

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Sixteenth Legislature**

**Monday, June 29, 1970**  
**10:00 o'clock a.m.**

This being the day appointed by Proclamation of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, dated the Twenty Ninth day of June, 1970, for the meeting of the Fourth Session of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly for the Province of Saskatchewan, and the Assembly having met:

Mr. Speaker, informed the Assembly that he had received a communication from the Private Secretary to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor stating that His Honour would open the Session at ten o'clock a.m. today, Monday, the Twenty Ninth Day of June, 1970.

10:00 o'clock a.m.

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

Mr. Speaker,

Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is my privilege to welcome you to the Fourth Session of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

For the past several months, several segments of employees within the construction industry have been on strike.

My government has made repeated efforts to bring employees and employers to the bargaining table to reach a mutual agreement.

However, neither the employers nor the employees have been able to settle their differences.

A point in time has now been reached where a further prolongation of the strike will seriously endanger and jeopardize the provincial economy.

My government feels that it is imperative and essential that a solution be found at the earliest possible date.

Therefore, you have been called to this Session to amend legislation, which will ensure the resumption of work in the construction industry.

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

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

**MOTIONS**

**SITTING OF THE HOUSE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Members of the Assembly, Standing Order No. 2 of this Legislature sets the daily time of meeting at 2:30 o'clock.

**June 29, 1970**

However, if it is your wish, I will by leave open the sitting forthwith leaving the Chair from 12:30 to 2:30 p.m. this day.

There being unanimous consent we shall proceed until 12:30 p.m. this day.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **RESIGNATION OF MR. C.G. WILLIS, MELFORT-TISDALE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I beg to inform the Assembly of the following vacancy which has occurred in the representation, that is in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale by the resignation of Mr. C.G. Willis, Esquire, effective April 18, 1970.

### **APPOINTMENT OF CLERK ASSISTANT**

I further beg to inform the Assembly that Mr. Michael A. de Rosenroll, Esquire, has been appointed Clerk Assistant of the Legislative Assembly.

## **MOTIONS**

### **ASSEMBLY TO DISPENSE WITH CUSTOMARY FORMAL DEBATE**

**MR. W.R. THATCHER (Premier)** moved, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) by leave of the Assembly:

That as the Legislature has been convened in this Session for the purpose of considering certain matters which have been laid before you in the Address of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, the Assembly hereby resolves to dispense with the customary formal debate on the subject matters of the Address as such matters will be debated during the consideration of the legislation submitted to the Assembly

Motion agreed to.

## **PRINTING OF VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS**

**MR. THATCHER** moved, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald):

That the Votes and Proceedings of this Assembly be printed after first having been perused by Mr. Speaker; that he do appoint the printing thereof and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.

**MR. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, if we proceed, and I'm not sure if this is the right place to introduce it, but it seems to me there would be advantage in having the proceedings during Committee recorded. Whether or not this has bearing on this Resolution I don't know, but I would like to draw to the Government's attention that this is our request at this time.

**MR. THATCHER:** — I think we can agree to that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The procedure in regard to recording the Debates in Committee, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier will both recall this, that if this is the request of both sides of the House then the Legislative Assembly Office will arrange for the recording of those proceedings. I understand the Leader of the Opposition's request was that the proceedings in Committee should be recorded and this was agreed to by the Premier if I understand this correctly. Therefore the recordings of the Committee on those matters which may come before the Legislature will be recorded in their entirety for the duration of this session. Am I correct in this? Then I shall see that it is so ordered.

**MR. THATCHER** moved that the following Rules be suspended for the duration of this session:

1. Rule 51 respecting the appointment of Select Standing Committees.
2. Rule 75 respecting lists of reports required to be tabled.
3. Rule 106 respecting the report of the Legislative Librarian.

### **SITTING TIMES OF THE HOUSE**

**MR. THATCHER** moved, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) by leave of the Assembly:

That notwithstanding Rule 2 this Assembly shall meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. each sitting day and there shall be a recess from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

### **SECOND READING**

**MR. W.R. THATCHER (Premier)** moved second reading of Bill No. 1 — **An Act to amend The Essential Services Emergency Act, 1966.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Government, to fulfil a clear and immediate responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan. This Legislature has been called to end a strike in the construction industry, a strike which has been cruel in length, devastating in its harm to the provincial economy, and one which has worked real hardship on the many workers involved. As Hon. Members know, the strike has now lasted between two and one-half and three months. During that period, there have been countless efforts to mediate, or in some way to bring about a compromise settlement. When the Government announced its intention of calling the Legislature to find a solution, it gave both parties 10 days' advance notice. It did so in the hope that during the interim period some settlement could be hammered out between the unions and contractors involved on a direct basis. However, all such efforts have failed. All such efforts have proved futile. There appears to be an absolute impasse. It is therefore with regret and reluctance that the Government calls upon the Legislature this morning to bring the workers under the provisions of The Essential Services Emergency Act.

**June 29, 1970**

Last Thursday, Mr. Gilbey, President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour according to the Regina Leader Post, made the following statement.

The move was a smoke-screen to smash collective bargaining in the province.

This I emphatically deny. This Government is just as sympathetic to the legitimate aspirations of labour as my hon. friends opposite. But we also have a responsibility to all the citizens of the province. This strike is not simply a strike against a few plumbing contractors and electrical contractors. It is a strike which is harming the public of Saskatchewan. In the public interest it must be ended.

Over the past several years, the whole of Canada, indeed most of the world, has been fighting a losing battle with inflation. Inflation is like a thief in the night. It works particular hardship on the poor, on those in the lower income groups, on pensioners, on those with fixed incomes and those particularly who are not organized. Year after year inflation has forced up the cost of living. Inflation has raised interest rates to a level never before seen in Canada.

There is not an economic authority in the nation, who does not emphatically contend that inflation must be restrained and slowed down, otherwise a major economic recession with all its implications is inevitable. In short, I suggest to you today, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians face restraint or chaos.

The Federal Government has taken numerous steps to halt the raging inflationary fires. It has adopted deflationary budgets, restricted spending, tightened the money supply. It has asked major industries to hold back prices. These are the traditional weapons. However, in recent months it has become increasingly apparent that these measures have failed. Ottawa asked Canada's trade unions, in the period of crisis, to exercise voluntary wage controls and it suggested 6 per cent guidelines. Almost without exception, the leaders of organized labor have bluntly, militantly, and in my opinion irresponsibly, refused to go along. Their refusal to exercise restraints is scuttling the whole anti-inflation program. Now it has been obvious for many months that no inflationary drive can succeed without labor's co-operation. Without this co-operation, I repeat, the alternative is recession and no group will be hit harder than the working people of this country.

The Government fully realizes that wages and salaries are only part of the battle against inflation. There must be curbs in the areas where there are excessive profits. With respect I suggest that there are few industries in Saskatchewan this year making excess profits, certainly not those under Provincial jurisdiction. For example, would my hon. friends, the Socialists, suggest that the farmers are making excess profits, or the potash companies or the retailers, or the implement dealers? Would they suggest that the construction industry is making excess profits? Certainly the lumber industry has its problems. I challenge my hon. friends when they speak in this debate to tell us what industries in Saskatchewan that are under our jurisdiction that are making excess profits.

I assure Members of the Legislature that we will co-operate with Ottawa in any measures it deems necessary in this field.

**MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina Centre):** — Dead horse!

**MR. THATCHER:** — If my hon. friend, the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) talks that nonsense he may have trouble with Romanow on Wednesday.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — In Saskatchewan, we have consistently tried to co-operate with Ottawa in battling inflation. We have endeavored to establish 6 per cent guidelines because we think those restraints are in the overall public interest. Our Civil Service and Crown corporation employees, admittedly with some reluctance, made such a settlement. So also did our hospital workers. In most fields, we have been successful, perhaps more than in any other province, in holding the line.

Of course we have had an additional reason for asking our unions to exercise restraint this year. Mainly because of the wheat crisis, but also because of surpluses in other fields such as potash, lumber, and uranium, we have experienced an economic recession. It is small comfort to know that the recession has been caused not by poverty or scarcity, but rather by dramatic wealth and over-abundance and surpluses and over-production. Agriculture still provides about 40 per cent of our gross provincial product. When the farmer cannot sell his grain, the effects are soon adversely felt throughout the whole economy. At a time when the farmer is plagued by low quotas, poor deliveries, and dwindling export sales, surely it is not unreasonable to ask other segments of our provincial society to accept reasonable income guidelines.

Primarily because of faltering agricultural purchasing power, the construction industry has been in the doldrums for over a year. Tight money has drastically curtailed housing and commercial construction. As a result, hundreds and hundreds of tradesmen, for the time being, have moved out of the province. I point out that the construction industry has also had difficulties in other provinces so that many of them are coming back.

Now this spring . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — My hon. friends apparently didn't learn much by the British election where the Socialists were tossed out. They don't seem to live and learn.

This spring, the Government, in an effort to bolster and stimulate the construction industry and the province generally, announced a massive \$20 million capital works program in addition to ordinary expenditures. However, before the program could be put into effect, the plumbers went on strike. Shortly afterwards the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers followed suit. Despite the wheat crisis, despite the problems of inflation, the unions demanded in some cases more than 40 per cent in annual wage increases. Subsequently those demands have been lower but they are still far out of line. Obviously, if these increases had been granted to construction workers, the 6 per cent guidelines would immediately have been rendered completely ineffective in the Province of Saskatchewan. I remind the House that these

two groups are already among the higher paid trade union workers. Moreover their demands over the next several years could have cost the taxpayers millions of dollars. The Government accordingly moved to freeze the new construction of all public buildings, including hospitals and schools where Provincial grants are involved until new wage contracts were signed. In the meantime the Department has been working on the engineering or architectural work involved. Hopefully the moment the strike is settled, we will put as many projects on stream as are feasible.

We are quite aware that the Government will be criticized for this action by the Socialists. However, all other solutions seem to have failed. If we did nothing, if we let the situation drift, we would be accused of being wishy washy and indecisive. Because we are acting vigorously today, the Socialists claim that we are dictators.

We contend that this strike has created a provincial emergency of major proportions, first because the strike is causing widespread unemployment which is accentuating a recession. I can tell you that these people in the galleries making a bit of noise would be the first ones to be on social welfare soon if we didn't take some action today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Secondly, because unless work is commenced immediately they would be on social welfare for most of the winter months because, unless work is started soon, most of these public buildings cannot be proceeded with this winter.

Thirdly, because most workers can obtain neither social welfare nor unemployment insurance benefits unless some policies are changed. Their strike funds I understand are virtually depleted. We are concerned with the well-being of their families and we are not alone in our concern. I say to you today, Mr. Speaker, that many union members are not sympathetic to the attitude of their leadership, and there are many workers who are sick at heart with being out of work and out of pocket. Indeed several hundred have voted to end this strike, almost half of the plumbers have voted to go back to work. There are many wives of union members — some of the wives probably of those gentlemen in the galleries — who are anguished over the powerless positions of their husbands. They are getting sick and tired of them sitting around the house doing nothing. Finally we must keep in mind the well-being of the thousands employed in the secondary and service industries who are dependent in a major way upon construction dollars. For all these reasons the Government contends that there is a provincial emergency. However, we recognize that construction workers are in a somewhat different category from utility or hospital employees and, therefore, we are asking that they be placed under Bill 2 for a period of three years only.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all the right and all the wrong is on neither side. I believe that the unions can be criticized for irresponsible wage demands in this period of wheat crisis. I believe the contractors can be criticized for endeavoring to throw out clauses which have been part of their agreement for 20 years or more, such as the so-called hiring hall clause. The arbitration board which will be set up under the Act will rule upon all aspects and all issues involved in the strike. In the meantime work can resume on dozens of building projects throughout

the province.

Now most citizens of Saskatchewan and particularly most farmers will watch this debate with keen interest. If the Socialists don't like Bill 2, what are their alternatives? The only suggestion I have seen them make was that the Government should seek the services of an outside mediator. When two sides are as determined in their positions as the principals in the existing strike such action would be an exercise in futility. Now, do NDP Members suggest as another alternative that the farmers and taxpayers generally should finance the wage demands of the construction unions regardless of the cost? Does the NDP party suggest that inflation should be permitted to run wild with all its dreadful consequences? This debate could well show who is calling the tune in the NDP.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — This debate could well show whether the farmer is a forgotten factor in the NDP. The Liberal party contends that in this year of wheat crisis, an inflationary crisis, every group in our society must use restraint in their demands upon our economy. Every segment, including labor, should receive their fair share but no more. Most farmers that I have met are fed up with being bullied and threatened and blackmailed by economic pressure groups. I remind hon. friends opposite that the Labour party in England before it was defeated used harsh wage controls to fight inflation which were far more harsh and far more severe than anything we are proposing today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I assure the House that, when the workers return, as return they will, the Government will bend every effort to expedite a major public works program to create employment. Despite the lateness of the hour, despite the handicaps involved, we will endeavor to commence projects which will provide thousands of construction jobs this winter. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) will give details later during the debate.

I conclude by reiterating that the Government has done everything in its power to encourage a voluntary and satisfactory conclusion to these strikes, because such a settlement has not been forthcoming. I invite Members of both sides of the House to join together, seriously and with all sincerity in the very real interest of the people of Saskatchewan. Let us pass this Bill today or tomorrow, certainly with all possible haste so that jobs in the construction industry can be provided without further delay.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that the rules have been long standing in this Assembly as pertaining to the galleries and therefore should still be enforced under all circumstances. I believe this rule applies to applause or any noise in the gallery. I do not think that this is any special occasion and the rules should be applied as they always have been.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would draw the attention of all Hon. Members of the Legislature and those visitors seated in the galleries that we

are here to discuss a matter which is important to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I am sure all Members of the Legislature and also all those sitting in the galleries wish to hear clearly and well everything that is said in regard to the matter that is before the House and by both sides of the House. I would ask, therefore, that order be maintained both on the floor and in the galleries. It has been customary in the past to do so, and I trust that the precedent that has been set in the past of good order in this Legislature will be maintained henceforth and during this entire debate.

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — Further to the point of order, I think it should also be made clear that, failing order being maintained here, my next request in the point of order will be that the galleries be cleared.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The House will cross that bridge when it comes to it.

**MR. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to about a half an hour of a most amazing confession. I submit that seldom in the history of Legislatures or Parliaments in Canada has the Leader of a Government stood up and confessed so completely as the Premier of this Province and the Leader of the Liberal Government (Mr. Thatcher) did just now. He has in effect confessed to abject and complete failure on the part of his Government and an equal failure on the part of the Liberal Government at Ottawa.

He says our industries in Saskatchewan are without profit. He says people are leaving the province. He says we are losing our skilled tradesmen by I don't know how many each day or how many each month. And he has nothing to propose except, to use his own words, that the Government proceed on a path which is determined by "bullying, by blackmailing and by threatening." And I submit that the Premier spent a good part of his time this morning in attempting to move along that path of bullying and blackmailing and threatening.

He has suggested, and we will agree with him, that the Government does indeed have a responsibility to all the people in the province. It is precisely because we believe this proposed legislation to be the worst way to exercise that responsibility to all the people of the province that we oppose this Bill now as we opposed its parent Bill some four years ago.

The Premier says that the Government has made countless efforts to mediate. I submit that the facts of the case do not substantiate that statement. It has made some efforts. Admittedly he himself, and it is to his credit, took part in at a late date. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and his staff have done something to it. But they made these efforts only after they had destroyed their influence as an impartial mediator or as one who could be expected to listen to in bringing the parties together. Unfortunately their efforts were made against that kind of a background which prevented their efforts from being successful in the first place. We submit as we have submitted in the past that what we need to do is to get a person who could be considered as an impartial and a skilled mediator in an attempt to bring these groups together before we use the axe and the mallet of the law, as is being proposed here. The Government has not done that. The Government has ruled it out and I think this is failure on the part of the Government to understand people.



I think this is failure on the part of the Government to understand how people work together. Certainly it is failure on the part of the Government to read and listen to the report of its own committee which it set up and which reported to the Government just a matter of a few months ago.

You know the Premier made some other amazing kinds of statements. He pleaded as he so frequently does his great and abiding and abounding sympathy to labor and then went on to clobber them with almost every kind of extreme adjective that he could pull out of the book. He pleaded as he so often does his great love for the farm people and then attempted to set these two basic groups of people in the province at each other's throats. I submit that the people of this province are sick and tired, Mr. Premier, of those kind of efforts to divide the people and set them against each other. That is a further reason for opposing this particular Bill.

He did grant that there might be some other groups who had contributed to inflation in the province, but he said precious little, if anything, about what should be done to restrain the effort and the activities and the causes produced by those other groups of people.

Now he made the point that we have a choice and that choice is restraint or chaos. Nothing but the organizing genius of a Liberal Government could give us both restraint and chaos and that's what we have as a result of the activities of Federal Liberals supported, as the Premier said this morning, co-operated with, by the Government that sits across the way.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in his comments about the election in Great Britain but it seemed to have slipped the Premier's mind about what happened to the Liberal party in Great Britain.

**MR. THATCHER:** — What happened to the NDP in Quebec?

**MR. LLOYD:** — Perhaps having in mind — the Premier is in his best bellowing form, I can see that, Mr. Speaker, — that Britain is an older country than ours and having in mind that their history in regard to parliamentary institutions and forms, you know sort of set the pattern for ours, the Premier might look along the road to see the future of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan and in Canada in the history of the Liberal party. As I said the Premier is in good bellowing form. He will undoubtedly be around and pawing the earth and doing a bit of bellowing as the time goes on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the subject matter under discussion. Before I do so I find it strange that since the Premier was moving the second reading of a Bill, he really didn't have a reference to the Bill. We are entitled I think as Members of the Legislature to hear from the person moving the Bill what is in the Bill. We are in particular entitled to hear that when we have waived the usual notice, when the contents of the Bill at least in written form were not available to us until just a few minutes ago. However, I know that the Government is laboring under more than one kind of difficulty and I guess we can overlook that which the Premier saw fit to overlook.

Mr. Speaker, if this Legislature had been called into session

to repeal Bill 2, if it had been called into session to institute some adequate and impartial kinds of mediation, if it had been called into session to discuss a public program by means of which job opportunities and income opportunities would have been available, then this Legislature would have been making good use of its time. If we had been called into session to repeal Bill 2 and to establish a pattern for the use of adequate mediation, we would have been able to go home convinced that we had made a contribution to the stability of economic development in the province. We would have been able to go home convinced that we had made a contribution to building better employee-employer relationships in the province.

We would have welcomed the session, Mr. Speaker, if the Government had called it to propose instead of to punish. We would have welcomed the session if the Government had called one to propose programs of work for unemployed people, of help for students, of income for our cash-pressed farmers. All of these are obviously needed. There are some obvious things which this Government could be doing and is not doing that should be discussed, but this session was called not to propose. I submit this session was called to punish. It was called not to expand, it is called to restrict. It has been called not to heal but to irritate wounds that are already too wide and hurting too much. That of course is consistent with the record of this Government. It is short on proposals that build, it is long on proposals that punish.

This Government in addition I think suffers from a compulsive appetite to impose creeping compulsion and we have some more creeping compulsion today. This Government is in addition afflicted by a kind of political tape-worm that continually demands more and more power. This Government is dominated by a predatory power instinct and that is why we are here. We are here to satisfy that appetite for imposing creeping compulsion, we are here in response to the needs of the Government's political tape-worm, we are here in recognition of that predatory power instinct of the Government.

Now the Government proposed this legislation because it claims such legislation is necessary to protect the economic situation in the province. While we are here we must as a result discuss that economic situation. And the Premier has outlined to us just how bad it is, Mr. Speaker. No argument is needed other than to read back the words of the Premier to know just how difficult and how tough the situation is in the province with a Liberal Government at Ottawa and a Liberal Government at Regina. We need to examine during this session then what it is that's hurting our economic situation. We need to examine how much it is hurting.

I don't want to spend a lot of time on that, Mr. Speaker, but some things must be mentioned. I think we need to remember for example that in December, I believe it was, of last year the premier was assuring the people of the province and of the country that things were sort of bad in Saskatchewan but to use his phrase they had 'bottomed out.' At December we had hit the bottom he said and we were on our way up. You know I can remember the first speech I ever heard from a Liberal politician I believe and that was in 1932. He had a chart which showed what had happened in the economic world's ups and downs over the past number of years. In 1932 he was assuring his audience that all the records proved without a shadow of a doubt that the thing had 'bottomed out' in 1932 and good times were just around the corner. Well, the Premier was saying in December as other

Liberals were saying in 1932 that it had 'bottomed out' at that time. The fact is, of course, that it didn't 'bottom out' in December. The fact is that unfortunately the situation had regrettably gotten worse month by month since that time in almost every field one looks at.

Let me spend just a little bit of time in putting on the record what the economic situation is that we ought to be talking about here. We speak of unemployment as the Premier did this morning. I think the latest statistics for Saskatchewan indicate that some nine per cent of our non-agricultural work force is unemployed in Saskatchewan now. Remember when we say nine per cent of the labor force we are speaking of a labor force that is smaller than it was a year ago. We are talking of a labor force that has shrunk by some 12,000 people since this time a year ago. We are talking about some 22,000 people unemployed in the Province of Saskatchewan and that is serious. That's cause enough for a session of the Legislature to talk about how they get back to work, but that isn't what we are talking about in this legislation.

We can look at population which is one of the indicators which the Premier used to be exceedingly fond of talking about. We will note that there are still something like I think 2,000 people leaving the Province of Saskatchewan every month. Some of these are skilled tradesmen, some of them are in the professions, lawyers, architects, doctors — you name them, some of them are just people who haven't got a job and they are going some place where they hope the pasture may be somewhat greener. We can examine as one indicator what is happening in regard to retail sales. These are down some nine per cent as compared to the first four months of 1969. We need to remember that the first four months of 1969 were down 11 per cent from the four months of 1968. Farm implement sales down 46 per cent from last year. And farm implement sales last year were down from the year before. Construction, as the Premier has confessed this morning, has ground almost completely to a halt in our province.

The sad story of farm income is well known but needs perhaps to be repeated. Our farm cash receipts in 1969 were down 27 per cent, some 260 million dollars less than the year before. The net income of farmers which in 1967 decreased by 37 per cent, decreased 16 per cent more in 1968, decreased another 30 per cent in 1969. And what has been the response of Liberal governments to this hurting situation in regard to farm income? The total response has been largely negligible. The main response has been the operation of the program LIFT, which instead of lifting up is pushing down — a program emanating Ottawa and welcomed by my friends across the way.

One looks at the quota situation throughout the province. As of last Monday, and there may have been some change today I admit, Mr. Speaker, we had no points in the province with the delivery quota of five or six bushels and we had only six per cent of the points that even had four bushels. And let's look at the progression here; in 1968 on July 2 all delivery points in the province had a quota of four bushels or over, two-thirds of them had six bushel quotas; in 1969, 60 per cent had quotas of four or five bushels, none of them had six; in 1970, as I have just said, as of last Monday none of our delivery points had a quota of five bushels, none of them obviously had five bushels and only six per cent had even got to the point of four bushels. Not only are the quotas down, in many cases we are involved with lower quality wheat and in every case with prices down and in every case with costs up. Add to this the problem of the farmers with respect to paying back their cash advances.

Some farmers after they have sold what they can sell this year on their quota, after they have sold everything which they had to sell last year on their quota, still haven't been able to touch repayment of the cash advance of \$6,000 which they got this spring. The response of the Government to this has been program LIFT of which I think nobody is proud at this point.

If we look at the situation in regard to students, a survey made by those at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon indicated a few months ago at least some two-thirds of them without summer jobs.

What's the Government's answer to this and all the rest of the evidence that could be piled up? The Government answer is this legislation and the kind of speech we heard from the Premier this morning, the kind we heard from the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) a week or so ago. The Government's answer is to punish plumbers, to threaten teachers and to fool farmers. That is the extent of the resourcefulness of this Government in meeting this kind of situation.

Let me submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are indeed some more important reasons for this legislation than those that we had advanced this morning. Let me suggest that this legislation is indeed much more threatening than it appears on the surface, much more threatening than the Government suggested through the words of the Premier this morning. I think it is consistent with what I consider to be the design of this Government over a number of years. I think this Government is trying and has been trying to get a greater and greater control of the total wage bill of the province into its own hands. I think that is the design, I think that's the hope, I think the evidence points in that way. What the Government wants to do is to control, as completely as it can, the decisions about wages in the total Province of Saskatchewan. The Government has displayed a singular lack of interest on other kinds of controls or "restraints," to use the Premier's words. It has in this Legislature time after time after time voted down resolutions calling for the use of Government influence in other parts of the economy. It has not really registered any complaint or any opposition to administered prices which give us prices higher than there is any justification for. It has not registered any opposition to profits which are excessive. They may not be excessive in the Province of Saskatchewan, as the Premier admitted under a Liberal Government, but certainly if he reads the statistics across the country there are some very large profits still being made by many Canadian companies. There has not until very recently been any complaints with respect to exorbitant and usurious interest rates. It will be recalled that this Government went to a Federal-Provincial Conference not many months ago and had not a single word said about high and hurting interest rates at that time when the economy of the country was under discussion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — I draw the Premier's attention to some of the published facts with regard to the profit of the Canadian banking systems, for example. I think it was up some 27 per cent last year compared to the year before. I think the profits of the banks have gone up in the last 18 months something like 50 per cent. Recently they have made a grant gesture of reducing interest rates a little bit. One of the results of this, they

said, was that mortgages could be obtained for an interest rate of only 10 per cent. A really big deal helping out the people of Canada.

Just last week, Mr. Speaker, the Canada Packers published its financial statement in the June 25th issue of The Western Producer. The Canada Packers I believe are old buddy buddies of the Premier; he was close to them for a period of time, as I recall it. I know that this company is an international company, I know as a result that its profit statement doesn't reflect just the business it does in Canada. But if one looks at that statement they are not doing too badly, I don't hear the Premier talking about it. It says dollar sales increased 11.3 per cent last year, and net profit increased by 29 per cent. Now I think one wouldn't call that a bad year for Canada Packers. I return the Premier's question, what about the farmers? When did they last get a 29 per cent or 2 percent, or any per cent as a matter of fact so far as many of them are concerned, of net profit? One can read on and on in this statement and find that the sales increase over the year amounted to about 17 per cent whereas the profit increase before taxes amounted to something over 100 per cent.

It seems to me if we are going to talk about restraints in the economy we have to talk about restraining those parts of our economy which are really harming and take great gouges of money out of the public interest and public welfare.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — And this the Government doesn't do. It talks instead for the most part, loudly and belligerently and threatening. Not only does it talk, but it acts to control that income which comes directly in the form of wages. In so far as the others are concerned the game is deuces wild and the deck includes a joker or two as well. That's a way in which it suggests some should play the economic game in this country of ours. On the other hand when it comes to wages, there the rules are to be applied rigidly, and the rules to be applied are those which the Government decrees must be applied. The Government seeks to establish levels for wage income and amount of increases in wage income but it remains blissfully but guiltily I submit silent with regard to other forms of income. It seeks to establish wage controls by methods that are arbitrary and in amounts that are equally arbitrary.

I would like to hear the Government justify its choice of 6 per cent as a magical figure, either this Government or the Government at Ottawa. What justifies 6 per cent as a magical figure which is to dominate all wage settlements in Canada in this particular year of Our Lord? Was there any research attached to it? The answer I submit is, No. Does it relate to the cost of living increase? The answer I submit is, No. Is there anything in it that relates to productivity? I suggest the answer is, No. What happened it seems is that somebody in the Cabinet room cut the cards and 6 came up, and as a result 6 per cent became the magical figure. I think there is no more justification to it than just that. I submit that a government with that kind of record, a government with those kind of instincts hurts and harms and hinders this province and the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — That is one kind of meaning that there is in this legislation, this response of the Government to a political tape-worm to get ore and more of the control of the wages of the province into its own hands.

The second meaning is this: this Government is desperately looking for an emotional explosion to get people's eyes off the length and the enormity of the broken and forgotten promises of this Government that sits opposite. It is looking for some way of introducing this old political game of making people forget what is really bothering and what is really happening to them, so it brings in this kind of legislation and introduces it in the way that the Premier introduced it here this morning. In doing so and hoping for this kind of result, it underestimates the accuracy and length of memory of the people of this province. The people of this province aren't going to forget all of those broken promises. The Minister of Public Works can talk later until he is blue in the face about all the jobs he's going to create by something that happens next week or next month. People aren't going to forget the broken promise of 80,000 new jobs of a few years ago. People aren't going to forget that this Government as recently as one year ago cut back its construction program and so decreased the number of jobs. People aren't going to forget that a claim of this Government was that it would give greater farm security, when as a factual fact there is less security on our farms today than has been known for many many years in the past, perhaps ever.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — So if it thinks it is going to create a kind of emotional explosion that gets people's eyes, ears and feelings out of their own hurting personal problems, then it underestimates the length and the accuracy of the memory of Saskatchewan people.

I think it also underestimates the sense of fair play on the part of Saskatchewan people. I don't think that Saskatchewan people generally like to see rights and established freedoms and worthwhile procedures stopped and curtailed as this Bill proposes to do. Again a government with those kind of instincts and a government with that kind of record is not the Government that the people of Saskatchewan deserve.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, this Government attempts to justify this Bill by talking about the needs of the economy. I suggest that even here there are alternatives the Government should be acting on. It should have acted on alternatives to getting this settled. With regard to meeting the needs of the economy, the list of the alternatives is wanton. Let the Government not plead the thinness of its own pocketbook when it refuses to proceed with those things which could create work in this province. The Government has the money which could be used to help even at this late date some people who are out of work in our towns and cities, farmers who are short of cash, and the students who are out of work and likely not to be able to return to school when school opens this fall. The Government has things it can do which would help these people and put some money into the empty tills of many of our businessmen as well. It has this in two forms I submit.

First of all there is the money which was voted for construction in this Chamber just a few months ago for construction purposes. Money by the millions will not be spent on the basis of the present program under way or planned by this Government. It voted millions. Whether the Government ever intended to spend these millions is quite another question. Certainly it claimed credit for a bigger program than the Budget provided and the Premier continued to do that this morning. To catch his words, Mr. Speaker, "\$20 million of expenditures in addition to that which they had already planned." There is no evidence in the budget, and it was shown here in the Budget Debate and in the discussion of the Estimates, that this \$20 million was nothing other than words flowing from the lips of the Premier. It wasn't a fact of the program of this Government proposed and put on the table during the meeting of the Legislature. This so-called crash program to create more jobs was long on sound crash, and short on cash crash as is so often the question over there.

I urge this Government at this session to make a commitment, and I welcome the fact that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) is going to make a statement later on. It should make a commitment to transfer this money which was voted, but which will not be spent for construction, into programs which create work and provide income. It has some money, yes, from a second source as well. On June 13th the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was quoted in the news media as saying that we were going to get in Saskatchewan \$15 million more money from the Federal Government than we had counted on. This too can be used to create jobs and some income for those who need jobs and income. I appeal to the Government to forsake its worshipping of a balanced budget in this particular time of crisis. Balanced budgets are always a relative matter, certainly they are never sacred. This Government tends to treat them like the sacred cows of India; they are allowed to consume the countryside and at the same time interfere greatly with development.

