minister Olson. Concerning one of the strikes mentioned by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker), the grain handlers' strike at the Lakehead, I need only to quote The Leader-Post of September 9th, 1968 as follows:

Agriculture Minister Olson Saturday laid more than 50 per cent of the blame for the month and a half long grain handlers' strike at the Lakehead on the shoulders of the companies. Mr. Olson said his chief concern was that he wanted to dispel the idea that 100 per cent of the blame for the strike lies with the labour union. Fifty per cent or better lies on the other side of the table. I think it is erroneous for farmers and the general public to think the labour union is the devil in this case. In my opinion it is not.

April 9, 1970

Alright, this is what Agriculture Minister Olson says. I amendment not saying that there are not work stoppages where in fact the trade union is more than half wrong. I amendment not saying that. I amendment saying that it is very, very significant that the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch wants to enact legislation to stop strikes but he doesn't want any legislation to stop lockouts.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, as will be known to all Hon. Members, in a recent work stoppage at Vancouver the grain handlers were anxious to load Prairie grain and they were prohibited from doing so by the employers. That is fact and it cannot conceivably be denied.

I think that most fair-minded people would be prepared to say that some blame lies on both sides and not no resolution can fairly be considered which does not admit this fact. The Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch's Resolution conspicuously fails to admit this fact.

The amendment which I propose to move would be one where, among other things, a government could seize an enterprise and operate it where a strike or lockout was in effect. The difficulty with respect to legislation which enforces employees back to work, the difficulty with that legislation is that it holds few terrors for management but removes the strongest bargaining weapon that employees have. Accordingly, whenever legislation dealing with compulsory arbitration exists, it removes from employers much of the pressure to come to some sort of settlement and by doing that it precipitates strikes and the consequent imposition of compulsory arbitration. If there was a possibility that where management had wholly precipitated strike or initiated a lockout, then the enterprise might be operated under trusteeship, if this was possible, then there would be additional reasons for both management and labour to get down to the business or arriving at a settlement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It seems to me that a trusteeship would be equally undesirable both for management and for labour and each would get down to the business of arriving at a settlement. It is a more even-handed weapon. It will be more successful in achieving what we want to achieve — the prevention of work stoppages.

The Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) asks why a trusteeship would be undesirable for a labour union. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if the Saskatchewan Government were going to take an industry under trusteeship. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what hoops almost any working man in this province would go through to save being amendment employee of the Saskatchewan Government . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think that there is an important aspect of the problem which is missed by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch. What we should be bending our efforts to is not settling strikes once they occur — because some of them don't stay settled, some of them can't be settled even by compulsory arbitration and in any case they amount to a disruption in service — what we should be bending our particular efforts to is stopping strikes from occurring.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now this, I suggest, will be more effectively done by the procedures which are contained in my amendment than the procedures set out in the Resolution of the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch. This is particularly true when the procedures which he advocates and which are supposed to terminate strikes will in fact lead to strikes. There can be no doubt that on the evidence wherever there is compulsory arbitration, effective collective bargaining is eroded and there are far more work stoppages than there would be had there been no law requiring compulsory arbitration. So what he is advocating, whether he is aware of it or not, is an increase in the number of work stoppages and a way of terminating these. Think it would be far better to adopt the procedures which I recommend which will prevent many of the work stoppages in the first place.

Let me therefore, Mr. Speaker, summarize:

We agree with the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch that work stoppages in the movement of farm products is a serious problem. We agree with him that methods should be sought to eliminate this problem or to reduce it to the smallest possible size. We disagree with him that compulsory arbitration legislation will do this. We disagree for these reasons. 1. We think that in many instances settlements by compulsory arbitration have proved costly to shippers and we see no reason why this will be any different in the future. And Members opposite should cast their mind back to whether or not they believe that some of the settlements made by compulsory arbitration have been in the interests of the shippers, whether they have been such small settlements that they would be the sort of settlements that shippers would wish for. 2. Compulsory arbitration legislation has not been effective in eliminating work stoppages. In my remarks the other day I instanced the case of Australia and today I have talked about mail tie-ups in the United States and strikes by air traffic controllers in the United States. 3. Compulsory arbitration legislation does great harm to the process of collective bargaining, which processes are far and away the best way of settling wage disputes peaceably and thereby avoiding work stoppages. 4. Compulsory arbitration legislation, particularly that which would prohibit strikes but not lockouts, is an unfair weapon that will particularly engender resentment among employees and an unwillingness to bargain in good faith among employers. Employers will be sorely tempted to try their luck with compulsory arbitration rather than bargaining in good faith. 5. The idea set out in the Resolution proposed by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch has been studied in detail by the Federal Task Force on Industrial Relations and has been rejected. 6. The proposals set out in the amendment offer a much more positive and therefore much more realistic way of dealing with the problem. The amendment recognizes that the problem is one of human relations, not one calling for punitive and legalistic approaches, but rather approaches based upon human relations. The amendment recognizes that only by adopting a method of operation based upon the realization that we are dealing with free men who want to be dealt with as free men, only by adopting this approach will there be lasting industrial peace. For all of the foregoing reasons, Mr. Speaker, I, with leave of the House, seconded by the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) move the foregoing amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 9, 1970

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — I would like to ask the Hon. Member from Regina Centre whether or not he adjourned the debate on this Resolution the other day?

Mr. Blakeney: — Yes.

Mr. Gallagher: — This will be the second motion you have moved on this Resolution, I suggest that it might be out of order.

Mr. Blakeney: — Right, and this is why I said, “with leave”.

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently.

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of participating in this debate but, in view of some statements made by our labour leaders opposite, I feel that their misrepresentation and distortion of facts must not go unchallenged.

First of all I must commend the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) for introducing this Resolution to the Assembly. I am sure that every farmer in Saskatchewan including our farm Members opposite appreciate the clear and objective way that he outlined on behalf of the farmers of this province the effects of strikes in the grain-handling industry. Regardless of what Members opposite might say to distort the picture we must not lose sight of the fact that the objective of this Resolution is to provide protection for the farmers of the Prairie Provinces. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution was introduced three weeks ago and three labour Members spoke to it and then the debate was adjourned. For three weeks they have refused to debate this Resolution. Farm Members are afraid to participate for fear of reprisal from the labour element of their party. Members on this side have been prepared to speak on behalf of the farmers for the past three weeks, but not the Members opposite. It is interesting to see how many farm Members will rise to support this Resolution. The desirability of the Resolution was shown since the original introduction because there has been another strike on the West coast that has slowed up the movement of the farmers' grain. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is also going to be a vital question in the leadership campaign opposite, as farmers will wish to know if the next leader has any interest in the farmers rather than in the international labour unions. A leader cannot be for both.

Their particular interest lies in the position of the Mayor of Regina who obviously will become a leadership candidate. Newspaper reports show that his constituency at the present time has been taken over by the hands of the Wafflers. Now, will he support their stand, as their Member, which is against the farmer or will he resign as their Member and follow his own conscience? I understand from The Leader Post that the change in his constituency, which is also my constituency, occurred at the constituency annual meeting before the sitting Member arrived. The majority of the larger general executive are also young leftists, according to their new secretary, Mr. O'Sullivan. But Mr. O'Sullivan denied their entrance looked like a conspiracy. He said, “It was not an invasion but an effort to inject socialist content into the program.” In other words they do not see their

present Member as being a Socialist. Mr. O'Sullivan said that Mr. Baker accused them of being hostile and out to get him, but we managed to table that resolution, they said. So, Mr. Speaker, it will be significant in the weeks ahead to see what position the Member from Regina South East will take in regards to the farmers of Saskatchewan as opposed to the labour unions of the North American continent.

Now as was prophesied by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker), no sooner had he sat down than the strings of the labour puppets opposite became activated. In fact it was almost with indecent haste that we watched them scramble to see who would be the first to gain acclaim by coming to the defence of their labour leaders. The first puppet to win out in this made scramble for recognition was the usual one, the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), who after all has the inside track for being first as he is a paid executive member of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. What was amazing, Mr. Speaker, was that all the time that he was trying to defend the great international labour unions, not once did he mention the problems of the farmers with which this Resolution is dealing. In his attempt to muddy the waters and protect his employers, he talked about Sweden and Australia. He quoted figures of 1945, but not once did he show sympathy for the farmers who suffer from the strikes in the movement of grain. According to him it was all the farmers' fault, proving as we have said that there is no concern for the farmer by the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) or any of the unions which he represents.

His defence of the union movement has become a pattern well known to all of us. First of all he attacks the Liberal Government, then he praises the unions, then he takes us on a world tour and consistently concludes without every justifying the role or the actions of the union that he attempts to defend. His bias is so illogical, so bitter, so unreasonable that he has completely lost his veracity and his usefulness as a labour spokesman. He is more an embarrassment than an asset.

Now after the puppet from Regina North East sat down, the string on the puppet from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder), was activated. Again another union member dependent on their mercy for his job. And he added less than the previous speaker, for again he did not offer one solution to the farmers' conflict with the grain-handling unions. When the Member from Moose Jaw sat down the puppet show continued. The third string brought up the star of the show, at least from the unions' point of view, when the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) took centre stage. I would remind you again, Mr. Speaker, three men up, three down and not one farmer has spoken on this Resolution. To date the Member from Regina Centre has not been particularly obvious as a puppet of the labour movement. So many questions have been asked as to why the Member now has taken a stand against the farmers of Saskatchewan at this time. The answer is obvious. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has assumed a new role within the NDP party and its relationship to the labour unions and the role must be fulfilled. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that at the National NDP Convention last fall the 12 largest unions in the United States were given automatic membership on the NDP council, and a few hours after this was done the Member for Regina Centre was elected president of the national party. He became the Canadian mouthpiece for these 12 American unions.

The Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) will have his

April 9, 1970

chance to make his speech. I am sure that he will because again he has no interest in the farmers. He'll get up and read out the usual old stuff that he has been peddling here since he was elected many years ago. He hasn't had a new original thought since labour unions were invented.

The Member for Regina Centre's future in the NDP party will be determined by how well he supports the sacred labour cow and voices the union line. We must say that he is off to a good start. In his thirst for power he has forsaken the farmers of Saskatchewan and sold his soul for union gold.

So, Mr. Speaker, on a Resolution introduced to try and find a solution to the effect of strokes in the grain-handling industry for the benefit of our farmers, the first three spokesmen for the Opposition were union members who made no effort to do anything but defend unions responsible for the strikes. No mention was made of the farmers' problems. Now all three Members opposite that have spoken in this debate so far have referred to Bill 2, The Essential Services Act, passed by our Provincial Government. How strong it was the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and our friends opposite were advertising in every newspaper across the province the major rally for the repeal of Bill 2. They were expecting, so they said, anywhere up to 10,000 people, and they called on all those opposed to Bill 2 to rally to their cause. This rally took place a few weeks ago with a maximum of 350 people present. Of these 350, a large number were university students, a small number were communists and Maoists and the rest, amounting to some 200, were union people. So out of the total union membership of more than 50,000 in the Province of Saskatchewan, only 200 were concerned enough to join the protest organized by our friends opposite and most of them were more politically than union oriented.

