

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**2nd Day**

**Tuesday, June 30, 1970.**

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**QUESTIONS**

**CLOSURE OF TIMBER BOARD OPERATIONS**

**MR. J. MESSER (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Has the Government made a decision, a definite decision in regard to the closure of the Timber board operations at Reserve, Saskatchewan? If it has, what date is the closure set for and what disposition will be made of the yard and the machinery at that yard?

**HON. W.R. THATCHER (Premier):** — The answer is, No.

**MR. MESSER:** — No, that no decision has been made in regard to closure.

**CONSTRUCTION OF A ROAD FROM HANSEN LAKE ROAD TO DESCHAMBAULT**

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. I would like to know if any decision has been made to construct a road from the Highway to the Hansen Lake road to Deschambault settlement where there is an urgent need, as he is aware.

**HON. J.R. BARRIE (Minister of Natural Resources):** — No decision has been made.

**MR. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I've heard the Premier's answer No. Will he then consult with the Minister of Natural Resources so they could both give the same answer about this.

**REPRESENTATION TO OTTAWA CONCERNING CLOSURE OF POST OFFICES**

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a question and that is whether he has made any representation to Ottawa concerning the 200 post offices that have been closed in the rural areas of the province. I have written them a letter; I didn't receive a letter from the Premier. Could he tell us what he has done in that regard.

**MR. THATCHER:** — I will refer that to the Attorney General who has been handling the matter.

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have made a number of representations on behalf of the Government, not only in writing but personally. I spent some time with the Hon. Eric Kierens about a month ago, the Postmaster General, in his office in Ottawa. I wasn't able to persuade him that there should be a general change in policy or a reversal of policy, but I did seek and obtain his assurance that in individual cases and in cases of individual hardships he would have another look at the problem. If the Hon. Member has some particular post offices that he would like me to make representations about I would be glad to do so. I've done this in a number of cases so far and I am hopeful that in some isolated cases there may be a change of opinion or a decision.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Now if the Member has asked a supplementary question in connection with the postal strikes, otherwise we have had a customary three oral questions before the Orders of the Day.

**MR. MESSER:** — A supplementary question, if I may, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — No, we've got past that one.

### **POLLUTION FROM ONE POTASH MINE**

**MR. LLOYD:** — Another topic, I'm not sure which Minister to direct this question to so perhaps the Premier could answer. Has the Government any plans or any announcement it could make with respect to the concern about the pollution from one potash mine in the province that was recently raised by a group of farmers?

**MR. THATCHER:** — This matter also is under active consideration but we are not yet in a position to make a statement.

**MR. LLOYD:** — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, can the Premier say when the decision may be made, and if the considerations extended or if the research is extended to other potash mines as well?

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well, it is rather difficult to be specific until we get the reports that are involved. But we are looking into the matter. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) has that department under his jurisdiction and we will get the report as quickly as we can. Then we will decide whether any action is possible or not.

**MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the

Premier a short question in the absence of the Minister of Labour?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Supplementary . . . I've always thought that we should hold these oral questions down to three before the Orders of the Day and the Leader of the Opposition wanted the fourth one, so we have now had four.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READING**

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

**MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife):** — Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate all day yesterday with keen interest and several comments offered by Members from the other side must be answered. I recall the Hon. Member for Canada Packers, I mean for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), getting up yesterday and defending to some large extent the fact that Canada Packers only makes half a cent profit per pound and also the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) saying that 'poor Canada Packers and other corporations are not really making all that much.' It would be interesting to see these Members and the Government opposite answer one question: are they really for Canada Packers or are they for the farmers? They tell the farmer, 'You take what you can get for your price of meat but Canada Packers can go right ahead and make millions.' So I think the question here is: is that Government opposite really for the farmer or is it for Canada Packers?

It was interesting to note also the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) crying the blues for unorganized labor and the old age pensioner and the poor, and we agree that these are problems. But it is interesting. He talks, but when it comes to doing something he turns around and does the opposite to what he says. He turned around and voted with the Government opposite last year for deterrent fees to slam onto the sick and the poor and the pensioner, gas tax and increased income taxes. He allows the Government opposite to let nursing homes charge outrageous fees up to \$475 and \$500 a month for taking care of old people in the province. Yes, he is sure worried about them you can see that. You notice too the Government opposite decreases the grant to old folks homes \$40 a year and charges the old folks for it. It is interesting to note that when the Premier went to Ottawa, did he do something about the high interest rates. He didn't do a thing.

It is interesting too that Members opposite haven't mentioned here the fact that advertising done by huge corporations adds to inflations. Millions and billions are spent and the cost is put right on the consumer. No mention of this from Members opposite whatever.

I noticed too in the debate yesterday that the Premier pinpointed the problem in Saskatchewan today and I was disappointed that he didn't zero in on it and offer some real help. There is no doubt about it that the whole problem of Saskatchewan economy is that 40 per cent of the economy is farm-based. The Premier said so, but he says it and then continues on to other areas of discussion. We've got to act on this area because until we do something for the farming people the whole economy will not move along. Did the Premier come up with any concrete proposals here? Did he offer to pay the farmers for farm-stored grain? Did he urge the Federal Government to reduce the interest rates? Did he offer to do anything about the Barber Commission Report and the cost of farm machinery? We saw what they did the last session, put in the wrong Resolution which is going to set up a commission to investigate the Barber Commission to see if Mr. Barber was correct in his accusations that the machine companies were making excessive profits. Yes, there is no doubt about that agriculture is in trouble and this is the key to the whole thing. The economy is not expanding and workers, such as plumbers and electricians, carpenters, painters are in constant threat of being laid off and many of them are being laid off. When this threat is there they become insecure, unhappy, concerned and the only means that they have got to express this concern is to withdraw their labor. If they are not able to work full time then their only hope is to make a decent wage when they are working and obviously in cases like this the six per cent guideline is really just not fair.

Therefore, as a result of this economic mess brought on by the Government opposite, thousands are leaving the province and we have heard of these figures often. Since 1964 some 80,000 have left our province. I wonder when the Premier hears that figure of 80,000 if it doesn't jog his conscience just a little bit, because we can recall a nice little promise made that he was going to create 80,000 new jobs. Instead he has driven 80,000 people out of the province and reduced that. There is a lack of work in the province for the workers, threats of vicious legislation.

Wages are really not in line with some of the other provinces, sister provinces, who have similar situations to ours. In Alberta wages for non-farm workers are \$10 a week higher than in Saskatchewan, and B.C.'s are higher still. Saskatchewan is about \$10.20 per week below the national average. Therefore, I would like to ask the Premier in particular — who is not in his seat — if he could possibly do it, to put himself in the boots of a workman — of course it has been so long since he has ever put in a hard day's work that I don't suppose he knows what it is like — and see what it would be like to say earn \$2.50 an hour, or \$3 for that matter — that's only \$400 a month — and to see around him the constant increase in the cost of living, the price of cars, homes and clothing and food going up steadily while profits of corporations keep going up, increasing 29 per cent to 129 per cent, perhaps only working three or four days a week, seeing his friends moving out of the province, vicious, anti-labor legislation as this Government is putting through, deterrent fees every time somebody gets sick in the

household, increased income tax — the threat of being laid off is always there — and then as in the case of the plumbers, offering to go back to work as they did on June 10, the management turning them down and then the Government calling a special session saying they have to go back to work and they must accept compulsory binding arbitration and fines of up to \$1,000 per day. No, I don't think even the Premier would take this type of thing sitting down if he were a worker, but he is not a worker, he is not a farmer, he is not a teacher, he is not a plumber. Therefore, he is not truly representative of the people of Saskatchewan at all. I don't think he is worthy of his vote.

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

**MR. KWASNICA:** — Neither is his party representative of the people. Instead the party is representative of only the corporate elite, that corporate elite that allows itself 29 per cent increase in profits or 129 per cent, but the demands of the working people get a flat increase of six per cent and no more. In simple words, Mr. Speaker, the reason there is chaos and confusion and economic stagnation and massive depopulation and breakdown in collective bargaining in our province is because of Liberal mismanagement and bungling.

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

**MR. KWASNICA:** — I would like to turn for a minute to try to assess why this session was called. Some answers have been put forth by the Members on this side of the House. But I think the number one reason is that it shifts the blame of the serious economic crisis in Saskatchewan onto someone and the Government picks the workers. It picks the plumbers. They are the guys who caused the mess, so says the Government. And who are these workers, the plumbers and the pipefitters and the electricians. Sons and daughters of farmers, obviously. This is a typical attempt by the Liberals to camouflage their own ineptness at governing our fine province. So it looked for a scapegoat and it thought it would use them. I should think also that this session was simply called to run interference with our Provincial Convention to take something else on. But I think really the most important thing that was uppermost in the minds of the Government Members is the fact that 15 MLAs on the side opposite there who were elected in 1964 need about eight sessions to be eligible for the MLA pension. They have seven without this extra two-day session. I think that, since the Premier wants to feel free to call an election in the fall if he thinks he can win it, well, the only way he could assure his 15 MLAs of a pension was to call a special session and he used the plumbers to do just that. I wonder who these 15 MLAs are.

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

**MR. KWASNICA:** — I see the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland)

has been napping off and on this session. I wonder if this was uppermost in his mind when they were discussing whether they should call a session. I wonder about Mr. Loken, and Mr. Grant, Mr. McIsaac, Mr. Larochelle and Mr. Breker. Then there is the Hon. Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) — he is not here either — he's got a gerrymandering going there that would make your eyes pop, but maybe he may not make it even with a gerrymander so they had to call this session. Then there are some fellows by the name of Hooker, Howes and Leith. I haven't heard any of these Members speak in this debate yet either. I just wonder if they are really concerned about the situation. As long as the pension comes in there they are pretty happy about it all. Really the thing is, I think, it is an absolute waste of the taxpayer's money to call a session here, particularly and spend thousands of dollars, as it will, to bring us all here and put everything into motion to send the plumbers back to work, the plumbers who have already offered to go back to work anyway. I would like to quote from an article in The Leader Post, June 13, 1970, which says, "No action planned on strike at this time." It was brought out here but you would have to read pretty carefully to pick it out but it says here:

Ken Busch, business agent for the Plumbers' and Pipefitters' Union pointed out Friday that the Union had made an offer Wednesday to go back to work under the terms of the expired working agreement, while negotiations for a new contract continued but that the offer was rejected by management then. The Union proposal still stood, he said.

All the plumbers and pipefitters said they would go back to work under the old contract providing negotiations were to continue. So, what is the meat here? And I would like to ask Members opposite: who turned that offer down, who turned that offer down? Mr. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), you chance is coming. Management turned it down. And I would like to know what is going to happen if management turns your decision down today to send the workers back? They may say, "We don't want it." Then what are you going to do? Are you going to impose a \$1,000 a day fine on them too? So you can see it as plain as day, they have made their offer to back to work. This is the subject. It seems to be your problem. Your pension is okay, Mr. Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), you are all right.

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

**MR. KWASNICA:** — Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Cutknife constituency, I sincerely want the plumbers and pipefitters to go back to work so that these vital construction projects may be continued with the greatest possible speed. We don't want those projects to be stopped. And it is certainly a principle of our party that the welfare of the community may take precedence over the welfare of an individual. But I do not agree with the sledgehammer approach. That is the tactic of the Government ever since I have seen it in operation, forcing plumbers to accept compulsory binding arbitration. I cannot support this Bill

as proposed by the Premier. This Bill will really destroy collective bargaining. This is the way I see it, because if management knows that the Government will step in and say six per cent and nothing more, why should management worry about making any settlements. They just hold back and hold back until the point of breaking comes and in comes the Government with a big stick and says "Six per cent, back to work slaves." And it is a similar situation with the teachers in this province. Isn't it? We've got a compulsory area bargaining act there with guidelines and headlines and the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) couldn't care less whether they are met, and in comes the Government with a big stick and saying, "Six per cent and that's that." Now I would have supported this Bill if it had related to the immediate problem, to the immediate problem only and if the legislation would not have become permanent under the statutes of this province. If you are worried about a certain situation, why just deal with that. Let's not include everybody else. I would have supported the Bill if it had asked the plumbers to go back to work on the basis of the old union agreements without the threat of fines and reprisals and other discriminatory actions. I would have supported the Bill if it had called for an impartial mediator to assist in instituting a new agreement while they went back to work. But because this Bill does not engulf any of these principles, I cannot support it.

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

**MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest for all day yesterday to this debate and certainly many statements by Members opposite would be open to question. There is only one which I am going to deal with at the moment because it particularly disturbs me and this is a statement made by the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) yesterday. He implied, I believe, that the construction costs of a house today run about 10 per cent. Now I have heard this argument before by various labor leaders and I'm sure that it is open to question. If you check with various consultants they will tell you that construction labor costs may run around 45 per cent, not 10 per cent, but this doesn't include the labor costs of the materials that are used, the manufacturing costs, the cost to prepare the lumber, to make the cement, the various other components, plumbing fixtures, heating fixtures, manufacturing costs of all of these parts, the labor involved. Actually the true concept of the \$20,000 house probably runs around 80 per cent or more, not the 10 per cent mentioned by the Member for Moose Jaw South.

Now as you know, Mr. Speaker, I represent a rural area in this province and I think you probably know by now that rural people in general are fed up with a never-ending number of strikes. There is little sympathy in Moosomin constituency for labor bosses who will call their members out on strike and ask for increases of \$1.50 per hour for workers who already are getting \$4.50 per hour. My constituency is a typical rural constituency made up of farmers, merchants, old-age pensioners

and workers in businesses, small businesses and agriculture. Very few of these people are getting anything near \$5 an hour. I wish they could. I sincerely wish they could. At the present time not many of constituents are able to share in these good wages but as taxpayers they suffer when these higher paid workers strike and ruin our economy. My main concern, Mr. Speaker, is not for the few people now on strike, and I certainly don't feel qualified to judge whether labor or management is at fault in this particular dispute at the moment. Perhaps they both are, in fact, I personally feel that they both are. But I am concerned about the thousands of other workers who are denied construction jobs because of the actions of these few strikers. What about the truck drivers, the cement and the steel workers, the carpenters, the plasterers, the store clerks, the students and many others? These people want to work; they want to get construction jobs; they are prevented from doing so by this strike. I am concerned about the taxpayer of Saskatchewan who suffers when jobs and businesses are destroyed by lengthy strikes. Farmers and rural merchants have time and time again seen costly strikes of railroad workers, dock workers and grainhandlers. These strikes have certainly contributed very greatly to problems faced by rural areas today. Grain sales lost due to strikes have no doubt added to the farmers' problems. When I go around my constituency, people in all walks of life ask me, "When is someone going to take action against these costly strikes?" And I'm sure that the rural Members opposite have had the same question asked of them. I'm pleased to see that the Government now is doing something in a small way to alleviate this problem. This is certainly demanded by the vast majority of our citizens. I am sure that the rural Members opposite must be aware of the feelings of the merchants and farmers in their constituencies.

It is obvious that the NDP Socialists are actively supporting the strikers and we have certainly seen evidence of it in this session. The NDP have completely deserted the farmers and rural people. They have become dominated by the labor unions and a group of university radicals, and the old rural CCF-NDP simply no longer exists. As a result of this strike skilled workers in other trades can't find employment in construction. I agree that we are losing them to other provinces. This is why they are leaving because they can't find jobs due to the strikes. And the NDP are to blame for this.

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

**MR. GARDNER:** — What about the hundreds of extra people who will be on welfare next winter if construction is held up any longer. I wonder if they have any concern for them. What about the extra millions of dollars that the taxpayers will have to pay to look after the welfare next winter. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Legislature would not be doing their duty if they stood idly by and let a handful of strikers cripple our great construction industry.

The people in my constituency in the southern part of the



province are especially interested in the immediate construction of the Base Hospital in Regina so that medical services will be improved in Southern Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. GARDNER:** — This great hospital is being held up at the present time by the action of the strikers. If some summer construction is not started immediately then work will not be able to proceed next winter. A whole year again is going to be lost in hospital construction. How many rural people and people in my constituency will be caused extra suffering because this hospital is not ready due to the action of this strike? Are the Members opposite and the union leaders not interested in providing these medical services for the sick people of Southern Saskatchewan? The NDP apparently want this strike to continue. However, I am pleased to support this Bill which will end the construction strike.

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

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 — 31**

**Messieurs**

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

The debate continues on the main motion.

**MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, I was interested

in the remarks made by the previous speaker, the Hon. Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), when he talked about the concern of the farm people in regard to this dispute. I would ask the Hon. Member and the Government generally how many representations have they received from farm people, from farm organizations, that they are really concerned about this dispute and that it is somehow affecting the farm economy.

I invite them to produce any briefs, any submissions that have been made to them, that this dispute is in some way inhibiting and having a serious effect on the economy of our farmers. I challenge them to produce one bit of evidence and place before this House that they have received submissions, representations about any kind of an emergency situation that the farm people are concerned about and are desperately interested in this dispute being settled. I submit that the farmers of this province are the least worried about the plumber's dispute or about the electrical dispute. I am sure that the farmers are concerned about the ineptness of this Government to give any leadership to provide farm income for the farm people.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — I doubt whether they have expressed any real concern about the effect of this strike on the economic conditions of our farmers.

I was also interested in the remarks of the Hon. Member in regard to the labor cost in building construction. I invite the Member to examine a newspaper report and let him explain to me and to this House of this kind of a situation that appears in The Leader Post or in the Star Phoenix of a few days ago.

Saskatoon — mechanical equipment and piping for power — Saskatoon, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, at Scarth Street, Regina:

A low bid was received from Balzer's Plumbing and Heating, 535 Arcola Avenue, Regina, of \$277,101. Other bids received June 9, Canadian International Comstock, \$320,488; Botting and Associates, \$324,006; Smith Plumbing and Heating, \$340,164; Flanders Installations of \$353,204; Dominion Bridge \$306,000; Brown and Root \$399,000; Commonwealth Construction \$435,845; Piping Works and Process Plant, \$503,643; Northern Electrical Industrial Piping, \$701,499; Dusseldorf, West Germany, \$848,284.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the low bid of \$277,101 as compared to the high bid of \$847,280. A difference, Mr. Speaker, of \$570,000 on a project that a low bidder was able to give his bid of \$277,101 — 200 per cent more! The Hon. Member suggests that it is the labor cost between one company and another that makes this wide disparity. This, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is where the investigation should be taking place. What is the reason for this kind of wide disparity?

Mr. Speaker, I was also interested in the remarks of last night, in fact this morning I saw the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and I congratulated him. What a tremendous job he did yesterday in representing Canada Packers! You know he must be commended for his representation. It is interesting to see the Member for Cannington representing a rural constituency — he didn't really talk about the plight of the farmers or the workers, he talked about poor Canada Packers. Well, congratulations to the Hon. Member from Cannington. A job well done! Really the Hon. Member from Cannington doesn't have to worry anymore. He is taken care of. Ross has made sure that come next election he will be pensioned off and he will be taken care of.

The other congratulations I would like to extend to the Hon. Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Estey). He is only in his first term of office and he can't get a pension at the present time. The Premier has been talking about the importance of representations on the Board of Directors of international and national companies from Saskatchewan. I wonder whether the Hon. Member for Nutana Centre, making the pitch and such tremendous representations for Canada Packers, is not looking for that post on the Board of Directors after the next election. I would extend him my best wishes and I hope that he gets that post. Maybe he might become their legal counsel if not a member of the Board of Directors. He might even make the Senate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this special session has been called by the Premier at this time for a very deliberate political purpose. The timing of this session and its political purpose should be patently clear to every citizen and voter in the Province of Saskatchewan. It falls on the heels of the New Democratic Party Convention, at a time we will be electing our new political leader. The public image of the Saskatchewan and Federal Liberal parties at this time is very bad to say the least. Both are responsible for leading this province and this country into serious economic crisis — massive unemployment, farm income at its lowest level since the hungry '30s, small business bankruptcies are unprecedented, inflation continues and so does the population exodus. With each passing day people on fixed incomes are having a tougher time to make ends meet. Tight money policy on the one hand and on the other banks, finance institutions and foreign interests are reaping huge profits.

The Liberals in Saskatchewan have lost all credibility and this the Premier knows.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — At the same time the stock of the New Democratic party is growing by leaps and bounds. Our people are talking about new policies; the leadership campaign has given the Saskatchewan NDP additional publicity. The people know and understand that only a New Democratic party can lead the province out of this Liberal-created inflation and depression.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — And make no mistake, both were planned and created deliberately by the Liberal Government policies. This is the first time in history that government by deliberate action has chosen to create an economic depression, because of its policies, or in other cases, because of lack of policy.

The Premier is hopeful that by calling this session he may somehow take the edge off the inroads that the New Democratic party has made into past Liberal support. Let me say it loud and clear, Mr. Speaker, the last thing the Premier is concerned about is settling the plumbers' and electricians' strike, to get what he calls his \$20 million crash program moving. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, there was and is no crash program. This I and my colleagues exposed in some detail when I discussed the Budget last winter, because the money was just not provided. This the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) conceded publicly and confessed to me privately after I spoke on the Budget and provided conclusively that no additional \$20 million public works program was included in the Budget. And this he knows.

So what is the Premier's ploy? Simply this, he wants to steer the public attention off the New Democratic party support that is mounting by using this Legislature as a public platform and whipping labor as the culprit for the economic ills of this province.

If this Government in fact had a crash public works program, and if that program had been meaningful in creating a large number of jobs, and thus helping the general economy, then the action the Government is proposing to take now could have been taken last April, before the winter session prorogued on April 18, since both strikes were then in progress, Mr. Speaker. That is not to say that I or anyone on this side of the House would have supported this type of legislation. Let me remind the House what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) was saying and let me quote:

Labour Minister Coderre has assured members of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters Union that he has not and will not interfere in the province-wide plumbers strike which began April 6.

In a meeting with Ken Busch, business agent for the union, and other union officers, Mr. Coderre said he and the Premier had earlier assured the union that there would be no government interference in the strike.

As far as I am concerned, the Minister said, the Government has said its policy is that it will not interfere. I have not and will not interfere and I don't think any Members of the Government will interfere.

But what is the Government doing now? Is it keeping its hands off? Far from it. It is proposing to enact punitive legislation against the workers and their union. But are the unions to blame for the continuation of this strike? Far from it, Mr. Speaker.

Here is what the plumbers' union offered the employers on June 10. It gave this offer in writing to the employers, to the Government conciliation office, to the Minister of Labour and to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald). Let me quote:

The negotiating committee for the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, Local Unions 409, 179, 264 and 258 propose to call a special meeting of the above mentioned Locals and will advise the membership to return to work under the terms and conditions of their expired agreement. The committee also proposes to continue negotiations with the contractors until such time as a new revised collective agreement is negotiated with the contractors. The committee has indicated their acceptance of John Elchyson, Chief Conciliation Officer of the Department of Labour, to sit in on negotiations to assist the parties.

This document is signed by six members of the Union's negotiating committee. Did the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), did the Premier, did the Government apply any pressure on the employers to accept the union's offer and resume construction? Mr. Speaker, I have not read such reports in the Press. Certainly the union is not aware of any such pressure exerted on the employers in the light of this clear position stated by the union in offering to return to work.

Is the Government proposing at this time legislation to compel employers to accept the union's offer? No, it proposes to punish the union by extending Bill 2 and forcing it down the throats of the workers.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has on several occasions called on the Government to employ impartial mediation or conciliation. He called on the Government to give leadership. He suggested some very reputable persons who can be called upon by the Government to assist in resolving these disputes, but the Government refused and failed. It chose to play politics. It encouraged employers to take a tough line. It is this Government that created these strikes and for this it must be condemned, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Let us be reminded that just as the first strike occurred the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) was talking about cancelling the construction start of the Regina Base Hospital, if the employers and union agreed on a substantial wage increase. He gave the employers a signal to hold tough. He, in fact, was telling the employers to help him out of his political commitments

which he has no intention of fulfilling. He asked them to help him so that the hospital construction does not start.

**HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Health):** — Just wait until . . .

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Well I am waiting. I have been sticking around for six years, Hon. Mr. Minister of Health and I am sure I am becoming more and more convinced that we will have to wait a much longer time if the Liberals are in office. But that isn't going to last very long.