It is not enough for the Government to put some of these unspent millions voted for construction or the \$15 million more from the Federal Government into its own little political piggy bank. It is not enough to put that money in there and to release it to purchase political goodies for election purposes. This is not a realistic response to the great needs of many Saskatchewan people right now. The Government has the money. That is established. The question: has it the will to make use of it as it should be made use of in Saskatchewan now? Has it the ability to quickly devise and to organize needed programs? It is too much to hope that it has plans; well let's hope that it could devise and it could organize.

Now as to what could be done, Mr. Speaker, I am sure if we were to take three minutes of quiet meditation here, that each and every MLA could come up with quite a list of useful things that could be done with a little bit of extra help from the Government in each of our own constituencies. Certainly every municipal council could add to that list. Let me suggest just some of the things which the Government could get going in the reasonably near future. First, park and picnic facilities need improving and extension. One has but to travel about the province and to have noted some of our picnic facilities, to be convinced that more care and more attention would be useful with respect to those facilities.

Second, certainly it could speed up and extend the power and

gas programs under way in the province. These are programs which are self-liquidating. Certainly our power system could stand some additional repair and rehabilitation. We are going to spend a lot of money in the future if more isn't done about that in the very immediate future.

Thirdly, it could do the same kind of extension of programs with respect to telephones in the province.

Fourthly, it could give some impetus and encouragement to a pollution clean-up, pollution control in the province. There are streams which could be cleaned up. I read in the North Battleford paper just last week I think it was about the need to clean up the river there. Recently here in Regina and all credit to them, groups of school youngsters undertook to clean up something of it. There could be meaningful and useful programs of this kind undertaken right across the province.

Fifth, together with local governments, it could clear away and get rid of every unsightly, unseemly town and village dump-ground in the province. You may have read the recent report of the Medical Health Officer in the Regina Region, pointing out the problems in his region, right here within sort of a shadow almost of the capital city.

Sixth, let it pay to the municipalities some of the monies which the municipalities have earned but not yet received for road construction. This money in the hands of municipalities would find its way into more job-creating projects there.

Seventh, that it encourage and assist municipalities who don't have unspent funds through unexpected Federal Government millions to step up their own projects. City streets, many of them could stand repairing, so could rural roads, gravel could be stockpiled.

Eighth, let's get at the business of salvaging and cleaning up in our forests. I would presume that after the tragic fires that we had in our forests earlier this year that there is a needed job for clean-up and salvage in that respect. Then if some of that isn't done soon, there is some wastage. Let's get some more acceleration in the reforestation program.

Ninth, channel clearing in some of our rivers. There is a real serious problem for many of the farmers in the Qu'Appelle Valley. Moose Jaw River and other rivers, irrigation systems, drainage systems in which channel clearing could be undertaken.

Ten, in a month or two if things take their usual course, you will be able to walk across Wascana Lake on top of the weeds almost. Why can't we get on with improving the basin, the dredging and the beautification of this whole area. A very creditable job has been done, let's do something more.

Eleven, there are as I mentioned thousands of people out of work. Many of them could benefit from upgrading and training programs. Why not a big push to extend upgrading and retraining programs now. Pay the unemployed to attend, use our classroom and our technical facilities of the province.

Twelfth, by grants and by organization, encourage the storage of more fodder, of which there looks like there is going to be a lot this year.



Thirteenth, step-up the program of housing for our population of Indian ancestry, much to be done there yet.

Fourteenth, this Government should not fail to very measurably and appreciably extend bursaries and scholarships for students of technical institutes and at the University.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — Fifteenth, I suggest that they get those young people in the province who are out of work together, help these young people to organize, give them a chance to design and to designate some programs which they could undertake now, such things as financing the construction of some recreational camps and hostels right across this province. Finance some groups of these young people to go out and study the problems that threaten our environment, help to get them interested, impressed by the need and impressed by the possibilities. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am sure every MLA here could sit down and add lists of things that could be done to help his own constituency, things that would provide some work and distribute some income such as is so badly needed.

Could this Government also be as persuasive and as tough in its talk to the Federal Government as the Premier attempted to be here today, in his talk to people who are working for wages? Well the federal Government's main contribution to employment in Saskatchewan has been the appointment of people to inspect farmers with respect to the LIFT program. That has been its biggest contribution to creating employment in Saskatchewan in recent months. I think this Government should be urging the Government of Canada that all of the monies which it was prepared to spend for the LIFT program should be spent, some \$154 million, even though people don't participate to that extent in the LIFT program. I know that the LIFT program thanks to the weather is probably going to be more successful than it would otherwise have been. Our man in Ottawa in the Federal Cabinet may not speak to the Premier, but he does have a line with the weatherman. He certainly got a lift for his LIFT program from the weatherman which wouldn't otherwise be there. Let's urge the Federal Government to undertake a vastly stepped-up and immensely needed housing program and water supply program and prepare a fodder production program on our Indian reserves.

Does this Government and the Federal Government have confidence in the future of the potash industry? We are frequently told that we are going to be able to sell lots of potash in a few years. Markets are going to pick up. I wonder if the Government has considered, if it has that kind of confidence, talking with the Federal Government about a joint Federal-Provincial Marketing Purchasing Program, whereby we could purchase at agreed-to conditions and prices and stockpile the potash which is going to be sold in the future. Ease it out so we don't have such a tremendous drop in production that I think is something that ought to be talked about. Certainly it ought to be urging the Government of Canada to assure the farmers there will be no loss because of the change of the value of the Canadian dollar and what this can mean with respect to monies received for export sales of grain. I don't know whether the Government has talked about this or not. I suggest it should be talking louder and more impressively than it has been. Certainly as I mentioned earlier there is need for this Government to take a stand with regard to the real factors that cause inflation, if it is that

worried about it. If it is going to do this, then it will have to take a stand on behalf of controlling inflation at the point where the causes exist, and that means much more than it has done to this date.

The Government, Mr. Speaker, however instead of doing these things, stirred by its compulsive appetite for imposing creeping compulsion, and responding to the gnawing of its political tapeworm, and guided by its predatory instincts for power, calls us into session to extend Bill 2 to an even larger group of people in Saskatchewan. More compulsion applied to more people, employed in more kinds of service. This of course is precisely what was predicted when Bill 2 was first introduced. This precisely is what is suggested happens when this kind of legislation is introduced any place in the country.

This book I am looking at, Mr. Speaker, is a report of the Privy Council of Ottawa, a study on a Task Force on Labour Relations. It is Study No. 8 by Harry Arthur, entitled "Labour Disputes in the Essential Industries." Let me just read what this book has to say with regard to what almost automatically flows from compulsive legislation such as Bill 2.

The continuing existence of Bill 2 on the Statute Books spreads infection, by just the fact that it is there. This study comments:

If the parties are not faced with the consequences of refusing to settle, their desire, determination or even ability to settle dwindles. This has occurred under each and every law of procedure, federal and state, legal and extralegal which has been in existence. No strike control law or extralegal method has succeeded in avoiding this pitfall . . . Emergency disputes create their own rationale. Behavior becomes tailor to the laws . . .

I would hope the Premier would listen to this . . .

The more laws enacted, the more "emergencies" are created and the more "necessary" become the laws.

And on such a sea are we now afloat in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. We are about to enact more laws. You are enacting more laws in a sense because of some of the laws you set up before. I quote again the study.

The more laws enacted, the more emergencies are created and the more necessary become the laws.

This Bill then is proceeding to do as we predicted it would do, when the Father Bill was introduced in 1966. Intervention becomes a way of life, when you have legislation of this kind. That comes from another section of the same report which is also worth referring to in this debate. In summary says the report:

An initial decision that a particular industry is essential tends to be self-confirming and self-reproducing. Intervention becomes a way of life. The very fact of past intervention is presented as evidence that the essential community interests are involved and can only be protected by further intervention.

The Premier this morning in recommending this Bill to us told us

how wonderfully Bill 2 had acted with respect to the hospital workers. This was part of his reason for saying we should be doing this, because of the success there in regard to hospital employees. Intervention becomes a way of life. Past intervention is presented as evidence that essential community interests can be protected only by further intervention. The question, Mr. Speaker, then is, because compulsion of this form is habit-forming, because the Government's appetite is growing quite large from its eating to date: where next? Is it going to move to destroy the rights of collective bargaining? Now we heard the protestations of the Premier this morning of how much this Government respects and endorses the collective bargaining process. I would like to hear the Government, the Premier, the Minister of Labour, stand up and make a short clear statement, a clear short statement, to this effect that in Saskatchewan collective bargaining is public policy. I invite them to make that statement before this debate finishes, to say that collective bargaining is the public policy in the Province of Saskatchewan. I invite them to go on and say that the Government's role is to encourage and to assist not to destroy such public policy. Admittedly when we make that statement, we realize of course that the bargaining process doesn't always work perfectly, sometimes it works pretty painfully. Sometimes there is temptation, but I draw attention, Mr. Speaker, to the consequences. I want to again refer to the same Federal Government study that I read from before, because it in one part warns against this kind of response this kind of growing appetite for intervention.

It is a mark of a free and pluralistic society, says the report, that there is substantial tolerance, both for deviate belief and deviate action. In the exercise of right, minority groups will no doubt often cause public displeasure, perhaps inconvenience and occasionally serious disruption. Yet if we feel that the freedom value used to justify the action is important enough, libertarians will say that the discomfort is the price we must pay for our freedom.

It goes on to say that:

Freedom of economic action is and is believed to be an important value in our society.

Certainly nobody stands up more frequently and talks about the rights of certain groups for freedom and economic action than the Government Members who sit opposite. Why not more general application of it?

When the residue of the economy remains unregulated, then to impose controls widely throughout the labor sector would surely be seen as discriminatory.

That is precisely what this Government is stating. It is saying that the residue of the economy may be unregulated but that controls must be placed on the value of those efforts of direct labour and that surely must be seen as discriminatory.

Let me talk for a while, Mr. Speaker, just about the way in which the Government has handled this particular difficulty. I submit that the way in which the Government has handled it denies that in this province collective bargaining is as a matter of fact public policy. I submit that the way in which it has handled this particular difficulty shows that it is not convinced

that collective bargaining should be public policy. Certainly the Government's handling in this respect has been inexpert, inept and inappropriate. The question is: has the Government's handling been that bad by design or does it just illustrate some general disability on the part of the Government in the whole field of human relationships? Let's see what it has done. The pattern is this: it pushed the contractors to take a hard line. Let there be no doubt about it. The Government encouraged and even threatened contractors so that they would take a hard line. And the contractors did so. Later on when the Government tried or pretended to try to restrain the contractors it couldn't get the response it wanted. I submit the question is: was that designed by desire or not, pushing the contractors hard and then later on trying to hold them back so that the Government could say, as the Premier said this morning, that the employers are partly at fault. Is this by design or just the consequence of Government action without thinking?

We have got the same picture with regard to the situation in education, Mr. Speaker. There the trustees have been pushed by the Government to take a hard line. Now they are saying that trustees are partly at fault. I submit what we have here is an exercise of a kind of brinkmanship by the Government with somebody else being pushed up to the brink and taking the responsibility and the blame.

This Government, as I have said before, at the outset in this particular dispute destroyed its effectiveness as a mediator or as a leader in good employee-employer relationships. First of all there was some early and repeated denunciation of the employees as the villains. And we heard it over and over again this morning from the mouth of the Premier as he spoke.

Secondly, we have the Government setting in advance the only conditions which it will recognize. They must be within this magical 6 per cent figure which it determined by flipping a card in the Cabinet room. It must be two-year contracts. Now if the Government had wanted to establish guidelines why didn't it get the assistance of the people involved in establishing what the guidelines should have been? Why try to impose it? If it felt it needed guidelines surely to goodness this should have come out of some examination of the situation in which the employers and the employees both took part. A guideline derived in that way has some additional chance of being effective. It cannot expect the automatic acceptance of a guideline which is developed simply by turning up a card and naming that as the magical number.

I don't want, Mr. Speaker, to take the time this morning to read off the numerous Press statements by the Premier. Some of my colleagues will undoubtedly bring this kind of evidence to the House. The fact is that there was repeated interference by the Government before the actual negotiations and during the actual negotiations and before the Government entered the picture as honest mediator. It destroyed itself. It should now be doing something better than that and getting somebody else into the picture. Certainly it introduced punishment. It stopped contracts for Provincial public works. It prevented school boards and other groups from building. Here in the city of Regina for example, the construction on one school has started three times and has been called off three times as I understand it by orders of the Government.

The most important part of this whole discussion, Mr. Speaker, is to remind ourselves that almost two years ago this Government set up a committee known as the Labor-Management Committee on the Construction Industry. We need to look for a moment at the membership of that committee. The chairman was Mr. Murchison, the former Deputy Minister of Labor in the Province, appointed to that position, I believe by the present Government, a long-time employee of the Department of Labour. Its members included Mr. Foley, Pool Construction Ltd. now in Winnipeg. Pool Construction is finding it difficult to keep its business going here and it is moving people into Winnipeg, Manitoba. Mr. Gilbey of the Federation of Labour, Mr. Jones I think is with a Saskatoon contracting company, Mr. McWillie who is a representative of one of the trade unions, Mr. Upton, Mr. Young who is a Regina electrical contractor. The only point in using the names, Mr. Speaker, is to remind us that this was made up of people equally balanced between the employers in the construction industry and the people who work in the construction industry. This Committee worked for about two years. It reported to the Government in March, 1970 and it may be recalled that some of us on this side, my colleague from Moose Jaw, tried to get a copy of the report from the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour wasn't willing at that time to make the report public, he wasn't willing to make it available to MLAs. The Press had it. The reports in the Press stated what's going on in Ottawa in recent days. There is a relationship between this Government and that at Ottawa with regard to the way they do things.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — Finally some weeks and weeks afterwards we did manage to get some copies of it. But let's just take a look at this report in very brief fashion, Mr. Speaker. It notes that it heard briefs from nine legitimately interested organizations. After it had received these written briefs, it had public hearings to discuss the content of these briefs. I quote from page 1 of the report. It says:

The Committee also met on numerous occasions with individual groups and organizations who have a special interest in and knowledge of the construction industry, who held in-camera discussions with labor lawyers, union business agents, international representatives, construction employers, senior officials of the Canadian labor movement, Government administrators and many others.

The terms of reference of this Committee, an Order in Council obviously, included these words.

It was to recommend changes in legislation, regulations or administrative procedures to bring stability to labor relations in the construction industry.

After all of those meetings and discussions and in pursuit of that objective they brought in an unanimous report. Now it was bad enough for the Government to withhold this for weeks from the legislators even after the newspapers had it. It was worse, measurably worse for the Government to have the report and not bother to read it or at least not bother to heed it, because clearly all the work and the recommendations of this Committee have been shoved in some pigeonhole some place. If the Government had read this report and listened to it we would not be here now in this session, Mr. Speaker . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — I read a bit more from this report which came from such a group unanimously recommended and completely, I gather, rejected by the Government. On pages 1 and 2 we find the group saying:

Our meetings with union officials and employers were most valuable as examples of the value of dialogue between the parties on their problems and differences.

An example, I submit, of what some impartial person or people could do in getting and talking together when such an effort is possible. Secondly, they emphasized the:

importance of providing a competent and adequately staff conciliation service.

This they say cannot be overestimated. Third:

All the evidence placed before us supported the fact that many of the strikes that take place today can be eliminated if competent conciliators are called into the dispute before it is too late.

There is an accusation, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this Government's handling of this case. The Committee says:

All the evidence supported that if the right people got into it before it is too late, strikes could be avoided.

This Government fails to give the kind of assistance to collective bargaining that can prevent strikes in this province and that is another reason for defeating this Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — The Committee goes on and says on page 12:

We have some reservations about whether the enactments of penalties and factions would achieve the objectives that the proponents of this type of action desire. There is a real question in the Committee's mind as to whether it is possible to force men to work against their will. We would prefer to create conditions that minimize discontent.

Let me ask the Government, let me ask the private Members over there to look at that and to weigh this present decision which brings us here against that kind of thing.

We have reservations about the enactment of penalties. There is a real question . . . as to whether it is possible to force men to work against their will. We would prefer to create conditions that minimize discontent.

This Government has failed to create conditions that minimize discontent. On the contrary this Government has created conditions which maximize discontent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — Finally, the most important

conclusion is found on page 22. This one the Government hasn't read. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) evidently wasn't convinced. The Committee says:

It is our conviction after nearly two years of review that there is no substitute for free collective bargaining. There should be no government compulsion in this process in the construction industry.

I ask the Government and I ask the MLAs to read that and to read it against the Bill which we are asked to pass in this Legislature today. A group of people drawn from employers and employees spend two years studying the problems. They consult widely and they study widely. They make a unanimous report to this Government. That unanimous report says:

It is our conviction that there is no substitute for free collective bargaining. There should be no government compulsion in this process in the construction industry.

The Government's response to the advice of its own Committee is to drop the report in the wastepaper basket and proceed as it wanted to do all along to satisfy its own appetite. Mr. Speaker, that is simply not good enough.

We ask this Government even at this late date to listen to the recommendations of that Committee. The route that is proposed by this Government is at least an unhappy one and at worst it is thoroughly bad. We are convinced that there is a better way. We are convinced there is an alternative. We are convinced there is no value in extending the restrictions and the punishments and the harm of Bill 2. In addition it will make it worse. Mediation efforts have not been as wide-spread as the Premier would have us believe in his words this morning. The efforts of mediation to date have been confined entirely to a couple of Cabinet Ministers and some of their own employees. The efforts of mediation came about after the Government had already destroyed its credibility by showing its lack of fairness, by showing its willingness to punish. We argue that there should be honest to goodness effort made before time goes any further to get an effective mediation procedure going. As a result, Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes):

That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

this House not now proceed with the second reading of this bill but request the government to substitute therefor a new bill that would:

(a) order the return of striking construction workers to their employment on the basis of the old union agreements while an impartial mediator convenes the parties to assist them in a successful conclusion of a new agreement, and;

(b) provide that in returning to work, striking employees be fully protected against reprisals or other discriminatory action.

The debate continued on the Motion and the amendment.

**HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, in taking part

in this debate — I will deal with the amendment later — I was rather impressed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) with his crocodile tears who took over one hour of the time of this House and took only about seven minutes of the time as to why we are here today. Of course I don't altogether object to that. After all every man must have his dream and this is his last dream, this is his last session, so I presume that we will have to accept all crocodile tears and hear of the things that he wished that he would have done when he was on this side of the House and didn't have the fortitude to do anything to make it possible whereby any differences that do take place in this society are resolved equitably.

He went on and told us of the problems but he didn't mention once what to do to resolve this difference. Not once!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Get rid of the Liberals.

**MR. CODERRE:** — You would like to do that I am sure. But that will be a long, long day. But the strange thing about it is that all the time that he has taken he did not mention anything about the strike, did not mention anything about the great problems of wives, children and workers themselves, how they would like to get back to work. In the last two months, Mr. Speaker, I have had more calls at home, in the office, from people who would like to get back to work and by God we haven't found one single way how to resolve the differences of man in some way or the other. We have gone to the moon. We have come back. We have taken pictures of different planets, we have built computers in this world, but not one way have we found to resolve the difference between people when they do get an impasse in negotiations, Mr. Speaker, as we have, when we are dealing with this very grave matter. It appears that we have a bunch of clowns who would sooner laugh than act in a responsible way as this Legislature should do.

Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Member for Biggar spoke he said that the approach the Administration is taking to get the members back to work is legislation of the worst way. But he did not mention, as he was speaking for the members in the gallery, that in the '60s when he was the Leader of the Government, that he threatened and had legislation prepared that was by far more restrictive than Bill No. 2. He wasn't speaking to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker. He was speaking for the people of the gallery.

There was much more restrictive legislation brought in by my Socialist friends across the way than Bill No. 2 has ever been.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CODERRE:** — They had assumed in that Bill complete dictatorial powers. Complete!

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — When was it introduced?

**MR. CODERRE:** — It was not introduced, it was used as a threat.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**MR. CODERRE:** — I indicated quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, that they had prepared legislation which was much more restrictive. As far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, we don't use clubs or anything else. We say to the people of this province that in the opinion of the Government there is an impasse which has occurred during negotiations between labor and management in the construction industry. We say that we are making it possible to establish the machinery so, where both parties will appoint a member to this Board that is labor and management, appoint a chairman and that chairman shall be a judge of the courts of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it is within the realm of possibilities for both labor and management to get together to select their own chairman. If they are unable to do it, Mr. Speaker, then we will assume that responsibility. I am sure that I wouldn't appoint Woody because he wouldn't deal with the subject matter in any event. He would be way off base. Surely this is one way, Mr. Speaker, that we can get the people back to work. But what does his motion say? Read this, Mr. Speaker. I will only take the part of the second paragraph. His suggestion — my dear Socialist friend's suggestion is:

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

this House not now proceed with the second reading of this bill, but request the government to substitute therefor a new bill that would order the return of the striking construction workers.

We would not take that responsibility of ordering them. We will let a judicial body under Bill 2 do it. But you put in here that the Government should order the striking voters back to work. Oh, these holier than thou Socialists!

**MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, will the Minister yield to a question? Will he accept a question?

**MR. CODERRE:** — You sit down. Then the audacity to say that there have not been skilled mediators. I think that this is shameful behavior on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, criticizing the staff of the Department of Labour. I make no apologies for the effort and the goodwill and the hard work of John Elchyson, the Chief Conciliating Officer of the Department of Labour. He has done his utmost. He has had the most discouraging task that he has ever had. I could go on for hours explaining the obstacles that he has had to overcome, Mr. Speaker, because I have sat at some of those meetings and have seen the behavior of the individuals at the bargaining table, whether they were management, whether they were union. I have seen it from time to time. It was frustrating for John. But with them is an impasse. Bring in another mediator — who? They mentioned all kinds of names, but you are at an impasse. Isn't it time that this Legislature sits and makes a decision for the people to give these people an opportunity to go back to work?

He would like to have some suggestion as to the proposal of six per cent? The cost of living has gone up 4.1 points based on the 1960 base. This is the total increase last year, 4.1 points, which means roughly a 3.8 per cent increase. Therefore

establishing a basic guideline of six per cent gives a leeway of about 2.2 per cent. The guideline has been strictly adhered to by the Government. Early in July of last year all Departments were ordered to cut back in their expenditures in various ways. We have established the guidelines — the wage guidelines — within the Administration. Whether we are going to argue whether the guideline is the right thing or not, the fact remains that we are assuming our responsibility of trying to establish rigid guidelines, both in our expenditures and otherwise, to help maintain the biggest bogey of it all, and that is inflation. We can be criticized possibly for saying six per cent. We could probably have frozen all increases, but the six per cent does not indicate six per cent across the board to each and everyone. It is six per cent of total payroll which can be adjusted as it needs to be.

And then the Member started indicating and using the usual Socialist arithmetic — 9.9 per cent unemployment rate. Of course, my good friend Bill, the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) is going to come along and is going to bring more Socialist arithmetic — that was his Socialist arithmetic during the winter. But DBS indicates that the unemployment rate, the last report that we have had; Manitoba, the great Socialist province, 6 per cent; Saskatchewan, 4.4 per cent; Alberta, 3.9 per cent. This has been the latest report that we have.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What's the matter with Manitoba?

**MR. CODERRE:** — I would like to put the position of this Government on the records very clearly insofar as collective bargaining is concerned. Collective bargaining means, as far as I know, two parties getting together to arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement, both as to conditions of work and wages. That is the purpose of it. This is a private matter, a private matter between the employee and the employer. The Department of Labour provides within its structure a staff of conciliators to assist in arriving at an agreement between the two parties. At no time have I or any other member of the Department of Labour or my colleagues ever instructed the conciliation officers as to what they should do. Their job is to try to arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement when they are called in. And I say all agreements are private matters. What goes into these agreements does not concern me. We offer the skilled, impartial help of the conciliators when negotiations break down.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Does it matter to the Government if the increase is more than 8 per cent?

**MR. CODERRE:** — I feel rather strange, Mr. Speaker, I hear a voice but it seems as if he is speaking from behind his desk and getting lower and lower.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make three important points quite clear in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding over the intent of the Bill. Personally I have never been one to boast . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! We are here assembled in a special session to discuss a matter which is considered to be of sufficient importance

to warrant the convening of a special session of this House. This Legislature and all of the Members and all those other people here in this Chamber listened with care and attention to the Premier when he moved that Bill No. 1 be read the second time. They listened with equal care and attention when the Leader of the Opposition spoke in opposition to the legislation. May I ask Members and suggest that we maintain that same degree of decorum through this entire debate and listen with care and attention and with a degree of silence to all those other Members who are going to speak from here on in. Other Members on both sides of the House are going to want to take part in this debate. I suggest that all Members whether they be in the front benches or in the back benches are all deserving of the same courteous attention as has already been accorded to the Premier and to the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. CODERRE:** — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I have never been one to boast that the Essential Services Emergency Act represents a progressive piece of legislation. I know it is not. All of us know it isn't. I am not proud of it either and I am sure that neither is the Government. But we do take pride in the fact that we have lived up to our governmental responsibilities of taking necessary action however distasteful to protect the rights, the welfare of the people we serve and that is the citizens of the province. It is now apparent that conditions exist which require the Government to extend the provisions of the Act to the construction industry, because, in my opinion, of the deep concern of many employees who are unable to work because of the strike, unable to work through no fault of their own, the number of appeals by women, young people and employees themselves to do something. I have had many calls from these people who have known me, whom either I have met or who have called me and said, "Lionel, for God's sake do something." Now what in the Sam Hill can we do other than what we are doing. Another point is the probability of work starting too late for a continuous part of the winter months. We introduce this legislation with a good deal of reluctance but once again the introduction of the Bill reflects the Government's acceptance of its duty to promote the best interests of all segments of society.

My second point, Mr. Speaker, relates to the permanency of the proposed enactment. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, a time period has been specified during which the amendment will be operative. A number of critics have suggested from time to time that the Essential Services Act — I don't know what it will be referred to now, at one time it was Bill 2 and now the present amendments are Bill 1 — would be utilized as a universal instrument of compulsory arbitration. Well, the record speaks for itself. The Act was passed nearly four years ago and how many times has it been called on? — Twice. In 1966 is provided the basis of a settlement of the dispute involving the employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and earlier this year it was used on request to provide arbitration in the case of the strike of non-professional hospital workers in Prince Albert. Now if the Act had been intended as a general strike-breaking weapon one would have expected it to be applied somewhat more frequently than it has. Similarly if it was supposed to be the forerunner of widespread compulsory arbitration I rather think that its coverage would have been extended to additional occupational groups before now. We know that the compulsory arbitration procedure has been working very effectively for the last forty years or so all over the country, and at least for twenty some years in this province particularly as it applies to the firemen.

I have never heard from anyone of any complaints about the results of binding arbitration in one sector of the economy. So I believe it is only fair to say, Mr. Speaker, when the situation is close to the wire that some machinery must be brought in and I think the Essential Services Act should be brought in to cover the construction industry. Surely, I think, we will convince the most suspicious Members opposite that the Bill before this Assembly masks no sinister motives nor will be employed by the Government of Saskatchewan to destroy the collective bargaining process in the construction industry. It will only be used in my personal opinion and in the opinion of the Government when there has been a complete break-down. Surely when the pay cheques of workers have not been coming home for two and one-half months, surely we have a responsibility as legislators to do something about it. There are many points that I have seen throughout the negotiations where more rigid action probably should be taken.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) mentioned that the Labor-Management Review committee gave me a report. Everyone knows that this report applied to the construction industry and dealt almost exclusively with the possibilities of walkouts in solving grievances. But at no place in that Committee Report were any recommendations made affecting people out on strike and at the end of an agreement. It does not. The best approach is free collective bargaining method. But when that breaks down, Mr. Speaker, I ask this Legislature and all fair-thinking people in this province what then does the Government do.

Thirdly, I want to make certain that everyone understands that in drafting the Bill we are not implying any particular party is entirely to blame for the current impasse in negotiation and I pray to God, Mr. Speaker, that this situation, strike, impasse and legislation, do not end as a vendetta against anyone. There are two sides to every question, Mr. Speaker. Both labor and management must also bear the responsibility for the failure of negotiations to reach a mutually acceptable agreement. I wish that it would be possible to ask members who were at the bargaining table to give their reasons why there is a break-down.

I probably should take one minute of the time of this House, Mr. Speaker, to explain what has actually happened. Proposals were presented by the union, they were counter-proposals by management and they started scrapping. I call it a scrap because these people didn't seem to approach the table in the proper spirit. Then there were proposals and counter-proposals to a point of breakdown and harsh words. More proposals were made and both parties said in all cases they had to take it back to membership. Surely there must be something wrong with the bargaining process when those who are at the bargaining table haven't got some authority to accept some of the proposals on general principles, where clause after clause presented had to be directly referred to the membership. Surely there must be a break-down in the negotiations process, surely we are intelligent enough some days to grab a hold of the bull by the horns and try to bring something constructive in it. But in the meantime we are going to wait this long. That is why the Bill is here.

The sole purpose of the amendments is to facilitate a fair and equitable settlement of construction labor disputes within we hope the stated guidelines deemed as a prerequisite to economic stability. In this way construction activity in the province can be resumed and we can get on with the job of putting this province back on an even keel.

Let me say in this regard that we should not make the mistake of underestimating the contributions of the construction industry to the prosperity of Saskatchewan. The Government of Saskatchewan attributes a high degree of importance to the industry. Its building up of the economy, the structure and engineering projects which mark our progress and wealth are constant reminders of the significance of construction in our daily lives. It is inspiring to see the people all over the province while construction is in progress. It indicates a lively economy. This is the reason why the Government is so concerned to see that this keeps on moving. Here we are almost the first of July — half a year gone — and negotiations have been deadlocked for two months. An evaluation of the gross value of commodity production in this province reveals that the construction industry ranks amongst our major industries after agriculture. Estimated value of work performed in the construction sector in Saskatchewan last year was over \$645 million. This amount is more than one-half the size of the entire provincial budget for 1970 and 71. The industry provided direct employment for 27,000 in Saskatchewan in 1969 and many more thousands of members in the labor force are dependent on construction for their livelihood in more indirect ways.

On-site construction activities generate a substantial volume of secondary outside employment in enterprise, manufacturing, building materials, transportation. The climate and geography of Canada along with abundance of natural resources with which we are endowed have caused construction to play a great role in this country and in many other nations of the world. And this is particularly so of Saskatchewan. Because of 20 or 30 years of stagnation we had to go ahead and get some development of some sort and this has provided jobs for our construction people. Here the value of construction work performed per capita and the percentage of non-agricultural working people who earn their living in construction are both considerably higher than the national average. The construction business is accordingly one of the most significant indicators of growth in the province and our economic well-being depends to a marked extent on the healthy state of the industry. For this reason the need for harmonious labor-management relations within the industry can hardly be exaggerated. This is what prompted the Government of Saskatchewan to establish the Labor-Management Construction Committee to study all aspects of labor relations in the industry with the object of maximizing stability and minimizing work stoppages. The greatest number of work stoppages in the construction industry these last few years has been based on jurisdictional disputes and lack of good-will on the part of the employers to resolve grievances. And this is the main body of the report. Most breakdowns take place during the term of the agreement but not when no agreement exists. The recommendations of the Committee for legislative and administrative changes in existing labor-relations machinery are being studied very carefully by the Government and a decision regarding implementation of new policies will be made in due course. I don't think it would be the right time to do it at this point.