The point was made the other day that it was unfortunate that this presentation to the Government was marred by the actions of the young Maoists and communists, and I agree that it was unfortunate. However, on the other hand, what could Members opposite and the trade unions of Saskatchewan expect? You can't beg for support of these groups at one moment and then turn them aside at the next. We are not surprised that the radicals and the revolutionaries and the anarchists and the communists were out to support the demonstration. We have been telling Members opposite for years that they should be more careful of the company they keep. You will recall that a couple of years ago, the board of governors of the University of Saskatchewan had a meeting in Regina. A small number of the same type of activists that appeared at the rally here pushed, shoved and rudely treated members of the Board in a shameful display. These same activists organized an all-night sit-in to protest increased fees. And who were the two main speakers of the evening pledging the support of the NDP and the Saskatchewan Federation of labour? There were none other than the MLA for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) and Len Wallace who was chairman of the demonstrators the other day.

We also saw this summer the NDP and SFU calling on these same young activists from the University to support them in their attack on our Prime Minister. So if the NDP and the Federation of labour were willing to support and ask for support from these red flag-waving groups at these protests and demonstrations, why was it so wrong for these same groups to come out to the rally and support them in their demonstration against

Bill 2? The trade union movement in Canada has been in a state of steady decline for many years. Our friends opposite like to blame the Liberal party for this decline, but the facts are evident that it is the NDP who are responsible for the situation that the labour movement finds itself in today. This decline started back in 1961 when Tommy Douglas, and the Member from Biggar, after counting up the number of farmers in Canada and the number of trade unionists decided that for their own political expediency they would exploit the trade union movement. A few labour union leaders, to their sorrow, listened to the cajolery of these two leaders, put common sense aside and allowed themselves to be duped into becoming the pawns of the NDP political movement. I still find it hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, how so-called reasonable and intelligent men from the labour movement would throw all their eggs into one basket, particularly the basket of a political party that had gone nowhere, was going nowhere and that had no chance of every going anywhere.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — By so doing, Mr. Speaker, they cut off the lines of communication with the two main political parties of Canada by formally affiliating and supporting the NDP. This was a sad day for the labour movement. I would tell the Member for Moose Jaw, who probably forgets his history, the labour movement received more consideration under William Lyon McKenzie King when he was Prime Minister of Canada than they ever did receive under Tommy Douglas when he was the Premier of Saskatchewan. And they will not deny it.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — When . . .

Mr. Guy: — You had your chance to make your speech. Better go and get your history book because I think you're fogged up a little. No, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it was a sad day for the labour movement and particularly the vast number of workers who made up this movement when that decision was made back in 1961. The respect that they had earned from the Liberal and Conservative Governments was lost as they ceased to be a non-partisan movement representing all political parties to become the affiliated arm of the NDP.

The second cause for decline in Saskatchewan occurred in 1964 when the two members of the Saskatchewan Federation of labour were elected as NDP Members of the Opposition and convinced the Federation against their interests that it would be in their interest to immediately pass a resolution at their convention calling for every attempt to be made to defeat the Liberal Government. Federation of labour sold their membership down the river and cut off the hope of a good working relationship with the Government of the day. The two SFL members claim the Liberal Government is anti-labour and this is far from the truth. We are, however, anti-NDP and if this affects the labour movement that is no fault of ours. The truth is we have the greatest sympathy for the union members themselves because they have a difficult cross to bear when you consider that their leaders, in their ignorance and stupidity for their own personal gain, placed the NDP and their political quest for power ahead of the interest of the working man. To carry the NDP on their backs is a cross no movement should be asked to bear. I can tell these union members

April 9, 1970

today that the Liberal Government has their interests far more at heart than their union leaders as represented particularly by the two members in the Legislature and the national President of the NDP. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the day will come in the not too distant future when the union members in Saskatchewan and across Canada will say, "We have had enough of this type of leadership. We will throw out our leaders, break our affiliation with the NDP and return to the position where we can work harmoniously with the government of the day, regardless of what its political philosophy may be." And when that day comes you can rest assured you can depend on the support of our Government in this courageous action.

The final reason for the decline of the labour movement in Canada today occurred over the last few months, and reached its peak with the confrontation the other day with the Prime Minister. For the last six months the Government of Canada, the Governments of the Provinces with industry and business have waged an all-out attack on the problems of inflation. Continuously they have called on labour for their support. To date this support has been withheld and nothing but derogatory remarks have been made against the Government's attempts to win this battle against inflation. The other day at a meeting with the Prime Minister and Cabinet the Canadian Labour Congress poured scorn on the efforts of the Government. Organized labour has been the only significant group which contributes to inflation that has refused consistently to work with the Government in its attempts to voluntarily control inflation. The actions of the officials of the Quebec Confederation of national Trade Unions at a meeting of labour leaders with the Federal Cabinet of Ottawa was disgraceful and did nothing but blacken further that already tarnished image of the labour movement.

Until labour leaders across Canada and in Saskatchewan recognize that they must learn to co-operate with the Government of the day regardless of its political philosophy, I can see nothing but despair for the many thousands of trade unionists who are represented by such irresponsible leaders. Instead of the labour movement having the NDP fight their battles in the Legislature and organizing their demonstrations in the streets, they should stop for a moment and take a good, hard look at themselves. They should compare their image and the successes of the politically independent organization prior to 1961 with the reflection of their image today as a satellite of the NDP. They should ask themselves honestly what has this affiliation done to help them. It is true the NDP have used their funds to fight election campaigns; they have exploited their problems for their own political gain; they have destroyed their political neutrality; and they have closed the door to harmonious dialogue with every Government in Canada today. This alliance, Mr. Speaker, I submit has been a one-way street all in favour of the NDP. If labour would look at this alliance with an unprejudicial eye and weigh the advantages and disadvantages I would respectfully suggest to them that they would have to admit that the sooner this bond with the NDP was broken, the sooner the labour movement will return to its rightful place as an equal partner in the building of a better Canada. If they will not accept this responsibility they will find that every provincial government and the Federal Government will have no choice, in the best interest of the public, but to pass legislation similar to that recommended in this Resolution.

Members opposite claim that we are driving a wedge between the farm and the labourer. This is not true. The wedge was

started in 1961 when the NDP sacrificed the farmers' support for the support of organized labour and has been driven deeper by their actions ever since. Through the actions of The Canadian Labour Congress, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour operating as tools of the New Democratic party, they have sacrificed the farmer completely to the interests of big labour and no amount of deathbed repentance immediately before an election in Saskatchewan will have any effect. The party opposite are tied to labour due to the financial benefits they receive, and labour has tied themselves to the NDP in their lust for political power that will never come.

It will be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note how many farm Members opposite will get up and speak against this Resolution which is being urged by your Government in order to protect the interests of the farmer against the labour bosses of Canada and United States. For that reason it gives Member a great deal of pleasure to support the Resolution of the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) and oppose the amendment by Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I think the time is long past due when we as legislators request our Federal Government to pass legislation that would protect our farmers from continually being victims of strikes. Also I think that it is time to bring to an end that farmers are continually being used to further the ends of the power struggle between ruthless labour organizations and ruthless labour bosses. Mr. Speaker, I will be accused of being anti-labour, because the minute you say something about labour that the Hon. Members from Moose Jaw and Regina North East don't agree with, you are branded as anti-labour. If it means I have to be branded anti-labour, Mr. Speaker, because I stand up for the farmers of this province and tell them the unreasonable demands of the various labour organizations and the strikes they have caused and how they have in many ways contributed to the present cash-shortage position of the farmers, then I don't mind being called anti-labour.

The Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) said that this Resolution should be defeated because it was designed to test the Opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is time for the farmers of this province to find out where the NDP's concern really is and that they, the Socialists, are the ones who are really anti-farmer. The NDP anti-farmer record in this province is well known. It was really shown in this Legislature several weeks ago and again today when the first ones to speak against this Resolution were the Members from Moose Jaw, Regina North East and Regina Centre. All are connected with labour and there was no concern indicated in their speeches for the farmer. I was amazed that the farm NDP Members from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) did not stand up at once to say that they were in favour of this Resolution to help the farmers. Instead they were strangely silent. The NDP Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) said he was sure the Liberals introduced this Resolution to help the farmers with some ulterior motive in mind. Mr. Speaker, I think this Resolution is necessary at this time when it appears that we have some orderly marketing of grain. We must not wait until trouble starts again and both sides are deeply involved in a strike when hard feelings and bitterness run rampant. The time is now to set up an independent board to

April 9, 1970

settle all disputes. The board would have the power to make decisions that would be binding on both sides for a period of time. It would be illegal to have a lockout by management during this period and would also be illegal for labour to withdraw its services. Penalties would be handed out if they did not abide by the board's decision.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina North East likes to talk about freedom, freedoms for labour people. What about the freedom of the farmer and people not in labour unions or big business that are jeopardized by the actions of some of these total irresponsible labour bosses and unions. It is all very nice to talk about freedoms by these various labour bosses and unions as long as they get their demands, but what about the farmer on the Prairie who has lost his freedom to sell grain and his income is reduced because his wheat and produce were either not hauled or handled or loaded into ships? Some people say this Resolution is harsh legislation. I do not agree with that. I say it should go farther. When I look at the Western farmer and Western economy I think the farmer has been used far too long and is fighting for his survival. Further actions by unions or management that may increase his cost through markets lost and withdrawal of handling just cannot and will not be tolerated by the farmer any longer. I think that it will take this kind of harsh or repressive labour legislation to give farmers protection, because actions by the various labour unions since 1966 have proven this. If the unions cannot be responsible with the rights they now have and use their powers to the disadvantage of the farmer, then we need this type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one has only to look back just a few years to see how some of these unions have used their rights in an irresponsible way to the loss of the Western economy. In 1966 it was unbelievable the amount of time lost by lockout, lockouts and strikes. The unions were demanding wages without relating their demands to productivity and they did not care. They were prepared to get their demands at the expense of the whole economy of Canada. When one compares Canada with other countries you will find that productivity of labour in Canada was well behind that of other countries. As a result cost of manufacturing increased in Canada while that of other countries remained lower. No wonder Canada is continually pricing itself out of the market. I think the labour leaders appear to have demonstrated that once they have established themselves in an economic activity which is of importance to the country, they will make irresponsible demands on management without regard to reason or the effect on Canadian economy. I believe the longshoremen's strike and its results for the Western grain farmer were devastating in 1966. No one will ever know what it cost the Western farmer the 38 days the harbours were closed and the 84 vessels that were unable to load or unload grains. I believe some countries would have bought Canadian wheat at that time but were unable to do so because they could not be assured of delivery. It cannot be denied that the 30 per cent increase given to the longshoremen at that time is one of the major reasons of today's farmers' increased cost. Mr. Speaker, then came the strikes. In the fall of 1966 and 1967 in Vancouver, demurrage charges alone cost the Western farmer nearly \$1 million which was deducted from his final payment, not to mention the fact that it cost thousands of dollars for additional storage payments. This strike at the West Coast had such drastically adverse effects on the Prairie grain belt and the effects posed such a serious threat to Canada's trade commitments with other nations, that it is all the more reason

to impose rigid and binding restrictions on the activities of organized labour. The farmer's patience is wearing thin and he is bound to speak or seek the measures that this Resolution is calling for. How much longer must a Prairie farmer and the economy suffer the ravage that has been brought by the various strikes? The Canadian grain farmer suffered enough from the elements and inconsistencies of export trade without this added hazard. These strikes coming on top of poor wheat-export years catch producers at a time when their income is already suffering and their effects are therefore intensified. In Western Canada the serious blow which these strikes cause to the economy of the grain producer is a threat to the economy and the welfare of most Prairie dwellers. Other Canadians will have to recognize that this will ultimately threaten their welfare as well. The reaction of many farmers is a tendency to be critical of the workmen who are on strike, and in many instances this attitude is reinforced by the demands of the strikers. Even if we were to agree that the various demands of the union were valid, I cannot agree that they should continue to tie up the movement of grain until their point is made.