The other piece of the Government's manufactured shameful deception is the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts in Regina. The first day the plumbers went on strike on April 6, the Premier was saying the opening of the Centre would be delayed. The plumbers agreed to return to work on this project and they did so within a couple of days. On April 15, the electricians went on strike and placed pickets around the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts' project.

Mr. Speaker, I am told the next day April 16, Mr. Bob McWillie met the Minister of Labour at 2:00 p.m. at the Minister's office and offered to remove the picket line and proposed to assign 24 or more electricians to work around the clock on the project without any payment of wages, Mr. Speaker, that is, the union would provide the labor free of cost. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the day before the strike there were only eight electricians employed on that project. Mr. McWillie asked the Minister to communicate this offer to the Premier. Later the Premier telephoned Mr. McWillie. Mr. McWillie was re-stating his offer to the Premier, but in the middle of the conversation you know what happened? I am told the Premier hung up the telephone on Mr. McWillie's ear. Remember it was the Premier who initiated the telephone call. At 8:00 p.m. that same evening, in the Premier's office, Mr. McWillie again repeated the offer to the Premier, but the Premier's answer was, "It is too late."

Take note of that story, Mr. Speaker. You know I cannot help but be reminded of the Premier's statement of August, 1966, when he was questioned by the Press in regard to the Oil Chemical and Atomic workers negotiations and the impending strike of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The Premier was asked how negotiations were progressing between the IBEW — Mr. McWillie's union — who was seeking a 16 per cent wage increase with the SPC, while the Oil Chemical and Atomic workers' union was willing to settle for eight per cent. The Premier replied, "I think the second union is a much more sensible one," with reference to the IBEW.

However, when the IBEW members offered to work around the clock, provide three times as many men as employed by the contractors, free of charge, and ensured no further delay in construction in respect to the construction at The Saskatchewan Centre of Arts in Regina, the Premier said that the same union

is unreasonable. He hung up the telephone on the representative's ear and says it is too late. I say the Premier is unreasonable.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — I say it is the Government that is responsible for the delay in the opening of The Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts. And incidentally reports have it — and they were printed in the Press — that the building would be completed at the beginning of the year. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that it was this Government's fumbling and stumbling that delayed the construction. It was the internal Government feuding and fighting that delayed this construction. The changing of their mind every few days, by not ordering the equipment on time to arrive for the opening. These were some of the delays. This is well known by the workers and to the construction managements, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). This is known to the Press. These facts have been conceded by many of the Government officials to many citizens in the city of Regina. And it is common talk on the streets of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps if there is any doubt, let us agree that there should be a public investigation to expose the truth and to place the blame where it belongs . . .

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — on the doorstep of this Government, on the doorstep of this Premier.

Mr. Speaker, so the timing of this session can only be described as dirty politics, a deliberate trick designed to mislead the people by again blaming the wage earners and their unions for the economic ills that face the people of Saskatchewan and for which this Government must be held largely responsible, not the unions. The Premier hopes to steal some of the publicity away from the NDP Convention and perhaps one further fact is that by bringing in this single Bill, this evil Bill, he hopes to create the impression that by us opposing this Bill, as we must, that the only thing the New Democrats is concerned about is defending the rights of labor and its unions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the people of Saskatchewan and I urge the news media not to fall into this specially and ill conceived Liberal trap. Yes, we need a special session to deal with the real issues in this province, the issue of unemployment, farm crisis, poverty, business bankruptcies, improving health services, extending education opportunities for our people. We need a special session and a plan to place Saskatchewan on a new course of action and take it off the course to disaster that this Liberal Government has directed this province on. We do not need a special session for punitive action and for further denial of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, let me now discuss in some detail the particular dispute. The bargaining agreement between the plumbers' union and the plumber contractors expired on March 31 of this year. The union was seeking improvement in wages, welfare benefits and working conditions which would be similar to those in our neighboring provinces of Alberta and Manitoba. Joint bargaining negotiations started in the middle of February between the plumbing contractors located in the cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Moose Jaw and the four local unions in these cities. The employers had a committee of 10 representatives for the purpose of bargaining, three from Regina, three from Saskatoon, two from Prince Albert and two from Moose Jaw.

The union was represented by a committee composed of equal members. The union and the employers reached agreement on all matters except wages before the contract expired or at least before this union took strike action on April 6. The wage rate for Regina and Saskatoon journeymen plumbers under the old agreement was \$4.55 per hour.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to your attention that this rate took effect only as of January 1, 1970, and it applied to journeymen only at Saskatoon and Regina. The previous rates were as follows: between April 1, 1969 and October 1, 1969 — the rate was \$4.10 for journeymen; between October 1 to December 31, 1969 it was \$4.40. As of January 1, 1970 the rate went up to \$4.55. Therefore when the higher rate was achieved it applied to very few men since most of the plumbers in Saskatchewan were unemployed during the winter months.

The wage rate in Prince Albert is five cents an hour below Saskatoon and Regina and the rate in Moose Jaw is 50 cents an hour below Saskatoon and Regina. Take note — the Moose Jaw rate is 50 cents an hour below Saskatoon and Regina, or a rate of \$4.05. Despite this wide and unjustified disparity the Moose Jaw plumbers have not taken strike action. No one will convince me that the cost of living in Moose Jaw is some 12 per cent below Regina or Saskatoon.

Wage rates for apprentices are as follows: first 12 months it is only 50 per cent of the journeyman's rate; between 12 and 24 months it is only 60 per cent of the journeyman's rate; between 24 and 36 months 70 per cent of the journeyman's rate; between 36 and 54 months it is 85 per cent of the journeyman's rate; after 54 months and until a journeyman's certificate is achieved 90 per cent of the journeyman's rate. In some areas the predominant group are journeymen, in others it's apprentices. Due to the seasonal nature of work and fluctuation in the construction industry it takes many years for an apprentice to obtain his journeyman's certificate. This is an important thing to underline and note.

Mr. Speaker, I have read and listened to dozens of accounts of this dispute and the one wage rate that is constantly repeated is \$4.55 per hour, but no one ever mentions that a man working in this industry for the first 12 months of his employment



receives only \$2.27 1/2 per hour in Regina and Saskatoon. In Moose Jaw he receives only \$2.02 1/2 an hour, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you that this apprentice would be much further ahead financially if he worked in one of the unionized shops in the retail or wholesale food industry, the industry I am associated with since the starting rates are much higher. In fact in a matter of a year or so from now, the most junior office clerk's starting rate in some of our food wholesales is going to \$2.60 per hour. Mr. Speaker, take note of this, the \$2.60 rate for the most junior clerk will be exactly \$200 a month more than this Government is paying to its junior clerk in the public service, \$200 a month less than the same kind of a clerk working in a private food wholesale industry. Mr. Premier talks about his belief in high wages. Well he will have a hard time convincing me. Now our warehouse men are not subject to the extremes of climate, hazards and dangerous conditions on the jobs, nor are they subject to the same insecurity of employment and repeated lay-offs.

Under the old agreement wages in Regina and Saskatoon were identical to those of Alberta and Manitoba. The union wanted to maintain parity rates. The construction unions in Alberta settled for a \$1.00 per hour increase in a one-year agreement. But the plumbers' union in Saskatchewan indicated to the contractors that they would be prepared to settle for 17 per cent total improvement in wages and welfare benefits for a one-year agreement. The contractors offered a wage increase of 18 cents per hour effective April 1, 1970; 18 cents effective October 1, 1970; 19 cents per hour effective April 1, 1971 and 20 cents per hour effective October 1, 1971, for a total of 75 cents per hour in a two-year agreement. The union proposed conciliation but the employers rejected the union's offer of conciliating their differences. The membership on the other hand, in the light of this position, turned down the employers offer. With their determination to maintain parity with Alberta rates, they chose to take strike action on April 6, in Regina. The Saskatoon and Prince Albert plumbers took simultaneous action. The Moose Jaw local whose contract also expired and who were involved in the joint bargaining with the industry did not at that time and to this date have not taken strike action.

Let us take a brief look at the electricians' dispute. Their agreement also expired on March 31, 1970. The parties first met on February 2nd to consider bargaining procedures. The union submitted its request to the employers on February 24th. In respect of wages, what was the union's proposal? The union in its submission said this: I quote.

Following the signing of our current collective agreement and up to the present time, the electrical industry enjoyed a stable relationship in the Prairie Region, which we are sure is to the benefit of both parties.

One of the major contributing factors which have brought about this stability in our judgment is the fact that parity has been achieved to a very large measure in both wages and benefits in our most recent collective agreements. Therefore, during the course of negotiations of

this collective agreement we will be raising or submitting proposals in reference to wage rates to ensure that parity is maintained in our collective agreement and therefore should be the basis . . .

Mr. Speaker, I want to underline,

. . . therefore should be the basis for collective bargaining at this time.

In other words, the union was saying, "We want parity and we submit parity as a basis for arriving at a collective bargaining agreement." Certainly this cannot in any way be interpreted that the union was holding the gun to the employer's head. It was a basis for negotiations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, three bargaining sessions were held, February 24, March 12, 13 and March 17. It was at that time that the employers finally presented the union with a counter-proposal. What did the employers propose and demand? Well, Sir, I want the Premier to listen to this. Among the things that the employers demanded is a 50 cent per hour wage cut, Mr. Speaker. Yes, a 12 per cent wage reduction. Mr. Speaker, what are the rates in the electrical industry. Well, a journeyman also receives \$4.55 as of October 1, 1969. Prior to that between April 1, 1969 and October 1, it was \$4.15. Apprentice journeymen — and I want the Members to listen particularly and perhaps they might take some notes and look at these wage rates. The first six months for an apprentice rate is \$1.82 per hour; after six months, \$2.28 per hour; after one year, \$2.50 per hour; after eighteen months' service and up to two years, \$2.73 per hour; after two years, \$2.96 per hour; after 30 months, \$3.19 per hour; after three and a half years, \$3.41 per hour; and even after four years, the same rate is maintained at \$3.41 per hour. A \$1.82 per hour starting apprenticeship rate, this is only slightly better, Mr. Speaker, than the Federal minimum wage. But has the Government taken the trouble to inform the public of these low rates? No! The only rate it kept repeating itself is \$4.55 per hour. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that 50 per cent of union workers in the plumbing industry are on the apprenticeship rate. A six per cent wage increase in each year over the two-year period would bring these workers 11 cents per hour in the first year, and another 11 cents in the second year, for a total increase of 22 cents per hour. This would only bring them slightly ahead of a \$2.00 starting rate.

I can tell this House that I have recently been engaged in several sets of bargaining negotiations and our settlements provided for wage increases of 61 cents per hour and 71 per hour, establishing a minimum base rate of \$3.00 an hour for warehouse men. In percentage terms our increases range from 26 per cent to 32 per cent for 26 and 27-month agreements.

Mr. Speaker, even though the IBEW were faced with a 50 cent per hour wage cut, they did not break off negotiations, they continued on March 18th. Government conciliation services were requested and meetings continued on April 1, April 7 and 8 with

**June 30, 1970**

the Government conciliation officers. But no progress was in sight. The Government was threatening the unions that if their demands exceeded six per cent, government contracts would be cancelled. In other words, the Government was aiding and abetting employers to get tough with the union or tougher than they were.

The electrical contractors finally made an offer to the union similar to that that was made in the plumbing industry, that is, 75 cents per hour increase for journeymen only over a two-year period.

Again the Minister of Health threatened; he is reported in The Leader Post on April 10th saying, with particular reference to the Base Hospital, I quote:

The Government would probably not sign contracts for any of its major projects if there were provisions for wage increases of more than six per cent.

The Government would expect them (the construction trade unions) to stay within those guidelines the same as everyone else.

Who else was talking about the six per cent limit other than this Government, who helped decide on the six per cent, Mr. Speaker? What measurements were used? Let me remind the Minister of Health of the double standard he employs. I refer him to the 1968 Medical Care Insurance Annual Report, page 42, the doctors were granted and let me quote:

An average increase in payments for insured services of approximately six per cent effective November 1, 1967, and a further 14 per cent effective August 1, 1968, based on the 1967 distribution of services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have with me a report of The Regina Leader Post, dated June 19, 1970. The headline reads this way, "Doctor and surgeons, Saskatchewan income leaders." It says:

Medical doctors and surgeons in Saskatchewan recorded an average income of \$26,831 in 1968.

This was, Mr. Speaker, before the full impact of the 14 per cent increase was realized. If one takes into account and it is safe to assume when the full impact of the 14 per cent was realized, the average income of the doctors in Saskatchewan was at least \$28,500. Did the Government apply the six per cent guideline for the poor doctors in Saskatchewan in view of the Saskatchewan economic condition. Oh no, Mr. Speaker, no sooner had the session prorogued than the Minister of Health announced that the poor \$28,500 per year doctors deserve an 11 per cent increase — over \$3,000 a year increase. That increase is more than the total wage earned by many hospital employees. No six per cent guideline for the doctors, Mr. Speaker. I am sure as I am standing here that every wage earner, every farmer in the

Province of Saskatchewan would welcome a \$3,000 annual increase.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine what has happened since the strike of the plumbers and the electricians started. Well, as soon as the winter session prorogued, the Premier formally invoked the so-called six per cent wage guideline and ordered the construction industry not to grant increases beyond that level or else no government-financed or supported contracts would be let out by the Government. The contractors had already offered an eight per cent increase before the strike started. The IBEW received this telegram on April 20th from the Electrical Contractors' Association negotiating committee, let me quote:

This is to advise that our last proposal (that is the eight per cent proposal) for new agreement with respect to Local 529 and Local 2038 is hereby withdrawn.

It is easy to see why the proposal was withdrawn, the Government directed the contractors to withdraw their proposals.

Newspaper accounts show that a contractor by the name of Haddow and Maughan working on a project in Saskatoon offered to come to terms with the union, but was being persuaded by the Government officials not to enter into an agreement with the union. The particular contractor told the Government where to get off and reached an agreement with the union, but not without prior interference and dictation by this Government. The unions were then subjected, Mr. Speaker, to the 30-day votes. In shops where the membership appeared to be weaker the employers applied, the union applied where their membership appeared to be most militant. The votes proved nothing, Mr. Speaker. It was a standoff, except that it created confusion for the employers, the union and in the minds of the public.

Mr. Speaker, having the support and encouragement of the Government, the employers moved with their next attack and advised the unions that the entire contracts were being cancelled, with special emphasis on the union shop and union hall hiring provisions, an issue that had been resolved prior to any strike taking place. The union hall hiring practices have been in existence in the building trades union in Canada and the United States for a half a century, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General and the Premier aided and abetted in this little game that went on, and further made public statements suggesting that perhaps the hiring hall clause was illegal and that they were receiving communications stating that the union was intimidating its members. Mr. Speaker, the union representative, Mr. Busch wrote the Premier, asking that he provide him with any evidence or documented proof of any intimidation, threats or coercion, so that the union would be able to investigate and take any action to stop any guilty party. I have a copy of that letter, Mr. Speaker. I am advised as late as this morning, Mr. Speaker, that over a month has elapsed and the Premier is still to answer that letter and provide any evidence or any proof that there was any coercion or intimidation or that he had in fact received such a letter.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that the 30-day vote provision and contract cancellation when a strike occurs were amendments to The Trade Union Act legislated by this Liberal labor-hating Government. We warned them that these were bad amendments, which would bring about this kind of disastrous situation. Our warnings, Mr. Speaker, have become true, my only request is that the Minister of Labour and I don't know whether he is in his seat, but perhaps . . . In fact the Front Benchers have disappeared. Oh, they are way out in the back, there's one, two, three. I think we have twelve Cabinet Ministers, where are the other eight? They said they are interested. Ten Members in their seats. But that is the usual Liberal interest, Mr. Speaker, my only request to the Minister and to perhaps the Hon. Minister of Welfare or Minister of Health, is to take note of this, that he start preparing amendments to The Trade Union Act for the next session to restore the Trade Union Act to the 1964 standard, if we are to get out of this mess and confusion that you have created by your legislative action.

Another interesting demand which the electrical contractors decided to force on the union is a new and their own definition of what an electrician is. They refused to accept the legal definition as established under the Apprenticeship Regulations. The union could not possibly agree to this kind of a provision and jeopardize the whole trade where standards are established in co-operation with every province in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I have already read in detail the plumbers' union offer of June 10, to return to work on the basis of the old agreements and to continue to bargain. The IBEW made the same offer verbally to the employers and the Government. This as I understand it was a proposal that was requested of the union by the Premier. Mr. Speaker, it was the Premier that made this request of the union, that they agree to return to work on the basis of the old agreement and that negotiations continue. The union agreed. Then the Premier started to laugh at the union, because he is no doubt quietly supporting the employers' position of a 50 cent per hour wage cut and the elimination of many other contract provisions including the hiring-hall clauses.

Mr. Speaker, if this session was to be called, it ought to have been called for the purpose of introducing a Bill which would have directed the employers to accept the offer of the union for the resumption of work and continuation of bargaining in good faith. The facts prove that this Government, more than anyone else, is responsible, first for creating these strike situations and, secondly for making it possible for these strikes to continue for such a long time, since the Government both openly and behind the scene, was pouring fuel on an already inflamed situation with the Premier fanning the fire.

Let me give you a further example of the Government's interference. On June 22nd, CEL Construction Ltd. Of Saskatoon and Local 179 of the Plumbers and Pipefitters, signed a letter of agreement which provided:

1. That the men would return to work immediately under the terms of the old agreement.
2. That all wage increases ultimately agreed to be retroactive to June 22nd.

This firm was working on the extension at the Boundary Dam Power Plant in Estevan, a government project. What happened? The men went back to work for 24 hours. Then suddenly there was no more work for them to do. The job wasn't finished, the contractor was ready to complete it, the men were on a payroll, ready to work, ultimately the taxpayers will be paying the bill. One has to assume it was the Government which stopped the work on this project, not the contractor, not the union. Please note the date: June 22, just three days after the Premier called this special session. I submit that the Government stopped what could have been a pattern for a general return to work, so that it would proceed with its plan to subjugate the construction workers and extend its doctrine of creeping compulsion to still another group of Saskatchewan workers.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that has not been explained by this Government, even during this session, is the cancellation of all building construction projects. Let us remember that it is only the plumbers in the cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, and the electricians in Regina who are on strike. I ask the Government, I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) perhaps he can tell us — he is now the only Cabinet Minister here who is holding the fort — why did the Government cancel the Peacock high school construction in Moose Jaw, or why did it cancel the Moose Jaw Highways Department warehouse, or the Comprehensive high school in Weyburn? There is no strike in Moose Jaw, there are contractors in Moose Jaw, there are contractors in Weyburn, there are plumbers who are ready to go to work in Moose Jaw; there are electricians ready and anxious to go to work in Moose Jaw and Weyburn. Why did you cancel these programs? Why has the government, all the government construction come to a standstill. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the excavation work on the Base Hospital could have been proceeded with, including the pouring of footings and the basement. The same is true of the Vocation A school in Regina. The laborers, the carpenters, sheet metal workers, ironworkers, bricklayers, and other trades are not on strike. The plumbing and electrical work is done when projects are well on the way, Mr. Speaker. So when the Minister of Labour says that the Government has no vendetta against any party, I am not convinced, Mr. Speaker. The cancellation of all contracts is nothing else but vendetta. Mr. Number One wants to prove that he is boss again, that is why all contracts were cancelled, and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, on this basis he will not have to prove later that there was no \$20 million special construction program, and that he has. He will not have to prove that he in fact is responsible for the massive unemployment in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Government could have moved some of the money into other employment-creating projects, projects which do not require plumbers and electricians. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition yesterday

when speaking in this debate outlined at least a dozen projects which could be initiated immediately and could have been initiated three months ago, to get them started so that work could be provided for the people, because those are jobs and projects which do not require plumbers or electricians. But the Premier knows that he and his Government created this economic crisis in Saskatchewan and he is trying desperately to make labor the scapegoat.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer to the Report of the Labor-Management Committee on the Construction Industry. Let me draw your attention to page 3 of the Report under the heading, "Services of the Department of Labour." Again, I hoped that the Minister of Labour was here, because I would like to read these sections to him because obviously he hasn't read the Report. Maybe at least he could turn his ear phone on and listen and learn a little bit. The Report says this:

One thing that becomes very evident throughout our enquiry was the fact that the Government funds extended to provide effective services to labor and management who are well invested. An efficient Government labor-relations service saves the industry, employees and of course ultimately the public millions of dollars. In order to obtain and keep competent personnel, the Government must be prepared to compensate them on a basis that is comparable to private industry and other governments.

By the same token, the importance of providing a competent and adequately staffed conciliation service cannot be overestimated. It is most important that conciliators have a high degree of professional competence, if they are to enjoy that vital element, the respect of both labor and management. All the evidence placed before us supports the fact that many of the strikes that take place could be eliminated if competent conciliators are called into the dispute before it is too late.

Furthermore in the event that a strike does occur, the services of a conciliator can be used to shorten its duration. We also feel that it is of prime importance that the Department has a well-staffed research branch to provide accurate and up-to-date information on collective bargaining, the labor force and other areas of importance in the labor-relations field. The provision of this information can be of great assistance to the parties in negotiating and interpreting their collective bargaining. It also allows the Government conciliation service to keep on top of the industrial relations picture in the province. These are areas of vital concern. If the Government does not provide an adequate level of service here, everything else will be of little value.

Take note of that recommendation, Mr. Speaker. Let me say it is not good enough in today's technical and complicated industrial relations to have fire, safety, or electrical and

boiler inspectors acting as part-time and casual conciliators. These are secondary jobs. That is right, Mr. Speaker, that is right. I can prove it. We have just had that kind of a casual part-time conciliator involved in one of the negotiations that I was at. I can tell you from practical experience that the services are something less than good and proficient. They are in fact inadequate. This is widely acknowledged by labor and management both, Mr. Speaker.

Why is it that within a period of six years since this Government took office that it has had four Deputy Ministers of Labour? Saskatchewan might have been better served if we had the same Deputy as the one we had when the Government took office. It has had four different Ministers of Labour in the last six years.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — The Department of Labour has been starved for funds. The budget has virtually not changed in the last six years on the main items of administration, research, labor relations and labor standards.

Mr. Speaker, all of us well remember the Liberal promise of 1964 of creating 80,000 new jobs within their first term of office. But, Mr. Speaker, instead of that what did we get? Over 80,000 people have left the Province of Saskatchewan in a six-year period since this Government has taken office. A year and a half ago, the Premier was trying to persuade the people that there was a 10,000 man labor shortage. Mr. Speaker, today nine per cent of the labor force is unemployed and the numbers are climbing with every passing day. This week, Mr. Speaker, thousands of young people are leaving high school. None will be able to find jobs in Saskatchewan simply because none are available. I have people in my constituency who have not held a job for a period of six months. The resolution of these disputes is not going to help or mean anything to these people. They were unemployed prior to this strike.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — That's right. The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw has already pointed out that hundreds of tradesmen have left the Province of Saskatchewan. It costs between \$18,000 and \$20,000 to train a man to become a tradesman. This is a loss to Saskatchewan. In the last week or 10 days 35 electricians left Saskatchewan, that left Regina, there are perhaps more from Saskatoon. This is only from the city of Regina. You know where they got jobs. Many of them will not return and why should they when wages in Manitoba are now 45 cents an hour higher than in Saskatchewan. They are not the losers, not these workers who are really the losers. Perhaps there is the cost involved in moving and so on, but because their wages are at least 10 per cent higher they will be able to make that up fairly soon.



It is Saskatchewan, it is the people of Saskatchewan who are the losers. We lost the tradesmen, we lost citizens, we lost customers, we lost consumers, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SMISHEK** — The Premier talks . . . You know the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) always gets irritated when he hears some truth. The Premier talks about good wages. The Premier always . . . oh, he is here, good.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — The Premier always talks about good wages, but he really practises a low-wage policy. This Bill is another pressure lid to keep wages down. Saskatchewan's average wage is \$10 per week below the national average.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Way above what it was when you fellows were in.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Oh just listen, just listen. You had your chance to chirp, give me a chance to talk.