In the meantime, however, we have a genuine crisis on our hands and I am quite convinced that it is a crisis. There are work stoppages which have been tying up construction projects for over two months, coming at a time when we have a serious general business slow-down. Strikes and related delays in construction schedules are wasteful and harmful to everyone concerned. I am sure many people who are in the galleries today

are in the construction in the labor force don't want strikes, but we as legislators have never been able to provide the machinery whereby it would be equitable and a fair way of adjusting or resolving the differences. We have failed.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You have failed . . . society.

**MR. CODERRE:** — You have failed. We have failed. I speak collectively. If I could find the answer to resolve these differences we would have no strikes, not even one day's loss in wages for anyone. I've prayed — I don't want to sound to be religious at this point — time and time again have I prayed to find a way to resolve these differences and I have not succeeded.

At the session of the Legislative Assembly held earlier this year I made the reference of chain reactions of losses due to strike. Unfortunately there has been an opportunity since that time to observe these strikes in action in Saskatchewan. The striking employees and their families have suffered a loss of income which has seriously reduced their standard of living. Employees not involved in strikes but directly affected are those who expressed the most concern. One honestly wonders whether wage adjustments arising out of the current dispute will make up for this loss in working time, in the working lifetime, of many of the employees involved. Employers of course are forgoing their profits while strikes last. Some of them — 11 of them I know — are on the verge of closing their doors, absolutely right up against the act. And as a consequence of these two factors, consumer spending has declined and the provincial income has been lower. Further employee layoffs have taken place in construction establishments and other industries more directly affected as well. Large numbers of unemployed persons who would be engaged in construction projects financed by Government funds remain without jobs. In addition valuable working time has gone which can never be recovered causing delays in the establishment of important new commercial, educational and cultural facilities. The entire province is reeling with the shock of these interruptions and the public is suffering inconvenience and even hardship. Is it not reasonable, Mr. Speaker, therefore that the Government would be forced to do something? Is it not what a government is for? Do we just have to sit around and wait for the economic structure to crumble? Surely government, any government of whatever label, has to face up to its duties to see that these things do not occur. Otherwise the government would cease to govern. The elected representatives of the people must deal with the requirements of a complex modern society and must be able and willing to guarantee the smooth functioning of services which are so vital to the welfare of society. Needless to say we are all very concerned about our freedoms and we value them highly. However, it must be realized that in a truly democratic state freedom is a relative principle. No man is absolutely free to do exactly as he chooses unless we live alone on an island. People living in organized communities give up certain freedoms in order to enjoy the advantages of civilization. If you like to play the violin by yourself, you may do it to your heart's content provided you do not disturb the neighbors' sleep. On the other hand if you agree to play in an orchestra, you must follow the band and the conductor. You must obey the rules. So must every other musician otherwise you wouldn't have an orchestra. Instead of a symphony you would have a deafening noise. As for example in wartime selfish interests must become subordinate to the general good of the community. So it is I believe in the

present state, in the present case, in the light of Saskatchewan's current problems, both management and labor must temper unreasonable demands and counter demands with the knowledge that their actions affect not only themselves but also exert profound influence on the lives of their friends and neighbors.

In implementing the legislation before us the Government is most assuredly not attempting to undermine the process of collective bargaining. It is not endeavoring to apply rigid labor relations' control. I'm sure that since this strike has been in progress there must have been some contracts agreed to, there must be more negotiations going on that many of us are not even aware of, that even the Department of Labour is not aware of and it goes on and on. We recognize that labor and management by and large prefer to arrive at settlements and solve problems themselves without government interference. Our position has consistently been that the Government should confine its involvement in the labor relations' field to the formulation of policies which will make collective bargaining function more efficiently and which will remove the obstacles hindering the smooth operations of the system. As I have said on a number of occasions you simply cannot legislate human relationships. People acting as individuals or in groups can't be forced to agree with each other. In this connection it is somewhat strange that man has learned, as I have said, to harness all the forces of nature but hasn't harnessed his own. Surely we should find ways that will allow human beings to live together in peace and harmony. The only lasting and complete solution in labor-management disputes will come about when both parties decide that it is their own mutual interest to co-operate. The future of collective bargaining in this country will very likely be determined by the answers to the following two questions that were posed by Dr. John Deutsch, former chairman of the Economic Council of Canada:

How ready are management and labor to take up the challenge of trying to cope with the requirements of change through a system of free discussion and bargaining?

How much effort are two parties prepared to make to keep themselves continuously informed on each other's problems, attitudes and interest?

This is where the collective bargaining process has failed. We are not concerned about the future at the moment, Mr. Speaker. The circumstances which have brought us together here at this session constitute a special case which requires an extraordinary and immediate course of action. Last session I said, as Minister of Labour, I could not and would not stand idly by to see the Government's capital spending program delayed too long by work stoppages. Two months is too long. In addition to making needed services available this problem is an important employment-creating device which will provide a significant stimulus to the economy. The plumbers' and the electricians' strikes have gone on, I think, long enough. We have waited for a reasonable time for the parties to resolve their differences. I don't think that we as a Government, as legislators, can stand by on the sidelines anymore. My Department and I have done everything in our power to bring the parties together. We've had recommendations of accepting the old agreement, back to work on that basis but leaving open to conciliation but not to arbitration which would indicate that there could be another strike in the same area if they break down. Mediation would do the same. Let's get on with the job. Let's all get to work and do the job. All the services of the Department of Labour have been placed at the disposal of

both sides and will continue to be so. My conciliation staff have worked very long hours, very frustrating hours and have called upon all of the very considerable expertise that they possess to bring about an agreement and without success. They almost made it but not quite joined the two ends together. I might say incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that last year our conciliation services had the success of 94 per cent in the avoidance of strikes. So it is not too often that we are unable to assist the parties to conclude an agreement. The batting average is pretty good. The time for Government action, Mr. Speaker, has accordingly arrived in this respect. Our economy is lagging because of marketing problems, associated with wheat and potash, and this is a situation over which we have little or no control. That part of the economic slowdown which is caused by the halting of construction activity by disputes of some sort or the other is however a problem where it is within our power to adopt the corrective measures. This is what the Government proposes to do, Mr. Speaker, not to inflict harm on anybody but rather to the ultimate benefit of every citizen of this province, including the striking employees, the contractors and those who are unable to go to work because of bottlenecks in some segments of the construction industry. Our only objective, Mr. Speaker, in taking this step, is to get the wheels of the economy turning again to ensure the attainment of the goals and aspirations of us all. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that we get on with the job of getting these people who are unemployed and some who would like to go back to work and are unable to, back at work and get this province rolling ahead again.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

**MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion, I want first to congratulate the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) for the speech that he made and the amendment that he introduced. I wholeheartedly approve of the amendment because it would order the workers back to work under the old union agreement and ask for an impartial mediator, and it protects the employees from reprisal.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) ignored putting into effect the recommendations of his own Construction Royal Commission Report — if it was a Royal Commission Report. I think that if it had been introduced we wouldn't be facing the problem that we are facing today. And after listening to the Hon. Minister of Labour, particularly when he was replying to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition — he said that the Hon. Member for Biggar was off base — I didn't think that the Hon. Minister of Labour was off base, I didn't think the Hon. Minister was on the diamond. The Hon. Minister wasn't in the dugout. He wasn't even in the ball park, Mr. Speaker.

He said that this was a special case. Well we were told that the SPC was a special case, the hospital workers were a special case. Now the electricians are a special case. The plumbers are a special case. The carpenters and the bricklayers, Mr. Speaker, what this adds up to is a special case of Liberal bungling complete with an apology from the Hon. Minister of Labour.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, this Legislature has been called in an emergency session because of the unmatched and unquestionable failure of this Government to cope with the problems of our province. Politically, economically, philosophically, administratively, the leadership demonstrated and practiced by those who sit opposite is bankrupt. This Bill, this legislation, is the final proof, the clear-cut evidence, the written documentation of that bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker. One must say, one must conclude, when a democratically elected government, headed by a democratically chosen Premier, introduces legislation that is in effect slavery, it is not only bad judgment, it is not only bad administration, it is not only anti-democratic, but it is a political sin against freedom and a political violation of the rights of the individual, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, it is slavery. The only difference between a free man and a slave is that the free man is free to work for whom he chooses, when he chooses; the slave has no choice.

This Bill in its present form gives the working people no choice, no chance, no freedom. It is the work that you would expect from a government headed by a dictator. It is the thinking of a political bully, written in legal terms. It is documentation of a suspicion long held by many people in this province, that the Premier and those who sit with him believe not in freedom, not in free enterprise, not in the rights of the individual, but in legislative coercion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to expand my criticism and I am sure it is the criticism of free men everywhere, not just working people, but of farm people, teachers, every segment of our society, criticism of men and women who really believe in freedom and I want to talk about it under three headings.

1. The Government's failure to administer labor-management relations. 2. This Government's failure to provide any controls over those who make the cost of living unbearable to working people, farm people, pensioners, those on fixed incomes. 3. The Premier's failure to advance any economic solutions, any choices, any proposals, any programs, that would provide either employment, stability or confidence.

Mr. Speaker, from every corner of the province, from the farm community, from organizations in the management group, have come warnings, ideas, suggestions, yes, even from the construction industry, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition pointed out this morning, as to how labor-management relations might be improved. Even the advice of the Federal Minister of Labour, when he suggested legislation to force bargaining will not solve this type of problem, has been both ignored and rejected. And I suggest the resignation of the Deputy Minister of Labour and many other deputies throughout the Government, suggests that these people opposite are loath to listen to suggestions. They don't like to have new procedures presented to them. This is why we have a wholesale resignation, a whole long list of deputy ministers leaving the province taking other employment.

There are times when people in this province have felt that the Premier is a Tex Rickard — Tex Rickard was a man who used to promote the Dempsy-Tunney fights and all the famous fights of

years ago — that he is a Tex Rickard of labor-management and that he was actually promoting labor-management fights and disputes. Certainly his inflammatory and bullying statements in the Press could not, did not and cannot, if he continues to make them, settle or solve labor disputes. In the whole field of labor relations, his Government, whether dealing with its own employees about the cost of meals or increments, or whether blaming electricians for the failure to open the Auditorium — when in fact the electricians were not to blame — or whether he was just making anti-labor speeches for political advantage, has contributed nothing. He has in no way brought disputants together. As a matter of fact he has appeared to the general public in the role of the professional promoter. One would almost think he was getting a percentage on every labor-management fight that he promoted, Mr. Speaker.

Members on this side of the House and other sound-thinking citizens of this province in every walk of life have long since arrived at the conclusion that the Premier is playing politics with the bread and butter, with the employment, with the future economy of this province by making irrational, irresponsible and uncalled-for statements, before, during, and after labor disputes. Mr. Speaker, to John Birchers in New Orleans or some semi-christian group or whatever fanatical group of anti-labor bigots and anti-union fanatics he may have been invited to address, the Premier is a hero, but to the people of this province, to the men and women whom he represents, he has become an embarrassment. He has become a promoter of disunity, a merchandiser of distrust, a retailer of biased half-truths. If these statements brought to the people of this province labor harmony, perhaps we could put up with them. If these pompous exhibitions of verbosity and inaccuracy promoted prosperity, we might tolerate them. If these rantings and exaggerations to some John Birchers in the United States had expanded our prosperity or employment, we might say, well, at least there are people working in Saskatchewan. But, under the circumstances, all these activities that I have mentioned, all these unfortunate outbursts, all these violations which have been so constantly and so persistently exercised both in the province and out of it, have not promoted, have not brought prosperity to Saskatchewan, to what he called the New Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true, Mr. Speaker.

If the Premier had a hard hat for every business that has closed its doors in this province in the last few months there wouldn't be room, there wouldn't be enough shelves in his rumpus room to hold them. Even some of the hard hats he has should come down because some of the enterprises he opened have long since collapsed. His record for labor relations, his wage schedule, his record for training technicians, the whole Government record in the administration of labor affairs make not only business, but trained technicians give this province a wide berth, they either fly over it, or go through it as fast as they can, or they leave. But, Mr. Speaker, they don't stay.

Let me turn for a moment to what the Premier might have done to check the cost of living, the cost of living that interferes with the standards of all the people whether they are on the farms or in the unions or whether they are senior citizens. When Prime Minister Trudeau was challenged at Humboldt last July in this respect, he said according to the local paper, July 17, 1969, I quote:

When he was asked whether the rising cost of production couldn't be met by price control, Mr. Trudeau said that price control was a provincial power.

Yet we haven't as much as a consumer agency. Without any restrictions, Canada Packers, Swifts, Canada Safeway, Loblaw's, are allowed to run rampant. No controls. Yet the Prime Minister of Canada has said that, and I quote him again, Price control was a provincial power." If we can control the price of potash, then I suggest we can control the price of meat. Ask the pensioner who is eating cereal three times a day if he thinks the price of meat should be controlled; ask the low income people; ask the unemployed. Ask the farmer who has seen the price of pork drop \$10 in the last few days. Yet Canada Packers' net profits last year increased 29 per cent, a new record for the company. The farmers who produce the meat did not realize a 29 per cent increase in their profits, Mr. Speaker.

We on this side of the House and people of this province have got to the stage where we question the reliability, the responsibility and just the plain ability of the Prime Minister of Canada. We have no doubt that he can dance with the girls in New Zealand, and we know he can ride a motor scooter. He is a pretty fair water skier, but his greatest athletic ability is to skate around the problems of Canada. And in this case we thought that's what he was doing, until the Premier of Saskatchewan set the price of potash. He set the quotas for potash and when he did that he decided how many people would work in the potash industry and he decided how many plants would be built, what the production would be, what the income from royalties would be. The Province's jurisdiction to set the price, to completely control this giant industry told us clearly that where there is a will there is a way. But in this respect he was acting on behalf of the potash industry.

Mr. Speaker, he has failed to explain to us why, if he could control the prices of potash, he could not control the price of farm machinery. Why, if he could control the price of potash he could not control the activities of Safeway stores. Let me quote what the Batten Royal Commission said about Safeway. Everyone knows that the chairman of the Batten Royal Commission was once a Member of this House — a very capable and competent Opposition Member who sat for the constituency of Humboldt — an appointment made jointly by this Government and the Governments of Alberta and Manitoba. Let me quote page 207 of that report.

As just shown, costs and prices to the consumer are higher than they need to have been, resulting in a loss of \$15.32 of well-being per person or \$61.28 per family of four per year.

. . . this Commission is convinced that the dominant positions of Canada Safeway and the Weston companies have led to the currently unsatisfactory performance of the retail grocery industry on the Prairies.

Allow me to quote further.

This Commission recommends that the governments of the three Prairie Provinces request an immediate investigation of the grocery retailing industry, under the Combines Investigations Act.

I suggest that not even a consumer agency has been organized to investigate or to curtail this activity in the Province of Saskatchewan in an attempt to even look into it.

Look at the picture of the foodstuffs and the profits that are being made in the manufacturing and sale of foodstuffs. Here are some of the headlines that you see in some of the financial papers of this country. Here is one, March 26, 1970, Globe and Mail, "George Weston profit increases to \$15,432,000." Overall profits significantly increase from one year earlier. The profit rose in 1969 to \$15.4 million from \$13 million. Garfield Weston said to his annual meeting of shareholders, "The Company was never in better shape." No guidelines for these people, no 6 per cent restriction on these people, no restriction of 6 per cent on their profits. Overall profits significantly increased from a year earlier. Garfield Weston Company was never in better shape, no guidelines for them.

Loblaw's now controlled by George Weston Ltd., also experienced a profit rise as reported for the last half of 1969. No guidelines for these people of 6 per cent. No one stops them from getting all the profit that they can take.

Here is another one, Swift and Company profit. No guidelines for them of 6 per cent. Profit of \$21.9 million for 53 weeks ended November 1, 1969, compared with \$15.8 million for one year earlier. An increase of \$6.1 million or a 39 per cent increase in the profits. No guidelines for these people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WHELAN:** — Meanwhile, the price of hogs drops \$10. More and more people are on unemployment insurance and unable to buy meat at any price.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Friends of the Liberal Party.

**MR. WHELAN:** — What about Canada Packers? No guidelines for them. Let us look at their annual report . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Sock it to 'em, man!

**MR. WHELAN:** — Another record, their annual sales and profits in the year-ending March 28, 1970. Net profit increased by 29 per cent, a new record for the year ended March 28, 1970. No guidelines for these people, no restrictions on their profits.

Mr. Speaker, why hasn't the Hon. Premier done something to control this situation? This was his own Commission that pointed out what was happening in the food industry, the Batten Royal Commission, it was their Commission. Nothing done. The working people, everyone who buys food is suffering as a result of these groups, these people who are jumping their profits by 29 and 30 per cent every year. Here it is documented by your own Commission, yet the Premier hasn't moved a muscle, he hasn't called the Legislature into special session, he has taken no action, because these people are friends of his.

Mr. Speaker, what do working men have to do when they want a raise? They have to bargain and fight and organize to get clean air to breathe, to get holidays, to get safety measures,

to get enough to eat. Without their unions and without organization they would still be crawling on their bellies in the coal mines of Britain, and dying of silicosis in the chemical plants of the great cities, losing their hands and arms and fingers in production machinery. I worked in those plants, I saw them, I saw the fingers on the machines. I know what happened to them, this is long before there were unions. If it hadn't been for the unions, and yes, if it hadn't been for the unions fighting for political action, we would not have today medicare, hospitalization and other benefits we enjoy. When these people want to get an increase in wages they have to fight for it. When their counterparts in management want an increase for their product, they just silently put the price up on the grocery shelves, 5 cents, 10 cents, 12 cents and up go their profits. No labor relations board for them, no strike for them, no Essential Services Bill for them, no restraints for them, just pay a million bucks into the political funds of the Liberal party and up goes the price without any consultation, without any conscience, whether you are E.P. Taylor, or Garfield Weston.

If we are following the Federal Government's rule of 6 per cent maximum increase in wages, we suggest that the Federal Government itself follow the rule when hiring a chairman for the Prices Review Commission. He was getting, you know, a small salary, \$30,000 a year in a position with the University of British Columbia. To indicate clearly to the people of Canada, Mr. Speaker, that he believed in holding the line and that salaries should be held at 6 per cent, particularly if it is a hospital worker, or a carpenter, or a plumber or an electrician, his salary was increased from \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year when he went to work for the Federal Government. Just a 33 1/3 per cent increase.

Each day we pick up the newspaper the Governor of the Bank of Canada is talking about inflation. His sincerity, his continuous pleas to hold the line at 6 per cent would bring tears to your eyes. His sincerity is so touching until you realize that a few short months ago a Bill in the House of Commons was introduced to raise his salary, not 6 per cent, not 10 per cent, or 20 per cent, or 33 1/3 per cent, but 50 per cent, from \$50,000 a year to \$75,000 a year. These are the two inflation advisors, these are the two propaganda experts from the Federal Government who tell the hospital workers, the carpenters, the electricians, the plumbers, to hold the line at 6 per cent. These are the people.

What about the other executives, who are talking about 6 per cent. You see this every time you lift up the paper. There was a review of salaries of Canadian executives in Toronto. They wrote 1,000 companies. These people were earning over \$20,000. What did they find? During the year 1969 there was a more rapid increase than in any other period in history. For these executive people — and don't forget it, 10 per cent on 20,000 is \$2,000 — the average increase was 9 to 10.1 per cent. I am sure that these people are among the group that are persisting in saying over and over again to the hospital workers and the carpenters, "You shall be restricted to 6 per cent." Let us look at what has happened in Canada. Let us look at the people we could control if we wanted, according to the Prime Minister. Let us look at Massey Ferguson. This year the last report, 1969, at the end of October 31, the last year of the report, their sales exceeded one billion dollars for the first time. Their profits showed an increase of 13 per cent. This

is just part of the huge E.P. Taylor organization. What about the farmers, what about the people that are working for them? They would be restricted to six per cent or less, but their sales exceeded \$1 billion for the first time and clear profit increased 13 per cent. No guidelines for them. I have a great list of these people. Let's look at the dividends in Canada. The same pattern all the way through, the people who are talking about 6 per cent.

Dividends for the first four months of this year rose to a record of \$502 million from \$456 million in 1968. June 4th, 1970 dividends declared by Canadian companies so far this year, the highest in history. For the first five months dividends, a record of \$571 million, up 9.3 per cent from the same period in 1969. No 6 per cent guideline for these people. No one is restricting them. No essential services legislation for these people.

Mr. Speaker, I once had a prominent Liberal in this country brag about how they had finally got a million dollars in campaign funds from one of these food barons. The consumers of this country have paid for this many times over. How? Well, no one has interfered with them when they jacked up the prices. The records show this, the record of profits prove this beyond a doubt.

I challenge the Premier, if he is going to draft an Essential Services Bill to make slaves out of working people, to also bring in a bill that says to those who sell farm machinery at high prices, "You can't sell, you can't have a licence, and if you are obstinate we will do like we did with the potash companies. If by your prices and your profits you place the essentials for living beyond our financial ability, if you are going to deprive us of necessary foodstuffs, then we are going to deprive you of the right to operate at a huge profit, until we are sure your profits are reasonable."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, what we are doing in this Bill is not only slavery, but it is discrimination against the slaves in two ways: one, when they are forced to work at a fixed wage and have no choice, and second, they have nothing to say about the price of the food that they buy.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no let-up by the Premier on the consumer, his efforts to tax people are noteworthy. Look at what is happening to the individuals of this province. He has a fine record in this respect. The per capita tax increase from \$128 for every man, woman and child in 1964-1965 to \$238 in 1970-71. What an inflation fighting policy that is! The increase in per capita tax from \$128 to \$238. This is its contribution, this is the Government's contribution; this is its way of saying to the people it represents, "We are helping you fight the cost of living."

One of my colleagues says that there is no 6 per cent restriction on that. Let me point out that the Premier and his Government have not controlled the cost of living. The very opposite has been the case. He has increased the cost of living by increasing taxes. He has ignored the Batten Report; he doesn't have a consumer agency; he has allowed profits to run rampant,

although he controls the price of potash and although the Prime Minister of Canada says that the Province has the power to control other prices as well.

Let me turn now if I may to my third point. What programs has the Premier introduced to stem the economic deluge that is about to come down upon us? Let's look at it. Millions of dollars are loaned back to us from the Canada Pension Plan fund at a low rate of interest; pension funds that are put there by, in many instances, people who don't own a home or who pay high rents. Has there been any plan to build homes for them using their own money at this low interest rate? No. The money has been used to expand Crown corporations, so they could be used as a taxing vehicle. Has more housing been built that would provide employment? No. Has there been any employment instigated by Provincial programs? No.

The unemployment rate in the province has risen to a fantastic figure, even with people leaving at the rate of 95 per day. The movers tell us that they are the busiest people in Regina moving Saskatchewan citizens out.

Year after year there has been a promise of public works. One day they were going to build a vocational school, the next day it was canceled. Since 1964 when this Government was elected the base hospital has been announced 18 times. I have counted them, and it hasn't turned the sod once. This is how it is keeping faith with the people who need employment and who are sick.

Now let's get it straight. There wasn't a plumbers' strike, there was a carpenter's strike and there wasn't an electricians' strike in 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 or 1969 and yet there was no base hospital.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WHELAN:** — But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there was a strike and that the Government was on strike against the sick and against economic progress in this province since the day that it took office and it is still on strike. Millions of dollars are poured into roads. What for? To transport the residents who are leaving. The manufacturing output of our province is down. The average weekly wage is down. I think I heard the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) even admit that this morning. The production of goods all down. But more than anything else, the morale of our people is down. They are in despair. They are without hope and the author of this despair, the instigators of this demoralization, the reason for this attitude, the reason for this wholesale evacuation of this province by the tradesmen and some of the best people we have, the instigators, Mr. Speaker, are those who sit on the Government benches opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, why doesn't the Premier of this Province undertake housing projects, first establishing a housing authority and with the pension fund to provide employment, provide decent housing? Why don't we have a work-and-wages program for rural municipalities in order that the farm population can pay their taxes and earn money while working on municipal projects?

Why isn't there a public works program that covers this province region by region to develop schools where they are needed, to renovate and update and rebuild hospitals? Why isn't there development of our Northland? Why don't we set out say a period of three years in which we will rebuild and modernize so many communities in Northern Saskatchewan? Why don't we set a deadline for the completion of these rebuilding and remodernization programs? Why don't we say to Saskatchewan Power and Government Telephones, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested, let's put all the electrical and telephone lines underground and particularly starting in the cities beginning now and complete it by a certain deadline? Why don't we build a fund in which the people of Saskatchewan can invest their money in bonds and set the funds aside for industrial development? Why doesn't the Province undertake projects of this kind?

He chains free men to their jobs. The Premier cringes, frightened by the economic chaos that surrounds him, paralyzed with a fear of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan sense this. They sense that — these people opposite, the Government opposite — has lost its courage. All they can do is blame small segments of our society — the carpenters, the electricians, the plumbers, and next year or next month it may be the teachers, blame them for their shortcomings, for their failure to plan, for their failure to exercise leadership, for their failure to demonstrate economic courage.

Let me sum up. First, the Government has failed to provide the machinery and the administrative know-how to head off labor disputes. And this is why I am supporting the motion by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). Second, it has discriminated against, criticized and attacked in a biased fashion only one segment of our society while ignoring those who are really responsible for the high cost of living — the profiteers who cause economic chaos around us. And third, Mr. Speaker, is has no plans. They are frightened men resorting to the most despicable measures in order to try to save their political skin. Why do they introduce this legislation? Mr. Speaker, a well-known political advisor from McLaren's Agency, after looking at some of the surveys that have been taken in this province, probably said to them: "You have got to find someone to blame,. Let's find a scapegoat and quick. It is your one political chance." And right at this moment, Mr. Speaker, it's the electricians, the carpenters and the plumbers. Next week as I said, it may be the teachers. The week after it may be the grainhandlers and the week after that it may be the railwaymen and the week after that it may be the Civil Service. It will come before this Legislature and brand them as irresponsible enemies of society, terrible people, creating the economic conditions that exist, while its leader, charged with the responsibility, sits immobile and inept, unable to solve our problems. And he will say as each one of them is forced into an impossible position: "These are essential services. We must make them stay on the job. We must make slaves of them." And the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, sooner or later — and the sooner the better — are going to make a decision and that decision will be that the services of the Premier and his Cabinet and most of his back benchers are not essential services.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, as Opposition Members with a proud record of labor negotiations and progressive labor legislation, a record that has provided security not only for the working people but for farmers and for those who are ill, it was expected and it could be predicted that we would fight this Bill because of its discrimination against free men. To those of you who call yourselves Liberals, to those of you in this House — and I hope the Press will quote us — this must be a disgraceful moment and a sad day for the Liberal Party.

One can quote modern-day Liberals such as the Federal Minister of Labour. One could quote Liberals in the labor movement in this country and there might be a division regarding agreement as to their judgment among Liberals. No such division exists regarding the judgment of the late Sir Wilfred Laurier. Sir Wilfred Laurier summed up this whole situation in two short sentences — 10 words in all.

This Government's coercion, first of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation employees, second, of the hospital workers, and now of the tradesmen of this province, is, I contend — and I am sure they regard it as such — a challenge to the very freedom of working men. Sir Wilfred Laurier said, and I quote:

Freedom breeds loyalty. Coercion always was the mother of rebellion.

How far the Government opposite has come along the road of reaction! Farther back, well beyond the thinking of Sir Wilfred Laurier, who died more than 50 years ago. Let me quote him again, and let those of you who claim that you are Liberals remember what he said:

Freedom breeds loyalty. Coercion always was the mother of rebellion.

This Bill is coercion. I oppose it and I support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important and necessary Bills ever to come before the Legislature in Saskatchewan. The way in which Members of this Legislature vote on this Bill will be closely watched by everybody in this province. The vote on this Bill will provide the Members opposite and particularly our two friends, the leadership candidates, with an opportunity to demonstrate to the people of Saskatchewan the way in which they react to a crisis, a severe economic crisis affecting the economic welfare of everybody in this province. The vote on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, will enable the people of Saskatchewan to determine the extent to which the party opposite is dominated by big labor and by the big labor unions. Mr. Speaker, it is clear from Press reports that the domination of the party opposite by big labor is becoming more and more apparent every day.

Let's take a look at the takeover of the NDP party in British Columbia by the trade union bosses. In the Vancouver Express, which was a paper that they had for a few months when the other papers were on strike last spring, the Vancouver Express of Thursday, March 26, 1970, there was an article

stating that there was a movement in the B.C. NDP to change the constitution of that party so that affiliated union weight in the councils of that party would be increased by 35 per cent at their convention to be held in June. They didn't have enough delegates, they didn't have enough weight, they wanted to increase the weight of the trade union leadership by 35 per cent. Then let's look at what happened at that convention. I quote from the Calgary Albertan of Monday, June 8th. Here is what Mr. Staley, the President of the B.C. Federation of Labour told the B.C. NDP convention and I quote:

You don't just welcome us as partners, you got us as partners whether you like it or not.  
We're not going to run away. We are entitled to the rights and conditions of a partner.

In other words they are not being asked, they are telling the NDP in B.C. where to head in. They said it and it's the truth.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear from the above Press report and from other straws in the wind that the labor takeover of the NDP across Canada is almost complete. The farm voice in this party is now almost nonexistent. And on this basis, Mr. Speaker, it is quite easy, crystal clear as a matter of fact, it is quite easy to predict the way in which all of the Members opposite are going to vote on this Bill. I predict that they will all vote against this Bill, including all of the farm Members and all of the potential aspirants for the leadership.

Mr. Speaker, at the last session of the Legislature we had a good debate on the Resolution of the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) asking for compulsory binding arbitration for the dock workers at the Coast and at the Head of the Lake who load our farmers' wheat, and of course all the Members opposite voted against that Resolution. I was interested in the remarks in that debate by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). The Member in that debate said that he is against compulsory arbitration. He is against compulsory arbitration in all circumstances and I don't think I am misquoting him. He gave a couple of reasons. First, he said, that he doesn't see this method of compulsory arbitration putting any money in the farmers' pockets. Well of course it will put money in the farmers' pockets, Mr. Speaker, because it would move the grain at all times and that's what the farmer wants above all. If the grain moves there will of course be money in the farmers' pockets. Then he said, and this is an interesting comment that the Member for Regina Centre made in that debate, that compulsory arbitration won't work because the unions will defy the law. He says and I quote: "But you try it with the longshoremen, they will say 'load the ruddy boats yourself.'" What a stunning admission, Mr. Speaker, and what a stunning indictment of the trade union movement. Surely if the necessary law is passed providing for compulsory binding arbitration in essential services the workmen will not defy the law and I have confidence that they won't. The union will not defy and I am confident that they won't. And even if this is the case surely this can't be used as an argument against compulsory binding arbitration. Mr. Speaker, in this country we live by the rule of law and we expect everybody else to live by the rule of law and included in that assumption is the trade union movement of course.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) has had a rather significant change of heart since 1966 when we debated in this Legislature Bill 2, the

original daddy as somebody said this morning, the original Saskatchewan Essential Services Emergency Act, I would like to quote from the Member for Regina Centre at that time and I am quoting from page 38 of the Debates of that special session and I am quoting from Mr. Blakeney:

As Paul Martin calls it, the right to strike is a basic civil right. But as other Members have pointed out, basic civil rights of employees are not the only rights around. Citizens have rights too and citizens have a right to more or less continuous service in essential public services. They have no right to ask management to spend huge sums of money so there won't be a momentary interruption. They have no right to ask labor to give up all sort of rights so there won't be a momentary interruption. But basically they have the right . . .