Mr. Speaker, every delay in grain movement threatens traditional export markets which once lost may never be recovered. It is almost certain to reduce total grain exports and this means a loss to the whole Canadian economy. It is unfortunate that the Canadian farmer has at times to pay such a high price for these irresponsible actions of various labour unions and their bosses. I cannot see any of the NDP farmer Members opposing this Resolution. If they do oppose the Resolution they are not acting on behalf of the farmer and will clearly show that they are anti-farmer and strictly for the labour unions. Mr. Speaker, the socialists have continuously dodged the issue that increased labour costs have a direct reflection on the farmers' income. In 1968 the pattern continued in the most crucial months of June and July when the grain handlers at the Lakehead walked off their jobs. This strike was really a deathblow to the Western farmer. For two months many ships with a carrying capacity of millions of bushels sat idly by with demurrage charges being paid by the Wheat board. This eventually resulted in a lower after-payment to the farmer. It is undeniable that crises have resulted from that prolonged strike. Stoppage of stock clearance 11 vital days before the end of the crop year jeopardized existing Canadian grain contracts made to exporters and placed further contracts in uncertainty. This grain handlers' strike hit hard at the Prairie economy and in particular the area from which grain shipments moved to the Lakehead instead of the West Coast. Adding to the Prairie gloom was the earlier Seaway strike and the fact that the mail carriers' strike and the grain handlers' strike overlapped, both having adverse local and regional effect on trade in the grain belt.

Mr. Speaker, in many Prairie farming communities you can see evidence of farmers' patience growing thin. A group of farmers writing to the Winnipeg Free Press on September 7 wrote in part:

Since these union strikers have done millions of dollars of damage to the agricultural industry, we as farmers feel they should be fired, every last one of them. We never want to see a union man on our premises again. We want men in our elevators who have heads and hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I can only draw one conclusion from all of these strikes and that is the strike weapon has outlived its usefulness.

April 9, 1970

It can no longer be afforded by any segment of Canadian society, industry, labour or management. Farmers are going to insist that Canadians must move closer to a unified view on labour-management reform. What the Federal Government can do and should do is prevent violence and the threat of violence and in case of emergency keep essential services functioning.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Members in the Opposition referred to labour-management policies of countries in Europe. What they do not refer to is the fact that unions there respect their rights and the rights of other sections of their society and their demands. They do not seek gains just for their own selfishness, or power-hungry union bosses, but for all people concerned. I believe that the increased cost of labour placed the farmer to some degree in the financial bind he is in today. I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that strikes, walkouts or lockouts and those that involve the orderly marketing of grain such as longshoremen, transportation and terminal elevators create greater hardships for the Western farmer than for any other part of our society. In view of these facts and the injustice it has caused to our farmers I will not support the amendment but fully support the Resolution. I personally feel the Resolution could be even still more harsh and by their conduct the unions have asked for it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Resolution moved by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker), asking for legislation to prohibit strikes in the essential services with binding arbitration, in particular at this time, the longshoremen, terminal workers and all others involved in the movement of grain to the starving people of the world. This Resolution is perhaps one of the most important Resolutions to be considered at this sitting of the Legislature. We ask that this Resolution be given immediate consideration by the Federal Government. All sections of the Canadian economy are affected by the continued strike actions taken by labour unions, actions to restrict movement of food grains to deprived people. Mr. Speaker, if Canada is going to be a strong, responsible nation with a healthy economy all Canadian citizens must work together. The thousands of people put out of work by planned strikes cannot receive their rewards when their fellowmen put narrow objectives ahead of responsibility. The strongest force for good is responsible individuals and responsible leadership working unremittingly for their own benefits and the benefit of others.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible that in this country the rights of many individuals go unprotected to the extent that good living standards for many people are jeopardized by an irresponsible minority. Authorities must impose measures of control that will assure all people involved that their basic rights are protected. The Resolution now being discussed outlines measures of improvement of work procedures. I am sure labour leaders opposite are reasonable and responsible people. I do hope that all the Members opposite will support the Resolution and assist this Government to press for immediate settlement of strikes, strikes that are hindering the urgent movement of grain shipments.

Mr. Speaker, I amendment given to understand that the constitutional intents and purposes of union organizations are for human justice,

human rights, human security to fight oppression, to fight subversion and to support God and our nation.

Mr. Speaker, these are indeed high ideals. Sincere, dedicated union members can be proud to work and live by these ideals. Canada would indeed be a marvellous country if producers, labour, industry, business and governments supported these ideals. It is unfortunate that shortcomings of some tarnish these men. In point of this time it is again an irresponsible leadership of grain handling services that is of grave concern to the agricultural people of Saskatchewan. Many farm families are facing the most critical financial situation of their lives. There was a time when labour people did suffer grave and serious injustice. Now labour people enjoy the best of our society. It is their responsibility to assist other Canadians to enjoy the same high standards.

Mr. Speaker, I amendment not going to discuss the immense financial loss, the immense suffering or the immense social injustices created by the continued strikes and labour unrest. Surely in this age of educated, informed and highly trained people with leadership, dissatisfied labour groups can sit down at the bargaining table with representatives of industry, business or government and agree upon a mutual satisfactory settlement. Considerate and thinking people agree that compulsory binding arbitration is the most satisfactory way to work and solve many of our problems with labour, production and distribution.

Mr. Speaker, there is little room in our society for organized disorder and violence. Let us get on with the job of handling a rewarding society for all people. Let us give the hard-pressed farmer a well-earned break for a change. Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that I shall support the motion and vote against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I have not got too much to say about this Resolution. I do want to draw to the attention of this House to some of the sheer hypocrisy that emanates from that side of the House, some of the accusations that are too ridiculous to answer coming from the usual channel from the far north, the Minister of Pollution (Mr. Guy). I suggest to these people across the way when they want to talk about some alliances of theirs that they better take a look in their closets. These people continually insinuate that we over here are being separated or supported by subversive elements and so on, and somehow or other there is always something devious and strange about this. They choose to point their finger at us. Well let Member say this that the former CCF party and the present New Democratic party have never joined hands with the Communist party of Canada officially as the Liberal Party did in 1945 in order to gain an election, some of the Communist labour leaders of that time, also supporting Tim Buck and joint statements being made by them, “Support Canada. Support the Liberal Party” throughout, in posters throughout the country. “Support Tim Buck and support MacKenzie King.” We are in this fight together. Never, never, Mr. Speaker, has the CCF party every, ever allowed any known Communist to come into the party. I’m not suggesting that they haven’t tried to infiltrate.

Now let’s get a little closer to home, let’s get a little closer to home in a little more recent history. Let us see how

April 9, 1970

clean these anti-labour people are when they get up and preach and pretend to be the friend of the farmers. At least the CCF party has never inveigled a racketeer to come into Canada to destroy labour unions, a thug brought in by Mr. Pickersgill who allowed him to operate, a man who was convicted of every dirty crime in the book, your friend, Hal Banks. Yes, the friend of five Liberal Members who received financial support from Hal Banks' union and it's on the records. That's a little more fact on records at Ottawa, the *Hansards* show it. That's public knowledge. It was the Liberal Government and a former Minister of Justice that laid the type of charges that allowed Hal Banks to jump bail and get down into the United States into that haven of racketeers and not allow the Canadian Government to bring him back. It is singularly obvious that the Liberal Government of Ottawa, in spite of the efforts of Conservatives and others to try to bring him back, have been very quiet on the subject, very quiet.

I am just going to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I am getting a little tired of these people pointing at respectable labour unions that are our allies. It is also pretty obvious that the Teamsters Union, the sensible one according to the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), has been the enemy of the New Democratic party and done everything possible to defeat us in every election and is in the pocket of the Liberal party and the Social Credit party in British Columbia. Now let's not have any more of this hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. I am going to say this, that I support this amendment, I support this amendment because this amendment is fair, it asks for fair play. I am not suggesting for one moment that we can allow costly strikes to go on. I suggest that the Member for Regina Centre has offered the fair solution and I think we can point the finger at all the guilty parties when there is a work stoppage that is not in the national interest. That's why I am getting up here today. I am not going to see the sons and daughters of my friends — many of them farmers — who are now in labour unions because the farm situation has been allowed to get into a state of complete depression. There is no place else for them to go but the labour market because again of Liberal policies, Mr. Speaker, these people have been forced to go into the labour market throughout Canada and the United States and they are the sons and daughters of farmers. Their mothers and fathers who may still be back on the farm are not going to appreciate legislation that is going to have their son and daughter bludgeoned while management goes scot free. Take a good look at this amendment because I am prepared — I am an agriculturalist, farmer and rancher — I am prepared to meet any one of you on any platform in this debate any time among farmers. I'll let my record stand anytime for and with farmers. Any of you that want to dare to meet Member on any platform in my constituency or anywhere else, I'll debate this issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we want fair play, and that is what the Hon. Member for Regina Centre has asked for in his amendment. We don't want a club to beat one group in a community over the head. We want the kind of thing that is going to do what is being done now in Great Britain, where everybody is asked to contribute to the national welfare. No one is allowed to take more than they are entitled to. It is small wonder that we have heard very little from our right-wing Premier this year about how bad things are in Britain. He used to use them as a whipping boy. We've heard very little from him this year, because Harold Wilson through a fair policy is gradually bringing Great Britain back out of the slump that the right-wingers left it in for years,

the Tory Government that was completely the same in its thinking and ideology as this group opposite — the right-wingers that brought Britain down to despair. It is taking a long hard pull and a lot of hard work to bring it back. It is being done, Mr. Speaker, through a method of fair play and common sense, not the kind of hate and despotism that is being shown in the speeches on that side of the House.

I think some of the Members opposite ought to take a look at an item in the World Book Encyclopaedia. I happened to look it up the other night, to look up some things, my daughter was working on social studies. The World Book said something about one of the world's bloodiest dictators in there, he was noted for and he rose to power, preaching hate for two special groups — Democratic Socialists and labour unionists. That is, if you care to look it up, look it up under Adolf Hitler. I am in favour of the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, rising to oppose the motion, and support the amendment moved by the Member from Regina Centre, I want to put on record my personal feelings and my stand on the issue in question. I must say I feel ashamed that this Legislature should have such a debate.