Under a CCF government it was only \$3 below the national average. This means, the \$10 per week means a loss of \$80 million per year in income or in purchasing power. Add to this the loss of income and productivity caused by unemployed, over 22,000 at times, add to this the under-employed. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that one department store no longer employs any full-time people, except for management. This is a gimmick to keep wages down. This was the law which was passed by this Liberal Government. Under a CCF government employers were permitted to employ one part-time employee for every four full-time employees. The Liberals wiped that off.

Look at the minimum wage in the Province of Saskatchewan. \$1.25 per hour in the cities and \$1.15 per hour in the smaller centres. Mr. Speaker, under the Socialists I can tell you this that the minimum wage in Saskatchewan was the highest in the Dominion of Canada.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Under the Liberal Government it is the lowest minimum wage. It is the lowest minimum wage east of the Maritimes. \$1.25 in Saskatchewan, the Federal minimum is \$1.65, 33 per cent below the Federal minimum wage. What does this mean? It means again that incomes are being lost, that people are underpaid, that they don't have the purchasing power. An increase in the minimum wage to the Federal level, Mr. Speaker, would inject at least \$50 million more purchasing power in the Province of

Saskatchewan.

Let me say this to the small business people or for that matter to the big ones, low wages are not good for business. The best future for small business is high wages. Low wages and unemployment have meant that 110 business establishments were closed in Regina last year, dozens have closed their doors since last Christmas. I say to the business community, don't be fooled by this stupid wage guideline of the Thatcher Administration. It is a policy that will lead you to bankruptcy. Don't be misled by this attack on unions because in the long run, Mr. Speaker, when workers and their unions are oppressed and suppressed your businesses will suffer and the iron hand of this Government will trample on the shoulders of your business.

Mr. Speaker, many people have been led to believe that construction workers are the elite of the working people. It is true that unionized journeymen often receive fair wages, but there are those who are still unorganized and whose wage is much lower; but remember the rates of apprentices are 40 to 50 per cent of the journeymen. Remember the long period required to qualify for a journeyman's certificate, and remember most of all that according to a survey conducted in the Province of British Columbia, the average construction worker is employed for only 7 1/2 months of each year. The rest of the time he is unemployed. The situation in Saskatchewan perhaps on the average is worse because of our more extreme weather conditions. So, when we talk about \$4.45 per hour what we are really talking about is 1300 hours work on the average. What it means is that the journeyman earns less on the average of \$6,000 per year. Remember too that while the average construction employee works 7 1/2 months per year on the average, he has to feed, clothe and shelter his family for 12 months a year, Mr. Speaker. Let us also not forget that the starting rate of apprentices on the average is about \$3,000 a year, about as much as this Government increased, in one year, the wages of the medical profession of our doctors.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 2, The Essential Services Emergency Act, has so far been used against the Saskatchewan Power Corporation Gas employees, members of OCAW in September of 1966 and Prince Albert Hospital employees, members of the Canadian Union of Public Employees in December of 1969. There were no real public emergencies facing the people, there was no danger of life, health or property that was in jeopardy. In both cases the unions offered to cover any possible emergencies. Also, there is nothing in the record of the two disputes indicating anything approaching an emergency. Gas continued to be supplied and no one was denied necessary hospital services.

There was no valid reasons for passing or implementing Bill 2. Since Saskatchewan became a province no public emergency has arisen out of labor-management disputes. Curiously enough, it was the Premier and other Government Members and supporters who, prior to becoming the Government, associated

themselves with the doctor's strike, which was much more serious than the labor-management dispute in Saskatchewan. Strangely also that Bill 2 could not be applied to the great majority of doctors should they decide to strike in future.

A further odd circumstance was that Bill 2 was used against the Prince Albert Hospital employees where there were two hospitals one of which was not on strike and where the strike had been in progress in the other one for only a few weeks. But the Government chose not to apply Bill 2 against the Estevan Hospital, which was the only hospital in that city and which had been on strike for a much longer time.

It is generally recognized that it is not desirable to make laws when the need for them has not been demonstrated. In fact, it can be dangerous since such laws may be used for purposes beyond their apparent intent. This is clearly the case with respect to Bill 2, where the Act was applied when there was clearly no real public emergency.

All evidence indicates that the real reason behind Bill 2 is to suppress wages, Mr. Speaker. Bill 2 suppresses wages by limiting or eliminating union economic or political power in collective bargaining, that is, the right of employees to strike, to collectively and simultaneously withdraw their labor, or to slow down or engage in other concerted activities aimed at creating a financial and/or political incentive on the part of employers to agree to fair wage conditions.

The application of Bill 2 has proved to be disastrous to both the gas workers and hospital workers. The Premier made sure those two arbitration boards were loaded. The workers ended up being worse off than prior to the strike or prior to the Board's decision. The hospital workers received only a 4.8 per cent wage increase. Some only got an increase of \$1 a week, Mr. Speaker.

Now in 1966 when Bill 2 was passed, this Legislature was assured that the Act would only apply if a state of emergency occurs. The Act explicitly provides that it is only where a state of emergency exists, jeopardizing life, health or property of the people. In this dispute no one's life, health or property is in danger. The plumbers and electricians have agreed to look after every emergent situation that might occur. The law is now being extended to apply much more broadly to cover the so-called economic situation. Mr. Speaker, what is a strike for if not to exert economic pressure on the employer? What the Government is doing is taking away from another 15 or 20 thousand workers the only economic pressure, the only economic strength that they have. For this and other reasons it enslaves another large group of workers in the Province of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. THATCHER:** — Such bungling.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Such bungling! Well, we listened to your bunk and you can pour it by the tons, Mr. Premier.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I call it baloney, Walter.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, David Ashe, a member of the National Panel of Arbitrators and noted author on labor law had this to say in regard to the American Arbitration Law which applies in regard to the railway industry. Let me quote:

Although at the moment compulsory arbitration is limited to the railways, if this legislation is allowed to stand unchallenged it will only be a matter of time before the principle will be extended to other, and ultimately to all industries. If that day comes, we will have the imposition of employment conditions and the fixing of wages, as well as the fixing of prices and the general regulation of industry by governmental agencies.

If we are to preserve the free-enterprise system (and I am not their particular supporter) we must continue to have free collective bargaining, and we must continue to adhere to mediation without compulsion in labor-management disputes.

Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan that day has come where the Government is in fact implementing conditions and fixing wages of workers, not only those employed by the Government, but those employed by private industries. That I have already established. If this Bill is allowed to pass, some 40,000 workers in Saskatchewan will lose free collective bargaining rights, Mr. Speaker.

This Government is hungry for power; it is determined to acquire more power and dictate to more people; it is determined to deny human and civil rights. This Government must be stopped now.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion, I therefore move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers):

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

This Bill be not now read a second time but that it be read six months hence.

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

**HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege of this House and a point of order, while the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) was speaking, he deliberately deceived this House, he lied to this House, in that . . . let me state my privilege.

**June 30, 1970**

He stated that Bob McWillie, that the Premier had initiated a call to Bob McWillie and that the Premier had the audacity to hang up on the gentleman. I checked with the Premier. The Premier does not recall having called him.

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

**MR. CODERRE:** — Mr. Speaker, let me finish my point of order and privilege. I 'phoned Mr. Bob McWillie, the person directed, and Bob McWillie has indicated he has not received a call. Therefore, it is a deliberate lie to attempt to deceive this House.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! Now I presume that the Member rose on a question of privilege which he stated. I draw the attention of all Members of the House that we are now operating under the new rules and regulations under which a question of privilege of course must be taken into consideration immediately but also notice should be given. The Speaker has the right to waive notice if he sees fit. However, I have listened to the statement of the Member and I hardly think that it qualifies as a question of privilege. It qualifies as a debating point you might say or a difference of opinion. But what I am concerned about is the fact that one Member has now called another one a deliberate liar.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — You must resign your seat.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Now I didn't call for any comment from the Leader of the Opposition about who would resign and who wouldn't resign.

One Member has now accused another one of deliberately lying. I suggest before we proceed any further in the matter that that statement should be withdrawn.

**MR. CODERRE:** — I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that the word "liar" was harshly used and not propitious to the Legislature. I will withdraw the word that he is a liar, but he certainly handled the truth very carelessly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It is all very well for a Member to say what the other Member said wasn't in accordance with the facts but when he called the Member of this Legislature a liar. Now . . .

**HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, on a further point of order. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) who is not in his seat interjected, "He is always lying." I wonder if that too shouldn't be withdrawn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well this I didn't hear. And I'll suggest that if there was a little less cross fire in this Chamber and little less argument back and forth probably we would all be able to hear some of these things. Now, where did we get to?

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may, I agree that I made that statement; this is the information that was given to me directly by Mr. McWillie and if the Government removed the motion, the one that was defeated, for a complete investigation giving this Legislature an opportunity to have everybody make representations so that the case may be properly heard. You voted against it. This is my information and I stand by it; I have no reason to believe that Mr. McWillie would have misled me.

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

**MR. I.H. MacDOUGALL (Souris-Estevan):** — I sat here this morning and I listened to the first speaker of the day and I never heard such a chintzy speech in all my life. If this is the representative of the school teaching profession in this province, I feel sorry for the school teachers. Really! When a man will get up and say that this session was called because Members on either side of the House, or this side of the House in particular, wanted their pensions, well he's got to have holes in his head that you could throw a football through. He is probably mad because he lost two days' teaching time. Apart from this his comments deserve no further comment on my part.

I want to make a few comments on the remarks of the Member for Regina North East. He feels pretty cockey these days since he stacked his nominating convention against poor old Henry. Regina North East I think made a mistake because Henry, with all his faults, tries to do something for his people. He is a leader.

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

**MR. MacDOUGALL:** — One thing about Henry is that he knows he is pulling the people's legs with his promises but the Member for Regina North East doesn't know the difference. He talks about us settling the strike last April. Well, Mr. Speaker, the very thing that this gentleman from Regina North East advocates, non-interference with strike action, this was tried but the union and the management couldn't get together so 2 1/2 months later we are here in this Chamber again trying to help the people get back to work. Now he tries to make out that the Liberal Government in this province and elsewhere is anti-labor. Let me tell you that the Labor Government in Britain had plenty of labor problems too over the past few years. I think of a friend of mine who went over there just recently to Britain and he talked about the problems that the ship-yards had over there. The

ship-yards lost millions of dollars worth of contracts due to some goofy labor strikes. I'll tell you what one of them was. There was a football game in Glasgow and the workers took the day off. The management objected because they took the day off so the next day they were out on strike. This goes on all the time. Every time there is a football game the workers leave. They lost millions of dollars' worth of contracts to Germany because they couldn't finish the ships that they had started to build on time. If this is an example of labor responsibility it is little wonder that the people in Britain turned the Labour Government out to pasture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words in support of the amendment to Bill 2. I am sure that the people, the citizens all over Saskatchewan, and over Canada are fed up to their teeth with the labor problems which beset us in Canada today. Hardly a day goes by without some union or other going out on strike tying up some segment of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to look at the costly strikes in the Province of British Columbia. Lumbermen, oil workers, longshoremen, grainhandlers, tugboat workers. Mr. Speaker, you name it, British Columbia has had it.

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

**MR. MacDOUGALL:** — This isn't the problem, it is the problem of the labor unions tied in with the NDP that is causing us our troubles in Canada. Mr. Speaker, who suffers the most? Again not the well-paid organizers like Mr. Smishek and Mr. Davies and you fellows but the worker himself. Many postal employees, indeed most of the postal workers in my own city opposed this strike and yet when fingers were snapped down east these fellows had to go out on strike. They objected to this and they objected to me personally and strenuously. Many other workers, for example, in the Brick Plant at Estevan are at present on a lay-off because no construction is taking place in the province. The department isn't moving any bricks and some of these people have called on me urging that we get the constructions trades back to work so that they can get on the job.

The history of labor problems in the Estevan area over the past three years hasn't been a happy one. First we had the SPC strike which necessitated the originating of Bill 2 in the first place. Then there was the major strike of the Brick Plant workers. This, Mr. Speaker, was engineered just prior to the 1967 election. Who was the organizer? He was a former NDP candidate from Medicine Hat. The Brick Plant strike ended a very few days after the election, after the workers had been out for over three months, if my memory serves me correctly. Now the next major strike was that of the Co-op, and this was a classic. The right arm of the NDP was attacked by the left arm. And lo and behold who was down there? My good friend Walt Smishek, NDP Member for Regina North East down there on the picket line. Now he's probably in the picket line in front of

the Building. This amazed many of the loyal Co-op supporters in Estevan, the Co-op of all places being hammered into submission by the union organizers. Mr. Speaker, many old NDP followers to this day still shake their heads at Mr. Smishek and the workers at the Co-op for going out on strike. The Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) was down there when this strike was on telling the people of the history of the strikes and keeping the strike going.

Again, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, the organizers should be put on strike pay when they organize a strike just as the poor workers themselves and I guarantee that strikes would be very short-lived. Finally in Estevan we had another major strike and this one had half the city of Estevan ready to take up arms. This was the strike of the hospital workers against the St. Joseph's Hospital. The Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) said the Government didn't choose to implement Bill 2. The Hospital Board didn't request the use of Bill 2 in this case so the Government didn't impose it on them. Now the strike lasted well over three months and many of the workers wanted to return to work, but time and again the CUPE organizers talked the workers into tramping around the hospital for yet another day or another week or another month. The final straw was the arrival of some Eastern union official who threatened to close the hospital down entirely and at this point local feeling was at the boiling point. The citizens of Estevan were most agitated by some Easterner telling them that their hospital would be closed.

Mr. Speaker, that is the recent history of our labor problems in Estevan. People are sick and tired of these strikes and I say the time has come for the Government to intervene. And if the Federal Government had any initiative, particularly Mr. Mackasey, it too would enact legislation banning all strikes. I feel we should have machinery whereby a judge or a panel of judges would decide what was fair. I don't expect the union organizers to agree because they would be out of their cushy jobs and much more power would be removed from their hands. The workers however would be the big winners as they would no longer be degraded by walking around carrying signs or slogans and banners. They would not lose any more time from their work through work stoppages and hopefully settlements as to labor conditions and wages would be every bit as fair. Labor really did themselves no favor when they joined up with the NDP because the NDP are constantly struggling for power and will go to any depth to gain that power using the poor working man as the political pawn. I ask Mr. Romanow, the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale, how can he support the tactics of his colleagues in the labor movement. Now here is a young man who claims to be for fair play and the rights of minorities, for farmers, where does he stand? He is going to be talking in a few minutes and he'll probably tell us. How can he not support the Bill that is before us to help his labor friends and the little people he talks about get back to work? He'll have a hard time, smooth talker and all that he is with that silver tongue, to get around this one. I have great respect for my friend for Riversdale but if



he doesn't support us with this Bill my respect for him will go down rapidly. I don't expect much from Taylor or Mitchell but surely the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) must realize he has a responsibility to get some of his people back to work. I will watch just how he votes on this Bill 1.

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

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, this is one time where I am somewhat at a loss for words to receive all this support by my friends opposite for the very important contest that is coming up in a couple of days' time. I know that they are rather hard-pressed to applaud for anything these days, especially this session, and I am pleased and proud that at least our party and our leadership race can give them something to applause.

Now, this has been quite a session thus far, a day and a half we have listened to Liberal speaker after Liberal speaker talk about everything but Bill 2 by and large. The Member for Souris-Estevan who just took his chair went on to talk about all strikes being NDP-oriented and used the word, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, of how the actions of the strikers who were walking around picketing were 'degrading'. Degrading for strikers and hospital workers who were fighting for a mere \$1.75 an hour which is still barely at the poverty level in the Province of Saskatchewan, a mere \$1.75 an hour! He calls their right to argue and to ask for that as degrading. He condemns my colleague from Regina for having been there to support them, he condemns my colleague from Moose Jaw for having been there to support them. If he had been doing his job as an MLA for Souris-Estevan he would have been there supporting them.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — These are not people who are NDP, these are people who are NDP and Liberals and Conservatives, members from his constituency, members who are looking for their Hon. Member to give them some guidance and some leadership in their fight to get a fair economic return. And what does he do? He turns his back on them and has the audacity today to launch once again another attack against the average person and slap himself on the back. We are waiting for the next election because when it comes that is one Member who is not going to be with us again, and he will indeed be very glad that this has turned out to be a pension session for him and his friends.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Now my hon. friends made some interesting comments. The Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) talked about clippings on the leadership race and made certain references to quotations and statements by members of this party. This is typical of

Liberals when it comes to any piece of legislation that they can't justify. They'll talk about Canada Packers as the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) has done. They'll talk about Intercontinental Packers, as my friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) has so eloquently and ably done. They'll talk about the leadership contest of the New Democratic party. They'll talk about the election in Britain. You would almost expect them to comment on whether the rain was going to hurt the rhubarb this growing season. They'll talk, like the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), about anything and everything but this odious piece of legislation that is introduced here. You know, Mr. Speaker, they think, they honestly think, I am convinced, that this leadership contest is somehow going to find the NDP disunited and parted. They somehow feel that after Saturday — at least they are hoping in their hearts, deep inside their hearts — that we are not going to come out a strong and unified force. They are grasping at that straw like they are grasping on this Bill 2 amendment to bail them out of this jam that they put the people of Saskatchewan in economically and socially. I am going to tell something to the Hon. Attorney General and to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) who is going to be speaking, that if you are waiting for the NDP, no matter what the outcome is going to be in the leadership race to come out ununified, in this one you are mistaken.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — If you are waiting for the members of the NDP to come out with no clear concise policy in this area, you are mistaken because you will find on Saturday, after this Convention is over, that our policy and our leadership, no matter which one of the candidates is chosen is united, it is going to be a strong and unified party and when you call the next election — we challenge you to call it right now — you and your boys are out and you are going to be reduced to a very small number indeed.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I agree with all the things that my colleagues have said about pensions and this being a pension session. I agree that this is an attempt to get the heat off the Premier and the Treasurer and their bungling of the job economically in Saskatchewan. I agree that it is a poor attempt to try and take away publicity from our leadership race. All of these things can be said about the special session. But I want to say a word or two about some of the remarks made by the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher). I am sorry he is not in his chair but I know that the Deputy Premier and several would-be Premiers are taking notes very carefully and will be making some comments, those who are on the periphery of power looking to get in, you can see them now.

The Premier said in this debate that Saskatchewan could very well be told which party stands for the interests of the farmer and which party is against the interests of the farmer. That is what the Premier said yesterday in starting this debate. I want

him to know that the farmer already knows where this Liberal party and the Ottawa Liberal party stand with respect to the farmers of our province. If they didn't know they know now as a result of the contribution from the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) and the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald). What did the Minister of Municipal Affairs say? He went on at great length about Intercontinental Packers and he went on to say, "Really their profit of some millions of dollars isn't all that high. I want to tell you that it is only four per cent." The Member from Cannington went on to tell us about Canada Packers. He said, "Oh, they have only made an \$8 million profit this year." Imagine, he said, farmers of Saskatchewan don't think that an \$8 million profit is very much. Not a word from the Minister of Municipal Affairs about the farmers. Not a word from the Hon. Member from Cannington about his friends who are the farmers in his constituency about the profits they are making or not making. Not a word from the Hon. Attorney General. What they are doing is defending the corporations of Saskatchewan and Canada because they belong in the hip pocket of the Liberal party.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Yes, I agree with the Hon. Premier. This debate will very well indeed tell us who stands for the farmers of Saskatchewan and who stands against the farmers.

Now this debate has revealed that our friends are not the friends of the farmers. I ask the Premier to tell this House that he is the friend of the farmer when he placed the 2 cent tax on farm fuels right after the election in 1967. Who put on the 2 cent tax, was it the Treasurer? The Treasurer, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Welfare, everyone of them on the Treasury Benches was responsible for placing that 2 cent tax on farm fuels, and why did they take it off? They took it off because their own party members were pressuring them because they know that the farmers of Saskatchewan were fed up to the teeth at having another burden, another cost to be carried as a result of the actions of the Liberal Government. You tell them that you are the friend of the farmer as a result of the 2 cent tax. I ask, Mr. Treasurer, to tell this House when you get up in the debate that you are the friend of the farmer when you welcomed and encouraged and supported the implementation of Operation LIFT on the farmers of our province. Your Government said that it would get money into the hands of our farming people. I recall that so vividly when the statement was made. At the time, the Premier, just to be on the safe side, left the back door open. He said, "You know, we welcome Operation LIFT but we weren't consulted. My Minister of Agriculture and I weren't consulted by Otto Lang and Pierre Elliott Trudeau." Well, if you weren't consulted, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McFarlane), all the farmers want to know is: why weren't you consulted? Here we in the foremost agricultural growing area in Canada, the party and the Government that are responsible

for agriculture, we have a program that affects absolutely every farmer in the province — Operation LIFT — and not a consultation, not a word of advice or encouragement or otherwise by the Minister of Agriculture, the Treasurer or the Premier opposite. This is a timid and weak Government, with a timid and weak Premier and Minister of Finance and Minister of Agriculture, who go around peddling stories, scare stories to the farmers of our province rather than giving them solutions to their problems that are created by the Liberals.

Well, now I ask the Premier and the Deputy Premier to tell this House that he is the friend of the farmer. The Premier raised this in debate, the Premier said this debate is going to tell who is the friend of the farmer and who isn't. I ask the Premier and I ask the Treasurer to tell the farmers why you voted against the Barber Commission recommendations. You tell the farmers why you voted for high farm machinery prices. You tell the farmers why you sought to protect your corporation friends, Massey-Ferguson, John Deere and all down the line when that Resolution came up. You tell the farmers who their friends are.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Premier says this debate will tell us who is for the farmer and who is against the farmer. I ask again of the Treasurer, here the boys wanted to go down to Ottawa to talk about bread and butter issues for a change, you recall. They were going to talk about the bread and butter issues, no more of this nonsense about the Constitution. So they went down to talk about bread and butter issues and lo and behold what do we find on their return, not a word about high interest rates, a bread and butter issue that affects every farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan. What about that one, Mr. Treasurer? What was your concern about the farmers on the interest rate? Have not a word in the brief whatsoever.

**MR. STEUART:** — I got it lowered personally.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You see, Mr. Speaker, how the Liberals act when they are caught — they went to Ottawa on bread and butter issues and got them personally lowered, not a mention of interest rates. Interest rates of 10 per cent. With a lowering like that, Mr. Deputy Premier, all I can say is that you had better not go to the farmers with support like that. If you think you lowered the interest rates down to 10 per cent from 12 per cent, you've got another think coming.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this Government that is concerned about the farmers, so concerned about these gouging interest rates, with not a word in their brief and not a word since that time, not a word against their friends, the financial lending houses of Eastern Canada. Have not a word whatsoever. Have not a word against their banking friends and their big business friends in Eastern Canada. Yes, this debate will tell us who is going to be in

in fact the friend of the farmer. Well, you know if we didn't know before, we know now. This party opposite, the Treasurer, the Premier, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Agriculture, the guardians of the interests of Western agriculture, tied up lock, stock and barrel with the large corporations that live off the backs of the farmers in interest rates and farm machinery prices.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — And what you have to propose instead are piece meal agricultural policies, no programs whatsoever but petty political sessions like this one.