And I am still quoting from the Member from Regina Centre.

. . . to continued services of an essential public nature.

This means that it may be necessary for us to take away private rights to accommodate this public right and we have well recognized this in times of war. We have recognized it with respect to police. We have recognized it with respect to firemen and I am prepared to say that under extreme circumstances we must recognize it with respect to power workers or gas workers.

Then a little farther down on page 38, in the same debate the Member for Regina Centre spoke as follows:

I think that most Members would agree with that proposition.

This is the Member for Regina Centre.

We start out with a proposition that the right to strike is a basic public right, a basic civil right developed over a couple of hundred years. We find that we have to take it away for good and sufficient reasons.

Mr. Speaker, this was the Member for Regina Centre three and one-half years ago in which he articulated the entire rationale for compulsory binding arbitration in essential services. But since that time, it seems and we will hear from him I am sure, but it seems to me on the basis of what he said at the last session that he has maybe had a change of heart. It seems that he is now unalterably opposed to compulsory arbitration in essential services. Could it be that the party line has hardened because of the increasing influence of big labor in the counsels of the NDP. Could it be because he is now wooing the big labor delegates to the leadership convention, and I see that he has a tag on today. I say again, Mr. Speaker, the votes of the Members opposite on this Bill will be interesting and revealing indeed.

Mr. Speaker, while I was looking at the report of proceedings of the 1966 debate, I also had occasion to look at the remarks of the Member from Regina South East. I guess it isn't South East anymore. I am not sure. Anyway, the Mayor of Regina (Mr. Baker). Is it North East? Anyway I found his remarks most interesting. I think that perhaps the Member, His Worship the Mayor may have had a change of heart from what he said in 1966,

having had the experience he has had with the machine-like tactics of union bosses at a little convention a week or two ago, he may have changed his heart. But do you know what the Member for Regina South East suggested by way of a resolution of the difficulties that we were in at that time, faced with the strike of our Power Corporation employees with winter coming on. I would like to quote from page 98. I don't know whether the Hon. Member remembers what he said, but I would like to quote anyway. This was the solution, this was the party line over there at the time and I am quoting now:

I would strongly recommend that this whole debate be adjourned and that we sleep on it for the next two months and see what could just transpire, see if this cannot be settled, because I know that the gentlemen across the way are going to find that this is not going to work in their favor.

This is in 1966. Further on on page 98 he said and I quote:

I challenge them . . .

And you are hearing this again today.

I challenge them to go to the people for an election with this issue. I challenge them to go. And you would see what would happen to the group across the way.

This was in 1966 before the 1967 election.

They wouldn't be coming back here with the Members they have. I doubt if they would have four or five left, because this is not legislation that is suited for this province at this time.

And then on page 99, still quoting the Member from Regina South East:

I would hope that they would call an election on this issue and I am afraid there wouldn't be too many left on the other side.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we did call an election about 12 months after the hon. gentleman made these statements and everyone knows what happened. Instead of being reduced to four or five Members the Government of the day was returned with a larger majority and several more Members. So I hope that we don't hear the Members of the Opposition in this debate challenge us to call an election on this issue. Personally I think it would a very good election issue, but I would remind all Hon. Members that the electors of Saskatchewan have already given their verdict on the question of compulsory binding arbitration in essential services. That was one of the issues in the 1967 general election and those election results vindicated loud and clear the actions of this Government in passing Bill 2 in 1966.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear in all parts of Canada that compulsory binding arbitration in essential services is not only necessary but desirable. I would like to quote from an article in the Regina Leader Post of February 18, 1970, dealing with proposed compulsory binding arbitration in

Alberta and I am quoting:

Alberta's labor leaders have registered strong objections for compulsory arbitration legislation expected to be introduced soon in the Provincial Legislature.

And the editorial goes on:

It would come as a great disappointment on many sides if the Government were to back off now and ease the terms of the legislation that it is preparing. A realization has developed among the public that strikes cannot be permitted to shut down certain essential services. This is believed to be what the proposed Government legislation will be designed to prevent. The labor leaders complain that compulsory arbitration would enable labor and management to avoid their basic responsibility which presumably is to bargain in good faith. But the number of strikes in recent years forcing the cancellation of essential services has indicated that labor was not really interested in exercising its basic responsibility while it had unlimited strike rights.

Still quoting from the editorial and I think this is the most important sentence:

There is a feeling general with the public that it has been let down in disputes where the public interest was totally ignored for selfish gain particularly on labor's part. The labor legislation reportedly in the works should find plenty of public support.

Mr. Speaker, that's the situation in Alberta. What about Ontario? Well the report of the Royal Commission on labor disputes in Ontario by the late Mr. Justice Ivan C. Rand recommended that the Provincial Government should have authority to designate essential industries where strikes would be prohibited and would also forbid strikes by public employees. Again the Woods' Commission Report recognizes that it is necessary to have special procedures for resolving industrial disputes in industries within the Federal jurisdiction which because of their record of industrial relations are prone to disputes which are likely to jeopardize the public interest. Certainly the construction industry at this point in time in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment comes within that category.

Mr. Speaker, farmers and the people in the rural areas of our province find it very difficult indeed to understand the militant opposition to compulsory arbitration in matters of this kind. I would like to remind all Hon. Members that in effect we have compulsory binding arbitration in the matter of compensation for expropriation of property. If the Department of Highways or the Power Corporation or the Telephone Company desires the farmer's land for public improvements they have the right under our legislation to take this property. If the matter of compensation cannot be agreed upon between the expropriating authority and the farmer the matter is referred to a District Court Judge and the compensation is fixed by the District Court Judge. This is really compulsory binding arbitration. So I say what does organized labor have to fear in compulsory binding arbitration. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the people who most fear the prospect of submitting to a fair and just settlement are those who have the most power to exact an unjustifiable one.

Mention has been made of Sweden, Sweden where they have labor courts. I am told that the labor courts have been used to a greater extent by the unions than they have by management. I am also advised that Sweden has only had three major strikes in the last 33 years. I am also told that Canada's population is about two and one-half times that of Sweden but in three recent years, 1964, 1965 and 1966 Canada lost more than 9 million man-days due to labor disputes compared with 389,000 lost by Swedish workers. Mr. Speaker, this is a ratio of 24 to 1 and it seems to indicate that the record in Canada is about ten times as bad as the record in Sweden.

Earlier I mentioned the rights of the public to more or less continuous service in essential public services and I was agreeing with what the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) had said in 1966. Let's talk now for a minute or two about the rights of certain segments of the public. What about the rights of the business community of this province, the other parts of the construction industry not on strike? This strike of a handful of electricians and plumbers is having chain reaction. It is paralyzing the entire economy of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this kind of a strike is not just a strike against a few plumbing and electrical contractors, it is a strike against the public of Saskatchewan and it must be stopped and it will be stopped.

Let's also talk about the rights of individual plumbers and electricians who have wanted to go back to work for weeks and who have been prevented from doing so by the bosses in their union. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk these days about basic human rights and individual freedoms. There is talk about a just society and we have a Prime Minister and a Federal Government that are dedicated to this objective and this goal. I have been naive enough to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of Canadians would gladly concede the rights of every other Canadian to go to work for the employer of his choice, and that no person or group of persons could prevent somebody else from earning a living in the location of his choice. And yet what happened in Saskatoon last week? Here is a notice which was given to striking plumbers, notice to employees delivered to them when they went back to work after they had had a vote. Here is what it said:

Any member of the local who returns to work without the sanction of the Union Executive board of the Strike Committee will be subject to charges from the local union.

This is what they gave to everybody who went back to work. Mr. Speaker, talk about abuse of power, talk about feudalism and serfdom, talk about economic bondage, talk about slavery. The Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) was talking about slavery. Here is a group of workmen, members of a union local, who legally and properly and in a democratic manner voted to go back to work, but could they go back to work? Heavens no, the union bosses didn't like the results of the vote so they sent them the notice I have read. They ordered them not to go back to work and then they threatened them with charges. Mr. Speaker, this didn't happen in Hitler's Germany nor in Mao's China nor in Communist Russia. It happened in democratic Saskatchewan in June of 1970. And my friends opposite and the SFL and its President, Mr. Gilbey who is also an NDP official I believe, talked about freedom and individual liberties. Freedom! The freedom they want is the freedom for labor bosses to hold the

power of economic life and death over their members, the right to say when they shall work and when they shall not work and indirectly, when their families shall eat and be clothed and when they shall go hungry. Mr. Speaker, this Government is not going to stand idly by and leave these solid Saskatchewan citizens to the tender mercies of Mr. Gilbey and his political cohorts in the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. Mr. Speaker, this strike is a political strike. The SFL and its political arm, the NDP, have decided in their wisdom that a strike in the construction industry with its crippling effect on our entire economy will be politically embarrassing to this Government and politically advantageous to them and so completely oblivious to the economic havoc they are creating and quite indifferent to the countless cases of heartbreak and privation they are causing to individual families who haven't had a pay cheque for about three months. They play their callous game of political Russian roulette. Mr. Speaker, this is political opportunism and gross irresponsibility at its very worst.

Mr. Speaker, this Government by these amendments will save these workers from the irresponsible excesses of their union bosses. You know, Mr. Speaker, a provincial election was fought in British Columbia last year on this issue, the issue of who would govern a province, the duly elected representatives of the people or a handful of power-hungry labor bosses and their political puppets, the NDP. And the voters of B.C. gave these labor bosses their answer loud and clear, and that answer was: we want a government not narrowly based, not representing only one segment of society, not a special-interest government. We want a broadly based government, a government of farmers, businessmen, teachers, lawyers, laborers and skilled tradesmen, a government truly representative of all the people, not a government from a political party that in a leadership race in the Province of Saskatchewan can't even field one farmer as a candidate for its leadership. A broadly based party, Mr. Speaker? Nonsense, stuff and nonsense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to a . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — I wish the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) and the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) — I think they are very good friends of mine — and I wish them well. But you know they need to be delivered more from their friends than they do from their enemies because it is very interesting what some of their friends have said about them. First of all the Member for Riversdale, he has a very good friend apparently who is the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer). The Member for Kelsey had a Press conference of sorts on the 21st of May back in Saskatoon. Well the headline is "Candidates urged to take firm stands." I'm quoting now:

NDP agricultural critic, Jack Messer, Wednesday expressed concern that neither the two Provincial NDP leadership candidates, A.E. Blakeney of Regina nor Roy Romanow of Saskatoon has taken a stand on the province's depressed farming economy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — Then he goes on and he said:

**June 29, 1970**

Because of the attempts to gain his support Mr. Messer said it was obvious that both candidates are having some trouble in the country . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:**

but said he would not announce his support until early June.

And then he goes on to say:

But whoever I line my support with there is a very good chance that he will end up with the leadership. Mr. Messer predicted because of the large percentage of rural delegates, — both Mr. Romanow and Mr. Blakeney are lawyers — in the NDP with mostly rural members there is a tendency to associate the leader with farm backgrounds.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — Still quoting Mr. Messer:

He said once his decision was made he would start pounding the farm country just as strongly as the candidate he supported.

Then he went on to say and I hope you don't have to eat these words. He said:

However, decisions to back the wrong candidate would prove most embarrassing to myself.

Here is what some of the other Members of your party . . . You know it is doom and gloom. We will get to Henry in a minute. But you know the Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) — he is a little nervous. I don't know whether he has decided who he is going to vote for but anyway before he went to B.C. he made an announcement up in Prince Albert and he said:

Berezowsky predicts NDP will lose unless Conservatives and Liberals back NDP.

I guess that is why he went to the Coast. He said he figured the jig was up.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — Then we have a statement here, May 25, the Regina Leader Post:

Baker feels he has farm belt appeal.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — In a Leader Post interview Friday the Mayor considered the chances of the two announced candidates, Allan Blakeney and Roy Romanow. "Both are urban men," he said, indicating that he was receiving many requests to run from the farm population. "A lot of things can happen in the next few weeks." They sure



did. "A lot of things can happen in the next few weeks which would make a considerable difference," the Mayor said, adding that he had a farm background which would appeal to the rural areas of the province. He said he felt that Mr. Romanow was hurting himself by running and would be hurting himself even if he did get elected as Provincial Leader. "You must remember it has to be someone who can take on Ross Thatcher on his own terms," the Mayor said.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — And then the Member for Regina North East and the newly nominated Member for Regina North East, Mr. Smishek, had a statement to make on Thursday, May 28, in the Regina Leader Post. He criticized the two announced leadership candidates, Roy Romanow and Allan Blakeney, saying, that "They have not identified the issues facing the people." Mr. Smishek said, "It appeared to him after reading news reports the declared candidates have dealt only with side issues saying there were many new problems." Then of course my old friend and my predecessor in this office, Mr. R.A. Walker, got into the act on Tuesday, June 2. Well, he said two or three things about Mr. Currie, the President of the Saskatchewan NDP. He said:

Bev Currie had issued a policy statement advocating nationalizing the farmer and making share croppers out of the farmers in view of an impending election. It made New Democratic MLAs angry that they would have to explain to thousands of farmers that Currie was speaking contrary to party policies.

No wonder they haven't got anybody running from the farm wing of the party.

One other little touch by a chap by the name of John Wornock who I guess is a strong NDPer and I think perhaps a Waffler. He has an article in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, Tuesday, June 16. This is what he says:

How will the farmers and those trying to live in the small towns dependent on agriculture react to the same old agriculture policies by the NDP. An indication can be seen by the reaction of the 7,000 members of the National Farmers' Union who gathered in Regina not too long ago. While the news media did not generally report it those of us who were there were surprised when the farmers loudly booed references to Roy Romanow, Jack Messer and the agricultural policy put forth by the NDP in the Saskatchewan Legislature at the last session. To the desperate farmer these tired old approaches are simply going to prove inadequate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think from these quotations, plus one or two others that I would just like to mention in passing — a resolution passed by the NDP organization in Saskatoon University constituency.

The resolution which saw only one NDP card-carrying member vote against it said, 'In the future a New Democratic Government will undertake public development of all natural resources on a rational basis within a general long-range economic plan for the total development of the province.'

That is what Mr. Walker was talking about, making share croppers out of the farmers. Now one other quotation and we wonder why they don't have much support from farmers or businessmen.

Workers' control of business urged.

Here are some resolutions passed by the Nutana South constituency organization to be sent to the Convention apparently. Here is what they want to do. A resolution moved by a party member, it said:

Socialism must include social ownership of the major production apparatuses of society and control by workers over the direction and operation of enterprises. Called also for a ban on the use of injunctions against labor unions in industrial disputes, legislation granting unions access to all company information and policy on matters of manpower, profits, investment, product research, corporate structure.

Here is a dandy.

The establishment of a 30-hour work week at 40 hours' pay.

This is the kind of incredible resolutions that apparently you are going to be discussing at your Convention and I hope you have a good convention but you wonder why there is a credibility gap between the people in the rural areas in this province and your party at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes I would like to turn to a detailed consideration of the principles which are involved in the Bill before us.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — First of all, the scope of The Essential Services Emergency Act, 1966 is widened to give the Cabinet power to extend the emergency procedures of that Act to labor disputes involving employees engaged in the provision of construction services in the province or in any area of the province.

Secondly, construction services are described by a new definition which is quite precise and is clearly restricted to the building trades. Highway construction for example would not be covered by the Bill. The definition is restrictive because we want these emergency procedures confined to the area of trouble, the area which is seriously affecting the economic welfare of our province.

Third, because this is emergency legislation and because it is designed to re-energize and revitalize our economy at a vital time, the Bill before you when passed will not become a permanent part of The Essential Services Emergency Act. I would direct Members' attention to Section 8 of the Bill. Under Section 8 it is clearly stated that the provisions of this Bill will expire and no longer exist on July 1, 1973, three years from now.

Mr. Speaker, we have an amendment and I expect we may have other amendments which may talk about the duration of the Bill. It has been suggested to me that perhaps some Member might move an amendment involving 30 days. I am afraid, however, that such

a short period of time would not be realistic. Mr. Speaker, this industry, the construction industry, not just in Saskatchewan but in all of Canada is in turmoil. The Province of Ontario has found it necessary to introduce special legislation to deal with the construction industry. Last year the Quebec Legislature passed a special Act known as the Construction Industry Labor Relations Act. Again a special Act for the construction industry. It has got some interesting sections. I make no arguments for or against this legislation or any particular section thereof except to repeat the observation that at least two of the Legislatures of Canada other than ours have deemed it necessary to pass special legislation in an attempt to stabilize this industry. Mr. Speaker, the plumbers and the electricians in our province have now been on strike between two and three months. Most of the other constructions trades are working on expired contracts. This turmoil and this instability have been building up and I don't think that stability and peace will return in days or months. Hence, we are suggesting a period of three years as being a reasonably realistic time.

Next, before the emergency procedures of the Act can be made to apply to the building trades, the Lieutenant Governor in Council must be of the opinion that the economic welfare of the province or any area thereof could be in serious jeopardy. In this connection it is interesting to note the action taken by Alberta at the last session of their Legislature. Before then, Mr. Speaker, they had in their Alberta labor Act a section similar to our 1966 Essential Services Act restricted to water, heat, electricity or gas workers and hospital workers. But at the last session they amended quite significantly this legislation. They extended the scope of this Act to include a situation where extreme privation or human suffering has been caused by any stoppage of services or work over an extended period of time. This means that in Alberta a Cabinet by Order in Council without calling the Legislature can stop any strike in any field and enforce compulsory binding arbitration, be it teachers or anybody else. Then they put another new section in the Act, Mr. Speaker, which sets up a public emergency tribunal. The Cabinet can refer these disputes to a tribunal or court to have three or more members with the power to impose compulsory binding arbitration. In Alberta, Mr. Speaker, who appoints this Board? Do the parties have the right to appoint a member each with the Government appointing the third arbitrator? No, Mr. Speaker, the Minister, the Minister of Labour in the Alberta Legislature appoints all members of this Board that will have the power to impose compulsory binding arbitration. No requirement even for the chairman to be an impartial judge as in our Act. Mr. Speaker, the procedures under Bill 2 are fair. They provide for all interest to be represented, they provide for an impartial judge as chairman and I invite any Hon. Member opposite to stand in his place and say that any one of our judges in this province will not render a fair, honest and unbiased decision in the matters referred to him. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that those who impugn the honesty and integrity of our judges don't want justice. Rather they fear justice.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — Our 1966 Act has been amended to provide for consolidation of the arbitration procedures where two or more labor disputes are involved. It has been drawn to our attention that in the present plumbing disputes for example, 30 or 40 separate contracts

exist, each with a separate employer and involving four separate locals of the plumbers' union. Surely it makes sense, Mr. Speaker, to provide machinery for the consolidation of these disputes and this is what new Section 3, subsection (2) and a new Section 4(a) try to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to enumerate what I conceive to be the basic principles of the Bill before us. I am sure that as the debate progresses we will see lots of red herrings, lots of amendments, sub-amendments, talk about freedom and slavery — and we have already heard about slavery, everybody is against slavery of course. Economic slavery can come from irresponsible employers but it can also come from irresponsible labor bosses.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this Bill will emancipate the construction workers of Saskatchewan. It will free them from the excesses of either the employers or the union bosses. It will get them back to work at once at a fair wage and under fair working conditions. Wages and conditions if not agreed on by management and labor will in the final analysis be fixed by an impartial judge free of bias on either side, Mr. Speaker, this Bill will do something else. It will get our economy rolling again. Our carpenters, our bricklayers, our general laborers will have jobs to go to. Our businessmen will be back in business again. Mr. Speaker, no segment of our economy can be allowed to paralyze our economy. The passage of this Bill will remove that paralysis and get us back into high gear again in the Province of Saskatchewan. I urge all Members to support the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this what I call evil Bill, and for the amendment, and against a Bill that should never have been brought in, in a session of the Legislature, that should never have been called, at least until all other avenues of negotiation and conciliation have been tried. Before getting into my main address I want to answer some of the remarks of the different Members across the way who have spoken. I want to assure the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) — he talked about domination of big labor — I can assure you that I am not dominated by anybody but my own executive and my own executive is about 85 per cent farmers. I have discussed this legislation with them and I was instructed to vote against it. I have no worry about facing the stand that I take in this House in my constituency, either with my executive or any of the voters of that constituency and I am quite prepared to appear on any platform anywhere in my constituency with anybody that the Government may choose and I will debate the issue with them. I'm not scared of coming out on top. It is a strange thing that the Attorney General . . . I must say I was a little disappointed with him today, he is generally much better than what he is today. He spent most of his time talking of other provinces of the Dominion. He went all the way, I believe, from Ontario to B.C. I really am surprised. I didn't think the Attorney General would ever become that naive as to believe that in this just society that he is talking about that we are really going to get justice. I'm sure that he doesn't really believe that. He spent a lot of time reading clippings and spent very little time on the Bill.

Coming to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) I couldn't

help but think when I listened to him what an object apology for a failure. The whole tone and the whole speech was apology. He was apologizing for not having been successful. One thing that he mentioned — I will withdraw if he didn't say it — but I understood him to say that the negotiators should have the power to accept proposals without having to go back to membership. Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, I have heard him so many times say — and I heard it said a few moments ago by the Attorney General — that the membership unions had no rights and that it was the unions' big bosses, to use their terms, who were making the decisions. This certainly proves the statement wrong because he complains that the negotiators had no power to accept. After all unions, like most of our other organizations in this country are democratic organizations, with the officials responsible to the membership. Then he went on and said that the Government in no way was trying to destroy free collective bargaining. Yet, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, your Premier orders no more than 6 per cent of an increase. If that is not an interference with collective bargaining I would like to know what is.

In my opinion there is only one reason why the Premier has called this session for today. He could have called it a month ago, he could have called it two weeks ago or a week ago but he didn't. Why? The reason is very clear and obvious and I've had hundreds of people comment to me in the last week as to why he did it. The reason is that he was worrying about the publicity that the leadership convention of our party was getting.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MEAKES:** — Knowing the Premier as I do I know he always worries about the publicity end of things. He hoped to get the attention of our convention by stirring up this paper bag issue, blowing it up and letting it go bang. Mr. Premier, I suggest, it is going really in the end to blow up in your face. In the last two weeks or so I have been in many parts of the province. Wherever I went I have run into old-time Liberals and they are fed up to their teeth with this Government, the Ottawa Government and Liberals in general.

The Premier calls this session and I noticed the Attorney General gave the same reason for doing so, that the construction workers' strike is destroying the Saskatchewan economy. The people of this province know different. They know what has put this province in the worst financial crisis since the 1930s. They know that a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan and a Liberal Government in Ottawa are completely destroying the whole economy of this province. They know that Liberal policies over the last 10 years, finalized by Operation LIFT, are going to drive tens of thousands of farmers off the land in the next two or three years. And here the Premier tries to throw the blame on a few thousand construction workers. I say how callous can you be, Sir, both in your actions and your statements.

No, Mr. Premier, you know different. You know that the real reasons for the economic slump in this province are the non-sales of farm products and the simple fact that farmers have no money. If these two inept Liberal Governments would do something about that the Premier wouldn't have to worry about the economy of this province. He knows that the farmers' and the laborer's costs have continued to rise year by year, and he also knows, as my hon. colleague from Regina North West said,

**June 29, 1970**

that the great monopoly enterprise profits have risen much faster than wages. He knows that not only farmers and laborers are suffering, but that across this province the small businessmen are being pushed out of business by monopoly enterprise. He knows that all these people have seen their life's work gradually vanishing due to the simple fact that a Liberal Government back in 1947 took off price controls. Ever since that time inflation has crept on us, robbing us year by year, and destroying the values of people's savings. And the Premier says this strike is destroying the economy of our province. I say baloney.

All you have to do is drive through the towns and villages and, yes the cities as well, to see the closed doors, the closed doors of people who have worked hard for years to set up a business, to service the agricultural community. Because of the inept policies of Liberal Governments these doors are closed and most of them have lost their savings. This is the real cause. Let us look at farm income. Cash receipts for 1969 are \$260 million lower than in 1967, the peak year. This represents a 27 per cent decline. In 1967 the cash receipts were \$976 million; in 1968, \$893 million; 1969, \$716 million. These are DBS figures and incidentally in 1970 there will be another large drop. The net income was 37 per cent down over 1966; in 1968 it fell another 16 per cent and last year another 30 per cent. Some quick mathematics will reveal that a farmer who netted \$10,000 in 1966 would, all other things being equal, have netted only \$3,704 in 1967. And the Premier says this strike is crippling the economy. The fact is this Government has done little or nothing except to make the situation worse. The Premier threatened to put off any company contracts if that company settled for any more than 6 per cent. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the shades of Hitler are upon us. Big bully.

The Government a year ago set up a committee to study labor problems in Saskatchewan. In March of this year it presented its report to the Government. And as my Leader sorrowfully pointed out, has the Government accepted any of these proposals of that report? The answer of course is, No. The Government has not only failed in its duties but it seems to me to have deliberately gone out of its way to stir up the pot, bring it to a boil, let it boil over on their stove, and then create a smell. Let us look at some of the clippings which the Premier has had to say over recent months. In the Star Phoenix, 1970, Premier Thatcher said Thursday night:

The Government will not proceed with any new construction projects unless there is an agreement that wage increases will be held to a six per cent yearly maximum. He says the Government will insist on two-year contracts.

In The Leader Post, 1970, the Premier says:

Whether the strikes last a day, a week, a month or a year, the Government will not change its six per cent guideline.

The Leader Post, May 13, 1970:

We plan to cancel all projects in which we are either directly or indirectly involved until such time as the construction unions comply with Government wage increases.

This is the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy).

On May 14, Premier Thatcher met with representatives in the construction industry Wednesday morning.

The Premier said he repeated his warning that contractors settling for more above the six per cent level would not get Government contracts.

Then on June 10, The Leader Post again:

Premier Thatcher Tuesday threatened to call the Legislature into session to bring in legislation if striking construction tradesmen and contractors do not settle their differences soon. Asked if that meant legislation similar to Bill 2 that compulsory arbitration covering essential services, the Premier said, 'More stringent than that.'

Then really the Premier really got into his Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde performance. On June 13, quoting again The Leader Post:

The Provincial Government will take no further action at this time to end the two-month old plumbers' and contractors' strike, Premier Thatcher said. He made the statement after plumbers rejected proposals coming from a day-long meeting Thursday convened by the Government with the plumbers' union and contractors.

In our opinion the fault lies on both sides, Mr. Thatcher told the Press Conference.

Mr. Speaker, all he was doing as usual was trying to land on both sides of the fence. But this is the picture, a picture of dilly dallying until suddenly the Premier calls a special session timed to be just before the New Democratic annual convention. Just a cheap Maclarens Agency stunt, aimed at detracting from the main problems and issues facing the Saskatchewan people, issues like the terrible crisis facing every farmer and businessman in the agricultural industry. This Government knows it is in deep political trouble. It knows that even with the most vicious gerrymandering of constituencies that it can't win an election. So Maclarens is called in to try to sell another phony issue, hoping against hope that this will save their skins. It won't. The people of this province are fed up to their teeth with Liberals, whether they are in Regina or in Ottawa or anywhere else. After all a Liberal is a Liberal whether he is sprayed with rose oil or not. They talk the same and they think the same and they act the same and they even smell the same.

Let me come to the whole principle of what this Government is asking this Legislature to do. I want to make my position and my belief very clear. During the last session on a Resolution moved by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) I spelled out very clearly my beliefs and I now intend to quote that speech again from that debate.

I have spent a whole lifetime fighting for human rights, whether it be the Indians or the Metis or the farmer or the laborer or any other minority group. I spent all my life as a farmer and for 25 years was a member and am still a member of the National Farmers' Union. I say I spent all my life as a farmer except for a period of time in 1948 and 1949 when I was an employee of the International Nickel Company at Sudbury. While I was there I was a member of that union, Mine, Mill and Smelter. I

worked as one of nearly 22,000 employees and I soon began to see the problems of life that faced the working man whether he was in the smelter, as I was, or underground or on the farm. The few months I spent there had a great influence on my life. Here for the first time I saw how the other half of our society lives.

My parents came to Canada from Great Britain, a country where unions first started. Some of my ancestors fought and died to have the right to associate and to control their own destiny. At my father's knee I learned that I must always allow the other person to have those rights which I desired for myself. And 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 a union to protect their own rights was burned into my mind as a child. He had always hoped that the farmers of Western Canada would learn the need of really unionizing as well. He was a man who taught me at an early age to be ready to not only fight for my own rights but that it was just as important to fight for the rights of others.

The Member for Regina North West has already quoted Abraham Lincoln who said, 'The only difference between a free man and a slave is a free man may withhold his labor!'

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to look at this Bill from the premise and the position that I learned as a child. Having said this I certainly am not in favor of or in agreement at all times with the actions of some unions. They like me have a responsibility to society and I 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 a critical time because of the actions of unions. I was as mad as anyone else. And at time like this I wonder about the answer to strikes.

Through the years people have criticized international unions. 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.

One of the lessons, Mr. Speaker, that I learned in Sudbury is that no worker or no union wants to strike. The strike weapon is only the last resort. It is only the lever which the worker can use to better himself. No worker wants to go out on the picket line for one-third of his pay or less. No worker wants to see the gaunt faces of his wife and his children. He would much rather settle than to cease to work.

My mind goes back to many of the talks I had with older members, workers at Sudbury and their stories of conditions of work prior to the union, the stories of intimidation, of persecution, working conditions, firings which preceded the forming of the unions. Whenever a strike occurs, two things have happened. First the union has rejected an employer's offer and secondly the company has rejected a union offer. Actually both sides have refused an offer. To me it can well be blamed on both sides.

I want to make it clear that I believe there are times in essential services when it becomes necessary for the Government to act for the interest of the third party, the ordinary citizen.



I think of a case back quite a number of years ago in this province when electrical workers talked about going on strike in February. This would have frozen thousands of homes. If they had done I think the Government would have certainly been within its power and its rights to have called a session together to deal with it. But it seems to me that each situation is different and requires a different solution.

I believe it was the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) or the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), I forget which, who referred to Sweden. Now there is really a marvelous record in Sweden with regard to strikes. Their record of non-strikes is beyond compare anywhere in the Western world. There is no compulsory bargaining in Sweden as I understand it. The number of man-days lost through strikes has dropped from 11,311,000 hours in 1945 to 4,200 hours in 1963. Certainly any labor 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 labor negotiations nor indeed do I understand the problems of labor negotiations, arbitrations, etc. but from what little information I have gathered I understand there is no such thing in Sweden as compulsory arbitration. I understand they have some type of labor court. I know very little about this but again I say that with a record like Sweden we in Canada and in Saskatchewan should be looking forward to such a program as industrial peace.