I was interested to note the people who have spoken from the other side. It was moved by a farmer and I give him credit for it. Then a teacher spoke, a machinery dealer and a storekeeper. I spent all years all my life as a farmer, and for the last 25 years I have been a member of a farm union.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — I say I have spent my whole life as a farmer, except for a few months, a period of time in 1948-49 when I was an employee of the International Nickel Company at Sudbury. While there I was a member of that union, the Mine, Mill and Smelter, I worked as one of 22,000 employees. I soon began to see the problems of life that faced the workingman, whether he was in the smelter as I was, or underground, or on the farm. The few months that I spent there had a great influence on my life. Here for the first time I saw how the other half of our society lived.

My parents came to Canada from Great Britain, the country where unions first started. Some of my ancestors fought and died to have the right to associate and to control their own destinies. At my father's knee I learned that I must always allow the other person to have those rights that I desired for myself. Above all, I was taught the basics of democracy and the necessity of the democratic process. The whole story of the struggle of the coal miners to organize the union to protect their rights was burned into my mind as a child. He always hoped that the farmers of Western Canada would learn the need of really unionising as well. He was a man who taught Member at an early age to be ready not only to fight for my own rights, but that it was just as important to fight for the rights of others. I believe it was Abraham Lincoln who said, "The only difference between a free man and a slave is that a free man may withhold his labour."

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to look at this problem from this

April 9, 1970

premise and position that I learned as a child. Having said this I certainly am not in favour of or in agreement with all actions of some unions. They like Member have a responsibility to society. I certainly can name times when in my opinion unions have not acted in a responsible manner. I have been caught in the web of not being able to deliver grain at critical times because of the actions of unions and was as mad as anyone else. At times like this I have wondered what the answer was to strikes.

Through the years I have often criticized international unions, yet as long as we have international companies I see no choice but to have international unions, one is synonymous with the other, one management, one union. To me this is just logical and a counterbalance.

One of the lessons I learned in Sudbury is that no worker or no union wants to strike. The strike weapon is only a last resort, it is the only lever the worker can use to better himself. No worker wants to go out on the picket line for a third of his pay. No worker wants the gaunt faces of his wife or children, he would much sooner settle and continue working.

My mind goes back to many talks that I had with older workers in Sudbury and their stories of conditions of work prior to the union, the stories of intimidation, of persecution, working conditions, firing, which preceded the forming of that union. Whenever a strike occurs, two things have happened. First the union has rejected an employer's offer, secondly, the company has rejected a union offer. Actually both sides have refused an offer; to me then there must be blame on both sides.

The amendment moved by my colleague, the Member for Regina Centre, is in my opinion a good one. It first calls for expansion and development of conciliation procedures. It seems to me much of the problem around negotiations is that they start too late. Too often there are no negotiations until the contract has almost run out. Why cannot these negotiations start months before? Once the contract expires, why cannot the Government see to it that conciliation procedures are started? I believe that there are times in essential services when it becomes necessary for the Government to act in the interest of the third party referred to by the hon. Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch, that is, the ordinary citizen. I think of the rail strike of a few years ago when the Prime Minister Pearson called together Parliament and let the elected representatives decide on the necessary action. It seemed to me that each situation is different and requires a different solution.

I believe that there is more responsibility being shown by unions than years ago. I must give credit to the longshoremen's union last fall which, after working without agreement for a number of months, went on working because they realized the hardship it would ensue on farming communities in the movement of wheat — I didn't hear any Members across the way giving any credit to the union for this action. Then what happened? The employers refused to allow the men to load grain, in other words the company went on strike. But not one whisper, not one groan, not one condemnation from the Premier's followers for company strikes. I think we must find a way to see that both sides are responsible.

I looked at the record of Sweden with regard to strikes. Their record in regard to strikes is beyond compare anywhere in

the Western world. The number of man-days lost through strikes has dropped from 11,311 hours to 4,240 hours in 1963. This is a fantastic record. Certainly any labour legislation that can achieve such a great reduction in strikes should be studied by this Legislature and also by the Government of Canada. Certainly I am no authority on labour legislation nor indeed do I understand the problem of labour negotiations, arbitration, etc. But from what little information I have gathered, I understand that there is no such thing in Sweden as compulsory legislation but there is a great improvement in labour relations because the Swedish government set up Labour Courts. But again I say for the record, Canada and Saskatchewan should be looking to such a program for industrial peace. The great majority of the labour force in Western Canada have a rural background, most of them have fathers and mothers or brothers or sisters who are still on the farm, most of them are not only aware of farm problems, but have an interest in the agricultural economy. Personally I am convinced that one of the reasons that the longshoremen in Vancouver agreed to load wheat was because a good percentage of the workers originate from the rural areas of Western Canada.

The main objection that I have to the motion of the Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) is that it endeavours to divide and to separate our society. It would encourage hard feelings and class conflicts, it is near-sighted and ill advised.

I might say that the words of the Hon. Minister of Public works and also the Hon. Member from Watrous, I wouldn't be bothered answering. The Hon. Minister of Public Works used the same speech with a couple of additions that we have listened to ever since 1960, when he first came into the Legislature and I couldn't waste my time answering them. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House know now that I will be supporting the amendment by my hon. friend the Member for Regina Centre with no trepidation, I am not scared. Because of my record as a farm spokesman and speaking for farmers over the last 25 or 30 years of my life in my community and in my area, I am not a bit afraid to invite any Member who would like to come into Touchwood, as the Hon. Member from Battleford said, "I'll appear on any platform anytime he likes."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, after hearing the speech of the Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) the other day, and after today hearing the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) and the Members for Watrous and Nipawin, I think there should be no doubt in the minds of anyone in this House about why this Resolution is before us. Primarily, if not wholly, it seems to me to be before us with one object, and that is of playing politics with a very, very grave problem. This is characteristic of almost every move and every statement that the Saskatchewan Liberal party has made in labour matters.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The intent of debating this Resolution is not to debate compulsory arbitration and the problems of farmers. Basically it is to excite emotion and aggravate prejudice, not to provide accurate information, not to provide a rational field for debate in a very complicated area of relationships.

April 9, 1970

I listened this afternoon to the constant stream of vituperation and venom directed against working people and their leaders. Not one helpful idea, not one positive comment from the Minister of Public Works; just a nauseous collection of distortions, innuendoes, abuse and stagnant clichés.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The Member for Watrous I understand, has a farm machine agency. He spent much of his time blaming the major economic problems of farmers on organized employees and he did not have one word to say about the recent Barber investigation into the cost of farm machinery that laid the blame on the high price of farm machinery directly at the door of the international manipulation of farm equipment companies throughout this world. Not one word! Not one piece of credit to the working people!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Order, order!

Mr. Davies: — When I hear, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General attempt to call me to order in referring to this matter, I only hope to refer him to what has already been said before in the debate this afternoon, and I am replying to that. What I am saying is that the Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) this afternoon says that the main reasons for the farmers' unfortunate and unhappy place is the high wages and the good working conditions of the working people of this country. This is another attempt to shift blame, to avoid the main reasons for the difficulties of farmers in Canada at this time which is the completely inept Liberal Government handling of grain sales. There has been little or nothing done during the period of the last two years to get the farmer out of his desperate plight. This has got little or nothing to do with strikes. The Members on that side of the House know that. The Liberals in this House are using this issue to blame labour for high farm prices. They are doing that which does nothing to improve the farmers' situation, they are attempting to mis-direct attention from the real issues that bother the farmers today.

The Minister of Public Works when he rose this afternoon also contributed nothing to the debate in the way of useful suggestions. He called my friend the financial critic a "puppet of labour unions", for making a series of constructive suggestions finally contained in the amendment which he put before this House. I want to tell the Minister for Public Works this, Mr. Speaker, if he is calling my friend the financial critic a puppet, then he is calling all of the hon. gentlemen that formed the Woods Commission puppets too, because what my friend said this afternoon is the reasoning of the Woods Commission. They are not forsaken souls who went for union goals as I think he put it this afternoon.

If one were to believe the Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker), Mr. Speaker, the main problem of farmers is labour unions. Now I don't think anyone disputes that a relatively few strikes in Canada have caused inconvenience and some difficulty for citizens, of one group or another, including the basic producer. But as I said before, I found it significant that the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch and other Members of the Government in this debate have not had a word to say about the fundamental troubles of farmers.

What about the consummate roguery of the farm implement companies, as revealed by the Barber Commission, which has literally robbed Canadian farmers for year after year in a system of international conspiracy on prices? Not one word from the Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch! What about the high interest rates which have functioned so detrimentally in the inflation of the past several years, and have had their damaging effects on every one, including the farm population? Not one mention from the Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch, or his colleagues either for that matter. What about the handling of agricultural problems by his own Government and the Liberal Government at Ottawa, especially with respect to grain sales, which have plunged the Western farmer into his present desperate situation? The Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch knows that this matter is on the lips of his constituents and of every grain farmer in Saskatchewan, but he just sublimely ignored it in his talk before this House.

What about the outmoded and arbitrary way that the railroads handle wheat shipments? According to James Bentley, the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, reported in February 23 issue of The Leader Post, Canada lost wheat sales of 200 million bushels in the current crop year because the railways could not move it, or would not move it. Mr. Bentley got this information direct from the Canadian Wheat Board. Why didn't our farm Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch raise this item objectively in a true attempt to help the farmer?

A reading of a transcript of the Member's speech shows that beyond any argument his intention was to attack labour, ignore the real causes and the sensible solutions to labour disputes, not to search into aspects which are at the root of troubles of Western agriculture. The Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch wants a tribunal that will in his words, "settle all disputes" that would make it illegal to strike. It would have penalties, presumably of the one-sided, partial nature, provided in the Saskatchewan legislation, the so-called Bill 2. He dealt about that this afternoon as an aside. The Provincial Treasurer when he was in his seat referred to this as good legislation.

The Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch says, and I am quoting, "that collective bargaining has become a farce." He thinks that mediators are 'nonsense'. He left the impression with this House that if had his way, unions and collective bargaining would be shackled and padlocked. The Member's speech was replete, as were others this afternoon, with charges about the domination of "power-hungry American labour bosses". He lumped together people that have achieved respect and admiration and all over North America, all over the world, people like Walter Reuther, William Mahoney. He lumped these people with Jimmy Hoffa, a man whom such individuals have fought with every resource at their command. He says that he is not anti-labour, but he objects to paying union dues as a condition of employment, from which I suggest that his dislike of unions seems to emanate. He hasn't a word to say about dozens of professional organizations which require membership not only before someone works in a single plant, but before a person can work in an entire province or region.