Just one more word about our friends opposite being friends of the farmers. The Premier in opening the debate said this legislation was needed because it would help in the fight against inflation. You recall, Mr. Speaker, how he colorfully described that as "the thief who comes in the night." Inflation. He said he supported Prime Minister Trudeau's fight on inflation. And how is Prime Minister Trudeau fighting inflation in Saskatchewan. He is fighting inflation in Western Canada by maintaining a wheat glut as an anti-inflationary weapon. The Treasurer laughs. The Governor of the Bank of Canada on July 5, 1969, is reported in testifying to the Finance Committee of the House of Commons that the inability, or if you will, I am now adding the word, the unwillingness of this Government to sell Canada's big stocks of wheat stored on the Prairies has an anti-inflationary effect on the economy. I say the Federal Liberals don't really want to move our wheat and they are aided and abetted by our Provincial Liberals because they are in the fight against inflation and that is the way to fight inflation in Western Canada.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Yes, the Liberals in Ottawa are prepared to carry a high rate of unemployment up to 8 and 9 per cent to fight inflation. It stands to reason the Liberals in Regina and Ottawa are carrying the fight against inflation off the backs of the farmers and they are doing it purposely and wilfully refusing, or if they are not refusing being negligent in their duties, to move the wheat in the large storage stocks of wheat in the Province of Saskatchewan. And where does our Premier stand? Where does he stand with his anti-inflationary measure that is being used by the Federal Liberals, the anti-inflationary measure not to move wheat? He stands four square right behind Prime Minister Trudeau. He has been trying very hard you know to say that sometimes he's a Liberal and sometimes he's not a Liberal. "Sometimes I'm with Pierre Trudeau and sometimes I'm not." This time in this debate he happens to be with Pierre Trudeau. But I ask the Premier whether he is with Pierre Trudeau in the Government's policy not to move wheat as a weapon to fight inflation? Is he a friend of the farmer in that type of a policy? I ask him to answer that question. I ask again: who is the friend of

the farmer? Liberals who refuse to sell wheat because it might give money to our economy and to our farmers, Mr. Premier. Liberals who refuse to attack large corporations with gouging farm machinery prices and high interest rates. Liberals who tax farm fuels. Liberals who are more concerned about Canada Packers and Intercontinental Packers and the Mafia than they are about the family farm. I ask you: who is concerned about the family farm? No, it is not the Liberals. Yes, Mr. Premier, this debate may very well show who is for and who is against the farmers of Saskatchewan. And I say this debate has shown it if it hasn't been shown already. This Government is against the farming person, this Government is against the working person, this Government is against Saskatchewan and not for the people. This session and this Bill show that if nothing else did.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — But the fight against inflation. Oh, we've got to fight against inflation. Yesterday the Premier said he welcomed the cut-backs in Federal spending in Ottawa. He said Prime Minister Trudeau was doing a good job here. The Attorney General talked about six per cent curtailment of expenditures in the Provincial and Federal Governments. They had made statements earlier in this area about their great admiration for the Trudeau Liberals. In a newspaper report I have August 15, 1969, not quite a year ago, the headline says, "Trudeau's clampdown pleases Saskatchewan Premier." The report says:

Premier Thatcher Thursday heartily endorsed the tightening of Federal spending and said he was becoming much more enthusiastic about the Prime Minister of Canada.

That was his statement on August 15, 1969. His enthusiasm is just bubbling all over today. He was commenting on the Federal guidelines to fight inflation announced by the Prime Minister of Wednesday evening.

Well how do the Liberals fight inflation and this squeeze on spending, cutting down on all the frills? You know how they do it? Real good — they buy four DC8s or 707s, I forget now what it is, but four super jets at a cost to the people of Saskatchewan and Canada of \$55.9 million. That's how the Prime Minister is fighting his fight against inflation with something a little under \$60 million.

**MR. THATCHER:** — That's defence!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Defence? Four jets that are used by the Prime Minister, private jets that are used by the Prime Minister when he is off junketing somewhere around the world. That's how the Premier of Saskatchewan stands behind the Prime Minister in his fight against inflation. How else are they spending their money? The Energy Department decides, according to the Globe and Mail, that they are going to buy two big yachts at an expense of about ten more

millions of dollars on the farmers of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada. Where does our Premier stand? 100 per cent right behind Prime Minister Trudeau. Oh, yes, he believes in four supersonic jets and two beautiful yachts because that's helping in our fight in Saskatchewan here against inflation. These yachts come from Debreze and Lench of Holland and they are the most expensive. You tell the farmers that you are fighting inflation when you support Federal policies like that. And then the Premier says this is a defence policy. Well, it has got a defence expenditure too, Mr. Premier, it is building a brand new Army Headquarters in Ottawa. We don't quite know how much that is going to cost but something in the neighborhood of \$70 millions, according to the last estimate. It is going to have this great, over-powering fighting force of ours housed now in one central agency in Ottawa. And our Premier is behind that type of action. Well to the worker and to the farmer, Trudeau and our Premier say that we must fight inflation, beware of the thief in the night. I am not so worried about the thief in the night Mr. Premier, as I am about the budgets of your Government provincially and the budgets of Trudeau, federally.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Yes, inflation is a part of Saskatchewan's problem, but it occurs only when large corporations profiteer at the expense of our farmers and our workers. We are in a recession more than we are in inflation. If not a recession we are in a depression that's caused by the Liberals opposite in Regina and Ottawa. We must not cut back on our economy, we must get it going. On the one hand the Premier says he welcomes the Federal cutback in spending such as it is, but at the same time he says we are going to embark on a mythical \$20 million spending program to get the economy going. Well, we welcome this program if he ever finds the \$20 million. But the argument on inflation, when he is contradictory and inconsistent in his statements as he is there, supporting the cutbacks federally and then saying on the other hand that he is going to encourage increased spending provincially, is a bad joke on the farmers and the workers of Saskatchewan. This Government is confused, it's inconsistent, it's contradictory. The fact is that this economy has ground to a halt due more to the fact that the Government has been hidebound to a balanced budget and has been helping Trudeau here in Saskatchewan.

Yesterday, the Attorney General talked about friends in our party. I want to refer the Attorney General to one friend of his, talking about this desperate situation we have in Saskatchewan. This guy is called Jean-Luc Pepin. Some of the Members opposite may know about the Minister. Mr. Pepin was in Saskatchewan about a year ago. We were telling the Liberals then that things were in a desperate situation but they weren't listening. Pepin comes out and says this, this is a quote from The Leader Post:

It is perhaps in the area of manufacturing and service industries that you should look to block the export of Saskatchewan youth to other provinces and countries, an export which I am told saw some 47,000 young people leave Saskatchewan between 1965 and 1968, Mr. Pepin said.

With friends like that, who needs enemies? But Mr. Pepin isn't finished, he said that he was not suggesting that progress in secondary industry in Saskatchewan has not already been made. Oh, no, he said:

I am aware that total capital and repair expenditure here have averaged over \$1 billion a year in the last five years.

Then get this:

Moreover employment and manufacturing have grown by more than 3,000 persons since 1965 to 1968.

Not 80,000, not 20,000, not 10,000, not 5,000, but according to Mr. Pepin, 3,000 jobs more since the Liberals came into office in 1964. Boy, with friends like that, Mr. Attorney General, you are right, who does need enemies? Today, those workers have disappeared like the dust caused by Operation LIFT. What about this Government's support of Otto Lang and the Liberals in Ottawa? Yes, with friends like that, who needs enemies?

Well, where has this party been led to, this Liberal party? Obviously to the end of the road come the next election. The end of the road, Mr. Premier. This debate is an attempt to try to create another issue to get you off the hook. When the Premier asks where does the party stand, our party and who controls our party, I ask him to stop and consider — I know he knows — who controls his party. It is a party backed with people, very few people, corporations, executives, professional people, a very small group of people with vested interests, Canada Packers, Intercontinental Packers. I have a quotation here from the Toronto Globe and Mail. The Globe and Mail reported a conference on the Liberal party, February 21, 1970. The headline said, 500 give \$100 to run the party. The Ontario Liberal party is supported mainly by 500 people, according to the director of the Ontario Liberals, Donald Rosebrugh. We knew that, I doubt if there are even that many in Saskatchewan. He said everyone of these 500 people donates \$100 a year. That's what keeps your party going. Here is another quotation from a Liberal MLA in Ontario. He said this, "Big business financing of the Liberal party was attacked last night by the Liberal Member for the House - Parkdale." He said the Liberal party receives most of its financing from large corporations, but few persons know how much is actually contributed. He said the Liberals should start getting back to trying to get some people. Here is the best one of them all, Mr. Speaker. The Alberta delegates in conference last year, one of the delegates writes — and you know Trudeau doesn't really want the Liberals elected. I know that Trudeau is doing all that he can to guarantee this delegate's comments come true. He said this:



The reason was that if a Liberal member were elected, he would have to get re-elected. To do so, he would have to do something to change the rotten patronage system upon which so many of our Liberal workers thrive.

Quotation by the Liberal party.

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

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 until 2:30 p.m.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — There is something that I forgot to do when I entered the Chamber and called the House to order. I note on Members' desks sundry insignia and what have you, in connection with Buffalo Days. I would like the Mayor of the City of Regina to make an explanation in regard thereto.

### **ANNOUNCEMENT**

#### **BUFFALO DAYS**

**HON. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina South East):** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. After that applause I think I'll join the leadership race.

Well I do want to draw your attention to the symbols you have on your desks, the Buffalo Day button, and the Buffalo Buck. I hope you don't all redeem them, you might break the City Treasury. We are presenting these on behalf of City Council and the Buffalo Days Committee. We invite you this summer to come and enjoy with us the Buffalo Days Festival in the latter part of July and the beginning of August. We have a good time, it is a gala affair. I invite all the Members here and others in the House to come and spend a few days with us. Please accept these on behalf of myself, City Council and the Buffalo Days Committee.

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

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill No. 1.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that as we called it 12:30 I was in the process of elaborating further on the Premier's remarks earlier yesterday about what kind of a party the Liberal party had become in the Province of Saskatchewan. I was showing to the Legislature the statements made by various members in the Liberal party that have indicated that they themselves had decided the Liberal party was a party really concerned only with the interests of big business, the corporate sector of our society. I had indicated to the House the statements made by the Member for Nutana Centre and the Member from Cannington and several others there supporting the big business operations. Then I had quoted what I thought was a very

worthwhile quotation from the Ontario Legislature of Mr. Trotter, a Member of the Legislature there who is himself in fact a Liberal, indicating that the Liberal party received most of its financing from large corporations. Then going on to say, "but few persons know actually how much is contributed to the Liberal party by these corporations," that is something that we in Saskatchewan have known for quite some time. Mr. Trotter rather belatedly acknowledges that, but we welcome him to that point of view. All this tells us that the Liberal party in Saskatchewan and in Canada has had it in terms of being a meaningful force in Canadian politics. This is not a New Democratic party member saying so, I have to go back to my friends in the Press . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What about the strike?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I'll come to the strike because it is in this atmosphere and background that this Legislature was called . . . to go back to my friends in the newspaper, the Toronto Globe and Mail, February 21, 1970. The Hon. Member from Athabasca, the Minister of Public Works, likes to bring us up to date every once in a while as to what our party has been doing, he says, and no doubt he'll be treating us to that again later on this session . . .

**HON. A.R. GUY (Minister of Public Works):** — What about Saturday?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I can hardly wait till Saturday. Well I am going to tell the Hon. Member from Athabasca a few of the things that have been going on in his party. This is just to support my contention, Mr. Speaker, that this party is, as I have said, out of it in terms of being a meaningful force in Canadian politics. Liberals at a big conference in Ontario, a couple of months back, I don't know how many they had, I doubt for the interest of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) that it approached 500 for the entire province, let alone one city. But nevertheless, we'll give them the benefit of the doubt and say that it was 500 people. The Globe and Mail which is one of the most reputable papers said this:

Ottawa. Delegates to the Annual Ontario Liberal party Conference reached a general consensus yesterday that their party is irrelevant in modern society. Speaker after speaker in an hour-long debate at the opening meeting expressed increasing frustration at the inability of Liberals to place in the party structure a meaningful role in dealing with contemporary problems.

The quotation continues with respect to one of the delegates called Thomas Burns of Ontario who said that 65 per cent of those who supported Trudeau at the Leadership Convention earned annual incomes in excess of \$12,000 a year. Then he said this:

‘Who do we represent,’ Mr. Burns asked. ‘Who are we fighting for?’ He suggested there should be more to membership in the Liberal party than the opportunity to come to Ottawa once or twice a year to attend a few cocktail parties and to call Cabinet Ministers by their first name.

That was Mr. Thomas Burns. The headline says, "Liberal delegates reached consensus, the party is irrelevant."

We know in fact that this party is irrelevant. We know when the Premier asks where we stand, and which party represents the farmers that this party opposite does not represent the average person of Saskatchewan. We know that you over there are fighting for all those ‘fat cats’ who control our country and our party at the expense of the farmers and of the working people. There is no other description to use other than that, because they are those who are in corporations, and executives, managerial capacities, who siphon off all of the wealth that is earned by the farmers and the workers of our province for their benefit. Your party provincially and federally exists solely and purely to protect them everywhere you can and this session is called exactly to do just that. In other terms, a favor for industry.

One other thing about this Liberal party is that it is designed to gain votes and it exists for votes and votes only, Mr. Speaker. I notice the concern of the Liberal party with respect to wheat policy. Every once in a while at their conventions they argue about the wheat policy and where it should go. One of the wheat policies’ big debate — this is going to be of interest to the Minister of Agriculture, I see he is not in his chair — however, one for the Agriculture Minister — they were concerning themselves about what to do with the Canadian Wheat Board. You know, Mr. Speaker, the last Provincial Convention of Liberal party, the Liberals argued that the Canadian Wheat Board was something that was irrelevant and meaningless, in fact, a lot of the Liberal party members wanted to do away with the Canadian Wheat Board, as the Minister of Highways has indicated, and the Hon. Member from Elrose from time to time has suggested, but that resolution was defeated. In this particular wheat policy change, the resolution asked that the Canadian Wheat Board be placed under direction of the Minister of Agriculture. Now to the Premier, I want to draw to your attention the words by your predecessor, Senator A.H. McDonald. Strong words favoring the change were spoken by Senator A.H. McDonald during the debate on the resolution. He said this:

The Canadian Wheat Board must be placed under a Minister who will take some political kudos for sales of wheat to foreign nations and make all the possible political mileage he can, said Mr. McDonald. The present Minister of Agriculture can do this and he will do this. He will carry a group of Western Liberal Members of Parliament to Ottawa on his back. Wheat sales should be publicized with the greatest possible amount of fanfare for the greatest political effects, something that has not been done.

Well, that was sure a far-sighted quotation and statement made by the Senator, Mr. McDonald. I doubt if Otto Lang can carry himself back into Parliament the next time an election goes on, let alone any other Members. I doubt if this Liberal party opposite, Premier Thatcher and his Government will be able to get back into Government the next time. The Liberals all, Mr. Speaker, every once in a while go through this ritual of trying to divorce themselves from their counterparts in Ottawa. The Welfare Minister, C.P. MacDonald, had something to say about this at the Convention in November, 1969. Mr. MacDonald has many good things to say to the people of Saskatchewan. He said:

Don't be fooled about this business of Liberals fighting the Liberals in Ottawa, we're all a big happy group. Any time the Premier gets up and tells us that he is a Saskatchewan Liberal, and that's something different from the Federal Liberals, don't you believe it, we're Liberals all.

We agree with that. The quotation exactly was this. He said:

Introducing a resolution supporting one Provincial party organization, Welfare Minister C.P. MacDonald said Liberals must stop fighting among themselves . . .

Imagine that, Liberals fighting among themselves. I didn't believe that that would ever exist in your party.

. . . would stop fighting among themselves, Mr. Premier, and start fighting political opponents in Saskatchewan. Mr. MacDonald said he was unalterably opposed to any division among Liberals in Saskatchewan. We have never believed in putting a Federal or a Provincial label on Liberals in Saskatchewan.

Even they applauded at that.

Then the newspaper report went on to say that that motion introduced by Mr. MacDonald passed, lo and behold. No, it didn't, with two dissenters, according to the paper. But, however, Mr. Speaker, the newspaper does not report those dissenters to be Otto Lang or Premier Ross Thatcher. All one family, all one type of Liberal, the type of Liberal more concerned about getting votes and breaking promises, forces workers back under compulsory arbitration, doing nothing for the farmer, more interested in political kudos for its Ministers. Liberals in Regina and Liberals at Ottawa have taken down the Province of Saskatchewan for us. This team of Thatcher and Trudeau is like TNT for Saskatchewan farmers, it is dynamite for us. Today, however, we have an image of a revitalized Premier Thatcher who is trying his darndest to escape Trudeaumania. He hopes that he can do it just one more time in the next election. Liberals opposite hope to fool the farmers just one more time in the next election, Mr. Speaker, TNT. They are here to stay, they think, but when the explosion comes, we'll be picking up the pieces of the Liberal party and they will be very few and far between.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is in this background that Bill 1, the amendment to Bill 2 has been introduced in the midst of the worst economic recession since the 1930s, the 1940s I am told, that this Bill is now being introduced. In this atmosphere of crisis and depression that is about all over the province, caused and created by Premier Thatcher and Prime Minister Trudeau, this Government, this session has been called, a session that could be doing something to put the province back on the move, but a session that is limited to considering amendments to Bill 2.

I want to make specifically two points about the proposed legislation. Firstly, all of the evidence shows that this strike has been promoted and continued because of direct interference by Liberals opposite. We knew in the dying days . . .

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — . . . of the last session when the Premier gleefully came to the House and made his announcement about the closing of the Arts Centre that this Government would be doing all that it could in the months ahead to keep this strike alive for its own petty political advantages. Secondly, the principle of Bill 2 and this amendment are unacceptable to a free and democratic society. It negates the principles of free collective bargaining. There are many great tragedies about this session, one of which is the fact that we aren't dealing with some of the problems we ought to be, but one of the tragedies is the failure of this Government to build up the fabric of free collective bargaining. This Government seeks to tear down, rather than to build; it frustrates free men, rather than inspires them; it makes every move for cheap politics rather than an atmosphere of statesmanship; it limits freedoms of Saskatchewan people, rather than expanding those freedoms. Much has already been said about the history of this particular dispute. I feel the record is clear that the two parties could have reached a settlement, had it not been for the direct interference of the Premier and his Government. This Government said that the legislation is necessary to get the plumbers back to work. That is not true. That is a big lie, Mr. Speaker. The Unions have stated publicly and privately that they are prepared to return under the old contracts until a new one is negotiated.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Government said that this legislation is introduced to fight against inflation. That too is a big lie on the people of Saskatchewan. This legislation is introduced because the Government seeks really to smash trade unions and the principle of collective bargaining, and all Saskatchewan ought not to forget about that.

At every opportunity in labor affairs many authorities, economics authorities have stated time and again that compulsory

is not the answer to labor problems. The Wood Task Force federally endorsed the principle of free collective bargaining, not only because of its virtue, but because it found that there was no other compatible alternative in our present system in North America. The Report has concluded that, "There was no conclusive evidence . . . " I repeat, Mr. Speaker, "No conclusive evidence that collective bargaining is the villain behind inflation." That's the Woods Report set up by the Federal Liberals. The Federal Labour Minister, Mr. Mackasey, a Liberal himself, has stated on many occasions that he does not support compulsory arbitration. In Hansard, September 19, 1968, he said the following:

I get a little tired of people who say we shouldn't have strikes. Compulsory arbitration is a dictatorial solution that really is no solution at all.

To those on the opposite side who soulfully argue that arbitration is somehow fair to both sides in this dispute, the Labour Minister said this:

The legislation inevitably works against the best interests of labor, and has come down inevitably on the side of management.

The Government's very own Committee that reviewed this matter specifically ruled that there ought not to be compulsory arbitration and particularly none in the construction industry. Mr. Speaker, that recommendation made by this Province's Committee set up by this Government has not been followed and the refusal has amounted to no more and no less than a direct slap affront to those people who compiled that Report and made those recommendations to this Government.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Yet, in the face of all of these authorities, Woods, Mr. Mackasey, the Province's own Committee, in the face of all of these authorities, the Liberals opposite introduced compulsory arbitration in this Bill. They hide behind the phoney argument of inflation; they hide behind our talk of leadership in our party; they defend large corporations; they argue everything and anything, because there is nothing for them to argue in support of Bill 2 and the amendments. They attack strikes and they have consistently attacked strikes. The attitude of this Government has been long known.

I have a quotation from the Star Phoenix which tells the story in the headlines. "Strikes barbaric, says Dean Otto Lang." The main article of the story says, "Strikes are the barbaric solution to labor problems, Dean Otto Lang of the College of Law told the general meeting of the City Park University Women's Liberal Association, Tuesday." I wonder if that's where the Member for City Park University got his views on labor. "No, it is better to reason than to resort to violence, he continued,"

according to the newspaper article. Then he went on, and we agree with that, that it is better to reason than to resort to violence. Then he went on to continue to say how strikes are barbaric and labor courts unnecessary. The interesting thing about it was at the bottom of this article the newspaper report said, "Plans were made for a wine and cheese tasting party in June." This is where the discussion was made and the recommendations by Dean Otto Lang. These fellows opposite, the Liberals, have no feeling, no knowledge, no understanding, no awareness of the concerns or the troubles of the working man. They talk about labor problems, and wine and cheese tasting parties; they talk about labor problems in their corporate rooms; they talk about labor-management disputes in their own back room, but they don't know what the basic problems are when it comes to labor-management.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — In the years that I have been in this House, not too many, the policy of this Government has been to arouse hostility and to divide our people in Saskatchewan, to set one group against another. This is what we get again today, at a time when our people are crying out for some hope and some leadership from this Government, hope in a province that's downtrodden and crumbled to its knees by the Liberals in Regina and Ottawa, we get division, bitterness and acrimony by the Liberals.

I say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) that our people will survive Bill 2. Our people will survive Liberal actions that have driven thousands from our province. Our people will not be taken in by sham politicians playing their sham game at the expense of Saskatchewan. It is a tragedy that so much is needed now in our province, Mr. Premier, that could be done in the Legislature, but won't be done because of the refusal of the Liberals to do something for the people of our province.

In the area of labor, there is a gigantic task for us. As legislators, we could be working to building and not destroying labor legislation. I want to say that I view labor legislation to be tied directly into our entire economic and social programs. These programs and the present private-enterprise world are totally bankrupt. It is our task to build a political and economic system that will get the wealth of this province more into the hands of men and women who produce that wealth, farmers and workers. The Members opposite see nothing wrong with a society that siphons millions of dollars out of the economy into the hands of the few corporate elite that the group opposite is designed to protect and support. They believe in that system; they believe in laws that support that system. This amendment to Bill 2 is designed to further support that system. They defend and protect their groups and they introduced this legislation.

To the people of Saskatchewan, I say the time is now to get

To the people of Saskatchewan, I say the time is now to get on with the job — and I say this to our Premier — of replacing these false values and to start building a society which will get wealth into the hands of our farmers and laborers. That is the goal that we must work to. In the meantime, much can be done to improve our labor legislation and it is not being done. Instead of taking down, we ought to be improving it in a number of areas. Firstly, much can be done to improve the methods of free collective bargaining. There is a need for improved conciliation, mediation and nonbinding arbitration services. We need a special industrial enquiry commission perhaps to make recommendations in disputes which reach a crisis. Secondly, our Labour Relations Board ought to be thoroughly reviewed to see if it meets the challenges of tomorrow. The procedures should be streamlined and certification should be made easier. Obstacles should not be placed in the way of free men to associate themselves in trade unions, as this Government has done in the Labour Relations Board and the workings thereunder. Thirdly, the Government would have done well to have brought in a new Workmen's Compensation Act in this session, instead of this Bill. This present Act and the Board make meaningless decisions. They are legalistic, they have no concern or understanding of the plight of the person who is injured and on compensation. It has no respect for knowledge of the operations of this concept and works under old and outdated views. Fourthly, the plight of the unorganized should be attended to. Liberals opposite say: what about the unorganized: The Liberals opposite yesterday talked of wage settlements of unions somehow robbing the unorganized. I say the unorganized are victimized. I agree with the Liberals opposite. I agree that they are victimized, but they are not victimized by the unions; they are victimized by the same people who are victimizing our working people, the unions, our senior citizens, our pensioners, and people in all walks of life in Saskatchewan, those on fixed incomes. Name me your corporate friends in your system. The answer is to assist the unorganized, Mr. Minister of Municipal Affairs, to assist them, but not to tear down the organized in the process of so doing. Rather we should enact laws that raise minimum wages; you are not doing that, you are concerned about the unorganized. What have you done to increase holidays, to limit the work week? There is a challenge to our trade union movement to receive the confidence of these unorganized. We all ask them to go and meet that confidence. They will meet that challenge if only you the Government of the day will give them a half a break with fair laws in which to organize the unorganized.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Fifthly, we need new legislation to prevent loss of time due to accidents on jobs, and to provide safety legislation. This is something that the Province has not even concerned itself about. Finally, I think our Government should at Federal-Provincial Conferences, whenever possible instead of mouthing its concern about inflation, be getting down to the



real task of tackling inflation through a meaningful prices and incomes control commission, that will tackle where inflation is caused, at exorbitant prices, the prices that my colleagues have outlined, at high incomes, and not the poor working man. Much more can be said. The point here is that we should be passing these laws in these areas at this time in this special session.