Because, Mr. Speaker, I think this Government hasn't done all it might have done in trying to negotiate this strike, I feel compelled to vote against the Bill and vote for the amendment. I listened carefully to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), to the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and they seemed to imply that they had done everything possible. If they had just followed the record of the Federal Minister of Labour, who has settled different strikes by appointing a real independent arbitrator, such as Goldenberg, and many others, if my friend across the way would listen to the philosophy and the speech and the words of the Minister of Labour for Canada I am sure this strike could have been settled without calling this useless and bad session of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons I am proud to vote for the amendment and against the Bill No. 2.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park University):** — Mr. Speaker, when we consider the situation we are facing today in this dispute between labor and management, we must look primarily at the very drastic effect that this dispute is having on the economy of the Province of Saskatchewan. We must consider the responsibilities and behavior of both management and labor and in doing this bring into focus the responsibility of this Government to all of the people it serves, not just the very small number directly involved who are causing a very severe situation indeed.

Our construction industry under the best of conditions is a seasonal industry and now to see it grind to a halt at the essential part of the season is simply a tragedy. The impact of this shutdown cannot be fully realized at this time, but our

people will more likely suffer the full result during the coming winter and no one needs a crystal ball to forecast what the condition of our economy will be at that time, if something isn't done now to get the construction industry moving. Because this Government is doing something about the very grave situation in the interest of all of our people it is completely unfair and unreasonable to claim that this Government is acting against labor. There is no question about it, a great many of our construction workers are in favor of the kind of action that will allow them to go back to work and they know that this Government is not anti-labor.

Let us consider the behavior of both management and labor in order to appreciate better the action that we as a Government are taking. Management is responsible in a very major way for the troubles that have developed. In spite of the fact that we have received continuous warnings and reminders of the dangers of inflation, business has not properly heeded these warnings. Wage negotiations as far as management is concerned over the past years have simply followed the line of least resistance. To set guidelines in the past few years has simply been an exercise in futility. In many cases management has agreed to wage rates of 25 to 30 per cent without any real effort to hold the line, and in many cases the fringe benefits agreed to have been equal or close to equal to the wage increases. We have examples where after negotiating a two-year contract a trade finds after one year it is out of step with other trades and seeks adjustments in their agreed rates. The mere suggestion of a strike has caused management to accede. This kind of procedure has been relatively simple. Then these costs have been passed on to the consumer as if there could never be an end result, so that if an economic crisis should come they would somehow not have to share the responsibility. Well now we are facing this crisis and business and management must accept the guidelines set out by the Economic Council or face more severe consequences than ever. Even though businesses may now realize their responsibility and are prepared to face it, they must still face the fact that they are responsible in large measure for today's crisis because of their lack of concern in the past.

Even now we are witnessing isolated cases. We have a situation where, became some plumbers vote one way they can work, and if they vote another they cannot, and in the case of at least one mechanical contractor, they have agreed to pay whatever is agreed to in the end as long as their men keep working and the strike applies only to others. There are the kind of people who expect the Government to have all the answers, who are satisfied to see the economy choked to death without any real concern for responsibility on their part. There should be no misunderstanding that indicates that this Government is acting on behalf of any one group in this dispute, and certainly there should be no way that business and management should look sanctimonious in the situation that we are facing in the construction industry today.

Then what about the attitude of labor? Surely no one could be so naive as to claim that the average construction mechanic does not understand that we are facing a crisis in Saskatchewan, but the member of a union is bound to abide by the rules and decisions of his organization. Many plumbers and steamfitters have voted to go back to work but they are governed by the dictates of their organizers, and I am referring now to the labor organizers above the level of the local business agent. It is a

pet topic of the NDP to speak about and to condemn what they call the American domination of Canadian business. Let the NDP now give a treatise on the domination of the Canadian building trades by American-controlled unions. Let the NDP tell us now of the literally millions of dollars that are being taken out of Canada by American-dominated and controlled unions.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Come on, Jeff, you know it is not true.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Come on stand up and say what you have to say and sit down.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You are making . . .

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — What did you say? I didn't hear what you had to say. I know it doesn't amount to a doggone thing but you have to be stupid enough to stick your neck out at the wrong time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — This happens to be a very serious thing that we are facing and we have for some reason to get some nut sitting over there squawking like a babbling idiot. If you would be good enough, Mr. Speaker, to let me continue.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You are making a joke of yourself.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — What did you say?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You are making a joke of it.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Let the NDP explain the coercion of Canadian craftsmen by the American labor bosses from the city of Chicago. Let the NDP explain how they favor and condone this American domination of the economy of Saskatchewan. How do they pretend to be the friend of labor when they condone this impossible situation? The Saskatchewan tradesmen are . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Get the Mafia . . .

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — That's a bright remark from you. That's a real dandy. I should get you a medal.

The Saskatchewan tradesmen are aware of this unholy situation and surely the answer is in their own hands, but in the meantime these American union bosses simply ignore the economic problems we face and are prepared to suck every last drop of blood from our economy with a total disregard for what happens to our people as a result. These people are completely ruthless and have no concern whatever for the welfare of Saskatchewan or the people in it. I think it is high time they stayed out of our country and let our own unions run their own business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with our whole economy suffering more and more, with this shut-down spreading more and more and each day

having a direct effect on an alarmingly increasing number of people in all parts of our society, surely this Government is to be commended to stepping into the picture and doing something positive for the good of all concerned. When we think of the claims we make for the superior intelligence of our society, we should certainly hang our heads in shame when we realize that we must still depend on such an archaic weapon as the strike for the settlement of the differences between management and labor. No one gains from this kind of strike atmosphere that is facing us today, where no sooner one trade settles than another follows with its strike and in each case the strike has an ever increasing effect on our whole economy.

Our people are suffering enough without the complete shutdown of the construction industry. We are not questioning a man's right to strike, we are questioning the absurdity of standing idly by as helpless witnesses to the destruction of our livelihood as a society. There is no question about the fact that it is our responsibility in this crisis to call a halt to the ridiculous situation that has taken place in our society. I will be pleased to vote for the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):** — It was back in the year of 1966, I believe, when we who were Members of this Legislature were called into session and to debate after a Bill known as Bill 2 was introduced, a Bill better known as The Essential Services Emergency Act. This Bill was, when it became law, a measure to force the Saskatchewan Power employees back to work without providing them with other suggested alternatives, which a truly democratic government should have done. Today we are back here in this same Chamber again being faced with a very similar occasion. Much the same Bill again introduced and only covering another group of people, all those who are connected with construction work. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who will be the next group to fall under the hammer or to be taken within the clenched fist of our Premier and have many of their alternatives and their liberties taken from them? I believe that it was Abraham Lincoln who said the only difference between a free man and a slave is that a free man may withhold his labor. When and if this Bill is passed, I believe many of our people will cease to become free. This, Mr. Speaker, is my argument against the implementation for the passing of this Bill. If there were no alternatives to offer it would be a much different situation but there are alternatives and many have been given by previous speakers. During the 1966 session two of my colleagues, the Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) and the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) moved an amendment to the Bill. This amendment would have had the same effect in relation to the problem as had Bill 2. It would have restored essential services. This would have been guaranteed but along with this the strike would have been ended and the dispute settled. The amendment had it been passed would have provided impartiality and would have eliminated this massive retaliation as a weapon.

You know, Mr. Speaker, people are human beings and want to be treated as such. They want to be a part of something and not just another cog in the wheel with no say in the manner in which the wheel is turned. They believe that only if they are a cog in a wheel or even if they are only one group in a construction crew, without them the desired results cannot be obtained. So they wish to deal with the problem both constructively and collectively and if this is done wheels of our economy will start

to roll and harmony will prevail. If this problem is not dealt with in this light I am afraid the situation will represent a serious loss of the democratic freedom for the worker and this I maintain he has a right to expect and a right to have, and the passing of this Bill certainly deprives him of this right.

All political movements are efforts to redistribute power. That is all politics can do. It can't create wealth or bestow happiness. It can, however, grant to people and institutions the power to decide public issues that can affect our economic welfare, the physical setting of our lives and even our personal contentment. The character of men chosen to hold office, the nature of the office and the limits placed on the range of the office holder's public actions very often determine the substance of those decisions. That is why I think politics is important. The issue of power, who shall have it and how it shall be exercised is the overwhelming political issue of modern times. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is far more than a political issue, it penetrates our social, our economic and our personal life. To me it would be very hard to overstate the extent of which the malice of powerlessness has eaten its way into our society today, evoking an aimless unease, a frustration and a fury. Many of our labor force today, Mr. Speaker, commute to a job that may be liked or may be even hated, but that they are most probably indifferent to, indifferent not to the income or status it provides, but indifferent to the product of its labor. It is the job that counts. Not the number of sinks or other plumbing necessities that he installs that really matters. I think he would be among a minority if he felt that his work needed improving indifference to the light of his country or that of his neighbors. At home he can either sit amidst some recent purchases, perhaps he can get in this car, drive to visit some friends, there is probably no place for him to talk, very often no neighborhood gathering place where he can meet with friends where he can discuss the day's events and share in satisfaction and concerns of the community. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is this increasingly atomized and insulated existence that we have created with our wealth. The unexciting tone of one's private life is heightened by growing remoteness of public life. The air around him becomes poisoned. Parkland disappears under relentless bulldozers. Traffic stalls and jams. Airplanes cannot land and even his own streets are unsafe and increasingly streaked with terror. He has no sense that there is anything that he can do to arrest the time. He does not know how to blame or who to blame. Somehow the crucial aspects of his environment seem in the grip of forces that are too huge and impersonal to attack. This sense of powerlessness is now being aggravated again if this Bill is passed in this special session. Individuals have a fundamental, instinctive need for a degree of personal mastery over their lives and their environment. If the quality of individual life were being steadily raised we would be less concerned that we had little share in the process. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case. The desire to increase our national wealth and distribute it more broadly, a desire that was idealistic in origin and welcome in its consequences, led us to create machinery for both stimulating and regulating the economy. The use of power was judged in terms of economic growth which meant the construction, technology and expansion were made into self-sufficient virtues. I am afraid if this Bill is passed in its present form a greater measure of powerlessness will be imposed on our society. We are like boats tied to a river bank, Mr. Speaker, with the rapid waters consequently seething beneath us while rope after rope breaks away. It is now commonplace to

observe the weakening of the ties of family and community. However, it is not merely that we are being deprived of important values because these institutions gave us a resting place, an association within which we could have some secure sense of our own value and place regardless of our fate in the world outside.

I cannot overemphasize, Mr. Speaker, that people today desire more than ever before the freedom to share in decisions and causes, a desire that, when this Bill becomes law, will be greatly eliminated. We have always placed certain abstract values, those which cannot be measured or weighed above economic, logic or physical tangible goals. We could add many to this list, the equality of opportunity, freedom to develop individual talent, but perhaps more important the individual must have the freedom to share in those public decisions which affect his private life beyond merely casting a vote in periodic elections. Time and time again we have heard the phrase, freedom of choice, repeated. I am afraid that for all the talk about our permissive society that freedom has steadily narrowed and the implementation of this Bill is a very good example.

I urge the Government to take a second look at compulsory measures. Let's take a step toward creating a more human environment. Not only is it within our power to create those possibilities but it is probably a more practical course than our present on-thinking and hopelessly scattered mixture of Government programs and of private enterprises. If Bill 2 becomes law in its new form, Mr. Speaker, it means compulsory arbitration. Compulsory arbitration merely papers over the real questions that gave rise to dispute in the first place. It will not settle the dispute. It will only provide reason for greater retaliation. I firmly believe that, had measures been taken by the Government to provide a competent and adequately staffed conciliation service, there would not be any necessity of convening here today in this Legislature at this time. We have had ample proof before us supporting the fact that many of the strikes that take place could have been eliminated if competent conciliators were called into the dispute before it was too late. After some time of review I am convinced there is no substitute for free collective bargaining. It is the only process in which democratic principles can be properly exercised and when an agreement will prove satisfactory and where harmony will prevail with all parties concerned. When the time arises or the day comes when any government can step in and negate one of its laws by a mere stroke of the pen as it is doing so now, what proof have we, Mr. Speaker, that sometime in the future years another right will not be taken from us? This must not be until every other measure has proven a failure and every consideration completely exhausted. I urge the Members to defeat this Bill for the reasons that I have tried to place before you and to support the resolution which my colleague and Leader of our party from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) has introduced as an alternative. If I might be a little personal, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in our family there are three girls. One has her teacher's degree or certificate; another one her secretarial certificate; another one is a music teacher. They are happily married to a doctor, a steel construction worker, and a clerk in a men's clothing store. And I, Mr. Speaker, as you know have been a farmer all my life. Any government that will introduce measures or Bills such as Bill 2 which will in effect will drive a wedge deeper and deeper between these people as well as many other professions, I am afraid I cannot support because there are other alternatives open to this

Government which if followed out would bring forth a united effort, creating a human environment where the wheels of our economy would once again start rolling.

I will support the amendment, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. R. HEGGIE (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, this Assembly has been called into session to deal with a very important public issue. I feel it my duty to speak on behalf of the Government because the near shut-down of all construction work in Saskatchewan is a grave emergency for the people of this province.

On my trip to Regina this morning I saw highway work in progress almost the whole length of No. 11. How proud it makes one feel to see men and machines at work on a constructive project that is benefiting the people of this province. It literally makes me sick to see these beautiful summer days slipping by and almost no construction work in progress whatsoever. We have a short enough summer season as it is without frittering it away by prolonged strikes. Is this emergency session in accord with public demand? I say emphatically it is. I have not met anyone, be he farmer, businessman, or worker who is against the Government's proposed emergency measures. Most of them in the last month have told me that the Government ought to have taken action long ago. The people of Saskatchewan are sick and tired of this strike and for that matter all strikes. What about the farmers? They are the eventual losers in strikes in industry, whether it is in construction, the railroads, among the grainhandlers or on the Seaway. Everything adds to the costs of what the farmer has to buy in an inflationary market and at a time when the grain markets are restricted. What about the workers? It is the workers who suffer the most in a prolonged strike. The gains they make are eaten up by the lost time. It usually takes a worker two years to recover his wage losses during a prolonged strike. Every prolonged strike goes right to the root of productivity and job opportunities in business and industry. Thousands of students this year are begging for jobs and yet the construction industry where these jobs are available is practically shut down because of the plumbers' strike. When oh when will workers realize that productivity is the key to high wages and a fair share of the good things of life. Japan is a living example of a nation putting productivity over security and social welfare.

We hear much about the right to strike. What about the right to work? The Government will be criticized that this is dictatorial legislation and that the heavy hand of government is picking on one segment of the whole labor force. What about the rights of the other people, the other workers who want to work? Should they be victimized because one segment of the labor force wants to strike? I say, No. The rights of all workers transcend the privileges of the trade union bosses whose self-interest appears to be the big factor in non-settlement of strikes. Will this legislation be passed? I think it will. Will this legislation merit public support? I think it will. If the small group of protesters who were outside the Legislative Building this morning is any measure of the situation, I venture to say that the sum total of all the opponents of this Bill is present in the galleries. The rest of the people of Saskatchewan are

busy trying to make a living and doing their own thing. The small crowd outside attests to the disfavor of this prolonged strike. If there is a suggestion of coercion in this Bill, it is only the protection of the public welfare. There will be compulsory binding arbitration under the chairmanship of a judge to deal with the equity of the dispute. I say let's pass this Bill and get on with the job of building Saskatchewan.

Now I listened to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in his long and rambling speech this morning on the economic situation. His attendant remedies were in the typical fashion of the woolly headed economic thinking of the NDP. If this treatise on economic problems is any indication of party policy to be hammered out at the forthcoming convention, then the NDP will be out of office for a long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, the public is fed up with strikes and I think the Government is taking the right action in assuming the responsibility to get the construction industry back into production. The general public feels the same about the postal strike. It is not up to the Government to keep on playing nursemaid to these industries to bring them together. The Government has given the plumbers and the electricians three months — they were on strike when we were sitting in this Legislature before. All they are doing is frittering away the good summer weather and holding up the right of other people in this province to work. I heartily support the Bill and will vote against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt in the minds of Members of this House as to the reason for the Government calling this Legislature together, I think the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) removed all doubt when he spoke in this debate a few minutes ago. The Attorney General devoted almost all of his address to a condemnation of labor and an attempt, I believe, to blame labor for all of Saskatchewan's economic woes. And he concluded that the passage of the legislation that is before us would get the wheels of industry turning again and that our economic problems would thus be solved. We have come to expect better things, I believe, of the Attorney General. We expect a more reasonable and a more rational approach from that learned person than the attempt which he entered into to find someone to blame for the sorry economic mess that this Liberal Government has created here in Saskatchewan. I am saying today, Mr. Speaker, that all the manoeuvring by the Members opposite will not disguise the fact that Saskatchewan is in difficult economic straits and our problems will not be solved by the kind of arbitrary action that is proposed in this Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER:** — Mr. Speaker, when notice was given that this Legislature was to be called together to place more of Saskatchewan's wage and salary earners under The Essential Services Emergency Act, the Premier indicated that he was taking this action, to use his words I believe, "without enthusiasm." I am certain I am incapable of judging the degree of enthusiasm of Members opposite, but I can speak for myself and I am sure for Members on this side of the House when I express keen disappointment and



dismay with the willingness of this Government to place another large group of Saskatchewan tradesmen under the restrictive conditions of a statute which is commonly known across Canada in labor circles as Saskatchewan's nefarious Bill No. 2.

One doesn't need a particularly long memory, Mr. Speaker, to recall the days in Saskatchewan when our record of labor peace was envied by other Canadian provinces. Our record, Mr. Speaker, for time lost as a result of strikes was a mark for other provinces to reach for. Our record was about one-half the time lost, about one-half of the national average with respect to time lost as a result of strikes. Saskatchewan only a few short years ago had a minimum wage that was the best in the whole of Canada. Today our minimum wage is below that of half of the provinces of Canada. Conditions under which a Saskatchewan worker earns his daily bread have declined and the basic rights of wage-earning citizens have been deliberately eroded by this Liberal Government opposite.

Today, Mr. Speaker, after slightly more than six years of Liberal Government here, we are faced with a situation which portrays our province as the backward one in the Canadian community in terms of labor legislation. Restrictive legislation that has no equal in Canada has been introduced in recent months. In essence, Mr. Speaker, the action of this Government in enforcing the provisions of The Trade Union Act extending the scope of The Essential Services Emergency Act will have the effect in essence of rendering the trade union movement impotent in this province.

The inclusion of construction workers under the terms of The Essential Services Emergency Act, Mr. Speaker, makes it clear that there are no workers in this province under Provincial jurisdiction who are immune from the attacks of this Government in its effort to control wages and working conditions of all Saskatchewan's wage earners. If plumbers can be regarded as performing vital and essential services, Mr. Speaker, then it is impossible to think of any classification of employees who will not fit into that broad definition. Using the criterion which has been adopted by this Government, there are very few, if any, of Saskatchewan's 46,000 organized workers who have any right to feel that they will escape the arbitrary intrusion of this Thatcher Government.

The Essential Services Emergency Act has in large measure, Mr. Speaker, nullified the requirement for management to sit down and bargain in good faith with their employees. In a number of instances in our province today, management is blatantly refusing to listen to proposals from workers' representatives, refusing to offer counter proposals, and has given an indication that it is prepared to let its fortunes be decided by a friendly arbitration board which will in some instances have two of its three members chosen by this anti-labor Government of ours.

Management in this province, Mr. Speaker, and in other areas of the country, knows by experience that compulsory arbitration awards have worked to its advantage and against the best interests of workers involved in disputes. Knowing this to be the case, management groups, armed with the kind of legislation that we are discussing today, are content to make little more than a token effort to arrive at an amiable agreement with their employees. Bill 2, Mr. Speaker, has at this point been responsible for frustrating management labor relations and without question has contributed to the length of disputes between labor and

management.

The point of view which I just expressed, Mr. Speaker, is not only my own it is one that is shared by such people as the Federal Minister of Labour, Mr. Bryce Mackasey, who is recorded in Hansard on September 19, 1968, as saying this:

Compulsory arbitration is a dictatorial solution which is really no solution at all. I think that too few people appreciate the collective bargaining process. Too many people fail to distinguish between labor and management in assessing blame for a strike. On those rare occasions when we have found it necessary in this country to introduce ad hoc restrictive labor legislation, that labor legislation inevitably has worked against the best interest of labor and has come down on the side of management.

So said the Hon. Bryce Mackasey only two short years ago.

Well if any Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, doesn't grasp the full import of Mr. Mackasey's declaration, then I invite them to review the terms of the settlement which was arrived at when this Government interceded in a hospital dispute only a few months ago. It will be remembered that an arbitration award delivered a settlement which gave hospital workers a severe financial beating, Mr. Speaker, and left many of them in a position where they would be about as well off on social aid. Saskatchewan hospital workers were and still are at the bottom of the wage scale in Saskatchewan. Bill No. 2 has given the assurance that these employees will remain powerless to improve their economic position. By passing the amendment which is before us today, if we do so, we will be compounding a felony by placing more of Saskatchewan's wage and salary earners in an economic straitjacket.

On other occasions in this House, Mr. Speaker, I drew attention to the fact that even prior to the turn of the century, recognition had been given to the need and to the right of management and labor groups to join together in free collective bargaining. By the year 1900, criminal law recognized the legality of union organizations and the use of the strike and the use of peaceful picketing. It recognized the closed shop as a legitimate object, it gave universal approval to the basic concept that free collective bargaining represented the only civilized way to resolve differences and develop mutual understanding.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, this Government is recommending action which will inspire disobedience to and defiance of the law. If laws are to be honored and to be acknowledged, then they must be just laws. The action contemplated by this Legislature is unfair and unjust; it must be regarded as a step into the deep, dark past. The inclusion of more Saskatchewan workers under the terms of Bill 2 commits an increasing number of our wage earners to a subservient role, I suggest, where their conditions of employment will be determined by people who have shown very little interest or concern for the welfare of working people in days gone by.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be some Members sitting opposite who recognize the fact that this Government is traveling in a direction which is contrary to the best interest of both management and labor groups in the long run. Countries

of Western Europe and the Scandinavian countries in particular have developed, as Members well know, a sophisticated system of labor relations that has led to mutual co-operation and mutual understanding. Their record for labor peace is well known and it need not be repeated here. However, instead of efforts by this Government in that direction, this Administration, Mr. Speaker, seems intent upon a course of action will deepen the rift and increase the tensions between labor and management groups.

One would wonder, Mr. Speaker, just where the Government goes for its advice. Certainly the Federal Minister of Labour can't be regarded as one of the advisors of this Government because Mr. Mackasey says that compulsory arbitration is a dictatorial solution that is really no solution at all. It appears also that this Government has no intention of acknowledging advice which was offered in the report on the Labor Management Committee in the Construction Industry which reported to the Government as late as March of this year. The Committee was established by Order in Council in July of 1968 by this Government and after two years of study this Committee in the final paragraph of that report said, to quote it:

It is our conviction after nearly two years of review that there is no substitute for free collective bargaining. There should be no government compulsion in this process in the construction industry. Government has a role to play but that role, during contract negotiations, is to provide the parties with effective mediation machinery.

Where then does the Government go for advice before embarking on a drastic course of action such as the one that is implied in the Bill before us? Well, judging from past performances, Mr. Speaker, it might be expected that the Premier, the Minister of Public Works and perhaps the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) may have conferred with Mr. Ralph Purdy before the present legislation was drafted. It will be remembered that Mr. Purdy or the association which he represents claimed that it had influenced the Government in the provision of some anti-labor measures which were enshrined into law at another time in this House. It is not beyond belief that similar influences were in the picture in this particular case.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that it really doesn't matter who it was that gave the Government this bad advice because the fact of the matter is that this Government must assume full responsibility for its actions in stripping Saskatchewan workers of their rights. And it has been a steady and a calculated process, Mr. Speaker. I think we all remember earlier amendments to The Trade Union Act which made the certification process in Saskatchewan more difficult, the amendments to The Trade Union Act which made decertification easier. As a result it is infinitely more difficult to form a trade union in Saskatchewan than was the case six short years ago.

In another amendment to The Trade Union Act, this Government provided the so-called 'free speech clause' which in effect provided the employer with the opportunity to threaten or coerce an employee almost at will without fear of having an unfair-labor-practice charge laid against him. Other amendments passed by this Government to The Trade Union Act have weakened the collective bargaining process by excluding greater numbers from the

bargaining unit. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, only a short while ago The Trade Union Act was amended by this Government with the provision of the "hot cargo" provision being added which is now to be found in that Act, which provides a penalty by law, if the employee refuses to take delivery of or refuses to handle goods at a strike-bound plant, if the carrier is not directly connected or concerned with the dispute. This provision makes it an offence if striking employees refuse to become scabs in conflict with their own personal or collective interests.

It would be possible at this time, Mr. Speaker, to continue at some length to enumerate a number of anti-labor measures that have been introduced by this Government. One could mention the fines which have been provided for, fines of up to \$1,000 per day in the event that the Government's God-like edicts are not honored or reference could be made to the inconsistent judgments that the present management-oriented Labour Relations Board has been responsible for in recent years. The anti-labor bias of this Government, Mr. Speaker, has manifested itself in a variety of ways since 1964 and the latest amendment to Bill No. 2 to include construction workers under the terms of that statute is further proof of an unwillingness to use rational 20th century approaches to the labor-management relations field.

My memory takes me back to 1964, Mr. Speaker, and I wish the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) was in his seat because it takes me back to a meeting which the present Minister of Labour addressed at Temple Gardens in Moose Jaw. While he was speaking to a group of organized workers, he attempted to convince that gathering that the newly formed government of which he was a part was really not anti-labor. Several times during his address he said: "By their fruits ye shall know them." This is the Minister of Labour back in 1964. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Well, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan workers have had over six years to make their judgment and it is little wonder that it is next to impossible to find a Liberal among working people no matter where you travel in the province today. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and his Government have written off the possibility of receiving any electoral support from either organized or unorganized workers in the province. Their disappointment and discontent with this present Government is a phenomenon which is general across Saskatchewan. If Members opposite doubt that fact then I suggest that they convince their dear Premier to call a general election in order that they may test their fortunes with the electorate of Saskatchewan.

The late Ramsay McDonald, as Leader of the British Labour Party, once admonished his followers to live up to the laws even though they were bad laws. Ramsay McDonald said at that time and I quote:

Bad laws by their working kill themselves and on their ashes we will grow better laws.

It seems apparent, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is determined to place some more bad laws on Saskatchewan's statute books, but one thing I suggest is certain and that is after the next election we will be building better laws on the ashes of the old.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think all Members will remember something of the

origin of the work stoppage that has been in progress for over two months. It will be remembered that from the beginning the Premier injected himself into the dispute by declaring that the Government would insist upon two-year contracts and that wage increases must be held to a six per cent year increase. The Premier also declared from the sidelines that contractors settling at a figure above the six per cent increase would not get Government contracts.

Mr. Speaker, this performance by the Premier bears a remarkable resemblance to the hospital dispute of only a few months ago when hospital boards and employees were anxious to negotiate a settlement, but the Premier sitting on the sidelines and holding the purse strings dictated policy to the participants. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this represents a strange set of circumstances when a third party is able to completely frustrate both management and employees in the course of honest collective bargaining.

It may not be well known, Mr. Speaker, but on June 10 last, almost three weeks ago the negotiating committee of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters made an offer to management to return to work while negotiations continued. Management at that time refused and so the strike has continued for some time. A copy of the offer which they made, Mr. Speaker, was sent to the Minister of Labour, sent to Mr. Elchyson, the chief conciliation officer, and Mr. Heald and the employers involved. The employers as I suggested earlier rejected the plan and refused to take part until the matter of hiring methods was resolved. I believe it can be seen from this that the workers have indicated their willingness to co-operate in returning to work while negotiations continued.

I believe it can be seen from this that the workers have indicated a willingness to co-operate in return to work while negotiations continued. I believe there is no question with respect to the difficulties which the principles in this dispute are confronted with. I also believe that the matter might very well have been resolved some time ago if the Premier had refrained from shouting ultimatums from the sidelines.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that there is no political party or group of people who are more concerned with the problem of inflation than those in the party that I associate myself with. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it is wholly and totally unrealistic for this Government or any other government to impose an arbitrary 6 per cent guideline on organized labor without regard for runaway increases in other sectors of the economy. It must be remembered that, when a trade union organization signs a two-year contract, that contract remains in effect for two years regardless of arbitrary increases in the cost of consumer goods and the cost of living in respect to the price that organized workers and unorganized workers must pay for the products that they buy. Corporations are not bound in any way to stay within the suggested guidelines.

We in our political party have said repeatedly that inflation must be met head on. This means effective and comprehensive controls at inflation pressure-points, prices, profits and interest rates supplemented by an income policy embracing all incomes, not just those incomes of wage earners.

On numerous occasions we have drawn attention to the

excessive profits which were exposed by the Barber Commission which investigated the price of farm machinery. Similarly excessive profits have been wrung out of sick people in exorbitant profits in the drug industry. We have pointed out that chartered banks enjoyed an increase in their net profit of 26 per cent in 1969, with the Bank of Montreal leading the parade with an increase in its net profits of some 89 per cent. Finance, insurance and real estate profits amounted to \$296 million for the first half of 1969, up by 47 per cent over 1968. Food and beverage manufacturers showed a net profit up \$27 million for the first six months of 1969 compared to the same period of 1968. Steel showed profits up to \$16 million in the first six months of 1969 and still they imposed an additional 6 per cent increase in their prices. For the first six months of this year seven chartered banks show an increase of 27.7 per cent over the profits that they enjoyed the previous year, a year when they enjoyed profits in excess of 26 per cent. The New Democratic Party has been firm and has been consistent with respect to the problem of inflation, Mr. Speaker. It has called upon Provincial and Federal Governments to deal decisively with prices and profits. We have said that this will require mandatory controls. We are convinced that this is the only rational approach to a serious Canadian problem. Certainly, the problem of inflation will not be met by imposing starvation standards on hospital workers or by restricting wage increases for construction workers to six per cent, while allowing corporation profits to rise alarmingly without a murmur of protest from Premier Thatcher or his Government. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it should be evident to the Premier that the \$5 billion, that is to say the \$5,000 million that is being siphoned out of the Canadian economy annually in net profits is a luxury which we as Canadian citizens can no longer afford. To attempt to impose controls on wage earners while ignoring this giant drain on our economy is the greatest folly of them all.