If the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch had brought a resolution before us on the simple proposition of compulsory arbitration, and then had urged straightforward arguments for its acceptance, we could then discuss it on the basis of the facts. But, Mr. Speaker, the Member has not done this. Rather he has

April 9, 1970

smeared the question with a repetition of the half-truths, inaccuracies, distortions and the discredited statements of virulent right-wing management people. At the same time he has ignored the thinking and the findings of every dispassionate investigation that has been made in this country during the past quarter century. His treatment of the subject would be itself be enough to discount and to obscure any valid points that he may have suggested elsewhere in his remarks.

The Member also cited figures to show that wage increases were prevalent without the productivity to provide them. This argument was continued by the Member for Watrous this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, over the years, there can be no doubt that, if anything, productivity has generally eclipsed wage increases. Since 1958 the situation is that wage increases in most major countries have risen at a faster rate than they have in Canada. But in any case, DBS Weekly for January 2, 1970 shows the range of productivity increases for the years from 1961-68. Real output rose 47 per cent in the goods-producing section of the manufacturing industry alone. In iron and steel mills, the output per person increased at an average annual rate, the real rate, of almost 4 per cent, discounting all other types of inflation. Output of the steel and iron mills rose 70 per cent, but during that period of time salaries and wages as a unit of output have been stationary since the first year of the group I mentioned in 1959.

Now the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch cited a year when he said that the United States productivity was greatly in excess of Canada's. The DBS Weekly issue for January 2, 1970 tells us that from 1947 to 1967, productivity in Canadian iron and steel mills grew at a faster rate than in their United States counterparts. In fact the United States productivity rose by 2.3 per cent yearly while the average for Canada was 3.8 per cent to 4 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, if the Member had restricted himself to arguing for compulsory arbitration as a principle, one might have a little sympathy for his approach. But he evidently anticipates that compulsory arbitration will force settlements less generous than the Coast grain handlers have received. As my friend, the Opposition financial critic, has already pointed out, this is certainly not always the experience. But, I say again, in passing, it is interesting to note his attitude. He evidently for example objects to a 26-week wage guarantee per year for employees. Why? It doesn't mean that the employees will receive this amount of money for doing nothing, simply that they will be guaranteed at least a half-year's pay if there is no work. I suggest that that would be a situation rather extreme. The Member, though and I say it is significant again, seems to see something grossly wrong with a guarantee of six months' employment in any one year.

Mr. Speaker, in the concept of the Member that introduced this Resolution, farm collaboration with wage and salary earners is complete anathema. He objects to labour getting 12 positions out of 84 on the New Democratic Party national Council, even although today 80 per cent of the total population of Canada is now in urban areas, and where the largest part of the population is composed of wage and salary earners. I think his concept goes something like this; 1. any increase in wages should be held to the bare minimum; 2. all increases in labour costs are responsible for farm difficulties; and 3. there is no room for farm labour cooperation. I want to remind the Hon. Member this afternoon that

were it not for the extra buying power generated through collective bargaining, thousands of farmers on the Prairies would not be able to diversify their operations, since people would not, as one example, be able to afford meat on their tables. I remind the Member that the consumption of animal products has vastly increased in aggregate, simply because there is a higher degree of purchasing power that has been generated by trade unions and collective bargaining. In the analysis, whether it is here, or anywhere else in the world, the prosperity of farmers depends on urban buying power. Basically, the failure to get into some world markets with our own farm products today is caused by the lack of purchasing power in the countries whose markets we would like to enter, or would like to widen, for our own goods.

The policy the Member is advocating is damaging, long-term, for other reasons. One is that the farm population in Canada today is one-sixth of the total and that population is declining further. The antagonism that he is building by his motion, the entire rightward-looking stance of his party on labour in this province damages the understanding and the support of the very majority section which must eventually be relied upon in this country to approve policies in favour of agriculture. His anti-labour policy and that of his party, is therefore fatal to the interest of the farming community that he claims to speak for. Here I must say that it is to the great credit of the national Farmers' Union that they have realized the interdependence of interests and have completely opposed the labour policy that is espoused by this Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that there are a number of Canadians who mistakenly look upon forced legal settlements of labour disputes as a kind of course-all. I think that many in this group have honest and sincere views. The most disturbing aspect of this Resolution is not merely the object that it hopes to achieve, but the reasons that are given in justification by those who support it in this House.

Some who are taken with the idea of compulsory arbitration genuinely want to find a way out. It is hard to perceive this motivation among the leaders of the Saskatchewan Liberal party and the Members of the Liberal party in this House. Almost any discussion of industrial issues involving organized employees is used by them not to increase understanding and harmony among the urban and the rural sections of the population, but to becloud and to befog the point, to excite suspicion, to inflame emotions and to keep and create divisions in the population.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is, in my opinion, before us for a narrow and an unworthy political purpose. It is not there to find any honest and enduring answers to labour problems, I say that as such the Resolution was suspect from the very beginning. Let us anyway, Mr. Speaker, examine the proposal made in the Resolution at its face value. First of all, let me say that compulsory arbitration is not compatible with the basic concept of free collective bargaining between employees and employers. More than that, it runs counter to the whole idea and defeats its very objectives. To paraphrase, when forced arbitration comes in the door, free bargaining flies out the window. The very nature of the forced process destroys one of the most effective forms of industrial democracy. It is not simply that most fundamental decisions are relegated to an outside source for decisions, the gravest hurt of all is done to an institution

April 9, 1970

which, while it may have its faults, has deep meaning and strength for our own way of life.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, those who are closest to the bargaining arena, as well as those who have most to do with prevention disputes and securing agreements, are overwhelmingly critical or opposed to compulsory settlements. The Hon. Bryce Mackasey has already been referred to here in this debate, and I must say also that he has more than once publicly stated his distaste and his opposition to forced arbitration. Apart from everything else, it is evident that this Minister has realized the specious nature of the form itself. Under collective bargaining in Canada and the United States, that is, under a measure of freedom to determine wage and salary and other conditions in industry, the productivity of the worker has soared since World War II. Mr. Mackasey well understands what happens when workers are dragooned and when settlements are imposed. Bad morale and resentment inevitably result in lower production and continuous operational troubles.

Czechoslovakian employees provide an excellent example. Reliable reports tell us that a situation approaching chaos has come about in Czechoslovakian industry, so keenly does the average employee feel about the interference of the government and of the Soviet Union in the affairs of his country.

Australia's experience in the five-year period from 1945 to 1950 shows that compulsory arbitration has exacerbated rather than eliminated labour disputes. Australia is a country with fewer residents than Canada yet it had in that period of time 6,062 work stoppages. Canada in that period of time had 1,113 disputes. Anyone who naively supposes that the peace of the grave descends with forced settlements in industry makes a very serious error indeed.

Now further, the Royal Commission on Compulsory Arbitration in disputes affecting hospitals and their employees of Ontario in the year 1964 noted that the arbitration system in Australia did not, and I am quoting the Commission:

clearly indicate the system's contribution to industrial peace, and that a substantial amount of industrial conflict had occurred.

And then the Commission goes on to say:

There is a consensus in Canada and the United States that the application of compulsory arbitration is repugnant to our free enterprise system and our free democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, as other people who have spoken in the debate have said, and especially my friend, the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney), we have more recently have had the advantage of the views of the Woods Commission, that is, the Federal Task Force on Canadian Industrial Relations. Members know that this Report was made in 1969.

I think that this study was probably the most comprehensive investigation of its type ever made in Canada. It involved for one thing at least 100 specialists of one kind or another in labour relations. It took more than two years to prepare and its officials worked with every Provincial Government in this country as well as dozens of organizations everywhere in Canada.

Many precise recommendations of the Woods Commission are controversial, but, Mr. Speaker, its underlying expression of the need to maintain and to extend collective bargaining is implicit and must be accepted. The Commission confirmed the right of workers to strike and it in general discounted compulsory arbitration as a desirable medium for settlement.

The Woods Commission has given lengthy consideration to the question of disputes involving the public interest. Here it recommended the creation of a Public Interest Disputes Commission. This body would be charged with the duty of assisting parties to management-labour disputes to negotiate special procedures that would settle differences that had arisen. It would only be, Mr. Speaker, in the event of failure to get agreement on a procedure, that the Disputes Commission would have power to prescribe and recommend measurements for settlement.

As my friend, the financial critic has suggested, the Commission and the parties would consider procedures like conciliation, mediation, non-binding arbitration, voluntary binding arbitration, involvement of the Disputes Commission itself, and special industrial inquiries, that would include fact-finding, and all other special bargaining and consultative procedures.

Mr. Speaker, in cases where the efforts of the Disputes Commission were not successful in bringing differences to a harmonious conclusion, the Federal Government itself would be empowered to request a report with recommendations on a range of choices, and these would include the merits of seizure of a company operation, trusteeship, partial operation and arbitration, in addition to the procedures that I have made brief reference to. And as been pointed out (where arbitration became an issue) the Commission significantly commented that if this question arose only Parliament should have the power to impose an end to a strike or to a lockout.

Mr. Speaker, I do not subscribe to all of the ideas that are suggested by the Woods Commission, but I do want to emphasize to the House, and particularly to the Government Members who support the Resolution before us, that it is abundantly plain that the Woods Commission after exhaustive consideration scored and down-graded collective bargaining. It is also further evident that the Woods Commission felt that existing settlement procedures must be overhauled and improved and that new, supplementary procedures should be concurrently developed, so as to reduce as far as possible strikes and lockouts. The Woods Commission obviously believed that, with substantial additions and improvements to settlement procedures, forced settlements were largely as unnecessary as the Commission believed them to be undesirable.

There is not the slightest doubt whatsoever that the Resolution before us now is contrary to the dominant current thinking and to the Woods Report. Indeed, the principle of the Resolution is revealed by the reasoning of the Woods Commission Report to be not only unwise and unrealistic, but inept, backward and un-modern in its outlook.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, therefore, I suggest to the House that the proposal that is embodied in the Resolution has been rejected as the prime means of settling disputes in areas where the public interest is involved, by the most extensive labour-management study that has been made in Canada to this time.

April 9, 1970

There has been from time to time reference made to settlement forms in Sweden. There seems to be widespread impression in some circles to the effect that Sweden's success in industrial relations has arisen because of compulsory arbitration. This impression is of course quite false. The reverse is really true. Certainly in Sweden voluntary arbitration is used from time to time, but settlements on wages and other benefits is negotiated and agreed to in collective bargaining in the overwhelming majority of cases.

I want to emphasize here, because I think it is important, that the Swedish success is due to a number of factors. The unitary nature of the Government, the centralization of employer and employee federations and the sharing of economic power by the working people of Sweden have created a wholly different situation than in North America where corporations unilaterally and often anti-socially make decisions that adversely affect the entire population.

Without saying much more on this subject, I want to underscore this fact. The Swedish worker is the beneficiary of a sophisticated collective bargaining structure in which compulsory arbitration is non-existent. The Swedish apparatus works well because of the development of bargaining forms which reject the whole idea of forced settlements in collective bargaining.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I did not subscribe to all of the proposals that were made by the Woods Commission; and I am not sure that we could slavishly transplant the methods that are used by the Swedes, although I think some of them would be clearly useful. The thread of the Woods Commission approach, and the substance of the Swedish practices, hold important answers for us in the field of management-labour relations. Solutions in industrial disputes must be found not in destroying and breaking down the bargaining structure but in reinforcing that framework and assisting it with the new methods that have been, or are being conceived, in the evolution of the institutions, and by rejecting compulsion as a prime tool for the elimination of strife.