Mr. Speaker, we must preserve the right of free men to associate themselves in unions, to negotiate their own working conditions and to sell the only commodity they have to sell, and that is their own labor. These amendments do away with that, and I oppose them for that reason. We must build that new and social economic order that will eliminate greed and profit as the standard of success and replace it with the principle that will guarantee fair financial return for those who produce our wealth. That should be the challenge of the Legislature in Saskatchewan for the 1970s.

I feel the Liberals have seriously misjudged the mood of our province if they feel this session will be the ticket for them to get back to power. Our people are looking for new and imaginative programs to solve their problems. They want a government that is imaginative, daring and forward-looking. The Government opposite is a sorry-looking lot indeed; it never will be able to do that. Saskatchewan wants a government that is dedicated to building up this province, Mr. Premier, not tearing it down. Saskatchewan wants a government that is dedicated to giving all segments of our society, the workers, the farmers and teachers, one of elevation, not one that is dedicated to smearing those segments of society. Today we ought to be dealing with solutions to get this province back on the move, and not a special session that is going to curtail the freedoms of working men and women.

We have many problems to concern ourselves with. This is not a debate that allows one to get into questions of education and natural resource policy. I say again that we are likely going to face the chance in two months' time or less of coming back in session called by this Government and this Premier to debate again the phoney issues that have been promoted by the Government opposite on teachers and trustees. I haven't heard once since I have been a Member of this House the Premier enter into a debate to discuss the quality of education with the relish that he entered this debate when it comes to limiting the freedoms of working men. I have never heard once the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) or the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) talk about the quality of life as it is directly related to education as it did in the plumbers' dispute, so that teachers and trustees may bicker and somehow they can ride up the middle. There are other issues and we ought not to be promoting false feuds. Now is the time for the Government to get teachers and trustees and students working together to build a new and vital education system for tomorrow and for all Saskatchewan. We want school programs that will stop teaching about values of materialism and substitute for

them values of human worth. We want our teachers to be treated with respect and dignity, Mr. Minister of Welfare. We want our trustees once again to have a say about how our schools are being run and not being dictated to by Regina. We want our province's wealth to be used to ensure that our sons and daughters get the very best education. We have many new avenues to develop an education and that's what we ought to have been considering in this special session rather than the phoney red herrings that have been dragged across this floor by the Members opposite. Our young men and women who are the backbone of our province want this province to assist them to get educated and to stay and build Saskatchewan into something bigger; they are not getting that help from our friends opposite. There are many things to talk about here in our House today rather than this. I say we ought to be charting new courses for health and welfare programs, ones designed to promote preventive medicine. We should include drugs, we should include dental care and we ought as legislators to get our citizens working to new ways of financing our health programs rather than dragging our people and our legislators back to this House on an issue of this nature.

I close by saying this, Mr. Speaker, that there are many things that one could talk about meaningfully in our society. This Liberal Government as I say will live with Bill 2. We suffered many injustices, taxation on taxation; we are reeling under Liberals in Ottawa and Liberals in Regina, but the real tragedy of this session is the unwillingness or the inability or the purposeful design of the Liberals opposite not to convene us with the purpose of getting this province rolling again. There is going to be a special session probably again right after the next election and when we occupy the Treasury Benches opposite, so that we can get some of this House in order and get the province moving again.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — And that will be a session, that will not be tearing down but will be building; it will be building a new education program and it will be building new health opportunities. It will be devising a new natural resources policy which will be geared and designed to all the people of Saskatchewan, getting the benefits of all the resources rather than the few that the Liberals opposite are protecting. This Government has forsaken our youth and our workers and our farmers; it's an old and bankrupt Government; it's paralysed by inactivity; it's helpless to act; it has no vision for the future; it destroys and never builds; it shows no confidence in our people and our people, Mr. Speaker, will show no confidence in it when it calls the next election.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — It is an old-style Government with old-style

politicians who act in old-fashioned and irresponsible political ways for votes only and not for the solution of the problems of the day. I will not be supporting Bill 2 on second reading, for the reasons I have stated because this Government has totally failed Saskatchewan, its working people and its farmers in its solutions for the problems of tomorrow.

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

## **ANNOUNCEMENT**

### **RESUMPTION OF NEGOTIATIONS**

**HON. W.R. THATCHER (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, a little later this day I have to leave the city for a very prime objective so I want to make remarks of only two or three minutes in length at this time.

I wish to announce to the House a new development in the construction dispute. Perhaps before I do this I could be allowed very briefly to comment on a few of the remarks of the middle-aged Member for Riversdale . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the Premier has a statement to make then I think we certainly are willing to extend him the courtesy and bend the rules to allow him to make it. But to allow him at this point — he having spoken in the debate — to enter into the debate again . . .

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Hon. Premier is surely entitled to speak on the amendment and that is what he is doing.

**MR. LLOYD:** — Mr. Speaker, the Speaker has ruled that we are now debating concurrently the amendment and the main motion, and the Premier, as the mover of the main motion, if he speaks now, closes the debate, and that we are not prepared to accept.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — If the Premier rises to speak — to begin with let's setup one argument — if he rises to speak he can't close the debate because there is an amendment on the amendment that hasn't been cleared off, and you can't clear the main debate until the amendment has been disposed of. The next part is that anybody who hasn't spoken to the amendment is entitled to speak to an amendment. You can't preclude a man the right to speak on amendments but he must relate his words thereto. Now the amendment that is before the House is "That this Bill be not now read a second time but that it be read six months hence." And every other Member who hasn't spoken to the amendment has

the right to do so including the Leader of the Opposition.

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

**MR. THATCHER:** — Then I would also point out to the Leader of the Opposition that it was at his request that we have permitted this debate to go all over the map. The Hon. Member who just spoke went one hour in length and I don't think he was three minutes on the strike. I'm not going to belabor this point but I do want to say that if the Hon. Member's speech was the one he is going to give at the Leadership Convention then he is a dead duck.

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

**MR. THATCHER:** — As a matter of fact I think from this time forward Members on this side of the House should immediately begin to support the Member for Riversdale, that's the leader we need.

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

**MR. THATCHER:** — It hadn't been the intention of the Government to immediately proclaim Bill 2 later this day if the debate had finished. However, this morning representatives of the plumbers' and electricians' unions approached the Government with a new proposal. They asked, one, that Bill 2 not be proclaimed for a reasonable period; two, that a mediator be appointed to sit down with the men and the contractors in one last ditch effort to settle the impasse. In the meantime they have given an undertaking that the workers will go back on the job immediately, on the old schedule pending a settlement. Now hopefully this would be Thursday. I met shortly thereafter with representatives of the contractors and they also have agreed to sit down at the bargaining table immediately as long as there is a deadline. Since the Government has invoked the provisions of Bill 2 to settle the strike, only after the failure of all alternative solutions, we are prepared to accept the last minute suggestion of the union. The Government has accordingly again offered the services of Mr. John Elchyson as conciliator. Both parties have accepted Mr. Elchyson and have expressed great confidence in his abilities. We have asked both parties to resume negotiations at the earliest possible moment, hopefully tomorrow and we are at the same time however setting a deadline. We intend to proceed today or tomorrow with legislation that is now before us. We intend to pass this Bill. However, the Order in Council implementing the Bill will not be passed until Wednesday, July 8, which will give the parties one more week to work out a settlement. If settlements are arrived at perhaps the legislation will not have to be proclaimed at all. I want to emphasize that the six per cent guidelines will and must be applied in any final settlement. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that this decision by both parties to return to the bargaining table and of the

unions to return to work immediately clearly vindicates the Government's decision to apply Bill 2 to the construction disputes.

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

**MR. THATCHER:** — I want to make it very clear that, if the unions and the contractors had made this offer some weeks ago or even some days ago and both agreed to it, this session might not have been necessary.

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

**MR. LLOYD:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a few comments following the comments of the Premier. Certainly those of us on this side of the House, since we have repeatedly urged that there be additional mediation, are going to accept the proposal, with pleasure, the proposal of the Premier if there is going to be this added attempt at mediation. We say, however, that it seems to me the Premier's remarks this afternoon were somewhat less than accurate, because as I understand it, as I read the correspondence I see the unions in question made precisely the same kind of offer not just a few hours ago but a few weeks ago.

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

**MR. LLOYD:** — At that time, whether it was the contractors of the Government, but somebody got in the way. They offered to return to work and they offered to return to work under the previous contract. It is a matter of great regret that at that time the procedure was not followed such as that which has been announced at this moment by the Premier. As a matter of fact we had evidence given in this Legislature earlier today of some cases in which the men had actually gone back to work. The contractors had put them back to work on one of the projects associated with the Boundary Dam and after being at work for some time somebody's hands entered the picture and stopped the work. I would be extremely interested to know what part the Government had to play in interrupting that settlement at that particular time.

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

**MR. LLOYD:** — We agree entirely with the statement of the Premier that we need not have been here in this session and that whatever we have done at this session I really don't think can be credited with the success of whatever happens in the next few days in settling this particular dispute. What we have seen at this session again is the Government entering in, interfering with collective bargaining and using its power to get in the way of the logically usual accepted processes

of bargaining and settling arrangements between employers and employees. It seems to me that there is no reason, Mr. Speaker, for compounding our errors in this regard. The thing could have been settled in the way in which the Premier suggested now some weeks ago. I think it will only interfere with the possibilities of settlement in the future if we proceed to pass this legislation. I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature do now adjourn.

Motion negated on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 22**  
**Messieurs**

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

**NAYS — 30**  
**Messieurs**

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

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

**HON. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I think that both sides of the House should have a feeling of satisfaction over the announcement by the Premier that both sides in this dispute are now returning to the bargaining table.

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

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I think it is important that we point out to the Leader of the Opposition that never at any time did both parties agree to the proposal that was announced by the Premier. It is also worthy of note, I think, Mr. Speaker, that when the announcement was made by the Premier there was not one ripple

of applause by Members of the Opposition. This rather shocks me, after listening here for two days to their great cry of how they wanted the workers to get back to work as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, before I commence there are a few remarks by Members of the Opposition that I would like to make a few comments on. First of all I have to speak and discuss very briefly some of the remarks that were made by Mr. Smishek, oh pardon me, the Member for Regina North East, regarding the labor dispute that has occurred here today. The gentleman who rose in his seat is a Member who works for the labor union movement. He is a man who in the Province of Saskatchewan above all people should have a knowledge of labor union disputes and labor union factors. He was accused by my colleague here this morning of being careless with the truth. Well, Mr. Speaker, I find that not only was he careless with the truth but so many things that were not in accordance with the facts that it makes me wonder if he is looking after his own job and his own personal preference.

Let me comment on a few things he said. First of all, Mr. Speaker, he said that all the electricians in Saskatchewan were moving to that Mecca in Manitoba under a Socialist Government. While they were in the Province of Manitoba they were receiving 45 cents an hour more than electricians in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, what unmitigated garbage and nonsense. I have here in my hand the working agreement for the electricians in the Province of Manitoba.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Under Schreyer!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Under Premier Schreyer, yes, the Socialist Mecca.

Until November 1, 1970, the electricians in the Province of Manitoba are today receiving \$4.80 an hour, today also, Mr. Speaker, there are electricians in the Province of Saskatchewan who are working under the latest proposal of the electricians, for \$4.82 an hour. They are not, Mr. Speaker, receiving 45 cents an hour. The Member for Regina North East knew the facts and deliberately did not present them according to the facts.

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

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, the second thing he did, he stood on his feet and said, "You know I admit that the electricians and plumbers get pretty good wages, but those poor apprentices, they are working for 40 per cent — 40 per cent of what the electricians and plumbers get." Mr. Speaker, once again, what a bunch of hogwash, what a careless misrepresentation of the truth, because if any man in the Province of Saskatchewan knows what the electrician and plumber apprentices get,

it is the Member for Regina North East. I have in my hand here the outline of the wages to the apprentices in the Province of Saskatchewan in the electrician's trade. Yes, some of them get 40 per cent, but you know how long, Mr. Speaker, they get 40 per cent for the first six months; they get 75 per cent for the majority of time and it averages over 62 per cent, the first six months 40 per cent; the second six months, 50 per cent; the third six months, 55 per cent; the fourth six months, 60 per cent and so forth. Yet that man stood on his feet and stated to the people of this Province as a member of the trade union movement that apprentices in the electrician trade are getting 40 per cent. Where is he I wonder?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hiding his head!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, he also said one of the major causes, one of the major causes of the strike was because the electrical contractors in the Province of Saskatchewan wanted to define what electricians were. They wanted to have the control and the authority to determine who was an electrician. Mr. Speaker, if any man should know, he knows that The Apprentices and Tradesmen Qualifications Act examines and qualifies all electricians in the Province of Saskatchewan. They are also licensed under the Department of Labour. Then he also said, Mr. Speaker, that the electricians sent a telegram withdrawing their offer because the Premier told them, the Premier told them to. Well, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? First of all, Mr. Speaker, the electricians withdrew the offer after the workers went on strike on April 15th. They know it and Mr. Smishek knows it. There was a union meeting on the 14th and the union hierarchy called them out on strike without having a vote of the membership, whether to reject or accept the offer made and delivered to members on April 13th. I would just like to very briefly enumerate some of the steps that occurred in this dispute. 1. The unions gave notice to open negotiations — I hope you don't leave, because I have a few comments for you too, Mr. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) — gave notice to open negotiations. They negotiated for eight days, four days with the labor relations officer. 2. The unions broke off negotiations and struck on April 15th. On April 14th, I repeat, a meeting of the membership was called, they were not allowed to vote on the employers' proposal of April 13th. 3. Contractors withdrew the April 13th offer after the strikers had struck. 4. May 14th, the employees offered a new proposal. 5. On May 22nd, the membership voted. For example, in the city of Regina, 169 men worked for employers at the start of the strike and struck. Of the eight employers, so many of them voted to accept and return to work, 109 would have been able to go back to work, if the union hierarchy had executed the agreement. Had they executed the agreement, 109 out of 169 would have returned to work. Union officials refused to execute the agreement. Now there is an unfair labor practice before the courts by the employers as a result of this. The union is defending its actions in the courts.



Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons and the steps that occurred in the labor dispute and a telegram was not sent, because the Premier directed it, and the Member for Regina North East is well aware of it. He also got up and said, "While I've had no evidence of coercion, I have had no evidence that there has been coercion." Yet the Attorney General stood on his feet yesterday and read this order. "Notice to employees" by the union:

Any member of the Local who returns to work without the sanction of the union executive board and the strike committee will be subject to charges from the local union.

Mr. Speaker, if that isn't coercion, I don't know what is.

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

**MR. HEALD:** — Same on you for that kind of . . .

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments and talk about the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed the moment of truth. Everyone in this Assembly, everyone in the Province of Saskatchewan, everyone that is going to attend the NDP Convention in the city of Regina has waited with baited breath for the remarks of the Member for Riversdale and the other member of the Four Horsemen, the man with the new look, the great leap-forward. Here in a time of real crisis, a major economic confrontation, we have all waited to hear the contribution of the man who holds himself up as a prospective premier of Saskatchewan. All of us expected this new look. A recognition of the seriousness of the problem. A recognition of the ineptitude of the past techniques and methods used, a recognition of the responsibility of the Province of Saskatchewan by the NDP. We waited to see Sir Galahad come charging in on his white horse, and the only thing we saw was Lady Godiva with her bare white hide. Mr. Speaker, what was the gist of his remarks. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are trying to smash collective bargaining, the Woods Commission supported labor; no other compatible alternative. These were his words, "No other compatible alternative." In the face of all these authorities, we have the nerve to interfere; we attack strikers, strikes are barbaric.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Otto Lang said that!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I am quoting what you said about Mr. Lang.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Members on this side of the House didn't expect anything else. We have become used to the Member from Riversdale waffling on every issue. He has attempted to be all things to all people, at all times. Today like the chicken, you remember when the Minister of Mineral Resources

described the Member for Riversdale as the chicken scratching, first he was on the left foot, then he was on the right foot, then he is on the left foot. Today he was on the left foot, away to the left, Mr. Speaker, trying to convince the labor unions that he was their boy, afraid to be outdone by the Member for Regina Centre. He acted like the reluctant bride, damned if he did and damned if he didn't. Mr. Speaker, why did he have this feeling?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Reluctant!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — That's right.

I want to tell you what T.C. Douglas said. Why is the Member for Riversdale so reluctant, why did he talk about Bill 2? Why did he talk about airplanes and ships and farmers and money and the Liberals in Ontario, because he didn't dare stand up and try to defend the labor union movement and their actions in this particular strike, because he knows the mood, as he calls it, the mood of the people of Canada. Let's hear what Tommy Douglas had to say at the British Columbia Convention when they endorsed links with the trade unions:

The New Democratic party Federal Leader, T.C. Douglas has said on Saturday night that the party must not fall into the trap of cutting labor out of the party, because the unions appear to be a political liability.

Ask the farmers of Saskatchewan if they are a political liability.

He told delegates that once the party begins dropping segments which appear to create problems, they will end up cutting other groups too.

Mr. Speaker, what is the record of the Member for Riversdale in relation to the comment of the Hon. Otto Lang about strikes being barbaric. You know I found a little clipping, it goes back to Saturday, May 24, 1969. You know what the headline is, Mr. Speaker? This is the man that says they have the right to withdraw their labor, they have their right to a strike, they have the right to do all this.

Find alternatives to strikes, MLA urges trade unions.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What MLA?

**MR. MacDONALD:** — What MLA? The Member for Riversdale, Roy Romanow.

The Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale has urged trade unionists to make a major effort to reform the economic structures of society by finding acceptable alternatives to strikes . . .

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

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Just a minute, he said:

The average worker would be happy to see the end of strikes, if the reason for them can be eliminated. Unions must devote considerable resources and energy to eliminate their cause  
...

Anybody else that calls strikes barbaric is a Liberal. This is what he says:

I have a sense of feeling of well-being by the members who often express no social concern for finding an economic system that will eradicate the use of brute force, barbaric brute force to resolve its economic disputes. The use of power by both sides can only be eliminated when the economic climate of the country is such that both parties are determined and prepared to make decisions in the interest of society as a whole, and that's what we are saying. Oh, democratic Socialism!

Mr. Speaker, he may have got a few labor votes today. He has been working real hard lately. First he invited the Wafflers to support him, those extreme left-wing revolutionaries who want to nationalize our whole farm population, those radical Socialists who want to socialize everything but the kitchen sink. You remember, Mr. Speaker, all of us have read this: "Romanow welcomes Waffle dissent." You know them, Mr. Speaker. Next he applied to the women. He supported the abortions. Mr. Speaker, he looks to the support of any and every group regardless of principle, philosophy or program.

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

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, no wonder "Happy Jack", the farmer's friend has serious reservations about his appeal to the rural people of Saskatchewan. Let me quote what Happy Jack had to say:

I have to consider my friendship with Roy (Oh, my friendship!) But it can't be the basis for the final decision. But whoever I align myself with there is a very good chance he will end up with the leadership. Mr. Messer predicted that a large percentage of rural delegates will attend the July 2nd to 4th convention but he said both Mr. Romanow and Mr. Blakeney are lawyers.

And isn't it funny, Mr. Speaker, the only candidates we have are three city slicker lawyers and a young member of the Wafflers.

"There is a tendency to associate the leader with a farm background, he said. But, he said, once his decision was made he would start pounding the farm country just as strongly as the candidate he supports. However a decision to back the wrong

candidate would prove most embarrassing to myself, he said. But, he added, that whatever candidate was elected, I am prepared to work side by side with him in the Legislature. Shoulder to shoulder."

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I really got a charge out of the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) when he got up and described the small electrical contractor, a plumber who started off as a plumber, as a "fat cat." This from a man who wants to be the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan. He slanders and ridicules the businessmen, whose savings and investment have made possible the jobs in the development of our province and our nation.

You know something, Mr. Speaker, I know that the businessmen and the corporations and all those entrepreneurs will be very, very interested in what you have to say.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the funny part is he got up and he said, "You know the reason for this strike is because the Liberals interfere." The Liberals interfered! It's too bad, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't agree with his Leader because the Leader got up and made the whole theme of his speech that the Liberals didn't interfere, they didn't give enough leadership, they didn't give enough action. You know, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) that Mr. Lloyd is still the Leader for a couple of more days.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the best of the whole works was when he was trying to get off this labor issue, trying to mean something to all segments, making sure he didn't lose any support at the Convention and he got on to the Liberal party financing. You know, how the Liberal party is financed. And he said, "I've got 500 names of 500 people that supported, that give \$100," and I'll give him a list of about 25,000 or 35,000 people in Saskatchewan that contributed \$2 but how did the NDP get their money? How many of us remember, Mr. Speaker, how many of the international unions contributed — American unions — contributed the hundreds of thousands of dollars to the political coffers of the NDP.

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

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a minute . . . you know one of the greatest things about the Socialists, Mr. Speaker, is that they are anti-foreign investment, anti-American. We've got to have the ownership in Canada's hands. They never talked about the labor movement. I have an article here which suggests something that is rather shocking to me and I think it is going to be shocking to the people of Saskatchewan.

CUPE official says U.S. unions take \$35 million from Canada annually, March, 1970. The national secretary-treasurer of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Mrs. Grace Hartman,

basing her remarks on government figures, told a recent teach-in at the University of Toronto that U.S. based international unions took about \$35 million out of Canada in 1967 and sent back only about 50 per cent or half of it in wages and other benefits. The disclosure that the international unions are operating at a profit of about \$17 million with no capital investment, with no income tax, a year on their Canadian operations should effectively demolish the argument that Canadian labor cannot be financed and be self-supporting. All evidence points to the fact that there is a net flow of unionists' money to the United States. Mrs. Hartman added that this made Canada a unique example. It is the only sovereign country in the world whose major labor-base resides in a foreign country. While the workers in General Motors of Canada belong to the United Auto Workers based in United States, those in England belong to the British Trade Union Congress, those in Germany to the German unions and those in France to the French unions.

This from the party, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Tell us how much goes . . .

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, then he wants to talk about this "where", where we got our money. Mr. Speaker, the only reason that the majority of the NDP are sitting in their seats right today and standing up defending or opposing this Bill is because they are paying off. They are paying off the political dues and the political patronage that they receive from these same trade union movements.

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

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, then the funny part of it is, Mr. Speaker, he stood up and then he appealed to the farmers. He appealed to the farmers, you know, and I don't blame him for appealing to the farmers because if there is anybody that needs a little farm help, it is the NDP right now. You know the Member for Riversdale and the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) have been travelling around the province and that's why they have only made a half-hearted effort in this debate. Let me read some personal viewpoints:

NDP needs a fresh approach to farming. How will the farmers and those trying to live in the small towns depending on agriculture react to the same old agricultural 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 long ago. While the news media did not generally report it, those of us who were there were surprised (I was there!) when the farmers loudly booed references to Roy Romanow, Jack Messer, Members of the NDP in the Saskatchewan Legislature

at the last session. To the desperate farmer those tired, old approaches are simply going to prove inadequate. They are looking for a political movement that will support innovative policies.

Well then, you know, why. What's another reason? Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the most powerful men in any political party is the president. You know what respect the Liberals have for our president. He is a very, very important member of our party. He provides great leadership and we've had a little debate going on and I want to give you one other impression of NDP wrong, and do you know who it is from? Bob Walker, you know, that old what we used to think was the old, left-wing Socialist.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's Roy's partner!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Roy's partner. And is it any wonder — he's Roy's boy. I think we know where he'll vote. Here's another quote:

Bev Currie had issued a policy statement advocating the nationalizing of farmers land, making sharecroppers 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 policy.