Well, Mr. Speaker, to return more specifically to the problem at hand, that of providing a just and equitable settlement for this current dispute, we on this side of the House must repeat the position which we took when The Essential Services Emergency Act was first passed. It is our contention that legislation should not be allowed to stand on the Statute Books of this Province which may be used as a weapon against workers in the course of collective bargaining. It is our position that Bill 2 should be repealed and that a fresh start should be made in arriving at a settlement to this current problem.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the negotiating team provided the method on June 10 to resolve this problem when they offered to return to work and continue negotiations until a settlement was reached under the terms of the old contract. In providing by legislation the provisions by which this agreement may be arrived at, I believe we have the weapon with which we may counter a problem which we are faced with today.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the action taken by this Government is doing our province irreparable harm. Saskatchewan is becoming recognized across Canada as a tough place to earn a living and a place where collective bargaining is a vanishing thing. Saskatchewan I think Members opposite will know is not a high wage area. Saskatchewan's average weekly wage has fallen behind the rest of Canada. Saskatchewan's average weekly wage has dropped by \$10 since this Government assumed office. In 1963 according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Saskatchewan's

weekly wage was close to the national average. Today, it is more than \$10 a week behind the national average. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics in its annual report on the relative income of persons filing income tax returns by province and by city shows the city of Saskatoon as No. 40 out of a list of 100 Canadian cities listed. Regina is 51st on the list, while my own city, the city of Moose Jaw ranked 91st out of 100 cities listed. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is falling behind and the action contemplated by this Government in calling the session together to restrict an ever increasing number of Saskatchewan wage earners can only aggravate the problem and accelerate the exodus of people from our province. Saskatchewan's population as Members opposite know has now fallen to a figure of 943,000, back to the level where it stood six years ago, indicating an absolute loss of our natural increase over the past six years. Saskatchewan has not seen this kind of a population exodus since the darkest days of the Depression years and it is virtually certain that when the most recent figures are made available, Saskatchewan's population will have shown another very sharp decline.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to suggest that this Administration has lost control and is floundering desperately without knowing how to extricate itself from the mess that it itself has created. Deputy Ministers and other top-level civil servants are fleeing Saskatchewan and leaving this Government service in increasing numbers. All indications point to a critical financial situation when the time arrives to bring down the 1971 budget. This Government, Mr. Speaker, in the action it is taking in calling this special session is playing mean and petty politics with the lives of Saskatchewan workers and their families in an attempt to exhibit a get-tough attitude which it hopes will gain it some political advantage in hard-pressed rural areas of the province. These kind of tactics, Mr. Speaker, are beneath the contempt of all fair-minded Saskatchewan people who expect much better things of government than this Thatcher Administration has delivered. Because this legislation represents a step backwards in labor-management relations and because other more acceptable alternatives are available to this Government, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the Bill on second reading and I will be voting for the amendment.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 22**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Meakes	Baker
Bowerman	Berezowsky	Pepper
Messer	Smishek	Matsalla
Wood	Thibault	Wooff
Blakeney	Whelan	Kwasnica
Davies	Snyder	Kowalchuk
Romanow	Brockelbank	Byers
Dewhurst		

**NAYS — 32**

**Messieurs**

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	Larochelle	Mitchell
Boldt	MacDonald	Gardner
Cameron	Estey	Coupland

Steuart  
Heald  
Guy  
Barrie  
Loken  
MacDougall

Hooker  
Gallagher  
MacLennan  
Heggie  
Breker  
Leith

McPherson  
Charlebois  
Forsyth  
McIvor  
Schmeiser

The debate continues on the motion.

**MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, this afternoon as I listened to the debate and in particular listened to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) I wondered when I had heard more nonsense about the institution of collective bargaining. I was especially surprised at the remarks of the Attorney General and I had also thought that the Minister of Labour might have displayed some element of leadership in the situation that we have now before us but this didn't appear. I had thought that he might have had something to say that was to the point with respect to the report of the Labor-Management Committee on Relations in the Construction Industry. I must say that there is no other way of looking at that report, Mr. Speaker, except to say that any reasonable Government would have followed its directions and would have done that which would have forwarded collective bargaining and won the dispute to the successful conclusion in the plumbers' and electricians' strike. There is no other way to look at it.

The Attorney General this afternoon was talking about Sweden and relations in Sweden. I think the last time the Premier mentioned Sweden was a month or so ago and he was talking about labor courts in the same terms as compulsory arbitration. I think the Minister of Labour should tell the Premier that there is no such thing in Sweden as compulsory arbitration, that in the labor courts that exist in that land are courts of voluntary associations between the employer and the employee. I could only understand the constant references to compulsory arbitration in Sweden as a failure to study even the elementary side of collective bargaining anywhere let alone the country of Sweden. The Attorney General this afternoon was again talking about this being a political strike there being some political imaginations worked up somewhere by the President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and the construction unions so that the full dispute is brought before this Legislature as a result of some evil association with the New Democratic party. How wrong, Mr. Speaker, can anybody be? These happen to be two union organizations to my knowledge that have never taken under-political action at any time and especially in this province. One of them is not even a member of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. Only one or two of the organizations of the other is a member of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. And I think that when the Attorney General tends to resort to this kind of an argument that he should know better.

Mr. Speaker, when Bill 2 was introduced by the present Liberal Government in 1966, we can well recall the rationale which accompanied it. An important part of the Liberal Party argument was that so-called "essential" occupations must be subjected to compulsion to end management-labor disputes. As you may also recall, Sir, at that time, the Members on this side of the House voiced their distrust of Government intentions. They spoke of the Bill as the opening edge of a wedge for the entry of compulsory processes into the whole realm of collective bargaining and industrial relations. Government leaders scoffed and made light



of our fears.

This Bill today, Mr. Speaker, that is before us fulfils in every way the apprehensions that were voiced both inside and outside of this House by people who saw that the Saskatchewan Liberal party was out to chain all wage and salary earners to a system which would see the end of collective bargaining as a legitimate and useful practice; a system which would deny the fruits of true industrial democracy to citizens who form the bulk of our society both here and outside of the province

Once many people were prepared to give the Liberal party the benefit of the doubt. They have now come to realize that pledges of Liberals to use forced arbitration in a very narrow area have been brutally violated — just as have many other promises — like the promise for a public drug plan and 80,000 new jobs in four years! This Bill, Mr. Speaker, amply justifies the public distrust of Liberal intentions and Liberal policy. We have before us legislation that rams another 15,000 to 20,000 workers into the iron maw of compulsion. But more significantly, its very principle presupposes that no occupation or employee in this province is safe from its deadly effect. Declarations of Cabinet spokesmen inside and outside this House leaves no room to doubt, I suggest that this is the kind of course that is contemplated by Saskatchewan Liberals.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, a government which shows this type of disregard for the rights of employees and collective bargaining will not stop before it brings all workers under this shocking legislation. In 1966, I can remember some of the Opposition Members voicing fears that the Bill might be used eventually to prevent a farmers' strike. This as everyone knows is receiving more and more discussion at the present time in farm organizational circles. In view of the steadily tightening stranglehold used by Saskatchewan Liberals in employer-employee disputes, can anyone in this House be bold enough to deny that it will never be used against farmers? Certainly, the Premier's own statements can't be taken as any valid indication. In 1966 he was reported in the September 2nd issue of The Leader Post to have spoken of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in terms of high approbation. It was a "sensible union," he said. This is one of the unions however that today now shares the continuous blame and calumny that are heaped upon employees involved in the current building trades' dispute by the Premier and some of his Cabinet colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, in 1966, those of us on this side of the House constantly drew attention to the one-sided nature of the legislation. It was not simply that the Bill 2 of that day was wrong and bad in principle and its likely results. It was that the Bill we said made the Government judge and jury with respect to the setting up of the compulsory machinery for settlement; that it made the Cabinet the sole judge of what constituted a so-called "emergency" in applying forced arbitration. It was that it provided no appeal whatsoever in the case of punitive fines where individual unionists could be assessed up to \$1,000 per day. It was that it gave the Cabinet — not the Labour Relations Board — unlimited discretion to wipe out the union's right to bargain.

I said, Mr. Speaker, in 1966 that Bill 2 was a grab-bag of the most coercive sections of like statutes in Canada, or North America for that matter, a kind of super-distillation of wrong-headed vindictive legislation of its type. Even the editorial

column of The Leader Post, which could be predictably counted upon to summon up a loyal defense of the Government, voice some extent of worry about the contents of the bill, even proposing that it should be left to gather dust on the shelf. Why, many people asked themselves, were the sweeping powers to control, to break and to cripple unions necessary? And why, in any case, were they vested to such an extent exclusively in the Government? Well, Mr. Speaker, now we know why. The legislation was never intended to be confined to so-called "essential" classes of workers like gas employees. The record shows that the Government intended from the beginning to enlarge the scope of the legislation. The action we see proposed here today is but the fulfilment of another stage of its plans. The final stages are all but declared Liberal policy, and that is the complete negation of the right to strike in any dispute, or the complete negation of that right in any dispute in which the Government wants to exercise its overweening and monstrous powers.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence speaks for itself. The Government has not striven for the improvement of collective bargaining relations in Saskatchewan. It has not followed the convincing series of recommendations made by both the Federal Woods Commission and its own Committee on Labour Relations in the Construction Industry, which by the way has reported just before the Government commenced its attack on construction union employees. No, the Government relies, as I think it has all along intended to rely, not on means to expedite harmony and agreement between the bargaining parties, but on the sterile and the grim and paralyzing hand of compulsion.

Mr. Speaker, what I've said to this point must surely be a damning revelation of the Government's lamentable labor policy, including of course its discriminatory and unjust legal compulsion. But what has taken place recently in the construction picture is much worse. Here we have a Liberal Government obstructing the fair settlement of a dispute between employers and employees, by setting arbitrary, rigid wage limits subsequently harassing and condemning them and their unions, and finally calling the Legislature together to impose the most menacing legislation in its armory of repressive labor law, all to force settlement in a dispute which was in reality sustained and fed by the Government's own autocratic decrees.

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason to believe that left to themselves, the construction employers and employees would, as they have many times done before, have successfully hurdled their differences and would have come to a settlement. But the intervention of the Government's six per cent limit has been the dominant factor in creating the whole basis for the long-lasting dispute we have seen this spring and early summer. Having created a prolonged dispute the Government sat back, sniping at every opportunity over organized labor's alleged excesses, until this month, when it was announced that the forced labor law would be the savior of the province.

Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there have been numerous occasions in the history of Canada where governments have been justifiably assailed for failures or for their biased attitudes in labor disputes. I can think of no other example where a government itself manufactured the ingredients of a dispute so that it would use its own restrictive laws to crush it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government might have the vestige of

a public position, however weak, if it sought to restrain wages in the Saskatchewan construction industry because they were far ahead of those in Alberta, and in Manitoba. Such of course is not true. The rates for building trades' workers in our two sister provinces are considerably in excess of the present Saskatchewan rates. And they would still be ahead by a good margin if the 6 per cent increases were effected. As well, further negotiations in both Manitoba and Alberta will occur before too long and this of course will leave Saskatchewan rates still further behind; the disparity is still greater.

Now the Liberal Government of this province would not dream of trying to peg the price of a beefsteak in Regina below the price of a beefsteak in Winnipeg or Calgary. In fact, it is very apparently not believing that it could try to bring down retail prices anywhere in spite of the evidence of too high retail prices offered by the Batten Commission. But the perverted logic of the Liberal Government doesn't however prevent it from acting to keep Saskatchewan wage rates well below the wage rates of Manitoba and Alberta cities.

When the Government's decree was issued, Mr. Speaker, unemployment scales in Saskatchewan were the highest in the Prairie Provinces. The Government announced with great fanfare at that time a program of the order of \$20 million to remedy matters. The program was not all as I recall it, building construction, but I think it would have been helpful. However, the 6 per cent construction wage deadline, accompanied by threats to contractors everywhere to adhere to it, make even this very modest construction program that was beginning in the province stumble and come to a dead halt. According to the last figures received, jobless people constituted well over 9 per cent of the province's wage and salary earning force. When the Minister of Labour this afternoon attempted to refute this, I must tell him that I am here speaking about the wage and salary earners, I don't know any better figure to state, it certainly is over 9 per cent.

Once more in any case we have a bizarre and unbelievable situation. First, we have the declaration of a rather inadequate Government program to help spark work in the province. Second, hard on the heels of that announcement comes the absolute 6 per cent Government fiat, to perpetuate a management-labor dispute which could have been finally resolved with the sort of Government encouragement and assistance. If the Government cannot be praised, I suggest, for positive leadership, it may have gained the doubtful accolade of being tops where manoeuvring and cunning tactics are concerned. What is the explanation for what it has done? I say, Mr. Speaker, that many an astute observer sees it this way. First, the Government our Liberal Government, decided that an attack on a labor issue was a good one. It would lower the heat of farmer discontent over low farm prices, agricultural troubles and a series of bungling policies that were fostered by a Federal Liberal Government and abetted by the Saskatchewan Government.

Second, it would set up labor as a punching bag and an emotional outlet. Third, it would attempt to saddle working people, and especially their unions, with responsibility for inflation and unemployment.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, it is 5:30, may I call it 5:30.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 o'clock p.m. until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Speaker, when we rose at 5:30 I think I mentioned three reasons why in my opinion that the Government has precipitated the situation that we are now studying in this session. I wanted to say at that point, when I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, that the economic situation in the province long before the advent of any construction labor dispute was appalling and I think that word is a proper one. The poor leadership and the misjudgment on the part of the Liberal Government that led to the cancellation of buildings and construction very much needed last fall, which might I think have arrested the very steady jobless climb of that period. When the relatively small construction program was announced during the last session of the Legislature, the damage had already been done. Builders, contractors had lost confidence, their plans for spring and summer work were at a very, very low ebb indeed, because in this atmosphere this Government's injection of its 6 per cent guideline was an act of cold political expediency and cynical irresponsibility.

The Government wants and I think has tried to convey the impression that because its building program did not go ahead, general unemployment has resulted. Mr. Speaker, even accepting, even excluding, even agreeing that a \$15 million construction program could have been launched by the Government, and I rather question this, in the time that is available, I think it is extremely doubtful if this much could have been spent in a year, and what's remaining of the year. But in any case, only about 10 per cent of the value of a construction building program is bound up in the wages of construction workers. If you assume an average wage for construction workers of \$6,000, and I am inclined to think that is high, a simple division will show you that this would not have accounted for more than the employment of some 250 workers of the many thousands of unemployed that are in the province. I am now talking about a full year. If we look at the current unemployed numbers of say 22,000 workers, this wouldn't be much more than 1 or 1-1/2 percent of the total jobless total. I said that our real unemployed rate is at least 9 per cent. I say this is without regard to the inclusion in the overall employed figures of thousands of other self-employed people like doctors, lawyers and the like. If these people were deleted from the total from which the rate is calculated, the real proportion of unemployed in the population would be startlingly higher than 9 per cent.

Let's turn to the Government's public position in relation to the 6 per cent guidelines. This rests on a quicksand. In the first instance, let's not forget that the squeeze was applied on the poor, literally poor, economically speaking, hospital workers this year. It is calculated that the final increases that were won by these depressed-income employees, some of them would qualify I think it would be agreed for social aid assistance, but this final average increase was less than \$170 a year. Their position has incidentally deteriorated rapidly in relation to the workers in hospitals in other provinces, because once Saskatchewan stood in this relation third highest, in terms of the non-professional hospital workers' earnings. Today, the province ranks sixth or even worse. However, with the use of Bill 2, a settlement was imposed. But hardly had the Legislature prorogued when the Government announced a settlement with the province's doctors that would average according to a spokesman for the Medicare Commission, about \$3,000 annually per physician. Mr. Speaker, I don't say that doctors weren't entitled to some

consideration. But what can we feel about the priorities and integrity of a government that drove hospital workers to strike and a settlement of 5.5 per cent of the amount that it granted the doctors?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. DAVIES:** — What can one say, Mr. Minister of Welfare, about the sense of fairness and humanity of a government that grants increases of \$5.50 for every \$100 that it granted to the high income professionals? What can one say about the sincerity of a government which is avowedly fighting inflation when it uses its powers to hold depressed income workers, whose buying power would actually assist the economy rather than contribute to feeding inflation's fires, to this meagre raise while it granted one that was 18 times greater to medical men in this province?

May I return to the construction workers themselves. I have already said that some 90 per cent of the money paid out for construction costs is not construction workers' wages. The major portion of course has not been made subject to any government deadline whatsoever, be it profits, executive wages, prices of the innumerable articles used in erecting the modern building structure, or anything else connected with it. There has not been the slightest suggestion that prices of construction materials should be subject to investigation, nor has there even been a whisper from the Government about restraining profits of any of the many companies that are concerned to some fixed amount or percentage of invested capital. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Premier has nothing to say by way of a general example of attitude at least about the increase in the operating profit of the Bank of Montreal, just announced a few days ago, up to \$53 million for the first six months of this year, up by 27.6 per cent. Of these really truly inflationary causes it says nothing. It does make some pseudo-militant noises about Saskatchewan people taking executive positions in Saskatchewan banks. While this little byplay goes on, involving a few individuals and nothing very fundamental, there are thousands upon thousands of construction workers who have been forced to leave Saskatchewan and some will never return.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is background for the deplorable changes that we are asked to approve today. To sum everything up, the province has been plunged further into recession and unemployment by the political ambitions, the prejudice and the ineptness of a Liberal administration that used to bugle and trumpet the world about the alleged stagnation which existed under a CCF-NDP Government.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Liberals have been very vocal in accusing others of causing dissension and strife in society. The accusers stand accused today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. DAVIES:** — Ever since the advent of this Liberal Government, a game of divide and rule has been played ad nauseam. It has been used against organized employees, it has been used against public and high school teachers, it has been used against our youth, to name a few. Is it any wonder that Saskatchewan's population is steadily dwindling? The same treatment that has caused so

many of our able public employees to leave Saskatchewan has caused employees in private employment to move on to areas where the wage and salary earners, by far as I have said the largest portion of the population even in agricultural Saskatchewan, are not subject to such continuous fleeing and venomous Government criticism.

Mr. Speaker, if this Government does not cease in its campaign of half-truths and misrepresentations against labor, if it does not permit sane and unobstructed collective bargaining in industry, we'll suffer many more huge losses in trained manpower. Already as I have said, thousands of our able construction workers are engaged elsewhere at wages higher than would have been negotiated in Saskatchewan without the Liberal Government's interference.

What does it cost the public to train a plumber, an electrician, a carpenter or like tradesman? I should guess not less than \$18,000 to \$20,000 easy, plus the many intangible costs of the industry itself. So for every 100 tradesmen who have left this province we have lost at least \$2 million in training and education costs. More important we have lost the high productivity that is associated with today's building tradesmen. I hope no one will smile when I make that statement. Overall, for these reasons, I say that the obstinate irresponsibility of this Government has done the province irreparable economic harm.

Mr. Speaker, the Government Members on your right in pursuing their ruinous course of labor relations endeavor to misrepresent the position of New Democratic Party MLAs as a policy that simply tries and aims at satisfying trade unions. What the Liberal Members of this House and outside of it obstinately refuse to understand is that the NDP policy is based on the best thinking and the most up-to-date information that is available on this subject in Canada today. What Liberals refuse to see also is that their outlook and their program on labor matters is a sowing of the wind to reap the whirlwind. Clearly, they pay no attention whatsoever to prominent people in their own party, whose experience and capacity to absorb some good advice at least has led them to accept an infinitely broader concept of management-labor matters that is current among the Saskatchewan Liberal party. Already comment has been made today about the stand and the attitude of the statements of the Hon. Bryce Mackasey as Federal Labour Minister. My colleague from Moose Jaw referred this afternoon to his statement in which he pointed out that compulsory arbitration is a dictatorial solution that is no solution at all. In June of this year, just a week or so ago as a matter of fact, when speaking before the Industrial Relation Centre of McGill University, he declared and this is an exact quote:

I disagree with legislators in my belief that fundamental individual rights can be eroded or eliminated by jurisprudence. When the day comes that government can eliminate or negate one of its laws by the stroke of a pen . . . what will prevent it, in future years, from negating other fundamental rights, perhaps in the field of religion, for instance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here you have a Liberal holding one of the highest offices in the Federal Cabinet of this country, with access to the best brains and the latest research and information on labor relations, passing out good advice that echoes the kind

of message we have urgently tried to convey to the Premier and his colleagues from this side of the House. I say that nothing could be more illustrative of the single-minded, rightward and downward direction taken by Saskatchewan Liberals in this extremely sensitive and vital area of human relationships than their failure to listen to anyone, even other better informed Liberals.

The Federal Task Force on Labor Relations, that is the Woods Commission, reported last year after more than two years of investigations which took the Commission and its very numerous competent staff to every province in Canada. Now there may be items that are controversial in the Report, there are some that I don't myself concur in. But few if any of the labor management leaders in this country have been critical of the primary propositions that are urged by the Commission. Generally speaking this says that the institution of collective bargaining, including the right to strike is not only a basic right, but is essential for the development and the growth of a democratic country. The Woods Commission, you know, came out with a statement that "there is no viable substitute for collective bargaining in a free society." The Woods Commission absolutely rejected the concept of ongoing forced arbitration as any real solution, recommended in fact the right to strike for public employees. The Commission said as a direct quote again, "We are mindful of the corrosive effects of compulsory arbitration"

Mr. Speaker, I say that the path that the Saskatchewan Liberal party is taking in this Bill is diametrically opposed to the thinking of the Woods Commission, because that concept urged the development of auxiliary methods and tools of research, of fact finding, expanded mediation and some permanent machinery to devise means of resolving disputes. Company seizure, trusteeship, partial operation of firms were only some of the alternatives suggested, but significantly in the whole concept of the Woods Commission, the Government role is seen in the role of an assister, a helper, rather than as a despot, or a policeman in management-labor relations. The Woods Commission also took pains to take issue with those who blame labor as the more or less exclusive agent in creating inflation in Canada. I wish my friend the Premier had read some of this material.

It is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Liberal party has taken an outworn, debilitated, harsh and vindictive position in labor matters that is contrary to the proper, impartial and dispassionate role a government ought to adopt. The Saskatchewan Liberal labor policy is also one that is disparaged and condemned by every authoritative study that has been made by the Federal Task Force on Labour Relations. If it were necessary, the case against the Government's Bill is made devastatingly complete on the record of the findings of its own Committee on Labour Relations in the Construction Industry, already dealt with by some other speakers today. It will be remembered that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) didn't produce copies of this report for Members of the House until after the last session, although a news article analysing it had appeared at least a week before prorogation. I say there is no doubt about two things: first, the Government's own appointed committee respecting the construction industry's labor problems, recommended in a direct and unequivocal fashion that there should be no government compulsion in the bargaining process and that the role of government should be to provide the parties with, in their words, "effective mediation machinery." Second, the Government has by this Bill spurned and cast aside the advice which was the synthesis of a Committee's thinking that was headed by a former

Saskatchewan Deputy Minister of its own appointment after two years of its deliberation.

During the last session, it may be recalled, I asked the Premier if he would appoint an impartial mediator of the stature of Mr. Justice Mervyn Woods to help the parties in the building construction dispute to agreement. You remember that he categorically refused. The suggestion of mediation was also, as I have already said, urged very strongly in the Committee's Report. So it has been likewise entirely ignored by the Premier and his colleagues. I say they have not been interested in settlement so much as they have been interested in lambasting unions daily for their own small political ends, because how else can you explain the situation. The Government has been afraid, I think, to introduce a knowledgeable mediator into the dispute and why? Because that person would have to take account of the Prairie wage comparisons in the construction industry and these facts upon discovery would demolish the whole artificial basis of the Government's 6 per cent wage limits.

The Premier says it's an exercise in futility to talk about mediators. Mediation has never been tried. Instead the whole committed Government machinery has been injected into the situation based on the premise that the 6 per cent guideline was the only acceptable basis on which settlement could be achieved. Is it any wonder that the Government has to this time failed to adopt a mediation basis?

Mr. Speaker, this Government justifies the use of the deadly legislation that we are asked to make even more lethal by the amendments before us on grounds that its purpose is to fight inflation. I have already suggested, I think, that shoving construction workers around, whose wages are about 10 per cent of all construction costs, is not a sound approach when the other approximately 90 per cent of cost is completely ignored. The Government has not stirred a finger to halt higher retail prices nor has it acted to effect the Batten Commission recommendations that tried to do so. And neither has it acted on the Commission's basic proposals for helping the consumers. We know the Government didn't take The Leader Post editorial's suggestion to let its restrictive labor legislation gather dust on the shelf but that's exactly where the Batten Report has lain for more than two years.

The Government seemed obsessed with the earnings of labor. But it made no effort whatsoever to control professional fees or executive salaries. Just on June 4th the Toronto Globe and Mail informed us that the average rise in Canadian executive incomes was 10.1 per cent in 1969 and that ranged everywhere from a \$1250 increase to a \$3800 a year increase. So this Saskatchewan Liberal Government apparently believes that increases of this size and order are alright when they are made for other classes and not for trade unionists.

The Prime Minister, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, also has the habit lately of castigating people who are not the real culprits or authors of an inflationary situation. The other day he was talking to some auto workers in Ontario and he tried to make this point, but he must well know, as Walter Reuther pointed out when he was alive, that auto workers' wages have got nothing to do with the price of today's car. In 1965 when the profit of General Motors was less than it was last year, Reuther made this point, never disputed so far as I know — and I am quoting from a



statement that he made:

The auto industry is one above all others in which prices could and should go down, apart from any effect of the tax cut. The industry is earning far higher than average profits. General Motors, for example, the industry price leader, in 1964 made a profit after taxes of \$1.7 billion. \$1700 million. This represented a return on stockholders' investment of 24.4 per cent, more than double the average return of 12.1 per cent enjoyed by manufacturing corporations.

Mr. Reuther then pointed out that:

General Motors could have cut their wholesale prices by \$100 a car, equivalent in the retail price to about \$140 a car, and its rate of return on investment would then have been 21.6 per cent.

And, Mr. Speaker, what about the outrageous practices of the big farm machine companies as revealed by the Barber Report? Has this Government secured action of the Federal Government to quickly end what has been barefaced, international robbery? No, Mr. Speaker, this Government has been very quiet and very inactive about these matters.

This Government's alleged fight against inflation is a simple sham and a sly snare. It has picked on one group in society and attempted to focus upon them all public discontent with high prices. Construction workers' wages, you know, may be relatively high but so is their productivity. Direct or labor costs in building a home, for example, have declined to about 12 or 13 per cent of all construction costs, some say less. So why have they been singled out?

If this Liberal Government wanted to do something genuine about the high costs of buildings and homes, it has only to look at the recent surveys that deal with this situation and provide the information that we want. Where are the high costs? Well mainly in high land prices, in grossly high interest rates, in speculation. Some other factors. No policy for inflation control in the building field has any validity that does not take account of these important items.

Mr. Speaker, I said that construction workers' hourly earnings are high in relation to those of some others. But let's remember fairly that these are hourly wages. The tradesman who is laid off for a period of two or three months drops from one-sixth or one-quarter of his possible yearly income, say a loss of \$1,000, or \$2,000 a year. And I want to point out that enforced idleness for the construction worker over longer periods than I have suggested in my example is not unusual. Members of this House well know that many, many people who are carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers, other tradesmen in the industry, leave it just to find a steady job at much less pay because in the aggregate they will earn as much or more because the position is year-round, without any layoffs in prospect.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this Bill before us flies in the teeth of all sanity and all logic in employer-employee relations. What are some of the results which have flowed from the policy that brings it before us today, and what will the eventual effects be of its application, if the Government uses its majority, which seems likely, to ram it through the House? Let me just

mention a few: 1. Large-scale unemployment because of the Government's halt on public construction and its insistence that all contractors observe its wage decrees. 2. The loss of millions of dollars in wages and the value which would have been produced by the construction industry and its workers if it had not been idle. 3. The loss of thousands of construction workers and their invaluable skills to Saskatchewan and the probability that the unfair and antagonistic stance of the Government will make their return to Saskatchewan extremely unlikely. 4. The exodus of many more employees to other provinces because of the Government's steady campaign to hold wages down below other areas, and the avoidance of Saskatchewan for similar reasons, by newcomers to Canada. And if I may pause here for a moment I want to remind the House again that if the Premier and other Ministers want to talk about the poor, look at the person who is unorganized, isn't a member of a trade union and do something about the very low minimum wage of this province which was once the highest single rate in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. DAVIES:** — Now we have a situation which is far below even our neighboring provinces of Manitoba and Alberta and, of course, much below the rate now set by the Federal Government of \$1.65 an hour. If we are looking for people to come to the province especially as I have suggested in my number 4 point, newcomers to Canada, let's do something about it because this Government has been very tardy and very dilatory in that regard.

Now No. 5, Mr. Speaker. I say that one of the results of this Government's unfortunate and regrettable labor policy is the inflaming of the whole Saskatchewan labor relations' atmosphere, resulting in less co-operation and consultation, and more bitterness, strife and less productivity on the job. No. 6. The backward and the anti-labor employer sections coming to the force in the centres of management in Saskatchewan, because of the encouragement provided by the Government's policies and actions, causing a check in the whole movement to improve industrial relations on modern and up-to-date lines. 7. Mr. Speaker, I suggest, the deterioration of genuine collective bargaining consequences and labor organization with the accompanying harmful consequences for industrial democracy, because I think there is no question but that there is a deterioration of a genuine collective bargaining atmosphere and I think that the Bill before us almost certainly will very rapidly contribute to that deterioration.

Mr. Speaker, of all the ill effects that I have mentioned, I personally view the last point as the most serious. We are, as everyone knows, swiftly moving to larger and larger urban centres, with concentrations of new millions of wage and salary earners. There have been countless articles about the helplessness of the individual in the metropolis and at his work-place. Trade unions have not only provided for higher pay and better industrial conditions and fringe benefits. They have helped, I suggest, to supply a sense of worth and human dignity for the member who sees his union as a major factor in preventing big corporation from treating him as a cypher and an unimportant cog in a great machine. To my mind collective bargaining through unionism has really meant an extension of freedom hitherto unknown in the undeveloped democracy.

Collective bargaining, is the living expression of the union and its members. Cripple it, paralyse it by legal means like the

Bill before us, and you also do deep damage to the health and strength of the organization itself. Curtail the freedom of its members by forced arbitration, that is, shear away the right to withhold labor, and a vital component of our society suffers very deep and grave damage.

This Bill in the old-fashioned phrase is wicked law. In the first place it is a deep affront to working people, organized or not. In the second place it is a serious blow to the province and its people. Why? Because the rights affecting a majority of our population are eroded and because the ultimate reaction and result are surely damaging to the stability and the growth of the province.

My opposition to this Bill is firm because of its contents. It is the more solid because I believe the Government has not tried to evolve an honest system of progressive labor relations, rather that it has distorted and used situations to play upon prejudice for the sake of political advantage. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this falls on deaf ears of those to your right. But in any case I want to urge the Government in the most insistent way to shelve this Bill and move positively to solve the dispute. Take the offer of the workers to return to the job, establish a mediator, and when you get a mediator for heaven's sake get a mediator who is an impartial person, remove Government interference and request the contractor-employers to conclude an early agreement with their employees.

Mr. Speaker, this will get the construction program rolling. This will get the people back at work and the dispute I am sure eventually settled. This is infinitely superior to the force and the violence to employee rights that is so evident in this legislation and the amendment before us. Because I believe in this way, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to move this amendment and this is seconded by the Member for Kinistino, Mr. Thibault:

That all the words after the word "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

This bill be not now read a second time until it has been referred to a Special Committee of the Assembly, so that representations may be heard from the public, and from the building contractors and trade unions concerned, with a view to securing as quickly and expeditiously as possible, alternative proposals for the early ending of the management-labor dispute in the construction industry.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently.

**MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, my remarks this evening will be brief. I know the Government forces are tired of the speeches today. They are having trouble, they are working in shifts — a few in and a few out — and we will try and get them in that manner. We will get the few that are in here now and give them a little shot of truth.

First, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves what is the purpose of this session. Now the Premier who speaks for the Liberal party says there is an emergency in the Province of Saskatchewan. He can be congratulated partly on being right and

I think we would have to agree with him that there is an emergency in the Province of Saskatchewan. Since we agree that there is an emergency in the Province of Saskatchewan we should have a look at how much further we can agree. I doubt whether we can agree how we got into this emergency or how the Government is going to get us out of it, whether that is the proper method. I have heard it said that the best method for the Government to clear the decks would be for the Government to resign and start with a clean plate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — However, the Government has shown in the past that faced with a situation of this type it puts its head down and bulls its way through. There are strikes in the construction industry and there seem to be an extra large number of strikes since this Government has been in power. I think it is a reflection of its labor-relations' policies. The Premier has stated that the unions which are on strike or the unions which are negotiating must stick to a six per cent guideline. The Premier has said that these unions that are on strike are demanding in wages and fringes about 44 per cent increase. The unions contend that that is not a fact. As a matter of fact I was thumbing through some material and I came up with an article from the Toronto Globe and Mail of May 21st, 1970 and it has this to state in part about the construction industry in the province.

The union leaders maintain the figures the government is using of 44 per cent wage increase demands are not right, that their demand is parity with Alberta and Manitoba and this would mean about 15 per cent increase and even these being negotiable in the light of economic circumstances.

The next question we asked: is there a disparity existing between the Province of Saskatchewan and her sister province on each side? A look at the figures provided by the DBS would show that there is in fact a disparity, a disparity that has widened considerably since this Government came to power in 1963. The disparity in 1963 between the Saskatchewan average and the Canadian average was \$3.95, in 1966 it was \$7.23, in 1967 it was \$6.99, in 1968 it was \$7.77 and in 1969 it was \$10.20. So in fact a disparity does exist and the trade unions contend that this does exist and therefore in order to keep their wages in line with the industry they want to have parity with other provinces, stating at the same time that they would be willing to take into consideration the economic conditions of the Province of Saskatchewan. Now it is not my duty or responsibility to put the case of the trade unions, I am certain they can put their case adequately themselves. Whether the Government will accept facts is another question. Why is there an emergency now, Mr. Speaker? Why wasn't there an emergency a week ago, or a month ago? The reason, Mr. Speaker, is that there is an emergency now because partisan, Liberal political propaganda can be attempted at this time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — The Premier allowed us a preview of his plan to make propaganda when he put a document marked 'confidential' on our desks toward the end of the last legislative session. This is the document that I have in my hand. It is the summary of bookings at the new auditorium that is being built and whose opening

had to be delayed because, the Premier said, the construction industry or the electricians had struck. Now the Premier with a certain amount of feeling drew our attention to the fact that the NDP Convention was being held July 1st to 4th in this auditorium and he suggested that we were going to suffer a great deal of inconvenience at that time. Little did we realize that the Premier had a sort of a special plan in mind for the New Democratic Convention arriving in July. It happens that there is an item on this agenda just before the New Democratic Convention and it doesn't have a date. It doesn't have a date — it says end of June — Saskatchewan Rock. I take it that must be a misprint, it should be 'Saskatchewan Rockbottom' and located at the Legislative Buildings because obviously this is where this Government is at — rockbottom.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — The Premier of this province now demands more power for himself to dictate terms and conditions of contract settlements. Therefore, the Premier must have been irresponsible when he said earlier, "We are determined to hold wage settlements within the guidelines no matter how long the strikes may last." That item was taken from a speech the Premier gave to a Liberal meeting in Saskatoon and it is quoted from the Saskatoon Commentator of May 27, 1970. The Premier couldn't have been telling the truth at that time because he has now seen an emergency arise that seems to run into conflict with the New Democratic Party Leadership Convention at the auditorium in Regina.

The manoeuvring done by this Government in the area of its labor relations with organized labor is easily matched by the Liberal distorted view of agricultural production. The total acceptance of unplanned farm assistance as a policy or at best, short-term negative farm policy has dragged the Prairies and especially the Province of Saskatchewan down to a farm recession unparalleled for some time in Saskatchewan history. The total mess the Liberal Government has made of the economy of this province has resulted in a collection of further problems for Saskatchewan people.

First of all we have the greatest population loss since the last Liberal Moses herded people out of the Province of Saskatchewan. Secondly, we have an unnecessary amount of unemployment in the Province of Saskatchewan. At least 8.8 per cent. I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) argues with the figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I might say, and it has been said before, that these unemployment figures would be considerably higher for the Province of Saskatchewan if it were not for the fact that thousands upon thousands of workers have already left the Province of Saskatchewan.

I recall an earlier speech I gave in this House at another session when I talked about the housing situation in the Province of Saskatchewan. I said at that time that the newspaper people were having trouble keeping up with the situation in housing. They had headlines reading, "Housing starts plummet", "Building figures below 1968", "July housing starts cut almost in half", and other things like "Housing starts plummet, etc.", and "Housing starts dip." I thought perhaps that we had taxed the newspapers to the full extent of their ability to come up with words that would describe the housing situation in the Province of Saskatchewan. However I see they have come up with another one

and this was after the session concluded, the last session, and it states on May 2, 1970, in the Star Phoenix, "Saskatchewan house building slumps." So we have hit another new low in house building in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In the face of this economic mismanagement the Government periodically displays a flash vindictiveness which illuminates its true dark, anti-labor form. I need only to refer to the display put on by the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) at the last session of the House. We saw a little touch of it this afternoon coming from the Junior Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois). This speech given by the Member from Nipawin was commented upon editorially by The Leader Post and the head of the editorial is, "The Silly Season." The body of the editorial reads:

Speeches the Legislature could do without, and there are many including the recent one by F.W. Radloff, the Liberal Member for Nipawin.

Mr. Radloff tied in the New Democratic Party with the "evil, lustful, corrupt, cunning Mafia organization." It is unfortunate he said that the New Democratic Members of the Opposition have allowed their party to be controlled "by the labor movement policies dictated by the United States labor leaders, possibly corrupted by the slimy, sordid, evil Mafia organization."

This was one of the more laughable speeches of the last session I have to agree with The Leader Post editorial. And it goes on to state that there was laughter on both sides of the House, and Mr. Radloff warmed up to his work. He saw this infiltration of the NDP as providing greater opportunities for Mafia controlled to impregnate all levels of government and financial institutions.

I won't read the rest of the editorial because it is a bit of an insult to this body, although I will have to admit it is the truth about this Legislative Assembly.

What can we do about the situation that we face at this time? Very little, Mr. Speaker, because the Thatcher Liberals have tunnel-vision when it comes to laboring people in the Province of Saskatchewan. We can offer our amendments as we have done. We can remind them of their own commitments, their own Committee Report, unanimously given by which they themselves stand condemned. I think that the most recent Committee Report that was handed to this Government of its own Committee and has been reported to this House by some other Members, bears repeating. This Report was requested by Members of this Assembly prior to the end of the last session of the Legislature. The Minister said that it was not available. The Star Phoenix came out with a story on the Report on April 13th. The report itself is dated March 1970, and I finally received my copy from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) June 1st, 1970. That in itself is an insult to this Legislature the way the Government treats the Members of this body. Now the conclusions of that Report are pertinent to the situation we find ourselves in at this time and I am going to read them into the records.

These are the recommendations of the Committee that the Committee feels that it must make to the Government. We are convinced that, if they are implemented and if labor and management approach them with the interest of their industry in mind,

they will go a long way to curing the problems of construction. We are invited by the parties and by other groups and individuals to consider other recommendations. However it is the opinion of the Committee that the issues that plague this industry will largely be met by the following: 1. An efficient and knowledgeable labor-relations board administering the provisions of The Trade Union Act. 2. A mutually satisfactory method of resolving grievances and jurisdictional disputes. 3. The creation of efficient and satisfactory participation at the bargaining table. And the final and concluding paragraph which apparently the Minister of Labour and others on that side of the House didn't read, or if they did they paid no attention to is this:

It is our conviction after nearly two years of review that there is no substitute for free collective bargaining. There should be no government compulsion in this process in the construction industry. The Government has a role to play but that role during contract negotiations is to provide the parties with effective mediation machinery.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Government stands condemned by the findings of its own Committee Report. I can only say that the only way in which the labor-relations situation in this province will be cleared up will be with the arrival on the scene of a new government with a new attitude towards labor relations.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — I don't feel that the Government is going to accept any amendments. However I think that they should consider them seriously and reject them at their peril. I do support the amendments that have been offered and I do support the amendment that was offered by the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies).

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I will keep my remarks brief because I feel that this debate has degenerated into a repetition of largely what was said by Members during the winter session on problems of a similar type and similar nature.

I think though, Mr. Speaker, that this debate has proven one point, a point which has been long and well recognized by many of the people of Saskatchewan and that is that the NDP has really degenerated into a parochial, narrow-minded political party that does not have the interest of all the people of Saskatchewan at heart.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — The reason I say it, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. Not one Member over there has talked about the distribution of income that the people of Saskatchewan are legitimately concerned about. We have listened to the Opposition Leader (Mr. Lloyd) give his swan song of a speech and it was pretty obvious as to why he is on the way out, after listening to his performance. They have Mr. Gilbey in their back pocket. He attends all the NDP conventions and is scarcely very creditable around the province when we can see his tie-up with the NDP and head of the

Labour Federation. He is not very creditable, Mr. Speaker, because all of his political speeches and all of his speeches in favor of organized labor are very, very slanted in favor of the NDP political bias.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the solutions to the problem offered by the Leader of the Opposition boiled down to about one or two things — conciliation and mediation. And after 2-1/2 to 3 months' waiting we are getting tired of waiting and I might add that the record around the world is not very good in this regard. If we take a look we have had about two years' negotiations with the Communists in Red China to try and get China recognized. We have had negotiations going on about Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, which amounted to absolutely nothing. I remember one of the last great meetings, Mr. Speaker, was held by Neville Chamberlain in about 1939 and he came back and he told us everything was going to be fine, then Hitler took over Europe. So, Mr. Speaker, the record of conciliation and mediation — it should be put to use as best as possible — but of course has its limitations and it is just postponing the inevitable day. He doesn't want to take a position on it, he doesn't want to alienate all the farm interest or the people who are very much concerned about their position in our society today. I even took the liberty the other morning of listening to the Member from Regina Centre on the "Hot Line" and having a certain degree of admiration for the Member, and respecting his intelligence, I had hopes that maybe we might even hear some semblance of hope for these people who are unorganized and poor and so forth and that we may have some hope that he would be a strong inflation fighter and help recognize the problems of these people. But not one word, only that wage increases weren't part of the inflation factor whatsoever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Opposition, and I might add listening and watching to the CLC Convention which not long ago was held in Edmonton, I again watched for some hope from their Leader, Mr. Douglas, to come forth and say to organized labor that we must have some co-operation with business, that must have some co-operation with the Government of Canada, that we must have some co-operation to stop inflation in this country because it is seriously eroding the position of the people that the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) likes to talk about so often. I wish he had given his speech today but he won't because it is not politically opportune for him to do so. He usually cries great tears for the unorganized, the poor, the people of social welfare, the old-age pensioners, but not today, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about wage increases. Not today do we get a word about the people who are being hurt by inflation. We listened in vain for the Member for Regina North West but all he can say is "Fellas if you are getting a pretty good wage now it really doesn't matter, you want to get all you can get while the getting's good."

Mr. Speaker, I want to relate a small story that I had in my constituency not long ago. An NDP supporter came to me last week — he is a very good friend of mine and I presume that he will likely go all over the province. He said to me, "I understand you are having a strike and that you are going to try and settle the strike." I said to him, "Well, I think the Premier is doing a pretty fair job in trying to control increases in the Province of Saskatchewan." And he said that he thought he was too. Being an NDP supporter this was quite a statement from him. He went on to say, Mr. Speaker, "The only thing wrong is I don't see why they should get any increase at all because I am living on 25 per cent less." Now, Mr. Speaker, these are not my words



and not my thinking because I do not agree with that individual. I think some increase is warranted and I think that if labor and the companies could work it out that this would be perfectly legitimate. But this is the type of thinking of very concerned people all over Saskatchewan, people who are farmers and living on less income, people who are businessmen and living on less income, old-age pensions who are fighting the cost of living, people who are disabled and are on pension, people who had small savings and are living on that, Mr. Speaker. What these people are saying today in Saskatchewan is that, if Saskatchewan is having a difficult financial time, if Canada is having a difficult financial time, what these people are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we want everybody to share in those difficult times, not just us.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What about Massey-Ferguson?

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — I am going to come to Massey-Ferguson because the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) has given one of the most economically illiterate speeches that I am convinced has ever been delivered in this House. I looked up what Canada Packers was making, Mr. Speaker, because you know the favorite trick of the NDP is to quote that somebody made a million dollars and they got a 50 per cent increase the next year. They don't tell you whether the guy invested an extra billion dollars or not to get it. That's totally irrelevant to them and I hope that as an insurance agent — I think that that is what he is in, the Member for Regina North West — I hope to heavens he runs it somewhat better than his economic ideas are when he gives his speeches. Because if he didn't and he ever has to go back to it, he will be totally bankrupt in a very short period of time. What he says, Mr. Speaker, is this: if he went and bought another agency for \$50,000 that he wouldn't expect to make any more money the next year, that he would expect to make the very same. If you look up what the companies of this country have been investing, like the Steel Company of Canada, International Nickel, Mr. Speaker, — and I am not saying that some of them are not making too much profit, some of them are and they need to come under the guidelines — what I am saying is these people have indicated a willingness to co-operate with organized labor if labor would give any indication whatsoever that they were willing. If this does not work then the Government of Canada should take action against them all, Mr. Speaker. But at least we should make a try. At the CLC Convention, Mr. Douglas comes along and says, "Fellas, don't work, wages don't count for anything in the fixed cost." And I am sure the executive the next morning likely doubled their contribution to the NDP because he told them just exactly what they wanted.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — If they didn't double their contribution they got short changed because that is what the CLC wanted to hear. Don MacDonald probably wrote Tommy Douglas' speech for him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come to what is the crux of this matter and that is the distribution of income and how we in this country are going to divide it up. And I am saying right now,

Mr. Speaker, that if organized labor and business are not willing to decide on the division of income so that all people in this country get some kind of consideration, then governments are going to have to do it. That is the position that we are rapidly moving to now. Mr. Speaker, what they say is that we should impose price controls which they know are practically impossible to make work in peace time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — Did they work in Great Britain? Did they? They tried them and they sure didn't work. The Socialists tried them. Your own people tried them there and they never worked. It really comes to the crux of the matter, they may have to be tried. But to a large extent unless you want a bureaucracy of three-quarters of the people working on enforcement then they are unenforceable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read to you a piece I picked from today's paper. It is exceptionally disturbing I think to people who are unable to get substantial increases:

W. Reuther said his union of 113,000 Canadian members who go into bargaining with Ford, Chrysler and General Motors next month have no intention of observing the federal 6 per cent guideline. On wage raises it will ask for substantial increases, he would not say how much.

Mr. Speaker, we have degenerated to this situation that those people in our society that are able to extract a large increase are doing it. The Steel workers are now the highest paid in the world, the International Woodworkers are the highest paid in the world.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — In society.

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — You want to tell me what a man wants when he wants something to eat. He wants food, he doesn't care about steel, Mr. Speaker,. Don't tell me. The Socialists like to say that all work is honorable and I agree with that but that doesn't say that the guy that makes steel should get paid triple the guy who makes a loaf of bread. Mr. Speaker, all work is honorable, but apparently they want to pay some people all the wages and the other people nothing. As the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) says, some men are more honorable than others according to the Opposition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate to any great extent but I do want to say this, that it is becoming more and more obvious to the people of Saskatchewan that the NDP are not interested in a legitimate, honest distribution of income to all the people of this province. They have indicated this in the position they are taking, and this Government led by the Premier is interested in the distribution of income for all the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — Because, Mr. Speaker, as sure as the sun dawns the people of Saskatchewan know that, if we give a big increase to some, inevitably they end up doing the paying. We can hand out

25 or 30 per cent to the teachers, we can hand out 25 or 30 per cent to the electricians and the plumbers but it means, Mr. Speaker, that the pie is still the same size and it means that the taxpayer, the fellow who is paying taxes on the farm is paying the teacher's salary, the man who is in business is paying it and that means he is living on less than he has lived on before. And so we can go on in this economic wilderness that the Members opposite talk of. They don't want to ever admit that these increases — they always tell us that some big corporation is making a pile of money and there aren't very many big corporations in Saskatchewan, very few. But they are always telling us that somebody is making a fantastic amount of money. I want to read to you just what Canada Packers did, I sent over to the Library for it. Of course it is not related at all to investment. You know the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) quotes that somebody made \$50,000 and somebody else made \$75,000 and it wouldn't matter if he had ten billion invested. It might be half of one per cent and he would still say it was a lot of money. I presume that when INCO invested \$100 million in the ground and expect to get absolutely zero return, I don't think they would be operating for long if they do. Here is the profit picture of Canada Packers, I don't know what Canada Packers' investment was. In 1964, in round figures it was \$6 million; in 1965 it was \$8 million, in 1966 it was \$8 million, in 1967 it was \$4 million, exactly one-half; in 1968 it was \$8 million. If you want to go back to about 1964 or 1965, Mr. Speaker, their net profit or net income position was just about identical over the past five years, despite the fact that Canada Packers has spent a good deal of money renovating and improving their plant and factory which has created many jobs for many working people. Now I know what the Member for Regina North West did, he went to 1967 when they made \$4 million, half of the previous year's and he said, "Well this is what they made in 1967 and this is what they made in 1968. They doubled their income." Just cheap political trickery, that's all it is. You know the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) did the same thing on the radio the other day with the Loblaw Companies. I even took the liberty of looking up Loblaw Companies. Loblaw Companies had a declining profit position for three years consecutively. I wish the Member for Regina North West would ask some of his friends how they have been doing in the stock market and the great amount of money they have been making. He should ask them once in a while. But the Member for Regina Centre did the very same thing with Loblaw Companies. If he took a look at it he would realize that Loblaw Companies had a declining profit position for three consecutive years and if they continued in this projection they would have been bankrupt, but they did finally turn the corner and improved their position which showed a net profit and it showed a fairly substantial improvement as far as percentage-wise is concerned.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They made 121 per cent.

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, 121 per cent of nothing still isn't very much. I suppose, as my colleague from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) says, I suppose they will quote Central next year after their bankruptcy this year. If they make \$100,00 to get a bankruptcy he'll quote they made about 1000 per cent maybe next year. But that's the type of statistical jargon that the Opposition likes to peddle. They hope that the people of this country are complete economic illiterates. But I have something to tell them, they aren't, they aren't economic illiterates. Every farmer in this country knows that if the cost of everything else is going up it

is coming out of his income and he is interested in some government in this country that is interested in controlling those costs to a degree, whether it be labor, business or whatever. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the proudest achievements of this Government that at last a government has taken enough interest, that it is taking at least a step in the direction of attempting to control this spiralling inflation which is a threat to many of the people in this country today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, my friend opposite, it seems to me from the way he speaks that he would like to be a Socialist but his position in this House denies him that status. One time he is talking like a Socialist and the next time he is talking like a capitalist. He doesn't know himself what he is. The fact is this, he is trying to be a student of economics and he is trying to tell us something about profits and so forth but he fails to tell this House that when these companies make their estimates on the profits they make on the shares, that many of these shares have gone up 10, 20 and 100 times what the original value was. There are companies like the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company — you could have got the shares for 50 cents — today they are probably paying \$1.65 in a half a year of interest. Why not use those figures? The actual figures of the value of the original stock instead of using padded figures like the Hon. Member who just sat down has been using. I don't want to get into that, I would welcome the Hon. Member who just sat down to debate on this whole thing to find out just what he knows about practical economics. He must have been reading some of the capitalistic theorists that didn't know what they were talking about. However, I don't want to see this debate degenerate into this kind of debate, I'd rather talk about what we have been called here for, that is to discuss this obnoxious Bill that has been brought in by the Premier and the Government of this Province of Saskatchewan. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that this debate has simply resolved itself around one point and it is this: do the workers of Saskatchewan have the right to collective bargaining or not? That is all we should be discussing.

**MR. THATCHER:** — As long as they don't interfere with the public interest.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Well if I interfered with you every time you interfere with me you would never be able to make a speech, Mr. Premier. Every time it hurts you, you have to jump up like a jack-in-the-box.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He is very thin-skinned.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I know he is thin-skinned. Now I hope, Mr. Speaker, that no one here today will argue that unions must be destroyed because it is through unions that the working people have obtained a certain degree of social justice. It also must be said I think in this House that collective bargaining is the basic value of a free society. These are the things that we must consider when we are considering this Bill. And I will say this,

Mr. Speaker, that in every modern civilized country, industrialized as they are today in this day and age, they have evolved this process of bargaining between employees and employers. As time has gone by changes in procedures have come about and there have been good relations and there have been some tough situations. But the toughest situation that we face now is when the third party, like the Government, involves itself by legislation like Bill No. 2 and tries to legislate more today. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my party, the Social Democratic party, we believe that changes are part of progress. We believe in adjustments to meet the challenge of the times but we do not like, like my hon. friends opposite, to believe that reforms and changes for the better can be brought only about with high-handed, tyrannical legislation.

Compulsion, Mr. Speaker, is not compatible with democracy or social progress or in labor relations or in wage negotiations. I recall as a young man — as a matter of fact as a very young man way back in 1918-1920 — that I heard about collective bargaining being practised on a voluntary basis in Britain, in Germany and in other European countries and it was after the First World War, I believe that advances were made here in Canada. It may be that the great Depression of the thirties that we experienced in Canada and in the United States kind of spurred the workers on to organize the strong unions and to promote the idea of collective bargaining for the protection and the security of the workers. And there came strength to the workers and we have not suffered any serious set-backs. As a matter of fact when we look at our economy — and the Hon. Member who just sat down has been talking about the economy — I don't think that the economy of this country has ever gone forward so much as it has in the past few years and it is all because of the fact that we have had not only, say technological, say, developments, but because our workers have become more trained and better trained and they know what they are doing that we have been able to build the kind of economy we have today. If we are suffering a recession, if we are suffering inflation, then I think that we should blame, not the workers, not the people who have produced, but the politicians who have made the situation what it is today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Now the Attorney General mentioned Sweden and may I advise him that as far as my knowledge is concerned, and I don't know too much about that country, I understand that nearly all the employees in that country are covered by collective agreements, not as it is in Saskatchewan where we have thousands of people without any say support or any collective agreement, but 75 to 80 per cent of the people in Sweden today are in unions. In fact, say 100 per cent are covered by collective agreements, even some of them that are not in unions. And if I am wrong, the experts on the other side, the Government who brought in this obnoxious Bill into the House can correct me. And I think this is a good goal and I think this is the kind of goal that we should strive for. In stead of knocking the workers, knocking them down when they are trying to achieve progress, achieve certain, say, standards of living, we should be encouraging. The Hon. Member who sat down has said, "Well, there are poor farmers." Well, of course there are. I know what farming is. I am one of the farmers that have had deficits for the past few years and I know exactly what he is talking about, but I for one will not get up on my feet and say what he has said that, because I have had no incomes, therefore I've got to bring my brothers

in industry down to the same poverty level as I am in.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — And only a Liberal would say what he has said in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in a democratic and free society voluntary bargaining is tolerated by some countries and certainly encouraged by others. But, in a few places — and I don't know of any other than Saskatchewan right now — but I will say in a few places there are parties in power, such as this Liberal party here in Saskatchewan, who denounce and oppose this essential progress of workers. They use any or every excuse to destroy the only defence that workers have. Now today I am not speaking just for myself, for farmers, I am speaking for the whole society. If we are going to get anywhere in our economic situation we must protect the interest of those who are organized and we as farmers are trying to do the same thing. We have our farmers' unions. We are trying to get somewhere. Is the next step, as one of my colleagues mentioned, is the next step to be a threat to the farmers that if they organize, if they say that they will go on strike by refusing to sell the product which is being sold for less than the cost of production, are they going to be treated the same way as the workers are being treated today? Is there going to be vicious legislation passed against them? Are they going to bring police into the various communities to force farmers back on the farms? I can't visualize that. And I can't visualize them passing this Bill because by passing this Bill it means a step in exactly that same direction. It was not long ago when the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was quoted to have said — and I have it here from a clipping — he said the next ones are going to be the teachers. Teachers could come under the Act. I don't need to read this because we want to go on with the debate but that's the next step. And after the teachers, who?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Farmers!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Right, my colleague says, 'farmers.' Farmers, yes, farmers, and Ministers.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — You talk about dictatorship. Don't call us dictators. We're not dictators. Well, what are you by bringing in this legislation?

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think of two heads of government who enunciated certain statements on social justice. One said — his name was Abraham Lincoln —

The only difference between a free man and a slave is that a free man may withhold his labor.

This Abraham Lincoln was consistent. To the end of his life and to this day he is known the world over as a great man, as a man who dedicated himself to humanity and he will always be remembered. The other is the Premier of our Province who is quoted in The Leader Post as having said practically identically the same. He

was quoted on the 12th of June in The Leader Post and here's what he said:

It is a free country and workers have every right to withhold certain services.

This man, the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Hon. Ross Thatcher, has not lived up to this philosophy and to this statement. And so Members may decide just how much history will record about him and just how far he will be considered in the history of this world.

It is remarkable to me that after making this statement as reported on June 12th in The Leader Post he had his mind changed. Being a Leader of a party, I can't visualize that he could be so shifty, saying one thing one day and another thing another day. So there must be some other reason. We look at the Press reports — and I wasn't here and I wasn't at the Liberal caucus and there was a Liberal caucus called for the 17th of this month — immediately after that caucus the Premier gave a different statement. It was then that he decided to call this legislative session, it was then that he decided to bring in this obnoxious Bill. And the only ones to blame are not just the Premier, maybe more than the Premier, the ones that are to blame is every Member who sat in that caucus, who sits on the other side of this House, the Liberal party of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — They have betrayed the people of Saskatchewan and the principles enunciated by Abraham Lincoln and the principles enunciated by the Premier just a matter of two weeks ago.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that if Premier Thatcher was right on June 10th or 12th, then he could not have been right on June 17th. Is it correct then to say that it is the right-wingers of the political party that he represents, the aspirants who somehow feel that this is the only way that they can get re-elected, who are responsible culprits who brought about this obnoxious Bill? Is it right to say that? I don't know. They do. But I do know this, and I reply to the Hon. Attorney General, I will say this because he quoted from a Press report which wasn't exactly true. He didn't read what I said. He read the heading where I said that on the basis of the last distribution, the Liberals have seen to it that they would get 40 seats out of 60. And this is correct according to the figures that I have been able to assemble. But that doesn't mean that they are going to get elected. That doesn't mean that at all.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — And I appealed then and I appeal now to every decent Liberal, to every decent Conservative, to vote for a party that will stand up for the rights of the people of Saskatchewan, be they workers, be they farmers, be they businessmen . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — and not for those who would use trickery to try to hold control of this Province of Saskatchewan. The only reason this

is brought in, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is that they are trying to find an election issue. That's the only reason. No other reason. Gerrymandering hasn't helped them. They have made surveys and I understand in Prince Albert they have made four surveys, in West Prince Albert, and the indication is that the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) is going to be defeated and probably run here in Regina.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The only thing that they can do is try and find an issue. Here is an opportunity to find an issue, to try and find a goat that they can blame. But I will tell you that, whether you try to blame the workers for trying to negotiate an agreement which they think is fair and proper, I as a farmer will be behind them because the next step will be that I will probably have to also ask the Government, demand from the Government, certain social justices. Six per cent guidelines — I can't help but think the Hon. Member who just sat down, the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) was talking about the depressed people, the pensioners, and others — it is true. It is true what he said that's what I said, he doesn't know where he belongs, whether on this side of the House or on that side of the House. I hope he makes up his mind because some of the things that he said are true. The pensioners receive a 6 per cent increase, the farmers receive a 6 per cent increase. Most of the people who are the base of this province of Saskatchewan get a 6 per cent increase now. Only those that are organized have been able to get 6 per cent. They are entitled to much more. People in Prince Albert whom I represent, who work in the hospital there were getting \$1.24 in this day and age, practically a minimum wage for the work they did in the hospital. They should be getting, in my opinion, at least \$2 or \$3 today. What did this Government do? The Government stepped in and used The Essential services Emergency Act to try to preclude them from getting social justice. And some aren't getting it at all, some that should get it, some can't get it because of the interference of this Government. Here's another situation where people are getting reasonably good wages. Nobody is going to deny that. But when you compare their wages to the wages they are getting in British Columbia. I drove 1200 miles just to get here to this session. When I heard about it, I find that they are getting considerably more money per day than they are getting here. The only result will be if the Premier and the Liberal Government here are worried about the people leaving the Province of Saskatchewan, for goodness sake let them negotiate decent agreements so that they will stay here because they want to stay here. But they won't be able to stay here if they don't get decent wages or if they get higher wages elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I stopped on the highway there they are repairing, Highway 97A or something, I forget, and there were about 20 men working there. A chap from Wadena — he told me he was from Wadena — spoke to me. He said, "You are from Saskatchewan?" And I talked to him for a little while and he knows my colleague, he knows other people. I just happened to ask him because I saw about 20 men there, "How many are working on this road from Saskatchewan, just you?" Do you know what he said, Mr. Speaker, "15 out of 20 are boys from Saskatchewan." And they didn't want to leave Saskatchewan, but if you are going to force this kind of legislation, if you are going to make it tough for them to make a living, what else do you expect but they will leave this



province? The only sure thing and safe thing you can do to protect the interests of this province and this economy that we have to try to improve it is to safeguard the rights of these people and forget about this kind of Bill, withdraw it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — After all I know why are bringing in . . .

There is an article here — I think I remember reading it as my memory is not too bad — where the Premiers of the Provinces of Canada met with the Prime Minister of Canada or Mr. Mackasey, it doesn't matter, but with somebody in the Dominion Government, and to save you time I'm not going to look for the article. Mr. Mackasey, I think, said that the Premiers have agreed to hold the line at 6 per cent, but not all the Premiers, Mr. Speaker, because two or three days later we find that the Premier of Quebec said that he didn't agree with that kind of a commitment; the Premier of Ontario said the same thing; and the Premiers of other Provinces . . . As far as I can see the Premier of Saskatchewan, in the poorest province, at least in the West, and one of the poorest provinces in Canada today because of the depressed farm economy, only he is going to stick by that commitment. He wrong or right ought to oppose the Liberals in Ottawa and yet day after day we hear the Hon. Members getting up here and saying, "Oh, we disagree with Ottawa." Look how they stick together when it comes down to hurting the rights of working people and farmers. I won't have to talk about LIFT I haven't got time.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion there must be expansion in collective bargaining, beyond working hours, beyond wages. Many years ago as I recall, the only thing that was considered in collective bargaining was hours of work and wages. Today we read that in certain countries, like in the United States and certain areas, the workers are bargaining to involve themselves in management. This apparently is good for management, good for the factory and industry and good for the workers. This is what is going to happen in this province if this Government doesn't interfere. The workers and the owners of industries will get together and they will thrive on both sides, but with this kind of interference by a third party, who happens to be the Government, this will not happen for a long time. This won't happen until we change the Government. It has happened in the United States. Why is it that you people up there don't wake up and see what is happening in the world? Why is it that you want to stay with the 18th and 19th centuries?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Why don't you sit down.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I don't have to sit down. I'm paid to be here on behalf of my people. Nobody is going to tell me to sit down. I'll sit down when I'm good and ready. And by doing what I suggested is happening, I can visualize the time and I look forward as a young man should, and I'm young enough to look forward, believe me.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I can scarcely see the sharing of profits by those who work and by those who own. It is the same happening in the United States.