Mr. Speaker, those who advocate courses such as proposed in the Resolutions we are debating fail to see that, apart from the disadvantages and the fatal defects, the forced arbitration of labour's wages and working conditions must irresistibly lead to compulsion in areas considered to be the preserve of management and individual enterprise. I am sure the entrance of such compulsion would dismay some of friends in the Government.

You cannot argue that crucial items that affect the life of the worker are subject to arbitration decrees without sooner or later having to conclude that products handled or manufactured, the firm's operation and administration, its prices and its everyday affairs are equally objects which must and should be within the same orbit of unilateral decision.

Mr. Speaker, the Members on your right are fervid exponents of what they are pleased to call 'free enterprise'. I say let them realize that the eventual outgrowth of the compulsion they advocate in collective bargaining must engulf the fights of management to process, to administer, to market and to price. They may want to restrict it to labour, but there is no way that such artificial distinctions could be maintained.

Let me Mr. Speaker, make further reference to the Woods Canada Commission. The Commission Report, observing that the majority of trade union agreements in Canada had arbitration sections for the settlement of grievances that were unresolved in the procedure set forth in other sections, noted that, while this common agreement to settlement was one thing, it was quite another, as they said, "to impose a settlement in the absence of mutual consent." The Commission commented on other shortcomings, notably what they call the "potentially corrosive effect on the decision-making process within and between unions and management." The Commission observed that compulsory arbitration may serve as a "crutch for weak leadership in either unions or management", and went on to say that in the long run the effect would be to undermine both the leadership in question and the collective bargaining process itself.

The Commission also suggested that, if the principle of compulsion in forcing thousands of employees to accept laid-down settlements were followed, it could not stop there. If it is legitimate to force settlements that affect people's lives by collective bargaining, then the Commission said how could prices, methods, administration and types of products be only matters for decision for the private management groups themselves.

I think that this aspect of the whole question should be kept in mind by those people who actively promote the idea of collective bargaining in this House. One might think too of eventual state controls where farmers were ordered to produce certain kinds and quantities under severe penalties for not so doing. Some in this House might say that this is an extreme possibility, but I want to remind the Members of the House that there are ready examples to be found in fairly recent history where farmers have been dealt with very harshly, to the extent of being placed in labour camps for disagreeing with such policies. I have no doubt though that cases of the kind concerned would fail here as they failed in the USSR where substantial modifications to forced farming had to be introduced to save agriculture from the eroding effects of non-cooperative collectivism.

Do we think that compulsion on workers in industry would work any differently? Of course not, Mr. Speaker. Compulsory settlements and the negation of bargaining can only result in civil resistance and direct opposition. The working people of industry will never produce of their best when driven and threatened, harassed and compelled. Those that advocate compulsory arbitration simply don't recognize the central facts of life in industry, either that, or they have a fixation for vindictive or negative thinking.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us does not spell out in detail the compulsory legislation desired, but I say that it is entirely reasonable to assume that the mover and its supporters, and the Government Members, want a kind of national Bill 2 to be legislated. I feel that there are thousands of people who, even if they have some sympathy for a kind of legally enforced arbitration, would be utterly and completely opposed to another and Federal, one-sided, discriminatory, unjust Bill 2, which is in Saskatchewan a grab-bag of coercive statutes, giving absolute powers without appeal to this Liberal Government.

I think that we can take it that this legislation calls for legislation that would let the Federal Government name two out

April 9, 1970

of three members on an arbitration board, determine when there is a dispute, cancel a certification without going through the Federal Labour Relations Board, and find individual unionists up to \$1,000 a day. We have to accept that the Members on your right, Mr. Speaker, want national legislation that permits the Federal Cabinet to determine the guilt and to execute the penalties. I say that the people of this Province have a right to know what is really being proposed in this Resolution and I challenge the Members opposite to deny that this is the kind of Federal law they want.

The very kernel of the Resolution before us means that legislation of the kind recommended could not be confined to what is already a numerous group — railway workers, grain handlers, dockworkers and the like. There are, in today's complex society, so many groups that can be connected with the field of public interest that no Federal Government could conscientiously legislate without including them all. That net would be a very, very large one and the effect would create the worst and most damaging effects on collective bargaining that have been seen in Canada for half a century or more. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the logic of things prescribes that legislation for compulsory arbitration would spill over so as to fold into its deadly embrace millions of Canadian employees. If for no other reason than this, the Resolution is dangerous and irresponsible.

There are undoubtedly formidable problems in bargaining connected with the industry that handles grain, and for many other industries not so connected but which are equally critical so far as public interest is concerned. Solutions to these problems can be found, just as they have been found in many other fields of human relationship.

Compulsory arbitration, Mr. Speaker, is neither a desirable nor a good answer. It has not worked and it will not work. The pathway to success in minimizing conflict lies in new and better forms, in increased labour-management government consultation and through ongoing, continuous application of efforts to overcome the causes of industrial troubles. The pathway to failure and to further strife lies in confining and repressive measures which have to fail because of their fundamental and underlying approach, Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this Resolution. It cannot succeed because it is repressive. It would do untold harm to both collective bargaining and the public interest it purports to speak for.

The strength of a free society lies in the free institutions and in the innumerable rights and practices which are the flesh on the bones of the legalistic framework in that society. Collective bargaining in the practice of industrial democracy is not a necessary evil in our midst, it is a symbol, Mr. Speaker, of the success and the strength of democracy. It is perhaps unfortunate that so few people in prominent positions of leadership, particularly, I think, of the mass media, pay more than passing and occasional tribute to industrial relations in a positive sense. Whatever the case, since collective bargaining accomplishes peaceful settlements in all but a negligible number of instances, there is no defence necessary of its principle or of the maintenance of the success of the practice itself. But the Resolution before us would start a chain reaction of practices and events which would destroy bargaining as an institution. Let us make no mistake about it. So entwined are relations in society today that it is difficult to identify what is essential and what

is not. It would only be a matter of time, if compulsory arbitration obtained, for it to become general. Whether this is argumentative or not, the meaning of the Liberal party is clear. their leaders have left no doubt but that they feel all labour disputes should be subjected to the iron clasp of forced arbitration.

I listened this afternoon to a recitation from one of the Members talking about the enormous amount of time lost in labour disputes. This has consistently over the years, Mr. Speaker, averaged less than two-tenths of one per cent. Unemployment in any one of the years of the last 25, taking in the worst years and the good ones, would be 50 or 60 times the amount of time lost due to strikes. Again, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that never, never, do I hear the Members who speak to a Resolution of this kind pay tribute to this sort of fact.

Mr. Speaker, I want to very sincerely call upon the Government to reject this Resolution. I want to call upon it to proceed to an active policy of peaceful industrial relations; and I call upon it to put an end to its endless hostility to labour. I think that, if this position is taken by the Government, if the direction it has taken at this time is changed to a truly liberal one — that is with the small l in front — this side of the Legislature will work with you in devising the type of extended and expanded conciliation, mediation, consultation and all the means indeed that are discussed in the Woods Commission Report, to the end that industrial conflict will be minimized in our province and in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this can be done and this should be done. It is the only way it can be done. I ask the Government to see this and act accordingly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in this debate and you will see that I haven't very much prepared.

But listening to the remarks here this afternoon, talking about the number of farmers on that side of the House and how many are on this side that are going to talk against this Resolution and for the amendment, last year I took a census of the House and I think we had 11 farmers on this side and 10 on the other side. After Kelvington we have gained one making it 12. I think that you also dropped one. Before very long, I think the Opposition will amount to about the number that is sitting in the House right now on that side. They are not interested in listening.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Where are all your fellows?

Mr. Thibault: — We will outnumber you any time you want to count. I also want to tell you and the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) . . . Now you look after the stable and there will be plenty for you to do, Mr. Member of the Horse Barns.

I ant to tell the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch that his Resolution is a very typical Liberal approach, trying to drive

April 9, 1970

a wedge and promote hatred. You have been doing that ever since you are the Government. Look at how popular you are today! Why don't you try a different idea? The grain question is one that has to be looked at from different angles. I have a news article here from The Leader Post February 24, 1966"

Canada lost wheat sales of 200 million bushels in the current crop year because the railway could not move it, James Bentley, President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, said Thursday.

Did we criticize this? Did we criticize the railway? Oh, no. They are holier than thou. Now agriculture is in trouble and we know it. But why take after one group of people? The Woods Commission has made recommendations and we have never heard the people across the way talk about them. We don't want to touch them at all.

I think that the amendment is a realistic one. It really faces up to the problem and I don't see why all Members of the House wouldn't support it. I can understand why those that are not in the House will not support it as they are not interested even to listen.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House an article that appeared in the Calgary Herald that certainly exposes our province for what it is, for the kind of management that we have had in this province in the last few years. And in a last effort the Liberals still think that the old trick is going to work, but look at what is happening in Alberta.

An ad in the Calgary Herald, March 28, 1970 stated:

Attention Saskatchewanites! Are you looking for work? We have a very attractive proposition to offer. Please forward your name, age, previous employment, to Box 8642, Herald. Will answer all replies.

Mr. MacDougall: — Who sponsored it?

Mr. Thibault: — I don't know who sponsored it, but there it is. But this goes to prove that not only in Saskatchewan they know that things are not going right. The people outside the province are inviting them there. At the rate that they are leaving — you lost 13,000 last year and that still doesn't change your mind. Teachers are leaving. The best teachers are leaving, cutting it off the top, looking for better jobs. Workers, farmers, are leaving in great numbers. Our population is going down. Promotion of hatred! Do you think you can encourage people to stay in this province when you have an attitude of this kind, being promoted from day to day, trying to make the people believe that the whole thing lies on labour. I have said it in this House more than once that I have children in the labour force and I have children that want to farm. I hope they will be successful in it. I am not going to teach them the philosophy that has been promoted by the Liberal party in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I want them to live as brothers. Those who are in the labour force, all they have to offer is their 10 fingers.

And what they have learned on the farm is a little different. But I certainly don't want to go and tramp labour into the ground the way this Government has tried to do. For what? Just for political gains and no other reason, for political gains. It is not a question of justice. It is just: can we gain a vote by doing it? This is what I resent and I resent it with all the power that is in me.

So I think that the amendment is really a good one. It is a realistic one and I hope that the House will do a little bit of rethinking. As you know, Liberal times are hard times.

I will support the amendment. What we will do about the motion, I think we will have to oppose it.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I am like some others here this afternoon, I did not intend to speak in this debate, but I am unlike some other Members, I don't have a prepared speech and I don't think my speech will be very long.

There were, however, a few comments that I would like to make in regard to what has been said earlier in this debate. The Hon. Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) brought forward some facts concerning the association by the Liberal party with Mr. Banks who was noted as being not quite the best type of labour leader that we . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Mafia thugs!