And then a few weeks later we got another Press release:

NDP executive endorses president.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder he didn't bother talking about Bill 2. No wonder. No wonder he gave us the campaign speech, because, Mr. Speaker, they are in trouble and they are in trouble because of their attitude, because of their narrow parochialism, because of the fact they have let the people of Saskatchewan as a whole down.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . chased them out!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Oh, chased them out? It's you that is chasing them. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that this whole session has been a half-hearted effort on behalf of our friends opposite, and if ever we heard a half-hearted effort it was from the Member for Riversdale. They are gravely concerned about the reaction of Saskatchewan farmers to this whole concept of no restraint and unlimited demands. They are frightened of losing what little support they now hold among the farmers. Let me quote another article expressing doubt — well, we won't bother, we have quoted enough about the Member for Riversdale's farm policy.

Is it any wonder that the farmers of Saskatchewan are concerned about the NDP? Is it any wonder? I also want to say a word, Mr. Speaker, about the Member for Moose Jaw, about his

10 per cent of construction costs. Well, I would like to tell him that if he can build me a house and I only have to pay 10 per cent for labor, by gosh, I'll be a millionaire tomorrow. If he takes that lumber from the day it is cut in the forest, from the time it is hauled to the mill, from the time it is sawed and processed, from the time it is transported, from the time the minerals come out of the ground, it is more like 75 or 80 per cent.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) got up and he said, "Where did the six per cent guideline come from?" A much more legitimate question is: where do the 40 per cent demands come from? Where do the 15 and 20 per cent demands come from? Is it based on a cost of living? No, Mr. Speaker, in the words of the Member for Riversdale, it is based on group force, withdrawal of services. It is based on what the demand or what the traffic will bear.

And then, Mr. Speaker, another one — the economic, I don't know what it is my colleague from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) referred to, but there is a comment that the Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) made, I don't know if he ever reads the stock market. He said reference to the fantastic profits made in the stock market. Well, I would suggest he go back and read the stock quotations and listen to the news. The stock market has suffered its greatest setback in the past months since 1929. The gains of 12 to 15 years have been wiped out. The hope for a future investment in Saskatchewan and in Canada is in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take now a very few minutes to talk about two concerns that I have in relation to this dispute.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What about Bill 2?

**MR. MacDONALD:** — That's what I am coming to.

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

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment for two very specific reasons. No 1, the year 1970 is a year of grave economic crisis in Canada. Galloping inflation demands that Canadians from the Atlantic to the Pacific use restraint to bring the economy back to its normal growth. The most unfortunate part of this special session is that the NDP have failed the people of Canada and the people of Saskatchewan. They have demonstrated that their narrow bipartisan support of the trade union movement comes before the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan as a whole. The most amazing aspect is that they have completely failed to interpret what the Member for Riversdale says is the mood of the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada. The mood of Canadians today is to challenge the right of trade unions to ignore the problems of their fellow citizens by unreasonable wage demands. They question the right of unions to destroy or seriously harm the general economy of

our country because of the strength of the organization or the power they hold. They believe that the economy of our province and our country is too complex to permit a few hundred unions to destroy the earning power of thousands of their fellow citizens. They believe that in 1970 trade unionists must find another solution to labor disputes than to engage in crippling strikes. They believe that in 1970 trade unions must be willing to co-operate with all other Canadians to battle inflation.

Mr. Speaker, let me enumerate the last offer of the electrical contractors. I am reading from a document of May 15th, 1970, which was the latest offer presented to the unions by the electrical contractors. I am not going to discuss the accuracy of the figures used, I am merely presenting what was presented to the unions. They certainly didn't question them.

A journey electrician now makes \$9,464 a year based on an average hourly rate of \$4.55. An apprentice averages 62 per cent of this sum during the four years' apprenticeship term. We are offering an immediate increase of 27 cents per hour which will raise your monthly income to \$835.46 and your annual wage to \$10,025.

On April 1st, 1971 we offer a second increment of 29 cents per hour, which brings your annual wage to \$10,628 based on a new hourly rate of \$5.11. But the hourly rate is actually much more than that. Look at it this way: your annual wage after the second increase in 1971 will be \$10,628. There are 1,888 working hours in the year. This means your real hourly rate under this offer will be in excess of \$5.62 per hour. Then add to that amount your Workmen's Compensation, your unemployment insurance, your Canada Pension Plan, all paid by the company. For each week that the strike continues, and assuming that the contractors ultimately agree to the union demands, which the contractors will not do — this is inserted — then you would have to work to make up for lost wages, 4 1/2 weeks for one week on strike, 18 weeks for 4 weeks on strike, 36 weeks for 8 weeks on strike.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is an example of what the union workers have lost today — \$1,983, made up of \$4.55 per hour, 8 hours per day, which comes to \$1,820 times three, plus \$54.60 for statutory holidays, plus \$109.20 for holiday pay, which comes to the total of approximately \$2,000.

Compare this, Mr. Speaker, to a farmer in my constituency. Let me take the example of a farmer working 600 acres of land on a four-bushel quota for farms half crop and half summerfallow and I wonder if the Member for Riversdale will listen to this. Four bushels at approximately \$1.30 for No. 2 what will gross \$3,120.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . a little high!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — It is a little high. I am



using or hoping that they will get 8 or 9 cents as the final payment. This, Mr. Speaker, before he pays taxes, before he pays for his seed, before he pays for his gas, before he pays for his power, before he pays for his parts. It does not include depreciation, land or machinery payments, food or clothing of anything for the labor. This farmer will end up thousands of dollars in the hole. He will receive nothing for his labor and will have to borrow to live. Is it any wonder that rural people are not sympathetic to unreasonable demands? Is it any wonder that they support the six per cent guidelines? What about the Socialists? Not one single speaker, not one speaker, Mr. Speaker, has stood on his feet to ask the unions to use restraint. Not one in the entire Opposition benches, Mr. Speaker. Not one single Member has stood on his feet and asked the unions to use restraint. Not one single speaker has accepted the need for guidelines. Not one single speaker has urged unions to co-operate in the fight against inflations. Instead, Mr. Speaker, they have turned the other cheek. They have condemned all guidelines, they have supported union demands, they have attempted to justify the principle of the survival of the fittest.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment is that the present impasse is threatening the very subsistence of thousands of Saskatchewan citizens. There are thousands of workers in Saskatchewan who are not involved in this dispute. They have no voice in bringing about a settlement, yet they have no opportunity to work even if they wish to. Their families are suffering, their savings are diminishing. Many of these workers who are unemployed due to the strike cannot draw strike pay or unemployment insurance benefits. Not only is it affecting them now but if projects are not underway soon, they will have no work this winter.

Many of these men plus others who are on strike will not qualify for unemployment insurance benefits next winter. In order to qualify they must make contributions for at least 24 weeks. They will not be eligible if they don't work for 24 weeks. As well many workers who normally save part of their income to balance any unemployed period will be unable to do so this year. There is a bleak winter ahead for many workers unless they return to work immediately. The welfare offices in Saskatchewan are finding that the months of June and July, which are normally the period of the year when the caseload is down when jobs are available, are now heavier than July and August of last year. Our caseload of employables has more than doubled since last July. On July 1st, 1969 1,117 were on our caseload searching for work. Today, one year later, there are 2,408 and when unemployment insurance benefits run out, Mr. Speaker, this could fantastically increase.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of Saskatchewan citizens are indirectly affected by any increase in inflation; the old age pensioner, the people on welfare, the unorganized workers. Where is the Socialists' concern for these unfortunate people?

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment and urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

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

**MR. R.H. WOOFF (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, "Here we go again," as the Press reporter at the ship's railing said when he was contributing to the Atlantic. There are a few comments on what has already passed that I would like to make before I turn to my address. First, Mr. Speaker, I was alarmed as I looked around the front of the Parliament Building and down the hallways yesterday. I suddenly became aware that the Premier, like so many leaders before him, who have pursued the pathway and the course of force and compulsion, had now become alarmed at his own shadow. What a state of affairs we have come to in just six years of Liberal administration, farm and business bankruptcy, unemployment and a genuine, a real stagnation until the Premier and the Government have become frightened of their own shadows, fearful like a child in the night. Mr. Speaker, I must admit that there is an economic blackout.

I would have liked to comment on the Hon. Member's statement, the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). You know I think it was one of the amusing incidents of the session when he undertook to criticize the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). Here is a would-be economist as a Member of the Government that he advises, a Government which has made the worst mess of administering the province in just six years that Saskatchewan has ever experienced. And he attempted to castigate a fellow Member. I say, what shall we see or hear next? I would suggest that after listening to the Hon. Member that shortly we will be back in special session debating the Emergency Services Bill on behalf of poverty-stricken Canada Packers and Loblaws. His constituents, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, will laugh him out of the community.

As I watched the Government Members' reaction to my Hon. colleague, the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) speaking on the matter of pensions yesterday, it was quite evident that the matter being discussed and voted on by the Liberal caucus is one of the important items of the session.

Just a word to comment on the population situation, and that is that one of the moving firms in Regina said the other day that for every one family that they move in Saskatchewan, they move 17 out. There is just one comment, one problem that the Premier won't be troubled with is birth control.

In 1964, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan people elected a Liberal Government after 20 years of the best, most progressive and industrial, peaceful period Saskatchewan has ever known. It was the ordering of trouble, real trouble. It was not difficult to foresee economic slump; not difficult to foretell rise in taxation despite election promises, or unemployment in spite of 80,000 new jobs that the Premier talked about during the election,

or an increase in debt provincially, personally and in any other way. And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it was not difficult to forecast these events because this is Liberal record over and over again. Hand in hand with all this, the Government has done its utmost to develop a fear psychology throughout the country. However, to me there is more serious overtone developing in this fair land of ours. I have said for the last four or five years that North America was drifting toward a dictatorship to the right as fast as we could go.

No less a conservative magazine and I say "conservative" with a small 'c', no less a conservative magazine than the Atlantic Monthly gives us a comparatively short time to be there. Listen to your Goldwaters and your Reagans or Nixons, with an undeclared war that has been running for almost 10 years, that Congress was never asked to pass on. Listen to the Bennetts and the Smallwoods and the Mannings and I was amazed how the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) was quoting the Alberta compulsory legislation the other day. And last but not least, the Thatchers in Saskatchewan, and I will come back to that. Listen to what Trudeau had to say and I am quoting now from Maclean's Magazine, June 1970:

Trudeau said of Opposition Members when they get home, when they get out of Parliament, when they are 50 yards from Parliament Hill, they are no longer honourable, they are nobodies.

Pure absolute contempt for democracy. This is that Prime Minister that we elected not too long ago.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has been in power six short years. People say that it feels like 20. Six years, Mr. Speaker, and this is the second time that we have been called into special session for the same mysterious purpose.

The Government record in this field is so bad that every three years we have this kind of undemocratic and unethical session. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has a three-year limit on the legislation now before us. Should chance return it, it expects to be back in special session here again in three years for the same reason.

Mr. Speaker, our farm economy is one of the worst agricultural disasters it has experienced. Because agriculture is our basic industry the province's economy is sick. What happens to agriculture affects the whole of our economic society, provincially and federally. Did this Government call a special session to deal with this farm emergency? Certainly not! Unthinkable to spend money that way and besides somebody might just come up with a real good bright idea that would be embarrassing to the Government. Worse than that, the Government turned a deaf ear to any proposals that have been made whereby the farm sector could be helped back to its feet. No special session here! Only Operation LIFT. The Premier went along with this until he saw the farmers would not buy it. Then, Mr. Speaker,

early this summer he read the NDP speeches of last spring session and went on television in an attempt to save face by an about-face. This Liberal Government has helped to push the farmer into the present squeeze by letting financial and industrial monopoly rob him at every turn. High interest rates, extreme farm machinery prices.

Now the only road that it can see in its blind thrust for power is to call the Legislature into session in order to bring still others under the ruthless fist of force, compulsion and constraint by extending Bill 2.

I told my good wife some years ago when things looked very rosy, "We started out in the Liberal depression when we were married, and in all probability we were going to end our working days in another Liberal depression." And, Mr. Speaker, it is all around us right now.

May I repeat what our Leader Mr. Lloyd said four years ago as printed on page 11 in the Debates and Proceedings 1966 special session and I quote:

This is an unnecessary session at which the Government expects us to settle a problem which should never have arisen.

More than one Government Member has talked about the wives of working people being at their wits' end and being alarmed. Mr. Speaker, this is true, all too true. But this has always been part of the game of the employer and I fear this is one of the reasons why the Government waited three months before acting, that it could cash in on this tragedy and weep crocodile tears in the House on behalf of those who are really suffering. This, Mr. Speaker, is an old trick, an age-old battle against labor.

In 1966 and again during the labor dispute of 1970 the Government's role directly and indirectly has been one of threat and harassment. And we heard it again this afternoon during the Premier's announcement. One of threat and harassment because of its appetite for power and most of all because it needed an election issue.

I said before I left home, here come the opening shots of would-be election. And neither the Premier nor the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) went contrary to my forecast, running through both of their addresses with a lightning gleam of political manoeuvring which defied all attempt at serious camouflage, which makes a mockery of this session.

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

**MR. WOOFF:** — The plain fact is that this Government is in such deep trouble that it can't wait another year and it must have a scapegoat.

One more I must turn to Sweden and say that Sweden does not have labor courts in the sense that the Members opposite wish to imply. The Social Government in Sweden — and I was surprised to hear the Attorney General start eulogizing the Socialist Government, but as usual it was misrepresented — Sweden has devised machinery whereby industry, labor and government sit down and constantly review wage schedules. Wage contracts are not let lapse for six months or a year until tempers are hot, nerves are frayed, and everybody mad.

Wages are not set by the demands of labor or the tough lines taken by the employer, but on the level of national economy. This means that both employer and employee share in the general buoyancy of the national income. And only so can strikes be abolished and general welfare be preserved.

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

**MR. WOOFF:** — That in brief is the secret of Swedish success in this field. I am not suggesting that improvements cannot be made even there, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a lot to learn from them.

I do not always agree with labor or farmers for that matter. But, Mr. Speaker, this province and Canada are never better off than when the farmer and the laboring group have buying power and that they keep the money tills of this province ringing from one end to the other. This is when everybody is well off.

Mr. Speaker, I beg this Government to rise above its petty politics and be statesmen-like in this whole matter. Withdraw this Bill and make a genuine effort at arbitration conciliation. I would plead with it, after the announcement the Premier made not long ago, that it withdraw the Bill and that we go home.

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

**MR. WOOFF:** — I am sure that if the Government had honestly spent the money that it will cost to conduct this session, in a statesmen-like effort to help settle this dilemma, we would not be here today, Mr. Speaker. I appeal to it not to continue to erode our democratic procedures but to lead the way to a better method of settling our differences than by strike, compulsive, repulsive legislation.

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

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, after waiting for a long time to get my turn, and after hearing the announcement this afternoon that the parties involved are settling, I think that the right thing to do would have been to adjourn the House.

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

**MR. THIBAUT:** — But to proceed with this Bill is a clear indication of this Government's lack of trust in people.

In rising to speak to this Bill, I look at this situation that this session has been called for a few reasons. Looking across the way, when you have about eight Members left in the House and at times you were down to three, if the people back home would know how you are conducting the nation's business, I think that is about the number that will be back in the next election.

When the Government called this session you could see it preparing for a sort of Rhodesian-style election, by a Rhodesian-style party, which had the Rhodesian-style redistribution — and you see the biggest Member sitting with the least number of voters on the voters' list. I am quite proud that I am representing the largest rural constituency in Saskatchewan with somewhere around 13,000 or 14,000 on the voters' list. You can see that I am not afraid to get up and say what I have to say.

I want to say that after we form the Government we are going to have a fair redistribution bill. People as in the town of Melfort will have the pleasure of not having a Member that has to spread himself so thin that he can't get around the whole constituency.

Now it talks about indemnities. I want to say that I have two constituencies for the price of one.

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

**MR. THIBAUT:** — I always get a pretty good deal. The Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) has one constituency one mile square. He could even sell his car and walk it out. But mine is 66 miles across as the crow flies, so that is a lot of area to cover.

I think there was another reason — and the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) said it yesterday — the reason for this session was to clear the deck for an election. With 15 Members over there that couldn't have gotten their pension if they didn't have this session, it was necessary to have this fake session. If the Government had tried a little bit as was proved today, it would have settled its problem and we would not have needed this session.

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

**MR. THIBAUT:** — Now for the Cabinet Ministers who needed this extra session, it means \$4,800 a year. I think that the taxpayers of this province should know that. This is why this session was called, for a \$4,800 a year pension. It clears the deck for the election. You see you couldn't have the election without that

session. You had to have this session.

Now when you look at the Government, it is also an examination of conscience. We went over it pretty well today and I hope that it will go and sin no more. After seven years of Liberal Government in this province, what did we give them? This party gave them a well balanced economy, money in all the funds, research in agriculture that we never had before, and what did they do with it? Medicare — what did you do with it? It is in trouble. You and the Federal Government were given the breadbasket of the world to look after. Saskatchewan agriculture — what did you do with it? Playing around with barter deals! And the little fights that we hear between Trudeau and Thatcher! I get a great kick out of that. It reminds me of my little boy when he used to run into the house and say, "Daddy, you know the neighbor's cat is fighting with ours again." And this kept on until he got a little older and then he said, "Daddy, I know that the cats are not fighting." Well we will stop it there as I think you got the message.

But I call it nothing but a fake session and as the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) said a little while ago, the second time during your term of office that you have called this Legislature in to force people. I call it swastika style. The extreme right wing is one way to put it.

I have no doubt in my mind that after the Leadership Convention is over that this Government will be prepared to call an election and I hope that it will. It has tried to heap scorn on our people who are running for leadership. We are quite happy that there are already four people, and capable people, who are willing to let their name stand for the leadership.

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

**MR. THIBAUT:** — But the people across the way — and there aren't very many there now — are stuck with little Davey. They haven't anyone else and I tell you that they are in trouble.

I don't want to take too much time and the ground has been well covered by the Members who spoke before. The reason, as I want to point out why I won't support the Bill, is because this Government has come out with so many intoxicated decisions that have wrecked this province no matter how you look at it. The people have left. We lost 18,000 last year plus the national increase which could be around 30,000. We visit British Columbia to visit someone else and we meet our own people down there. I think that you boys have had it. You can call that election tonight if you want to. We will take you on anytime you feel like it.

So with this, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that I cannot support this Bill. We should have adjourned the House long before this. In the first place this session should not have been held.

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

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 23**

**Messieurs**

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

**NAYS — 30**

**Messieurs**

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

**MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that some friends who are so vocal opposite, particularly when they were enquiring as to when some of us on this side of the House were going to speak have been called away to pressing matters of coffee or whatever it is.

I do want to say something in this debate. In my view it is an important debate. It is important because it deals directly with the rights and freedoms of perhaps 10,000 men and their families. No society is completely free. The battle for freedom is a continuing battle, and in this battle eternal vigilance is the price of safety.

In this battle every erosion of freedom, every attack on liberty is justified with the same arguments which we have heard here today and yesterday, is justified because it is necessary to protect the state, necessary to protect the public, necessary to protect the majority of citizens.

The wartime treatment of the West Coast Japanese by the Canadian Government was just so justified. And now we know that that treatment was wrong. The Duplessis treatment of the Jehovah's Witnesses was just so justified and we know that that



was wrong. The Duplessis treatment of striking workers at Murdockville and Louisville and Asbestos Mines and all of those other strikes in Quebec which were punished by the repressive hand of Duplessis, they were all justified this way and they were wrong — or I now hope that we believe they were wrong.

We are fighting another battle in this continuing struggle. Men are being forced to work, not on bargained terms, not even on terms arrived at by impartial arbitration, but on terms dictated by the Government, terms restricting their incomes according to limits imposed against them but imposed against no other segment of society. We now know, or should know, that that is wrong. We on this side will lose this battle but we will have fought and we will have been proud that we fought.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — There will be other battles and sooner or later the cause for which we are arguing today will triumph.

I want to turn now to some of the arguments which have been advanced by Members opposite in support of this Bill. They were gracious enough to agree that it was a distasteful Bill. I wish they would have gone one step further and agreed that it was a wrong Bill. They said we are bleeding for unionized labor, but we have no concern for the unorganized worker. Well how would an unorganized worker improve his lot? May I ask you that? He would improve his lot firstly by having a union. Have you people facilitated the organization of unions? He would improve his lot by having higher minimum wages. Have you raised our minimum wages to keep pace with the rest of Canada? You have not. He would be profited and benefited by reduced hours of work. Have you lowered the hours of work in your six years of office? You have not. He would be benefited by improved vacations with pay legislation. In your six years of office have you improved that legislation? You have not. How then can you stand there and say that you are bleeding for the unorganized workers?

In the last session short months ago unorganized workers such as workers who work for Kresge's or Woolworth's, for those people you put on extra income taxes and you put none on Woolworth's or Kresge's. That is how much you bleed for the unorganized workers.

May I now deal with some arguments advanced by the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). He said that we should welcome the announcement of the Premier. We would welcome the announcement of the Premier because this was the first time that both management and labor agreed to go back to work. And he may well be right. He may well be right! I know that the union agreed to go back on those terms on June 10th.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — He may be right when he says management did not agree with that. He may be right, but if he is right then how can the Government justify its next step, its next step of applying coercive legislation. To whom? To the management? No! To the union who were willing to go back to work twenty days ago.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Who is responsible for the continuation of this work stoppage? Is it the union? I submit it is not. Is it the management? If the Member from Milestone is right then the answer is Yes. But I invite any of you to look at Bill 2 or the amendment to Bill 2. I invite anyone of you to find one word there which in any way forces management to do anything. I ask you: if Bill 2 is applied, if there is arbitration, if a decision is rendered, does the union have to follow that decision? They do or else they are decertified. They do or else they are fined.

Look at Bill 2. Does the management have to follow that arbitration decision? No. No suggestion that they would lose any rights or licences. No suggestion that management would be fined. All you could do is sue them. You have applied coercion, not on both parties, but on one party. One party only.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And out of your own mouths you have said that both parties are to blame.

I want to digress for one moment and talk about the arguments advanced with respect to labor relations in Sweden. We have heard references to the system of settling industrial disputes in Sweden in this debate and many other debates. We have had the usual misrepresentation of the Swedish system, misrepresentation stemming probably from sheer lack of knowledge. We have heard Sweden's record for settling disputes praised and we heard it again from the Premier. And we have heard his reference to labor courts, when he knows or ought to know that labor courts in Sweden play no part whatever in dealing with salary disputes.

Members seem to have difficulty getting a grip on what the system is in Sweden. I would like to refer all Hon. Members to the December 1968 issue of "Task" which is a magazine of the Ontario Department of Labour. I trust that this will not be thought of as a sheet put out by international unions or any other group who you seem to want to hold up to abuse.

This issue contained a good description of the Swedish system of labor relations and I want to make a few short references to it. Let me quote:

The big difference between Sweden and North America is that in the Scandinavian country compromise is preferred by labor and management to conflict and reason to emotion.

In Sweden a few years ago back in the 1930s, as a matter of fact, they worked out an overall general agreement between management and labor and is sometimes called the basic agreement.

This article, among other things, deals with essential services. "The question of whether workers in essential services in Canada should have a right to strike is the subject of intense debate in this country. But in Sweden the right extends not only to civil servants but to police, the fire departments and utility and hospital workers. However, it is questionable whether the right to strike would ever be exercised in a vital service area. Under the basic agreement any conflict that threatens essential public services may be referred to a body known as the Labor Market Council. This is composed of three representatives from labor and three from management. The findings of the Council are not binding but because the body is representative of both major power blocks, it is not likely that the parties to a dispute would risk the moral censure of rejecting Council recommendations." It goes on to say that there have been difficulties. In 1953 the country faced the threat of a strike in the electrical generating industry. Positions in labor and management were hardening when the issue was referred to the Labor Market Council. All were aware that failure would bring a renewal of demands for government regulations in public interest cases. The crisis was averted through a unanimous recommendation by the Council which was accepted by the conflicting parties. Note the format — co-operation with respect to all labor-management disputes, no government intervention and no government coercion. Strikes are rare but they do occur — a five-month strike in the metal industry in 1945, dispute in the food industry in 1953, a teachers' strike in 1966. But that's a small number of strikes for 20 years. That's a record of high achievement, 25 years of near perfect labor peace. Years without strife, years without compulsory arbitration in essential services, years of government dedicated to promoting industrial peace and not industrial strife. This is a good record of a proud free people. We here must hide our heads in shame — in shame because in four years we have had to apply compulsion and coercion not once but four times. We have failed the traditions of Saskatchewan and I suggest we have failed the principles of freedom.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We have heard other arguments from the Premier and others. What do they argue? They have argued that there was a construction strike and that is true. They have argued that this strike is the major cause of economic depression now gripping Saskatchewan and that is patently false. They have said that the Government has done everything reasonably possible to settle this dispute and that is false. They have said that

it is fair and reasonable to control wages as a way of controlling inflation without controlling prices or profits or rents or interests, and that is false. They say that the Bill only covers construction workers, the people who are now on strike, and that is false. They say that the Bill substitutes impartial arbitration for collective bargaining, and this is false.