Most important of all, I believe, and I can see into the future that strikes as we have them to date will be eliminated. They have been eliminated for example in countries like Sweden and Germany. People have strikes, they only have strikes if they get approval of the government. But usually in most cases, 99 per cent of the cases, they go under voluntary courts. The agreement is decided there in a fair manner. That's the kind of thing that will happen in Canada and happen in Saskatchewan, provided the Government doesn't interfere.

I say that collective bargaining is a social necessity in a democracy. Let us not destroy democracy with foolish attempts to legislate for the parties in dispute. Collectively bargaining of labor unions is essentially the same as individual bargaining. I have a right when I have something to sell whether it is a product from my hand or the product of the field, I have a right to try and negotiate what I will get for that product. Essentially it is a product from my hand, just like the laborer. Essentially what he does is a product of his hands. But the workers finds it is better or convenient to try and negotiate, say co-operatively through his union, but it is actually as two individuals negotiating. Are we going to try to discourage this kind of freedom I ask? I say that this kind of freedom must be respected, and must be protected if we believe in free enterprise which we hear so much about and a free society. Strange isn't it, Mr. Speaker, that I have to stand up on my feet today and talk about freedom of the individual and free enterprise, which the Hon. Members opposite apparently are trying to destroy. I say there must be honor and fair play of course in all negotiations. In the final analysis I do not deny that the Government may have to act through some kind of court arbitration on a voluntary basis and it would only be in extreme cases. Certainly this case is not an extreme case, otherwise if it had been the Government would have acted two months ago. Why did it wait three months? Why didn't it act with a month or within two weeks, why did it have to wait three months? To protect who? So I say, Mr. Speaker, this issue before us, this Bill before us is a political Bill and nothing else. It is not an extreme situation. The Government should be condemned I say for its involvement in the calling of this legislative session to concern itself with this particular item.

The Premier says he is concerned with inflation. We all are. Now I must ask the Premier a few questions: what has the Government done about the farm situation? It has said yes to the LIFT program. Has it done as the former CCF did some years ago when the crops were under the snow. They went to the Federal Government, got money and paid the farmers. What has it done for the farmers in my constituency of these small quarter-section, half section, three-quarter section farmers? What has it done for farmers of that kind right across the Province of Saskatchewan? You know what this Government has done. This Government has forced them to sell out the few head of cattle they have had and try to find a job either in the pulp mill or in fishing or something else. This is the kind of Government that is concerned with people they say. God help us from those kind of friends, that kind of Government. What this Government should have done is to try to help these people stay on the farms, maybe increase their holdings, because it was essential, help them some way to continue farming, because that is what they wanted to do and not force them into cities and social aid or force them into labor tasks at an age when probably they should be retiring. Now it is punishing one group in our society who is trying to make a reasonable demand to protect their own interests.

The Premier has indicted that somebody is responsible for inflation. We know who is responsible for inflation. I don't have to tell this House, it has been said many times, that surely even somebody who wasn't normal wouldn't be able to remember. What about the banks lending out fictitious money and charging interest, lending money out — what is now — at 10 per cent — because Prime Minister Trudeau said to the banks, "You can now lend not 12 1/2 times, you can only lend out 9 times," lending money out, collecting interest, and fictitious money. I as a farmers and you as an industrial worker have to produce wealth to see that interest is paid. There is inflation, my friend, that's what you should be attacking.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — What about the corporations? I could name some, I don't have to name them, they have been named, they are in the Press, surely you can read. I can talk about Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, because that is in my constituency. I can talk about the Pulp Mill. I remember the time when privately the Hon. Provincial Treasurer told me they made \$9 million. Oh, they all must make money. The only one that isn't allowed to make money is the worker or the farmer. The real criminals there I say, Mr. Speaker, are the exploiters of our natural resources and our human resources, and the ones that support them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — The carpenters and teachers today are being threatened, cajoled, bullied by the Liberal Government. It intends to use this session of the Legislature to be able to find a gimmick to go down to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and say, "Here you elect us because these Socialists supported the plumbers and carpenters." Well what do they expect us to do? These are people like ourselves. These are people who are entitled to protection from the Government, because that's what a government is elected for, that's why I came 1200 miles here to speak on behalf of their interests. I don't care whether they are workers or farmers like myself, they are all people trying to make a living. This Government is not concerned the same way, this Government is concerned about political expediency. This Government is concerned about how it can extract money out of the farmer and workers in order that it can give grants to big business. Where do you get the money, Mr. Provincial Treasurer — he's not in the House — where does he get the money to pass out as gifts, at Meadow Lake or Prince Albert or anywhere else? But, if you ask, how many gifts does he give to the farmers? If the farmer wants to buy some cattle, what is it he has to pay, Mr. Premier? Do you give him a gift?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — On the interest rates. Do you forgive him the loan? If you do, you had better give some of my friends some of the loans. They have got to pay the loan, they have got to pay 7 per cent. Oh yes, they like it. I used to have a horse, the more you beat him he got accustomed. Yes, you love them this way, you beat them over the head, then you say you love them. But that isn't the kind of love you give to the big business friends that you have. I can say to you, Mr. Premier, you were not always a

Liberal. I was a Liberal once and when I found out what they were that's why I came to sit here. But you went over there. You know how you got there, I am not going to bring that one up, because I would have to go down to the basement and dig up the old records. I'll tell you something, Sir, . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Go dig in the garbage!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — No, it is not garbage, it is real good literature. I want to tell you this, Mr. Speaker, I will say that the Liberals of the past, some whom I have known, real fine progressive people, they must be turning in their graves to see what is happening under the name of Liberalism today in the Province of Saskatchewan. How much increase in wages have you given your employees at the hotel in LaRonge, 6 per cent?

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to go on, I think I have said what I have to say, but I still have a few things to say. But it is obvious to me and I am sure to you, that what is happening in our Province of Saskatchewan, is that the Canadian imperialists who worship material progress are the ones with the Saskatchewan Liberal party. That party today is the lackey of that establishment. Were it not true what I am saying, then it would not have brought in this Bill before us. There are only two sides you can serve, you can serve the people or you are against the people. You are not with the people when you bring in this kind of legislation. The only thing you can do, if you want to be worth your salt, is what the amendment is asking to do, is withdraw the Bill, let's go home and forget about it all and let these people go back to work and negotiate their differences.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I say this, it is not too much to give, Mr. Speaker, because if I go back to what I said at the beginning, progress in labor legislation came about after the first World War. Men and women walked the streets then and later, were willing to give up their lives because they believed in a better world and in democracy. The least that we can do in this Legislature, as men in whom the people have put confidence, is to do just that, see that we do not betray their rights, we do not betray democracy for which they fought. I have nothing more to say, Mr. Speaker, except to say that certainly I can't support the Bill, I am supporting the amendment. I would hope the Government would change its mind and go along with us and let the business of these people go on the way it should instead of interfering as we have today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. F.K. RADLOFF (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I got a great deal of enjoyment out of the Member for Prince Albert East's remarks. In the first place he was crying for labor and the next time he was crying for the small farmer. Who is putting the small farmer out of business? It is the service outlets, laboring people. I was talking to a chap who raises hogs. He had an electrician out that cost him \$78 to fiddle around with wires for a couple of minutes. At this session, we should all call a spade a spade, and let the chips fall where they may. However, I am not going to talk about the demoralizing criminal organizations, subversive political

ideologies or international labor control. The Member from Saskatoon Mayfair mentioned my remarks in the House a previous time, but I am glad he can laugh about them, because I am happy they have thrown the Mafia out of the organization and now they are running it themselves.

Today our chief concern is about inflation. Most know and have heard about the German marks. It took over 50,000 to buy a meal. People couldn't buy a job. This is perhaps an extreme situation. But anyone past the age of buying penny candy knows that we are all treading on very dangerous grounds. Mr. Speaker, it is easy for all of us to drift, you hope for the best, but wages keep going up, prices keep going up, money becomes cheaper. The race is now on to survive. The Government of this Province cannot take the easy way, it must take the responsible way even if the decisions are somewhat unpopular. People panic and the markets fall as we have seen in the past few weeks. We do not want any further extreme action in this regard. It is human weakness to want more and more until it becomes uncontrolled greed. It is common knowledge that Rome fell a lot faster than it was built. Our many benefits and our great progress can easily go the way of Rome and perish in the dust. People must realize how fragile civilization is and how easily it can slip from our grasp. Needless strikes, work stoppages, slow-downs, creating increased costs, lay-offs, unemployment, hardship and suffering can only lead to chaos. Members of this Legislature have a responsibility to do everything in our power to reduce these perils to a minimum. Saskatchewan people are entitled to maximum benefits on the economy we have here. Irresponsible actions by a few careless people could jeopardize our progress and our many accomplishments. Labor, business and government must co-operate and work together for satisfactory solutions. One cannot blame honest and diligent workers for being concerned. On the other hand we cannot condone leadership and fallacies leading to anarchy. Self-centred professionals and trade union groups are aggressively organized with fallacies and actions that sometimes flaunt authority and public welfare.

Minority groups that demand a large sharer of our national cake do so to the detriment of the majority of those who are unorganized who help pay the many bills and who helped pioneer this country. The Government of Saskatchewan has a moral responsibility to oppose and control various operations and interests. Members of this Legislature and that includes all of you owe the common ordinary citizen of this province continued support and assistance to obtain the best way of life.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical period in Saskatchewan history. Inflation demands that people have maximum employment opportunity. With continued strike action by construction workers, it is crucial that this Government take action to keep people working and gainfully employed. This is sometimes difficult in a free enterprise economy. We all know that Socialist governments controlled wages through nation-wide wage negotiations under government mediation. Contrary to what many of you say, in Sweden, Germany and Britain — you talk about the way they negotiate their settlement — but it is under government supervision. Communist and dictator-type governments of course have problems, but there people work or perish. We are meeting here to extend the power of Bill 2, The Essential Services Emergency Act, using compulsory binding arbitration to settle strikes of the construction workers. Compulsory binding arbitration in the main is equally fair to employer, employee and the buying public. Union leaders and labor people talk about their rights,

but other people have rights too. Wage settlements should consider both sides of the question. Bill 2, The Essential Services Emergency Act is not, I expect, the answer to satisfactory industrial labor peace. But it is the best answer until a more satisfactory way can be found. Members on this side of the House are hearing the same old diatribe of propaganda from across the way. I am constantly appalled by the way people swallow some of these hollow phrases. Mr. Speaker, many citizens are disgusted and dismayed at the NDP Members opposing progressive policies and this type of legislation.

My old exCCF friend says the new NDP are a disappointment and a disgrace to this philosophy. Mr. Speaker, Socialist economic planners and far-left supporters are for state ownership, the state to own all and all to work for the state. Forced labor in Siberia has been used to make similar policies work. Untold hardship and suffering are the results of narrow selfish labor leadership. Mr. Speaker, I am sure no one can figure out why they think they are God's gift to humanity.

Canadian people have been fortunate in being able to control the extreme left-wing activities, but this increasing pressure by this group is of grave concern to all of us. Responsible enterprising people cannot lower their guard for one single moment. We must be constantly aware of the formidable enemies and deceitful friends planning our demise. Democracy is a fragile thing, it must be guarded constantly, ever alert to these undermining influences.

Mr. Speaker, with the interests of the Nipawin constituency and the people of Saskatchewan in mind, I assure you that I will vote for Bill 2.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. F.A. DEWHURST (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I can't let this opportunity pass without saying a few words on this type of Bill which is before this Legislature today. I have seen lots of legislation come down in this Legislature, legislation which governments maybe had to bring in to serve a purpose of the day. But I have never in all my experience seen legislation as vicious as the original Bill No. 2 and now it's Bill No. 1, here before us today.

I listened with some interest this afternoon to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) when he was speaking. I thought for sure we would get a resume of what happened since this labor dispute started. I thought he would document what was proposed by the Government in response to the request by the labor unions and also in response to the request by the employers. But nothing was tabled in this House to give us any information on the problem which has confronted the workers of this city and other parts of this province for the last few months. He has done nothing about mediation; no proper mediation procedure was set up. Last winter on one occasion he said he didn't have the help or the staff to do the proper mediation. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is time that the Department of Labour did things that should be done to help people over problems like this, where we are trying to get diversification so that agriculture isn't the sole responsibility and the sole producer of goods in our province. Nothing was done by the Minister. Seeing that he has done nothing on behalf of labor for the last three months, I thought maybe he would tell us that he has now found the car which he lost

six

years ago, but we didn't even get that assurance. He is still looking for that and he is too busy with that to look after labor.

When the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) spoke this afternoon I was amused to listen to him. Now I rather at most times enjoy listening to my good friend, the Attorney General. He generally gives us a few good laughs, but today he was talking if we allowed labor to have an increase in wages how it would affect the farmer. He said the farmers were hard up and couldn't afford to pay any more. I can agree that the farmers are a desperate trade in the province today. But that is a lot different to what he said a little over a year ago, when he talked about the farmers being so well off driving the new cars and the new trucks. The average farmer had his bins filled up with wheat and his corrals full of fat cattle and his wife full of babies to get the baby bonus. That's quite a change isn't there, Mr. Attorney General. Quite a change isn't there, Mr. Attorney General? I fully expected him being the legal advisor to the Government, and the legal advisor of the Province in his Department that we would get some legal interpretation of these Bills. He would find out where did they get the 6 per cent guidelines. But we didn't get any of that information whatsoever.

I was also interested to note today, Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the House that there was a vacancy in Melfort-Tisdale. We have known that for the past three months, but nothing was done or has been done in the past three months to fill that vacancy. A by-election could have been held in Melfort-Tisdale to fill that vacancy. After all it is only three years since the last election, less than three years. Melfort-Tisdale has the right of representation. I am sorry that my former colleague had to leave this Legislature on account of his health. I think every Member of the Legislature shared with us the sorrow that the former Member for Melfort-Tisdale was leaving his seat in this House. But the Government is doing nothing about filling the vacancy in Melfort-Tisdale. What did it do? In order to try to pacify the people, it just did away with Melfort-Tisdale, cut it in half and put half in Kinistino and the other half in Kelsey. Then it could tell the people, well there is no by-election necessary because there is no Melfort-Tisdale. That is the way that it tries to fool people.

Now what is the Government doing to try to improve the economy of this province.

**MR. THATCHER:** — End the strikes!

**MR. DEWHURST:** — You created it in the first place. It is time that the proper steps were taken to end it.

We saw last winter in the Crown Corporation Committee by the tables of the Insurance Office the money it has invested. A sheet was presented to the Crown Corporation Committee showing the money invested, the money of the Government Insurance Office and money held by other Crown corporations where they had investment. The vast majority of that money was invested in General Electric and other such like companies. Very, very little was invested to build the Province of Saskatchewan, to build a firmer base under the economy of this province. They were taking the hard-earned income premium money from the people of this province and we know that they have forced the insurance rates up over the past years. They were taking this money to

invest in Eastern Canada, yes and even outside of Canada altogether.

Those are some of the reasons why we are having economic problems in this province.

**HON. A.R. GUY (Minister of Public Works):** — We didn't pour it down the drain in Montana . . .

**MR. DEWHURST:** — Oh, you didn't pour it down the drain in Montana. No, you brought Montana here to come and get it.

We see too what is happening in the province. We see people around our potash mines complaining that the fumes from the potash mines by Lanigan and other places are polluting the farms. Yet, nothing is being done. It is not taking the steps to see that pollution is prevented from our farmers in this province. The necessary steps should and could be taken. Employment could be provided in helping to provide ways and means to prevent this pollution, but it is not doing it. It is not giving the proper help and guidance where people in other parts of the province are asking about pollution control, pollution results. The people write in to the Government and ask for information on pollution. I have seen some of the letters, the answers they got back. There is little or no concrete information in any of the answers they get. These are some of the things that we should be doing to build a better society. We could be putting people to work on some of these projects on anti-pollution and other methods. Whether it is sewer and water programs in our towns and cities, our sewage disposals, it could be doing something about helping to alleviate the pollution. Nothing is being done.

Yet, we saw not too many months ago the Government say to the potash producers, "If you want to get any markets whatsoever, you must agree to cut from 40 to 60 per cent your natural production. But you can have an increase of over 50 per cent in your price, otherwise you can't produce potash." If any producer of potash says, I don't want a 50 per cent increase in price, well you can't produce, you must get a 50 per cent increase in price. You must raise the price from \$12 a ton to \$18 a ton. In order to do that they said that you must cut back your production. Now I hear the comment, that's the export price. Well what is the average going price across the country for plumbers, bricklayers, carpenters, electricians, or other working trades? They are not saying that you are going to get the export price as the average price, they are going to get the Saskatchewan price, the Saskatchewan prices are being pushed down.

We see thousands and thousands of people per month leaving the province and it amounts to many thousands per year. The percentage of unemployment is fantastic in this province today. In addition to that we have hundreds of boys and girls coming out of grade 12, writing their grade 12 exams this year, with little or no hope of a job for them. But in order to make these students feel happy they recently, these past few years, increased the grade 12 exam fee from \$1.00 per exam to \$2.00 per exam. This will mean that the grade 12 students of this province will pay in the neighborhood of \$200,000 in fees for writing their exams, and then when they are through, they don't know whether they can continue onto technical school, university or get a trade, or even a job without any further training. Nothing is



planned for them — unemployment drift or leave the province. This is also a charge on the farmers when we have had to build schools and put these children from grade 1 through to grade 12. A lot of money has been invested in plans and equipment throughout the years and now we see the young people of our province unable to get employment and having to leave the province.

We heard the Government last winter talk about Operation LIFT. The Premier in this House said it was a good program, and he thought it would really do the job, if the people would co-operate with Operation LIFT. For a considerable time Operation LIFT he said was really good. Well Operation LIFT was originally known as the Wheat Acreage Reduction Program. But the Wheat Acreage Reduction Program, when you take the initials off, spells "WARP." If you take the initials, of what the Premier is so proud, the 'W' stands for 'Wreck'; the 'A' for 'All'; 'R' for 'Rural' and 'P' for 'People.' This is the policy that they are following: "Wreck All Rural People." The policies of the Liberal Government at Ottawa, aided and abetted by the Saskatchewan Government, is wrecking our rural people and our rural communities, there is no mistake about it. Our rural people, our rural communities are suffering, and suffering badly. Yet not one word is said on their behalf by this Government to Ottawa, not one finger is lifted to help them out.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . Bill 2!

**MR. DEWHURST:** — Bill 2 is absolutely useless! That's what I think of Bill 2. When we see the rural people of this province being forced off their land through the agricultural program of Canada, having to go into our towns and cities, to look for a job, no provision found for them, only slum conditions for them to live in. If they join a union, then they are immediately a bad person. This Government ought to hang its head in shame, because it is not doing what should be done by a government.

If low wages were the salvation of the farmer, then the farmer should have been well-off during the 1930s. I worked through those years. I know what wages were like in those years. A farmer could hire a man for \$5.00 a month, and the Government bet the farmer \$5.00 a month that they couldn't keep the man all winter. If the man stayed all winter, they paid another \$5.00 a month. So the workers were not getting a big wage back in the 1930s. If it was low wages that was the salvation of the farmers, the farmer should have been well-off during the 1930s because labor got little or nothing for their wages. Many a hired man in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker, as you and I can well remember, was happy to get a job on a farm, if he could get his room and board and just the odd pair of overalls to cover himself while he worked.

This Government now today is trying to say that it is the fallacies of labor which are keeping agriculture down, when we all know that where the real culprit is, the high interest rates the farmer has to pay, the high price of his machinery, the high cost of repairs, and all the rest that goes into it. Then on top of that he must sell his products below the cost of production.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this Government likes strikes. It tries to do all it can to promote strikes, because it must have a whipping boy, somebody to be after all the time in order to take the attention of the public off the real issues. But the question is: where will they stop? It picks up one then,

another. It takes this group, then another.

I remember in the homestead years many years ago, when we went into the north country homesteading, partridges were very plentiful in that part of the country. But the settlers living there, the way they made a living, they had to eat a lot of those partridge. The partridge would get onto the trees in the evening, maybe a dozen partridge on one tree. The settlers would go with a snare on the end of a stick and they would go to that tree, put the snare over the partridge's head, and pull the partridge out of the tree. Provided you took them from the edges first, you could get every one of them. But if you started from centre of the group, the rest was gone. That's what this Government is doing with these labor bills, attacking the people. It is picking one off on this edge, one off on the other edge around the fringes. It knows if it attacks the centre of society first, society would revolt, but it picks them off one at a time. It started off with Baskin. Then it said that if the president of the Indian-Metis Association in Prince Albert was going to be elected again as president, there would be no grant for that Association.

We saw what it has done to the civil servants, sent out letters that they couldn't take part in politics even on their own time after hours. Bill No. 2 was brought in for the Power workers, then used for the hospital workers. Now we see in this Bill another step forward, making essential service for the building trades so they are going to be brought under the Essential Services Act. But it is just as essential a service if I go into a coffee shop for a cup of coffee and the employee says No, we are not going to serve coffee. To me that would be essential if I want a meal or a lunch. So next it will be picking on the restaurant owners, and the operators. It knows no bounds, it does not want to stop at taking in all segments of society. It wants to control and dominate and rule all segments of our society and it is not satisfied until it gets that control.

We saw what happened last winter in this Legislature here when a Committee of this House made a unanimous recommendation on a report on procedure. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), aided and abetted by his colleagues, made amendments to that report, those who had originally sponsored the report didn't dare speak against it. They picked them off one at a time.

We have heard this evening about grants to industry. After four or five years' time the grants to industry are done away with. They are written off, it is actually a free gift to industry. The Premier was boasting and said that it pays part of the interest to the farmer. It will pay part of the interest, he said the farmers really like it. A drowning man you can throw just a little wooden block and he will grab on to it to try to keep afloat. It is not going to be a lifesaver, but it may keep them up a little longer until they can grab a little bigger log. This Government ought to hang its head in shame for what it has done to the people of this province, be they urban or rural.

If this Government when it went to meet with the Federal Government had fought to try and get the Federal Government to use the Bank of Canada as a true people's bank, it could have helped them in the fight against inflation. The Government of Canada should make money available to provincial governments, municipal governments, hospital districts, school districts, or

local governmental services. Money from the Bank of Canada should be made available at cost. They shouldn't have to pay 8 and 9 per cent interest to the bank, after the banks have got it from the Bank of Canada at half the amount, and as my colleague from Prince Albert East-Cumberland said, then they can lend out several times the amount they have on money which they didn't have in the first place. These are some of the things that could be done to help alleviate the problems of this province. But nothing is being done. We see Bill No. 2, now Bill No. 1 added to it to hurt people and drive them down.

This session was not just called for this purpose. There was another purpose for this session, as has been mentioned by my colleague from Saskatoon. It was to try and get the headlines at this time of the year away from our Provincial Convention. We don't mind that, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to that, because we know it is going to backfire on them. But there is another reason this was called for. There are from 12 to 16 Members on that side of the House who have now seven sessions in. This is a Bill this session for pension purposes, which will qualify them for the minimum pension. This is the main reason why this session was called, because if the Premier wants to call an election he will have too much revolt from his backbenchers. Even the Attorney General, the Minister of Public Health, they all qualify in that. We have four on this side of the House, who qualify if it is declared a session for pension purposes. But they don't worry about that because they know that they will be back after the next election, but the Members opposite know that the majority of them will not be back. This session is called so that they will qualify for minimum pension, at the same time to try to create phony issues for whipping boys when the next election comes.

I am sure that the agricultural people of this province are not prepared to support repulsive, regressive labor legislation to force people to work. When the working trades today are prepared today to go back to work, they are prepared to back in as has been admitted in this House this afternoon, at less than 6 per cent, they have agreed to settle for, but the Government and the contractors, the employers, will not let them in. When the contractors and the employers were prepared to accept more than a 6 per cent increase in wages, the Premier said, any employer that did settle for more than 6 per cent would not get any government contracts. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, who is calling the tune, who is cracking the whip? Why are they cracking the whip? Because they want to have complete control and complete domination. The farmers do not appreciate this type of coercion and compulsion. Just because the farmers are not well-off today, they know that just because someone else is not well-off either. If you can force the other person down to the farmer's level, that doesn't mean that the farmer is well-off. The farmer knows he is no better off by pushing someone down to his level. What we need in this Government here is a government with some progressive ideas that will try to fight for the farmer and for the worker to see that everyone has a decent standard of living and can live in decency to feed and clothe themselves and have a little left over for comfort. The workers of this province are not asking for untold luxuries and untold idleness, they are prepared to do a good day's work for a decent day's pay. We have today technological advances where we have and could have one of the highest living standards of the world. Yet we are being deprived of many of the amenities

of life because we have a government that wants to take from those who have not and give to those who have.

**MR. HEALD:** — Have you talked to anybody?

**MR. DEWHURST:** — Oh, I have talked to a lot of people, and there are people in this city here who would like to go back to work who are on strike, but it is the legislation that was brought in by this Government opposite that prevents them from going back to work. This Government a short while ago amended the labor legislation whereby not only the people affected by a strike but anyone else in that same union would have the right to take a vote. If every worker who is in Regina or Saskatoon voted to go back to work and other members of the same union, be it an employee at Esterhazy or the Power elsewhere who were not on strike but they must vote according to the legislation brought in by this Government. They can prevent them from going back to work. If there is a problem in getting you back in, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), look at your own legislation. You are the ones who brought it in. You are the ones who have put the people of this province in this position. It is time that you looked at the legislation, not legislation for people but to help people instead of pushing people down. This legislation is vicious. This legislation is vicious and should never be brought in in a democratic Legislature.

I cannot support this Bill, I will oppose it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. C.L.B. ESTEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, to comment on the tirade which we have just listened to would be to insult the intelligence of every Member of this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ESTEY:** — They have mentioned today that we have during the past three or almost three months witnessed a prolonged strike in two segments of our construction industry. Any attempt to fix the blame on either labor or management will in my opinion accomplish nothing. It will simply widen the breach. We have also witnessed a situation where at least two votes have been taken on proposals and the last vote according to my understanding amount to this: in one of our larger cities the majority favored going back to work while in other centres the vote turned the proposal down. Now in my opinion whether the wages of those engaged in these two segments of our construction industry are not high enough is not the point which we are discussing in Bill 2 and its amendments. The point which we are discussing is that when those wages are compared to wages in other segments of our provincial economy they are — and I don't think this fact can be questioned — near the top of the provincial wage scale. Just because the unions involved in these particular strikes are well organized is no reason I contend to permit increases in wages over a period of, for example, two years, which increases would be nearly double the settlements which have been made in other branches of our provincial economy. It may well be that the guidelines which have been suggested for an increase are not realistic in a year of real economic activity, but surely

even the Members opposite must admit that 1970 in the Province of Saskatchewan is not a period which we could term as one of real economic achievement.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ESTEY:** — Thousands of our citizens, oh yes, thousands of our citizens in this province will have a decline in incomes. The grain farmer for example — and we have heard from both sides of the House on the situation in this respect — is facing a period of severe readjustment together with a reduction in his financial return. In 1970, even if we didn't have a plumbers' and electricians' strike there would still be a reduction, I contend, in the dollar value of our construction industry. But with these present two strikes our construction industry is virtually at a standstill. Unless something is done immediately, projects will not meet a point where we can continue on them and give employment to people during the winter of 1970-71. This Liberal Government, as is all too much in evidence today, will not permit the present situation to continue and the majority of the citizens of this province do not want that situation to continue.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ESTEY:** — The policy of this Government is to see to it that the differences between management and labor shall not adversely affect thousands of people who have very little to say in fixing the policies of unions or of management. The only suggestion which comes from the Opposition which is of a concrete nature is that we bring in an outside mediator. Mediators from the Department of Labour who have been in the Department of Labour for generations and mediated strikes under the NDP came into this dispute some time ago and were unable to reach a settlement. In my opinion if we bring in an outside mediator or had brought in one we in all probability would have faced an even prolonged period of inactivity insofar as our electrical and plumbing people are concerned. It is very interesting, it will be very interesting to see how some Members of the Opposition will vote on this Bill. I am sure that their constituents will even be more interested. To come to a point mentioned particularly by the Member from Regina North West and the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank), who is not in his seat, this concerns housing. The Federal Government in the last two weeks has announced a \$263 million housing project to provide houses across this Dominion for people earning less than \$6,000. In the city of Regina one firm alone had a contract to produce 50. A contract has been approved in Saskatoon for another 75. There is a second approved in Regina and I do not know the exact amount. But these houses are to be sold to people who have an income of under \$6,000 at a special rate of interest. Without plumbers or electricians we cannot take care of these people and you people over there in the past have been the ones who let on you are concerned with those people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ESTEY:** — I also want to point out another thing in regard to this housing project which I regard as the best housing project that has been in existence since I have been Minister of Municipal Affairs, and that is that the \$500 grant approved and brought

into this Legislature by a Liberal Government will cover the down payment in about 80 per cent of those houses.

Now we have heard a lot of talk tonight about profits in industry, never once related to profits according to sales or according to investments. You have a Member sitting opposite who has a meat-packing plant in his constituency which sells across this country. The Hon. Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) can go there, he can find out what the profit is on the investments or the profit on sales and I'll tell you it is somewhere below 4 per cent. Oh I realize that won't even phase some of you people because you talk about percentages but your own Member can find out. The Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) is waving around his banner. I suppose he holds shares in Canada Packers. If he can add and subtract, I am told that you will find that a pound of meat on the average yields less than half a cent profit to that same firm that you are advertising today. On investment capital the figure is less than 4 per cent and your own Member can find that out.

I suggest to the two people who are running for the leadership, if they could get together, that Mr. Romanow could find out in the Province of Saskatchewan, the profit picture in Saskatchewan, the profit picture insofar as meat is concerned. If they can't get together the NDP party will go back to where it was yesterday.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ESTEY:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with just one remark and that is as we have listened in this House today the speakers opposite seek to convey to us the idea that they represent all segments of the Province of Saskatchewan, that they are the only political party which represents all people. And I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that a short while ago that we had the four-ring circus in Saskatoon. We had the four potential candidates come to Saskatoon and a hall was rented, the most beautiful hall in the Province of Saskatchewan, the auditorium, which seats 2,003 people when filled to capacity. The report in the news media was that approximately 500 people attended the meeting.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ESTEY:** — The meeting was held in this auditorium. Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the only reason they didn't put it in the main hall was you can hardly find the 500 people so they went down in the basement. I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this gives some idea of a genuine interest in the NDP party in the province of Saskatchewan as of this date, when two leadership candidates come to the city of Saskatoon and they could only produce about 500 people to attend a meeting.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ESTEY:** — And I understand that they had 90 in Swift Current. Mr. Speaker, it is quote obvious that I will support the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife):** — Mr. Speaker, I often get into a bind when I say I will finish at a certain time. It being very close to 9:30 I would like to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.