Mr. Wood: — Yes, it could be one of the Mafia thugs that the Hon. Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) was referring to. The Members opposite endeavoured to kick up some dust around here to confuse the issue, but I do have here a few clippings and some excerpts from *Hansard* which might throw a little light on the subject. I would like to read first, Mr. Speaker, if I may, a quote from The Leader Post of November 6, 1964. The heading of the article is, "*SIU funds said given to Liberals*". It says:

The Toronto Star . . .

(which is a fairly well known paper)

says Hal Banks Seafarers' International Union issued cheques for about \$1,000 each to the political agents of five Montreal-area Liberal candidates just before the 1962 Federal election and also contributed \$1,000 to the 1957 campaign of a former Liberal Member of Parliament for a New Brunswick riding.

The world copyright story by reporter Robert Reguly, who several weeks ago found Banks in New York after the deposed SIU chief had fled the country following a conspiracy conviction, says evidence of the political contributions was unearthed by a Royal Commission but never made public.

The story says the Norris Commission, the Government inquiry headed by Mr. Justice T.G. Norris, which led to the imposition of a government trusteeship to run the union's affairs, "shied away from revealing the SIU's political entanglements".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 9, 1970

Mr. Wood: — there is another short excerpt here if I may, Mr. Speaker, also from The Leader Post of October 8, 1964. The heading is "*Banks' tape may name Liberals*". The by-line on this is from Charlottetown and it says:

radio correspondent Education Murphy, who covers House of Commons proceedings in Ottawa for CKNW, New Westminster, B.C., says he is going to broadcast a taped interview with Harold Banks, former Canadian chief of the Seafarers' International Union, now in New York, about November 20.

He says the tape mentions Liberal election candidates who accepted campaign funds from SIU sources and also discusses Banks' social associations with some Liberal leaders, past and present.

Other subjects in the tape include a reference to an appeal by British Columbia Federal Liberal candidates for SIU volunteers to aid as stewards at rowdy campaign meetings.

I think these are your thugs and Mafia.

Mr. Murphy says that in arranging to make the tape two weeks ago he contracted to keep it under wraps until the current SIU election. Balloting is expected to end November 15th with the result about November 20th, at which date he would be able to release the tapes for broadcast.

Now mention was also made of *Hansard*. Just in connection with these Press releases, or the Press statements, I would like to read a paragraph on page 9,941 of *Hansard* for November 10, 1964. The speaker is Mr. Eric Neilson of Yukon. He says:

The tentacles of Mr. Banks and the SIU seem to be involving even more Liberal Members of Parliament. The most recent one and the case which I think underlines the need for an urgent and immediate study of this problem by the government, is that of the Hon. Member for Vancouver Burrard who was implicated by name and by riding in the news broadcast this morning. Since lunchtime that Hon. Member has given an interview to Vancouver radio station CKNW and admitted that he had in fact received help from the SIU. This was following a story yesterday by CKNW reporter, Education Murphy. He is the first Liberal Member who has had the courage to come forward and admit his complicity. This in itself emphasizes the need for a detailed and immediate investigation into such situations.

Thus endeth the reading, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I think that this shows quite conclusively so far as I am concerned that there was no fabrication or imagination, that there were definite connections between the Seafarers' Union, Hal Bank, and Liberal Members who were well up in the hierarchy of the Liberal party. I think this is shown without any doubt. I think that, when Hon. Members opposite are trying to make out that Members on this side are in league with these type of people, they are barking up the wrong tree and trying to cover up their own misdemeanours in this matter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I would like to say myself, Mr. Speaker, that I am a farmer. I was born on the farm, Mr. Speaker, the farm which I still own and personally operate and lived on until the beginning of this year. I don't know whether the Members who were interested the other day are present here today, but I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that my farm is situated on the south half of Section 13 in township 17, range 15, west of the third meridian and that is about 100 miles south of the 45th township line. It is in Southern Saskatchewan. I happen to represent the city of Swift Current, which is the fifth city of Saskatchewan, and my plurality there, I am thankful to say, in the last election was quite a satisfactory one, but I also represent a farming community where, I am also thankful to say, my plurality was just, very slightly, but just slightly better than what it was in the city.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — And I think that I can say that I can stand up as a representative of the farming area around Swift current in the southwest corner of the province. I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to say that I would like at this time to service notice on Members on both sides of the House that I am prepared to go right down the line for the farmers of Western Canada in their efforts to keep grain moving through the ports.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I am not prepared to back down on this and irrespective of who says what, I am out to fight for the farmers and do everything that I can to help them keep their grain moving. It is important, very important, to the farmers at this time that they keep their grain moving, that they don't allow it to be held up by strikes or whatever may come about. I also think that I am quite right in taking this position of standing up for the farmers in regard to the city which I represent, because the city of Swift current, like all cities in this province, depends very much directly upon the fact that the farmers must have a return to keep them in business and that their grain must be kept moving.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, while I say I am prepared to go right down the line for the farmers in their fight to keep their grain moving, I don't think the best way of doing this is by getting up and supporting the ham-fisted, irresponsible position set out in this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I think that, if this Resolution was carried and put into effect, and if attention was paid to it by the Federal Government — which I doubt very much it would be because of statements which have been emanating from the Federal Cabinet — I think that there is quite a good deal of doubt that they would even give consideration to such a resolution as this. But if they did, I think it could be certainly calculated to cause a great deal of trouble and interruption in the shipping at the Head of the Lakes or wherever the longshoreman and others are at work.

April 9, 1970

In support of this position, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote just a couple of short paragraphs from an editorial of the *Star Phoenix* of March 31. It says here that:

It is understandable that many Prairie farmers and businessmen might support a suggestion by James Hooker, Liberal Notukeu-Willowbunch, that longshoremen and others involved in the off-loading of Prairie grain be prohibited from striking.

It says here:

But despite the serious blows strikes and labour disputes have dealt the Prairie economy the dangers and disadvantages of such a move outweigh any short-term advantages.

There is a good deal more but it largely backs up the sentiments of those that have spoken already on this side this afternoon. I will not take the time of the House to repeat them but it says here, if I may repeat that last bit, what this motion proposes, it says:

The dangers and disadvantages of such a move outweigh any short-term advantages.

I think that this is the truth. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in standing up for the rights and doing the best I can to support the rights of the farmers whom I represent, I believe in going along with the proposals of the Commission which was set up by the Federal Government to investigate and report upon such situations. I think the Woods Commission has given a good deal of study to this. I believe that the findings brought forward after this study are quite probably the best proposals that we have at hand for keeping the grain moving in the best interests of the farmers whom I represent. I think the study of men of this type and what they have prepared to recommend after giving the matter a good deal of thought should be given a good deal more consideration by this House than, as I say, the thoughtlessness of the Resolution we have before us as pointed out by the *Star Phoenix*. I am looking at the recommendations of the Woods Commission and I think that in view of doing the best I can for the farmers of my area, I must support the amendment and vote against the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I certainly am surprised that the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) would stoop down to such a low category and drag out names and speeches that were made in the House by politicians. Nothing was proven about Banks to my knowledge. It was recorded in *Hansard*, sure, but they were just speeches and can be recorded here too but nothing is going to prove that what you said is true. If you want to look at people that are involved in the Liberal party you should look at your own boulders and what about Clarence Fines. You know that would make Banks look like an angel compared to your friend Fines.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Liar!

Mr. Boldt: — And if you want to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! From here on in we are absolutely not going to have any more people calling each other liars back and forth across the House, whether they are standing up or whether they are sitting down. That's the end of all this liar stuff. Please, for heaven's sake let's maintain a little bit of decorum in this House.

Mr. Boldt: — No, he doesn't have to withdraw it. I recognize from where it comes.

If you want to read from *Hansard* or if you want to stoop down to that level, then I ask you to take a look at Tommy Douglas' daughter and read those Press releases that came around not so long ago. He was the Premier of Saskatchewan and he's the Leader of the NDP party. Talk about Banks what do I care about Banks? But these insinuations about the Liberals being associated with somebody, you have much more to be ashamed of than what we have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Then the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), that little waffly lawyer, brings in an amendment, you know, and this is typical of the way those lawyers operate. You know they don't want anything sure-cut. No. they want negotiations and negotiations and negotiations with the union and with everybody, just so that they can draw salaries and keep everything . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — What the Government wants and what the farmers of Saskatchewan want, they want something clear-cut. they don't want any lawyers or any judges sitting on courts and saying that this has to be done and this has to be done and that has to be done. The farmers are fed up with those lawyers.

An Hon. Member: — Don't trust them, eh?

Mr. Boldt: — No, Sir, at least the lawyers that come from that side of the House particularly . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — . . . particularly when we have the lawyer from Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). You know he doesn't know whether he is inside or outside when he talks. He is just the most incompetent individual that I have seen in this House. Nobody else has made more of a fool of himself than he has.

When the Member from Swift current (Mr. Wood) says that he got a great big majority. Well, the Hon. Gordon Grant and myself have the distinction of defeating the NDP and causing them to lose their deposits in our constituencies. I will go to my constituency with the Resolution that came from the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) and I will get support from

April 9, 1970

practically every farmer in the constituency, including a good number of the NDP that are fed up with some of these labour movements that you have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — You certainly have nothing to show. The Member from Regina Centre, I believe what he wants is long drawn-out commissions, real typical of Socialist planning which doesn't bring the farmer anything. Strikes, strikes, strikes, that's all you want and you want to get in there and be some kind of adjudicator and draw your wages and salary and make the unions and the farmers and the Government pay for it.

Well, there is a lot simpler way of doing it. I want to say at the outset that during the Dirty Thirties I remember the conditions of labour. This side of the House is no more against labour than those people on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker. During the Dirty Thirties and the forties labour had a real tough going, people got hired for \$5 a month and I certainly don't support this. But there are a lot of people in the unions today that think that labour has gone too far with these strong unions. It is about time the Government made some recommendations to the Federal Government which are very, very simple. We have got to have some kind of legislation where these strikes cannot come about any more and this is what the Resolution calls for. I want to commend the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch for bringing it in. I can't support the wishy-washy amendment that was brought in. I won't vote for it, I will support the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 21

Lloyd	Dewhurst	Michayluk
Bowerman	Meakes	Brockelbank
Kramer	Berezowsky	Pepper
Messer	Smishek	Wooff
Wood	Thibault	Willis
Blakeney	Whelan	Kowalchuk
Davies	Snyder	Byers

NAYS — 33

Thatcher	MacDougall	Leith
Howes	Grant	Radloff
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	Larochelle	Mitchell
Cameron	MacDonald	Gardner
Steuart	Estey	Coupland
Heald	Hooker	McPherson
McIsaac	Gallagher	Charlebois
Guy	MacLennan	Forsyth
Barrie	Heggie	McIvor
Loken	Breker	Schmeiser

The debate continues on the main motion.

Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Since the original motion was moved a great deal of time has passed and many things, I think, have been forgotten, but while Members were speaking this afternoon some of them were brought to my attention.