Turning first to the causes of economic depression, can anyone believe that the economic depression in Regina and in Saskatchewan is because of this labor dispute or any other labor dispute? Rubbish! There is one basic reason for depression in Canada and in Saskatchewan and that is that the Liberals are liars. I don't say Members opposite are liars, I am not permitted to say that. I am saying that the promises made by Liberal politicians have been uniformly unreliable. What has happened in Saskatchewan? Why is there a depression?

Well, first and foremost, the agricultural economy has ground to a halt. Grain sales are at rock bottom. Grain prices are at rock bottom. Farmers are at their wits' end. Second, our industry and commerce has ground to a near halt. Factory shipments are stagnating, mining production is stagnating. Retail sales are worse than stagnating. Thirdly, people are fleeing the province. In unprecedented numbers people are leaving Saskatchewan, leaving this depressed area, leaving to go to Tory Ontario, leaving to go to Social Credit Alberta, leaving to go to New Democrat Manitoba. Liberal governments have turned Saskatchewan into an economic wasteland. Anyone who is aware of the prosperity which prevailed in this province in 1964 could hardly believe that this proud and prosperous province could in six short years be brought to its economic knees, brought to its economic knees by the incompetence, the divisive policies and the outright untruths of Liberal party politicians at Ottawa and Regina.

The number one cause of distress in Saskatchewan and in Regina is not this strike, not this strike as the Attorney General was trying to convince us today. It is the farm crisis. There could be no possible doubt that there is a farm crisis and a serious farm crisis. Farm cash receipts in 1969 compared with 1967 are down \$260 million, down 27 per cent, down while other costs are rising. How did this come about? Well there are several reasons. The basic reason is because Liberal politicians told Western farmers, "You grow the wheat, and we'll sell it." Remember that, Mr. Minister of Agriculture? "You grow the wheat and we'll sell it." Farmers grew the wheat, they listened to Joe Green. Farmers grew top-quality wheat in record volume. Farmers did exactly what they were asked to do but did the Liberal politicians sell the wheat? They did not. They did next to nothing to sell our wheat. There was no evidence of aggressive salesmanship, no evidence of meeting competition, no evidence of competition in price and particularly in credit terms. Liberal politicians in Canada refused to do for Canadian farmers what central governments were doing for their farmers in Australia, in France, in the United States. Specifically, these

Liberal politicians refused to follow aggressive sales' policies. They left sales almost exclusively to the international private enterprise grain trading companies. And this combination of private enterprise and Liberal politicians has proved disastrous for our farmers.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — They refused to meet competition on credit terms. Recently there have been substantial sales to Brazil, to Peru and to other countries. These sales were made because of new and better credit terms. Sales like these could have been made 18 months ago. But they were not made, they were not made because Liberal politicians, like the Minister of Agriculture over there, were unwilling to stand up for Canadian farmers. Liberal politicians at Ottawa, I regret to say, and at Regina didn't give a damn. They promised, "You grow the wheat and we'll sell it," but when the time came for them to honor that pledge they sat silent, they sat immobile and they refused to honor that pledge. Sales of hundreds of millions of bushels were lost because they wouldn't compete on credit terms. In a desperate effort to hide their failure they have blamed the lack of sales on railway workers, and Seaway workers and grainhandlers and just about anyone else you can think of. Plumbers now, anyone but the true culprits, the Liberal politicians who deceived Western farmers. Thirdly, these same people refused to compete in price. Month after month our competitors were selling huge quantities of wheat while Ottawa watched. Their one excuse was that Saskatchewan farmers couldn't afford to sell wheat at less than \$1.95 1/2, basis No. 1 Thunder Bay. But this argument overlooks two things: firstly, if farmers couldn't afford to sell wheat at that price they could much less afford not to sell any wheat. I have been around the country this month, as Members opposite have been kind enough to make reference to, and I have talked to a number of farmers. In the month of June I have run into some who are still on the two-bushel quota. Can those farmers survive? The answer is not for long. But this argument that the Members opposite and their friends at Ottawa shouldn't compete in price overlooks another thing. It overlooks the fact that the farmers shouldn't have been asked to compete in price. It overlooks the fact there was no reason why the farmers shouldn't have had a guaranteed price while the Canadian Government wasn't competing in price. Particularly this is so, when you know and I know and everybody in Saskatchewan knows that these same people have promised \$2 wheat not once but dozens of times.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yet when the chips were down, when it meant something to Western farmers they found that the Liberal politicians who promised \$2 wheat had lied. How else have they failed us? Liberal politicians have refused to use the hundreds of millions of dollars of unspent foreign aid money and there it is at Ottawa now to

move Canadian wheat and flour to the hungry millions of the world. The United States moves hundreds of millions of bushels through its foreign aid program. Liberals will not. Canadians have mountains of wheat and flour. Canada has millions of dollars of unspent foreign aid money. The world has one billion hungry people. The Liberals cannot put together that money to buy that flour to feed those mouths. They can't or won't act for Western farmers.

You know Liberals have failed even to honor their promise of a two-price system. I want to say this about a two-price system, I believe that people in urban Canada have no wish to have lower food prices at the cost of ruining our farmers. Urban people believe that everyone is entitled to a fair return for their labor. Urban people would not have objected to a realistic two-price system. They have not really objected to subsidies on for milk, and subsidies for butter and we know these are substantial. They would have accepted a very small increase in the price of bread and flour, that small increase which would have been necessary if we had had a domestic price of say \$3 a bushel. I would say this, they would have asked for . . .

**MR. LEITH ((Elrose):** — How many bushels?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — How many bushels? The Member for Elrose asks and that is the number of bushels that are consumed for domestic consumption in Canada. They would have asked of course that this would not be the excuse for profit gouging by the bakery chains, but, profit gouging aside, urban people would accept a fair two-price system. Yet even that promise made innumerable times by Liberal politicians, those opposite and their friends at Ottawa, has been broken. Liberals have refused to honor their pledges to sell \$2 wheat, two-price system. What have they offered instead? They have offered Operation LIFT, offered by Otto Lang and endorsed by Premier Thatcher. Let me tell the Premier what he already knows and what the Member for Maple Creek is now admitting that Operation LIFT will do nothing for farmers in this crisis. It is a total failure and it has already failed. My figures indicate that seeded acreage will be down very slightly this year. Wheat acreage will be down substantially, but total seeded acreage will be down only slightly and most of that is due to weather and not LIFT. Farmers have rejected it and so they should. In face of all the promises made by these Liberals — and I won't repeat them all — the two-price system and \$2 wheat and "we'll sell your wheat" — Operation LIFT is very nearly obscene. It asks farmers not to grow wheat when they know and we know that there are hungry people needing wheat. It threatens those who won't comply with a perversion of the quota system. Quotas were meant to deal fairly with farmers who grow wheat, they weren't meant to threaten farmers to make them not grow wheat.

This program does one further thing. It attempts to force farmers to run down their supplies of grain without offering any price guarantees or any market guarantees or any guarantees of

any kind as to what happens in 1971. Operation LIFT illustrates better than anything I can say the total bankruptcy of Liberal farm policies. And if, Mr. Speaker, there was any possible doubt about that before, there is none after the Task Force on Agriculture has reported to the Government of Canada. That Task Force is a complete apology for agra business, it would wipe out thousands of Saskatchewan farmers. It's a policy to deliver Saskatchewan agriculture, indeed all of Canadian agriculture, over to the agra-business interests — to National Grain, to the packing houses, and I have not heard the Minister of Agriculture speak with respect to this policy. If the Minister of Agriculture has stood up and denounced the Task Force on the Agriculture Report I haven't heard him. I don't know whether I will hear him. I hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey), the Member for Nutana Centre speak on behalf of the packing houses. I hear the Member for Cannington speak on behalf of the packing houses. Can I look to those people to defend Western farmers against agra business? We know why we have seen these people line up with the packing houses, line up with agra business against family farms. The Wheat Pool it has alleged has endorsed this. As I recall it the Wheat Pool momentarily endorsed Operation LIFT and that's not to their credit either.

Liberals have allowed farmers to bear the brunt of the farm crisis. The result has been near disaster and that's the real cause of economic depression in Saskatchewan. Is there one person opposite who would honestly deny that? Is there one opposite who would say that this depression is in any material respect contributed to by the labor dispute we are talking about today? There is not anyone who would stand there and would say that that is real fact. The facts are that the farm crisis is 99 per cent of our problems.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The trouble is not strikes. The trouble is not unions, it is not carpenters, it's not plumbers, it's Liberals. We will not cure this thing by coercing carpenters, or getting rid of carpenters or coercing plumbers or getting rid of plumbers. There is only one way and that is to get rid of Liberals. The Bill is a transparent attempt to blame others for Liberal failure but we know better and, I want to advise Members opposite, so do the farmers of Saskatchewan know better.

Now if farming is in a state of chaos, industrial production isn't much better. I won't review all of the statistics of oil production down and potash production down and retail sales down, and farm implement sales down and construction down. All of you know those figures, all of you should be pondering them, asking yourselves how this can be in the New Saskatchewan. Construction is down not because of any strike. There is virtually no house building in Regina and it is not because of any strike. The reason is that there are 1,000 houses for sale in Regina right now, 1,000 houses for sale. Because of

Liberal-induced economic stagnation, houses are a drug on the market. You can buy a house in Regina for less money than you can build one for. How many houses do you think are going to be built in Regina, strike or no strike? That is catching up on Regina. I invite any Hon. Member to go down and look at 11th Avenue, look at the empty stores one after the other, after the other. These people have fallen victim to Liberal prosperity. They have fallen victim to the fiction that low wages bring prosperity. Well you can see what happened to them. Low wages meant no business, low wages meant no sales and low wages meant bankruptcy to those people. I want you to look at Child and Gower. It is gone. I am told that Christie Grant's is on the way, that they have announced a closing out sale and I could go on, one, two, three, four, tens and tens of businesses in Regina have gone to the wall. As I have said on occasion elsewhere in Saskatchewan, in 1968 Thatcher's Hardware went to the wall, in 1969 Steuart's Electric went to the wall and in 1970 both of them are going to the wall.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — They will be victims too of Liberal bungling and Liberal incompetence. You know how many housing starts there were in Saskatchewan this year. In 1969 at this time there were 577 housing starts. You know what the figure is this year? Twenty-four, 24 - 10, 10 and 4. Count them. I'll try it again the for the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). If you can say that that is a result of any strike then you have a very, very pliable conscience, because nobody can say that this depression which is gripping our city and our province has anything to do with a plumbing strike or an electrical strike. If you've got troubles in agriculture, if you've got troubles in industry, our third problem is probably a result of these two, the flight of people from Saskatchewan. Thousands are leaving. And what does it mean? No demand for new housing, no call for new schools, little call for new stores, or new churches or new facilities. This flight of population, major depopulation was in progress, was in progress before these construction strikes and will continue long after these construction strikes. I heard the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) say it was these strikes that were causing unemployed construction workers. It was these strikes that were causing plumbers and carpenters to go to Winnipeg. Where was he during the last session when we pointed out to him and to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and to other Members in this House that at that very time there were 1700 construction workers in Regina out of work? 1700 and there was no strike then. It was these 1700 and many more who went to Winnipeg and went to Calgary and went to Edmonton looking for bread for their tables.

The flight of dissatisfied people is not due to any strike, not due to labor unions. It is due to one thing, the bungling and the incompetence of this Liberal Government and the one at Ottawa.



How did we get into this situation where we are asked to nullify free collective bargaining? Well let's say a few words about free collective bargaining because I believe in free collective bargaining. I believe in the long term it is the best method of settling labor-management disputes in our society. With free collective bargaining, with the right of a man either alone or with others to bargain for the price of his labor, with that right goes the right to withdraw that labor. And I remember the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) being very eloquent in defence of this right when he entered this House. These rights are of very ancient origin. The common law of England hundreds of years ago established the proposition that no one had to work for an employer he did not want to work for except under penal sentence. About 100 years ago the principle developed that labor could combine to withdraw their services. This development of the law of trade unions was set and at least 50 years ago it was well established that in ordinary circumstances any group of employees had the right to join together to withdraw their services. As Paul Martin put it, "The right to strike is a basic civil right."

Let me quote some other authorities. "The right to strike derives its validity from the right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. In other words it derives from the fact that man is essentially a rational animal endowed with a free will by which he can achieve dignity and self-fulfilment on the basis that gives meaning and purpose based on justifying values to life and living." "The right to strike may be considered as an extension of the right of an individual worker to withdraw his labor if he regards conditions of work as unacceptable to him. When a number of employees act together and withdraw their labor such as going on strike, they are actually exercising their individual rights simultaneously." Those last two quotations are from that well known authority, the Hon. Lionel Coderre, the Minister of Labour, when he spoke in this House in 1966.

Let's agree then that for workmen the right to strike is a basic civil right. This right should not be withdrawn except under extreme circumstances. In respect of general emergencies endangering human life and health I have given my views in the debate in September of 1966 and I will not repeat them now. But in this strike, the one that we are dealing with, no one is contending that life and health are in jeopardy. The only justification offered is that Government action is necessary to control wage increases because we must control inflation. This is the justification offered by the Members opposite. We must control inflation. In order to control inflation we must control wages, therefore we will control wages, we will coerce workers. That is their argument. Reduced to its simplest terms, what is the Government's argument for its six per cent ceiling on wages? When again they say inflation is a menace, wage increases contribute to inflation, wage increases should be controlled. Are they saying anything else? Well there is some logic to that argument. We, on this side of the House certainly want inflation to be controlled.

We believe that the Ottawa Government has done an incredibly bad job of controlling inflation. It has been in office since 1963. It has had seven years and it has been seven years of total failure in the control of inflation. Now what is inflation. In this sense of the word it means this: it simply means controlling prices or rising prices. And if you want to control rising prices then you had better control prices. We agree that prices should be controlled, but we say this, we ask you people over there, if you believe that inflation should be controlled, if you believe that prices should be controlled, then why don't you control them?

The Government of Saskatchewan has full legislative power to control prices. If the Attorney General were here he would confirm this. Prime Minister Trudeau has confirmed this at Humboldt. Are machinery prices too high? Well if they are you can control them, but you don't. Are gas and oil prices too high? The Government can control them, but it won't. Are rents too high? The Government can control them, but it won't. Are doctors' fees too high? Lawyers' fees too high? Dentists' fees too high? Accountants' fees too high? If they are you can control them, but you won't. Does the Government control these prices? It doesn't even make these people, the machinery dealers or the oil companies, or the lawyers, or the doctors, it doesn't even make these people justify their increases before any sort of a board. It simply says to these people, "Raise your prices. We won't stop you. We won't ask any questions."

And how about contractors, road contractors? They have raised their unit prices 60 per cent in three years. Did the Government stop this? No. It collaborated with this raid on the Public Treasury. Members who are shaking their heads should look at the Annual Report of the Department of Highways for 1967 and it will show conclusively that the unit cost of building highways in this province went up between 1964 and 1967 to 60 per cent. Over 60 per cent!

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

I want to know what is the case for controlling workmen's wages without controlling contractors' profits, without controlling prices, interest rates, rents, executive salaries, professional fees. Liberals are wanting to control wages. They want to keep them down to six per cent but they allow prices to rise more than that, profits to rise more than that, salaries to rise more than that, rent to rise more than that, and totally uncontrolled.

How can it be possibly argued as I heard it argued by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant)? I wish that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) was here because these people argue two totally contradictory arguments. The Minister of Health has not spoken in this debate but the last session he

talked about doctors' pay and he said that we have to raise the pay of doctors. We have to raise the incomes of doctors because they must compare with doctors in Winnipeg and doctors in Calgary, and Edmonton and elsewhere in Canada. That's what he said. He said that we must meet competition in the other provinces, but when we put the same argument to the Minister of Municipal Affairs today about plumbers and carpenters and electricians he said, "Oh no. No, you can't compare plumbers and carpenters and electricians with plumbers and carpenters and electricians in Calgary, Edmonton or Winnipeg. You have to compare them with farmers in Saskatchewan. You have to compare them with other workers in Saskatchewan."

Well maybe that's right, but what is wrong with comparing doctors with farmers in Saskatchewan? Let's have a little consistency. If the right wage comparison for doctors is cross-Canada wages, why isn't it the right wage comparison for plumbers? How can one justify saying that doctors must get 11 per cent and 14 per cent and six per cent in three successive years? The plumbers shall only get six per cent.

The Government want to control the wages of the lowest construction worker. Let me tell you this, we are not now talking only about carpenters and plumbers and electricians, as the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) said, we are talking about ordinary construction laborers getting the labor rates. We are talking about guys getting \$2 per hour, not \$4.50 and \$5 an hour. This Bill covers everybody who carries a brick on the construction project, whether he has any skills or not. This is the man who must accept a six per cent ceiling on his wages.

He must accept that ceiling but has no protection on prices. He is the victim of high prices charged by the corporate friends of the Members opposite. He is paying too much for his food. The grocery chains are earning excess profits. I am sorry that the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) is not here, because Judge Mary Batten of the Batten Report said that in 1968 the grocery chains, in particular Loblaws and Safeways, were making excess profits. And those are her words and not mine. And when I say that it is a little bit much for Loblaws in 1969 to make 121 per cent more profit than they made in 1968, he says, "Oh, but their 1968 profit was low." Now get that. Their 1968 profit, he says, was low. Mary Batten says the profits were in excess, but if they were excess in 1968 now they are excess plus 121 per cent.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I have not heard one Member opposite suggest that there ought to be any controls on those profits or on those prices. The man who carries the bricks on construction projects is asked to accept six cents more or 12 cents more an hour if he is making \$2 per hour, and many construction workers don't make any more than that. He sees that 12 cents an hour melt many times in high food prices. And do I hear any concern over there

for those, even though the Treasury Benches have full right and full authority to control those food prices? They do not. Their concern for inflation stops when it gets into the higher price brackets. Their concern for inflation doesn't run to controlling Loblaws or Safeways, but just to food carriers and cement finishers.

The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is wondering who he will vote for at the time of the Leadership convention. All I can say to him is that the New Democratic party is somewhat selective in who will be allowed to be delegates at their Convention.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And one of us have any fear about the vote of the Member from Athabasca.

The Batten Report which I have here has been studiously ignored by Members opposite notwithstanding the fact that at that time that report said that food prices were too high. Since that time, in 1969, as I say, Loblaws profits have gone up 121 per cent — not six per cent. Burns Foods, one of the packers who the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Estey) was so anxious to protect, their profits have gone up during this period by 42 per cent — not six per cent there. And is the Government proposing any controls? The answer is No. This Government has no wish to control prices, no wish to control inflation. If it did it would act. It would act to control prices. Instead it wants to control, not prices, but people. The motive for this Bill is not to control prices, the motive is not prices, but power.

The Government wants to press its iron foot on the neck of another 10,000 people in Saskatchewan. It wants everybody to know that in Saskatchewan Uncle Ross is boss, boss of the working people, boss of the contractors.

I want to turn now to the contents of the Bill, because the Government, and I think the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) has been less than frank about the contents of the Bill. The Government suggests that the Bill will apply only to carpenters and the plumbers and the electricians. That seemed to be the arguments coming forth. In fact it will apply to all construction workers, low paid and high paid. I say that it can apply to a great many more people and I invite the Attorney General and the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) and the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Estey) to read that Bill. I say that it can apply to employees in sawmills. It can apply to the employees in the cement plant. It can apply to the employees in the steel plant. It can apply to the employees in the steel fabricating plants and it can apply to the employees in the brick plants.

All of these are employees engaged in the provision of construction services. It is because they have defined

construction services to include materials, materials for construction. As an example, workers in the cement plant are employees engaged in the provision of materials for the construction of buildings. They are that and they are covered by this Bill. They could be and I am glad to hear the Attorney General admit that the employees in the cement plant and the employees in the brick plant and the employees in the sawmills and the employees in the steel fabricating plant are all covered by this amendment to Bill 2.

It places under the bondage of Bill 2 further thousands of Saskatchewan working people, a number far greater than the number represented by the Members opposite when they talked about a few hundred striking employees or a few dozen carpenters. In fact there are tens of thousands of people who are brought under bondage by this Bill.

It has to be a labor dispute. Now isn't that a concession! But the first time there is a labor dispute at the cement plant this Bill can be brought into effect. The first time there is a dispute at Sask. Steel Fabricators this Bill can be brought into effect. The next time there is a strike down in Estevan Brick Plant this Bill can be brought into effect. If there is a strike out at Western Clay Products in Regina this Bill can be brought into effect. All of these workers are under bondage by this Bill. All of them have lost their free rights to collective bargaining.

I want now to deal with the question of whether or not the Government did what it could to avoid this dispute. The Government says that it has intervened only because collective bargaining has failed. I say that collective bargaining has never started. The Government stymied collective bargaining. We have a situation of total unrealism. Suppose the employers and the employees had got together and suppose that after studying all the facts they had decided that an eight per cent wage increase was justified. And in fact one group of employers offered eight per cent. Could they settle on these basis? They could not. The Government has decreed otherwise. The Government has in characteristic style set a ceiling but no floor. No floor! Perfectly alright for the employer to offer a 50 per cent cut in wages in the face of rising costs of living. That's alright, but an increase of 25 cents per hour for some employees, that has to be stopped.

Or suppose that the parties had agreed to voluntary binding arbitration and we have any number of calls of finding ways to settle disputes rather than strikes. What are they? Suppose the parties had agreed that they would have voluntary binding arbitration. Could they have done that in good faith? They couldn't because if the arbitrator had said, "Well I am going to do what has been done traditionally I am going to compare Regina wages with Winnipeg's wages and I am going to grant 10 per cent or 12 per cent." The employers would have had to reject it even though they agreed that it was binding, because the Government has decreed otherwise. There has been no failure

of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining has not failed, it is not been permitted.

Bargaining in good faith, Mr. Speaker, means that both sides are free to bargain. Yet the employees have no freedom. The employers have no freedom. The employers particularly were instructed two months ago that they could not bargain in good faith. This Government said to the construction employers, "You cannot bargain in good faith. You cannot agree to anything more than six per cent, regardless of how much justification there may be for more than six per cent, regardless of whether a conciliator suggests more than six per cent, regardless of whether an arbitrator suggests more than six per cent, you cannot do it. And if you do we will punish you."

Premier Thatcher said Thursday night, and I am quoting from the Star Phoenix of April 17:

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

For years as has been said on many occasions, construction workers in Regina have had rates comparable to those in Winnipeg. Wage negotiations have always involved comparisons with Edmonton, Calgary and with Winnipeg, but the Premier has said, "No. No more! Your usual patterns of collective bargaining are ended. I am the Premier and I have spoken. You can't talk about Winnipeg comparisons. You can't talk about Calgary comparisons. The ceiling is six per cent." The Premier says, "I don't care what they do in prosperous Social Credit Alberta. I don't care what they do in prosperous New Democrat Manitoba. Here in Saskatchewan we are poverty-ridden and six per cent is the limit."

As he has gone even further. He said, "Never mind whether in the course of free collective bargaining you decide that you want a one-year agreement. Never mind whether in the course of free collective bargaining you have decided that you want an 18-month agreement. I insist on a two-year agreement."

Mr. Speaker, and insisting on a two-year agreement has nothing to do with inflation control. I invite any Member opposite to find any guideline in Canada whether it is Trudeau's or Benson's or the Prices and Incomes Commission or anyone else that talks about two-year contracts. This is just another example of smashing any possibility of effective collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has continued this mockery right up to this House. It has continued this mockery right into this House, because it has introduced a Bill which establishes an arbitration board. And do you know that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) said that they were substituting binding arbitration, impartial arbitration,

for collective bargaining, but they have misled this House. They have substituted no such thing.