I wasn't a bit surprised when I moved the Resolution that the labour Members on the opposite side of the House got up. I think I have said that they would be first on their feet and what they had to say was only what I had expected. But I was a bit surprised when the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) got to his feet. One of the things that he did at that time was to accuse the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch of trying to ride two horses at once. He said he was trying to force compulsory arbitration on the unions and at the same time lower the cost to the farmer. I don't think he could have been paying too much attention to what I had to say, possibly at that time he had his mind on different things, but I am going to read the page in my speech that might bring back his memory.

I must admit that if this Resolution is approved and passed there will still be increases in wages and costs in the movement of grain. However, we will also have the assurances that these costs will have a direct relationship to productivity and cost of living. The farmer will pay his fair share and at the same time he will have the assurance that, if and when markets are available, nothing will interfere with the orderly marketing of his product. The industrial backbone of Western Canada deserves and must have better treatment than they have been receiving.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — That is what I said at that time and I say again that the Hon. Member could not have been listening or he wouldn't have made the statement that he did.

He also mentioned that in some of the labour disputes he was talking about United States. He said it was necessary to bring the army out to get the mails moving. Sometimes I wonder if that might not be a good thing in the Dominion of Canada when we have some problems. We have problems in Montreal with the movement of mail, maybe we should have had the army out assisting there. So I don't see where this has much to do with this Resolution.

He also mentioned that, if we put compulsory arbitration upon the backs of the workingman. Actually in my Resolution I am not speaking about the workingman as such, I am speaking about unions and union organizers. I could say that we could have the same type of penalties as we have in Bill 2 which would be desertification of unions. We wouldn't have to —put any worker in jail but we could decertify the union and we could fine the unions also. And if anyone had to go to jail, possibly it might be a good idea if it would be some of the labour organizers.

He also spoke of commissions, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, all of these would take time and I would say while all

April 9, 1970

this was going on we could have lost several hundreds, thousands, or millions of bushels of grain while the strike was going on and all these commissions were meeting. But I did say, during my speech, that I wasn't putting all the blame on labour and I will take and read you that portion if I can find it. I hope you bear with me. I notice the Member for Moose Jaw took a little bit of time this afternoon so I think possibly I can. I said:

Firstly, I will be accused of being anti-labour. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. I believe that every citizen should have employment opportunities. He should have adequate working conditions and a salary comparative to the productivity and type of employment. But by the same token I will continue to oppose the power struggle that goes on between ruthless labour organizations and management whose only concern is profit.

So I am not putting all the blame on the backs of the unions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 p.m. until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Hooker: — When we adjourned at 5:30 I was trying to answer some of the allegations made by the Member for Regina Centre. I was accused of placing all blame on labour and none on management. To answer that accusation, I want to read what I did say in my speech on presenting this Resolution.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — For the third time!

Mr. Hooker: — When the Member for Touchwood finally settles down and spreads himself over that seat, then I'll continue on. Personally I am not concerned with what the Members opposite say about me. My only concern is that the farmers of Western Canada are allowed to keep their grain moving and that we can fill markets when we get them.

What I was going to tell the Member for Regina Centre is on page 25 of my original speech, and it said that on January 14, 1970, Labour Minister Mackasey announced the establishment of a five-man labour dispute court, made up of specialists in labour-management negotiations. What would be wrong with using this Board to negotiate disputes when they arise and to hand down compulsory decisions binding on both parties. Using an established Board before a dispute develops should rule out the complaint of partiality which always exists when a Board is appointed after a conflict has developed. I am not saying that labour was wrong in all their demands, and in many cases, no doubt, we can lay the blame on the management. If I am correct in my assumption why then is labour or management not prepared to go before a Board, lay their cards on the table and accept the decision of that Board while continuing to supply the services that they are paid to perform. I think this proves that I wasn't laying all the blame on labour. Management must accept their responsibility also.

I must say that I was not too surprised to see the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) get to his seat and take off on his usual tantrums, discussing everything but the Resolution before us. He even went so far as accusing this side of the

House with hypocrisy. Well if anyone knows anything in this House about the use of hypocrisy, it is that self-same Member, because he is a past master of the art. He went to great length to tell us how they handled labour-management problems in Great Britain, I beg to differ with him, as I have read articles to the contrary. I want to refresh his memory by reading from a report in *The Leader Post* dated October 17, 1969. I would like to quote from this report. It is about the Canadian Labour Congress and Confederation and the National Trade Union and they called upon Ottawa to impose a one or two-year freeze on prices.

Wages however were not to be classified as prices. There seems to be an impression abroad that wage increases themselves are inflationary and we do not accept it.

So I would like to say to him: how would you bring management and labour together to settle their problems in the spirit of friendship and compulsory-operation when they have this in the back of their mind?

The Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) rose to this seat and told us of his experience on the labour market and as an active farmer. I must congratulate him on his sincerity. However, he too needs his memory refreshed when he made mention of the fact that labour was not given due consideration of the fact that they offered to keep grain moving even while on strike. I will read also from my speech:

Prior to the strike, the Minister of Labour, Mr. Mackasey had received a committal from the union that the members would continue to handle grain shipments in the event of a strike. A very commendable commitment by the union. Unfortunately though, due to forces beyond their control, only four ships already in position at the piers were loaded.

I may say while speaking on this subject, I did read an article in the paper where Mr. Roy Atkinson of the Farmers' union claimed he was responsible for getting the union to load these boats. Now I may say that the union members offered to do this, they weren't allowed to by the employer. But the reason they weren't allowed to by the employers, some of the employers were trying also to load other products. They had equal rights I presume to get their products off to market as we in Western Canada have in getting our wheat to market. So this is what happened in this respect. I say the same thing applies right here in the city of Regina — out in front of the Legislature all day where five or six men were walking up and down with the Pipefitters' Union on strike. I understand there are a lot of employers in the city of Regina not too happy because the union people are finishing the auditorium. I want to congratulate the union people for completing the auditorium while they are on strike, because this means that the auditorium will get opened at the date it was expected to. Had this not developed it would have cost the Province of Saskatchewan a lot of money and no doubt would have put a lot of people to a lot of inconvenience.

The Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) got on the scene. After a long holiday to Eastern Canada I expected him to come back in a different frame of mind, I thought maybe he would have learned something, but he came back and took off with the same old sermon that he usually gives me every time I get up and say anything against the unions. The only difference is he reminds

April 9, 1970

me somewhat of a minister that we used to have at home. He spoke for 20 minutes on a sermon, then after 20 minutes was over, he spoke for another 20 minutes, and I always thought he was trying to convince himself that he was right. I think this same thing must have applied to the Member for Moose Jaw, because he dusted off that old speech, gave it to us, then talked for about 20 or 25 minutes trying to convince us or himself that he was telling us the right thing. He quoted figures about productivity, I think he said he got his figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I also have the Financial Post from March 7, 1970. This is an editorial page and it also speaks of the productivity of the Canadian workmen today. I would like to read from this:

Ottawa's pre-budget examination of the state of the economy — the so-called budget papers containing a set of figures that will command special interest among Canada's spokesman for business. These studies show that labour and government have been contributing much more substantially to inflation than the business corporations. Consider the facts about the main components of the price change. During the past five years wages and salaries per unit of output have risen to an annual average of 5.8 per cent. This has accounted for three-quarters of the total increase of prices. Indirect factors per unit of output, mostly sales taxes, increased by an average of 4.7 per cent a year during this period. No estimate is made of the effect on wage demands of higher income taxes. In the overall price structure, this accounted for almost one-seventh of the inflation since 1965. Corporate profits per unit averaged .2 per cent annual increase from 1965 to 1969. The effect on the total price change, the budget paper says, was non-significant. When an economy enters a period of expansion and the slack gets taken up, profits tend to rise faster than wages. This was the case in the early '60s when profits per unit of output averaged 5.9 increase and wages only 2 per cent increase. Even then, however, wage increases amounted to nearly half of the overall increase in price levels while profits accounted for barely one-third of the economy's price rise.

This came from the Financial Post, if you care to have it tabled, I would do so.

The Globe and Mail, Wednesday, October 8th:

Member of Parliament complains of 30 per cent decline in port output.

This is from Ottawa,

Warren Allan Mann, Liberal MP for Montreal Notre Dame department Grace, said yesterday, the productivity of workers in ports of Montreal has declined by 30 per cent since 1964.

So I think that we have figures also that prove that the output per workman isn't what it used to be.

Now I also mentioned something about demands, of the labourers at the West Coast. I would like to read what I did say in my speech about the demands of the grain handlers. He asked me if I thought that the increase was exorbitant, and after I read this, I am going to ask him the same thing. It says here:

Let us look at the demands of the grain handlers as reported in The Leader Post on November 7, 1969. The increase in excess of \$1 per hour on a basic wage of \$3.64, this would bring them to a basic wage of \$4.64. Overtime pay of \$9 an hour instead of the present \$5.50.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — I don't think the Member should be introducing material that he has used before. I only quoted one part of the section that he is talking about, and that is the 26-week guarantee. I didn't mention any other things.

Mr. Hooker: — You spoke of the 26-week guarantee and possibly I would like to say that maybe a workman should have a 26-week guarantee, whether he works or not, I don't know. But I would like to say to you, does a farmer in Western Canada get a 50 per cent guarantee on his wages? He gets no guarantee whatsoever. While we're speaking of the grain handlers' demands, I would also like to say to you that they asked that after two years they get 70 per cent whether they work or not. I say these demands are exorbitant. I can't see how we in Western Canada continue to pay these prices and keep our economy alive.

I must say that I am a bit disappointed that we didn't hear from the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), who seems to be the agriculture critic, the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) and also the new Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers). I did expect when I brought this Resolution in that these people would be up speaking on behalf of their constituency. So far they have been very quiet by their absence. Now I know that the proposition that I have mentioned in this Resolution probably doesn't go down too well with labour. Maybe if I was a labouring man myself, I would maybe take the same position. But I would say this. If this Resolution isn't passed in this Assembly, and if it isn't listened to in Ottawa, then I am going to present an alternative. I am not going to do this in the form of a resolution, but I am just throwing this out to see what labour would think of this. I would say then that the only alternative is to have the Canadian Wheat Board and the people in the grain trade build large terminal elevators, possibly one in Great Britain, one in Germany, one in Japan. When grain is moving, we fill these terminals to capacity; when labour want to go on strike, let them go on strike and we serve our customers from those terminals that are already filled. I am quite sure that the workers in Canada wouldn't be too happy with this situation. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am quite sure that all Members on this side of the House are going to support this Resolution and I hope the Members opposite will do so also.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 29

Howes	Larochelle	Weatherald
McFarlane	MacDonald	Mitchell
Boldt	Estey	Gardner
Steuart	Hooker	Coupland
Heald	Gallagher	McPherson
McIsaac	MacLennan	Charlebois

April 9, 1970

Guy
Loken
MacDougall
Grant

Heggie
Breker
Leith
Radloff

Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

NAYS — 23

Lloyd
Bowerman
Kramer
Messer
Wood
Blakeney
Davies
Dewhurst

Meakes
Berezowsky
Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk
Brockelbank

Pepper
Matsalla
Wooff
Willis
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk
Byers

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