The Bill, and I invite the Attorney General and the Member for Nutana Centre to look at the Bill, the Bill charges the arbitrator with taking evidence and hearing arguments and making a decision on the basis of the evidence and the arguments. But in the same breath that the Premier introduced the bill which supposedly gives the arbitrator the right to make his decision on the basis of the evidence and the argument, the Premier has said, "But there will be an arbitrary guideline of six per cent, " a guideline for which there is no evidence or no argument for that guideline has been presented to this House and none will be presented to any arbitration board.

Other Provincial Government have a little more respect for the arbitration process. The Ontario Provincial Treasurer, Mr. McNaughton, speaking of arbitration under the Ontario Public Service Act was asked what about these guidelines. Are you going to tell the arbitrator anything? And Mr. McNaughton had the good grace to say, "We can't give directions to the arbitrators or the whole exercise would be pointless."

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

Let me say that again, "We can't give directions to an impartial arbitrator or the whole exercise would be pointless." But we heard again today the Premier stand in his place and say that there will be arbitration or if there is arbitration the six per cent guideline still applies. I suggest to you that that exercise is pointless. The Premier is giving direction to the arbitrator. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is giving direction to the arbitrator. The Government has scuttled free collective bargaining and is now scuttling impartial arbitration.

Wage earners have been robbed of collective bargaining and now I put it to you, they have been robbed of their right to impartial binding arbitration. The wage earner is being told that his wages are to be set, not by negotiations, not by arbitration, but by the Government and the Government only. This is not consistent with a free society. The workers covered by this Bill — and there are thousands of them as I have tried to illustrate — have lost their basic rights as citizens. They have even lost their right to impartial arbitration. This is coercion. Without being dramatic I can say that this is tyranny. The Government feels that rural people will slough this off and they will say, "Oh, well somebody has lost his freedom but it is not my freedom." I say the Government misjudges the people of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Government misjudges

the people of Saskatchewan for there is one abiding passion of the people of Saskatchewan, a passion for freedom, for free institutions, and they will not long accept coercion of this kind, creeping or otherwise.

In the words of the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) the people of Saskatchewan will decide that the services of the Thatcher Liberals are not essential services.

I want to summarize then very, very quickly. The Government has not made its case. The Government admits, or I hope it admits, that there must be the strongest reason to deprive free men of their liberty. The Government admits, or should admit, that free men should not be deprived of their civil rights unless all possible steps have been taken before resort is made to coercive legislation.

And thirdly, the Government admits, or should admit, that any coercive legislation should be restricted to the minimum necessary to deal with any crisis. What do the facts show? The facts show that there is an economic crisis, but that it has nothing to do with the strike. The facts show that the Government did not encourage collective bargaining; instead it prevented collective bargaining.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The facts show that even if one accepted the theory of economic emergency that this Bill is supposed to be based upon, the Bill is far more extensive, both in time and in the number of workers covered than any so-called emergency could justify. No case can be made or has been made for wage controls without controls on prices, profits, rents or other income. On all of the key things which this Government needs to show to this House in order to justify this Bill the Government has failed. On the evidence, Mr. Speaker, the Bill is neither necessary nor fair, nor just. It is not an exercise. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is not an exercise in labor peace, it is an exercise in labor coercion.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It is a Bill which cannot be accepted by anyone of good conscience in this House and, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the Bill.

The amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 23**  
**Messieurs**

Lloyd  
Bowerman  
Messer

Meakes  
Berezowsky  
Smishek

Baker  
Pepper  
Matsalla



Wood  
Blakeney  
Davies  
Romanow  
Dewhurst

Thibault  
Whelan  
Snyder  
Michayluk  
Brockelbank

Wooff  
Kwasnica  
Kowalchuk  
Byers

**NAYS — 30**  
**Messieurs**

Thatcher  
Howes  
McFarlane  
Boldt  
Steuart  
Heald  
Guy  
Barrie  
Loken  
Grant

Coderre  
Larochelle  
MacDonald  
Estey  
Hooker  
Gallagher  
MacLennan  
Heggie  
Breker  
Leith

Radloff  
Weatherald  
Mitchell  
Gardner  
Coupland  
McPherson  
Charlebois  
Forsyth  
McIvor  
Schmeiser

The debate continues on the main motion.

**HON. A.R. GUY (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, as one listens to the . . . you know, Mr. Speaker, I have heard about the worms coming out of the woodwork but I didn't know that they always headed for the woodwork, particularly those that haven't made any speeches in this House. I suppose maybe their conscience is bothering them in the fact that they didn't. The Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) I suppose has gone out to tell his executive that he really didn't mean to say "No" that he really meant "Yes" when he was holding the vote.

You know, Mr. Speaker, as one listens to the speeches from Members opposite it is difficult to realize the purpose for which we are in the Legislative Assembly today. Although our purpose is clearly one of ending the impasse that exists in the construction industry, that has seriously affected our economy, one would never know it from the Members opposite. In fact they appear anxious to speak on everything except Bill 2. Now one may be able to forgive the two leadership candidates for using this opportunity to woo some last minute votes but surely the other Members do not have that excuse. The Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) out of one hour spent 10 minutes talking on the Bill before us and I suggest that he didn't do himself any good in the leadership race with this approach.

The Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) started out with a great dedication to the problem before us in the Legislature today but he couldn't avoid getting off onto the problems of inflation, the problems of the farmer, the problems of everyone else, because he, too, is in the leadership race. When he first

started I thought that this dedication and being able to stick to the point before him, would hold in good stead but I regret that by the time he one hour and 40 minutes was up — well, I guess it was only one hour and 20 minutes — when it comes to the leadership race from the remarks made today by both the candidates, I still think they are running even.

However, I would like to say one or two things about the remarks of the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) particularly in regard to highway contracts. He stated that highway contracts from 1964 to 1967 were up 60 per cent. Now of course what he is talking about he is talking about highway contracts that have been left to private enterprise as compared to contracts that were done by the Government crews during the years of the CCF administration.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No.

**MR. GUY:** — Oh, yes, you are and you know very well that when you were running the Government you never charged any overhead, you never charged any administration to the unit cost of highway construction so today it is very easy to say that the costs from 1964 to 1967 were lower but what about the costs from 1967 to 1970. Why didn't you use those three years? Is it because you are always three years behind everybody else in this province? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is the truth and if he becomes the leader of the New Democratic party he'll be fighting the last election when we are fighting the next election.

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

**MR. GUY:** — Why didn't you take the 1969 highway report?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Because the figures have been pulled out of it!

**MR. GUY:** — Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No unit cost figures after 1967 in that Highway Report and I invite you to find one!

**MR. GUY:** — You know, I love the way those fellows hold up their fingers and wave their arms. If anything happened to them before Saturday, they would never get the leadership. You know, I feel sorry for the Members for Regina Centre and Saskatoon Riversdale who have been coasting merrily along each trying to out-promise the other in wild and merry abandon. We saw two extremes today. We saw the MLA from Riversdale get up and say nothing and make lots of promises, wave his arms, no fact, no truth. Then we saw the other extremes and saw the MLA for Regina Centre, very dedicated, very pointed in his facts and in

his figures. But unfortunately everybody went to sleep after about the second page.

You know they have promised something for nothing for every segment of society with no one asking where the money will come from. To date our leadership hopefuls have been everyone's friend, and it is too bad that just hours before their big day they are going to have to take a stand on a very important issue for the first time since entering the leadership race. They are going to have to stand up and be counted on whether they are on the side of the farmer, the small businessman, and the unorganized wage-earner or whether they are on the side of organized labor, controlled by the big unions of Canada and the United States, who couldn't care less for what happens to the economy and the people of Saskatchewan because they can't be for both.

Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps maybe I would like to call it 5:30, as I have quite a bit more to say.

The House recessed at 5:30 until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

**MR. GUY:** — Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the large number of gentlemen sitting opposite. I submit that this is just typical of the atmosphere that we have had here in the last two or three days. The Members opposite couldn't care less whether the workers get back on the job. They couldn't care less whether we have any settlement of this dispute or not. They came here for one reason only and that was to make political hay. They made their speeches. They never talked about Bill 2. They talked about the farm problem, they talked about everything else except the legislation in front of us today. And if you need any more proof of that, and I wish that I had my camera here tonight and I took a picture of the Opposition side, when out in the country where they know already that the NDP have no sympathy for the farmers, they have no sympathy for the businessmen, they have no sympathy for the unorganized workers, they've got no sympathy except for themselves. And if you need any more proof, look across the way tonight. Five out of 25 and I will tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, those are probably the five gentlemen that will be back here after the next election.

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

**MR. GUY:** — These will be five gentlemen and I will even go farther than that. I will make the prophesy that the gentleman sitting right across from me will be the next leader of the NDP party.

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

**MR. GUY:** — Because after all he's got the interest of that party at heart or he wouldn't be sitting here tonight. It is only

too bad that I couldn't be out on your convention floor on Saturday and make this same speech for you, because . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** — I would. Oh, I would be glad to. Oh, yes. If you give me a special invitation as guest speaker, I'd be pleased to come and make a little pitch on your behalf on Saturday because I can't think of anything better for the Liberal party than having the Member from Riversdale as the Leader of the NDP. Oh, I shouldn't have said that.

Well, you know, as I said, this is typical. We are here on a very serious occasion and this is the seriousness that the Members opposite . . . you know we listened to them for two days and they said, "Oh, why did we need a special session? We are wasting our money. We don't want to be here." The Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) said, "Oh, the farmers couldn't care less whether the construction workers ever went back to work or not." Well, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they're going to get an awakening in the next few months that will make them take back some of the statements that they have made today.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** — Well, you know, I think the Premier answered Kramer's wire very well. But he said, "You know this is just the typical intelligence that we expect from the Bull Moose from North Battleford." I believe that was the quote but I may have used it in a little looser . . .

As I was saying before we went for supper that the leadership hopefuls have been playing pretty fast and loose with the public of Saskatchewan. They haven't had to stand up to be counted but today they are going to have to and our leadership hopefuls have been everyone's friend and it is too bad that in the next few hours — and I am glad that there is one of them here now that can stay for the next few minutes and get the light because then he will really know how to vote. One of the leadership highlights of the NDP to date has been the scurrying around of the leadership candidates trying to come up with an agriculture policy. Now Don Mitchell says that he has the answer by nationalizing the farmers' land, the machine companies, the wholesale retail outlets and the means of production and distribution. This is probably a solution that will work but five years from now under his leadership there won't be any farmers left in Saskatchewan. Now George Taylor admits he hasn't an agricultural policy but that the party has a good one, which of course we have yet to see. However, Mr. Taylor does admit that he has some closeness to the farm population in that he saw a cow once when he was travelling down the highway in his convertible Cadillac. Now Mr. Blachan is not a strong supporter of the nationalization of land, not because he disapproves of the philosophy but he is afraid of the political

implications, because he has a bigger fish in the pond. He has stated categorically at a meeting at Yorkton that he would nationalize the Prince Albert Pulp Mill and the Simpson Lumber operation at Hudson Bay. And I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan were interested in that comment. He has been content so far on putting the blame on Ottawa and promising that if he is the new Leader that he will put more pressure on Ottawa for farm assistance. Now the fourth leadership candidate, Roy Romanow, doesn't know any more about agriculture than the others but he has at least tried to overcome this glaring weakness. He called on his buddy, the Opposition farm critic, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and together they came up with that grandiose 18-point agricultural program which was splashed across the headlines in the newspapers in Saskatchewan last week. And the number one point in Roy's agricultural program was to establish a Crown corporation that would make gasoline out of wheat. You know this reminds me of those old CCF days when we had Crown corporations to produce woollen blankets, Crown corporations to produce shoes, Crown corporations to produce leather goods, Crown corporations to produce wooden goods, all of which cost the taxpayers of this province many millions of dollars. But money doesn't appear to be a problem in this Crown corporation to make gasoline out of wheat. I want to refer to the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of June 22nd:

Mr. Romanow said it had been stated such an agency could be established for \$4,500,000 and he said, 'if that's all it costs, let's do it.'

Let's do it.

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

**MR. GUY:** — Okay. You know what happened to C.D. Howe with \$1 million, imagine what's going to happen to you for \$4 million.

Now of course the second major point in his policy and this second point was a good one and it is one that the Liberals haven't been able to control. The second major point in his policy was the establishment of a weather bureau solely to provide forecasts for the farming communities. I can just hear the news every morning starting like this: "This is your friendly weather man, Premier Romanow, predicting that there will be frost tonight so let's get our cozy comforters made by the people's woollen mill to ensure that we do not suffer any losses to be carried by our insurance companies."

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

**MR. GUY:** — You know it is no wonder after such an outstanding agricultural program that the next day we saw in the headlines of the papers across Saskatchewan: "20 more for Romanow."

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Who are they?

**MR. GUY:** — Well, I'll tell you. I picked up that paper with interest because I anticipated reading there 20 of the leading farm groups in Saskatchewan who were rallying to the Romanow cause due to his progressive agricultural program. And as I read on I found out that this was the new group — 20 more prominent members of the Saskatchewan New Democratic party had declared their support of leadership candidate Roy Romanow: Ron Duncan, Regina, international representative for the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union; Lee Gisi, president of the Prince Albert and district labor council; Alex Smith, president of the International Woodworkers of America; Mike Germann, former president of the Saskatchewan Labor Council; Joseph McLean, United Steel Workers delegate; P. Halowsky, United Steel Workers delegate; Arthur Frisk, International Woodworkers of America; J.T. Knight, representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Another farmer!

**MR. GUY:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, you kind of wonder, here is a man that was up in this House today, he was against foreign ownership, he was against foreign capital to develop resources, but he is all in favor of foreign support for the NDP party funds and he is more than in favor for foreign support for the leadership campaign. So you know that out of 20 delegates that rallied to Romanow after they heard his agricultural policy, there were nine labor union executives, three businessmen, two teachers, two students, one housewife, one lawyer and two farmers.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Oh, no two?

**MR. GUY:** — So much for Roy's farm policy.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Jack, you didn't do very much work on that!

**MR. GUY:** — I am afraid Jack didn't do that to get a job. Of course you know the real key to the leadership campaign appears to be the importance of experience. Allan Blachan is depending heavily on the fact that he is the only one of the four with government experience. Now some of his opponents, however, are quick to point out, unfairly of course, that it was his government experience as one of the advisors to Premier Lloyd that brought about the downfall of the NDP Government in 1965. Roy Romanow claims that since they are not the government, government experience is not necessary, that with his legislative experience, he can lead them into the government. He admits that once he is in the government he doesn't know what to do; but he has made so many promises to the back benchers that he would have to listen to them for the first five years anyway.

Now Don Mitchell admits that he has neither government or legislative experience but he has a far more important type of experience. As he expresses it, Mr. Mitchell at 26, the youngest of the candidates says, "You will hear a lot about experience, mine is different. It is not the experience of cutting ribbons or attending coffee parties or even sitting in the Legislature." He said his was the experience of trying to help groups, trying to help people such as last summer's tractor protest by farmers, the protest held during the visit to Regina and Saskatoon of Prime Minister Trudeau and protests on the steps of the Legislative Buildings.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this was an interesting admission for you will recall at the last sitting of the House, when I suggested that the NDP were involved in the organization of these protests, there was a great wave of denial from Members across the way. But here is one of the leading leadership candidates who says now that the only experience that he has had in government is that of organizing protests against the government of the day.

Now George Taylor the last candidate, he's had neither government, legislative or protest experience. His only experience has been raking in the dollars by representing the trade unions across the province.

Well there is no doubt that before the Convention is over the Wafflers will prove to be an embarrassment to the three city lawyers in the race. They all want their support but they don't want them in the party. Each candidate has solved the problem in his own way. The Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blachan) when he announced his candidacy made it clear that there was no room for the Wafflers in his party but since counting up their votes he has relaxed his stand against them. The Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) is a little more tolerant and little more diplomatic on the surface but he had his law partner, R.A. Walker, do his dirty work by sending out a letter to every constituency denouncing the Wafflers and the president of the national NDP and the provincial NDP for being one of them.

Now George Taylor, seeing the error that these two made, has said nothing, not only about Wafflers but about everything else to date. Don Mitchell, while not admitting he is a Waffler, welcomes their support.

**MR. D.G. MacLENNAN (Last Mountain):** — That's what Alex said too!

**MR. GUY:** — Are they related? When one looks at the four leadership candidates, one can have nothing but sympathy for the rank and file members of the NDP who supported the CCF and NDP party from their inceptions. The two leaders, or supposedly leaders, who are seated in this Legislature waited as long as they could before entering the debate, because they realized they had nothing to gain and everything to lose by opposing this emergency

session. But now that their speeches have been made, I am sure that they are more aware of this than ever before.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Don't press too far!

**MR. GUY:** — Mr. Speaker, regardless of who the new leader will be, it won't be the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). He will be called upon to face the bar of public opinion for the position his party took in this emergency. And, Mr. Speaker, I use the term 'bar' deliberately because this is one term that is understood by the three slick, labor lawyers running for the leadership of the NDP. How can a party that was originally farm-oriented live with the thought that the only men who would come forward to place their names as leadership candidates are either slick city labor lawyers or new left radicals who have never, will never have anything in common with the 90 per cent of the people of this province who represent the farms, the small businesses, the unorganized working man and those people who have brought Saskatchewan to become such a vital force in Confederation. It shows the very extent to which the NDP have become the tools of organized labor and completely out of touch with the aims and aspirations of Saskatchewan today.

So it looks like it will be a great Convention. Too bad for the first time in their history that their open-end and Democratic party are barring the Press from their panel discussions. I would like to take this opportunity as I will not likely be there on Saturday to wish the new leader the very best in the impossible task which lies ahead for the NDP in this province.

**MR. D.G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer):** — I thought you were a delegate!

**MR. GUY:** — I thought I was too but I understand from the remarks earlier that my chances of being a delegate at this Convention are really not too good.

**MR. D.M. McPHERSON (Regina South West):** — Don't count Henry out!

**MR. GUY:** — I must admit, however, that the role of the Members of the Legislature for the NDP has made the new leader's role that much more difficult in the Province of Saskatchewan today.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Allan, I don't think you believe that . . .

**MR. GUY:** — Well, you know I could say something about the remarks of the Member for Riversdale today but I don't want to say anything tonight that might get out in the Press that would hurt



his leadership chances on Saturday . . .

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

**MR. GUY:** — . . . because after all really the only reason that I referred to the leadership convention at all was the fact that Members opposite would not take this session seriously. You could tell that by the number that were sitting here this evening when the Legislature came back into session and that's the only reason that I strayed from the seriousness of the events of the last two days, because I am sure that it is with regret that all of us are meeting today in a special session to deal with the problems facing our construction industry, which has been in a state of almost complete shut-down for the last two months or so. You know at a time when construction is normally reaching its summer peak we have not yet started our 1970 constructions programs. I see these fellows opposite clapping their hands because after all they are the ones who don't want a construction program this summer. But Members on this side who are legitimately concerned.

**MR. ROMANOW:**— Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** — That's just another thing that I can tell. As soon as you get that finger up in the air you are going to make a speech and if ever anyone cuts it off, you are never going to make the leadership.

You know this is not healthy for our province, for our construction industry, for the employees who normally work in this industry, or for the small businessmen, for the suppliers and the others who depend upon the construction and related industries for a great deal of their income. There is no industry where dollars spent will filter through as many hands and give a lift to the economy as through the construction industry and that is why, Mr. Speaker, as a Government we cannot tolerate continuation of the situation that exists but must take firm steps on behalf of our citizens who depend on this industry.

Although we notice the strike primarily in Saskatchewan, it is also true that a similar situation exists in many areas of Canada. Now one hesitates to place the blame in any one direction for we are all aware that wage negotiations are two-way streets. However, there are several observations that I would like to make today that are becoming significantly obvious to the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada generally. The first four I would like to make are: (1) it is British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Ontario that are suffering most from labor strikes; (2) it is British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Ontario that have Opposition NDP parties;

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What about Manitoba?

**MR. GUY:** — (3) it is the Canadian

Congress of Labour and the Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Ontario Federations of Labour that have affiliated with the NDP party; and (4) the NDP are so desperate to obtain political power in these provinces that they will use every means at their disposal regardless of the effects on the labor movement, the economy or the people of Canada. You put these four facts together and it is not difficult to see why Saskatchewan and these other provinces are having the labor strikes that they are. In the past six months we have seen the attitude of the Canadian Labor Congress and its affiliates towards them co-operating with the Government of Canada and its fight against inflation. Every other significant group in our economy has agreed to co-operate with the exception of organized labor. One can only assume that they hope to gain by this attitude, whether their refusal to co-operate is purely economic or whether it is tempered or pressured by the political arm of the labor movement, the NDP.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — They have agreed to co-operate, Allan.

**MR. GUY:** — They have agreed to co-operate. There is only one organized group in Canada today that is not making an attempt to co-operate and it is represented by the NDP-CLC axis. But when one reads between the lines it is obvious that the Canadian Labor Congress is far more interested in the political implications than they are in the economic ones. It is not coincidental I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the speeches of T.C. Douglas, David Lewis, and the President of the CLC are identical in wording and identical in meaning. Whatever their motives may be I know that the people of Canada are beginning to ask themselves. And it would be wise if Members opposite would take heed. Do we wish to be governed by the duly elected representatives of the people, or do we wish to be governed by the Canadian Labour Congress?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — We wish to be governed.

**MR. GUY:** — Well your hopes of becoming Leader have just gone out the window right now. You've never made a decision since you became a Member of this House. You wiffled and you waffled, today was the best example. You were afraid to talk about Bill 2. Your opposition in the leadership race at least had the integrity to stand up here this afternoon and spend at least three-quarters of his time debating the issue in front of this House. I timed you, you had five minutes out of an hour and fifteen and you mentioned Bill 2 twice. You didn't have the courage to stand up and say to the farmers of Saskatchewan, "I'm going to support Bill 2 and to heck with you."

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You just didn't understand.

**MR. GUY:** — You know I heard today, I

talked to a couple of young people today who I thought for sure were going to be in favor of Roy Romanow and you know what they told me? They said, "I listened to Roy for fifteen minutes one night. I knew he was a phoney. I knew he could never be the Leader of the New Democratic party." I will lay you a wager tonight if you wish to that you will not be the leader after Saturday night.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You said I was going to be, Allan.

**MR. GUY:** — I changed my mind. You talked me out of it.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — This Government is always changing its mind.

**MR. GUY:** — Well, Henry's chances are coming up. All he has to do is listen to these fellows for a little longer and he'll be in the race. Well that's alright. After all I'm not running for leadership. All I am trying to do is point out to the people of Saskatchewan who have written to us, who have wired us and have said, "For heaven's sake will you please do something to get the construction industry back on the road." We know that the NDP are more interested in their political convention and their political concerns but surely to goodness there is a part in this province that will get down to the basic facts of economic life and realize that the construction industry is an element that we cannot do without. You know, Mr. Speaker, the situation that has developed in the construction industry across Canada and particularly in Saskatchewan this spring is the price we are paying for the National President of the New Democratic party, being the Deputy Leader of the NDP Opposition party in Saskatchewan. You know we have graduated from the minor league where the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour calls the tune for the Opposition in this province. We are now in the pro league where the Labour Congress, the 12 unions admitted to membership on the NDP National Council now tell the Saskatchewan Opposition what to do, what to say and when to say it. You may recall, Mr. Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), that last spring I said the time will come when union members will say we have had enough of our union leaders, we've had enough of the NDP and their utter disregard for the welfare and wishes of the union membership. And I said the day will come when the union members will wish to return to the position where they can work harmoniously with employers and the governments of the day regardless of political affiliation. I said also that when that day comes there will be no woe for the fellow from Moose Jaw South or the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). They will lose their jobs and they will lose their seat in the Legislature. But little did I realize that the day would come so soon when the members of the construction industry and other trade unions would come to the Government and ask them to give them some support. But if we have ever seen an example when individual union members need help against

their union leaders, the Canadian Labour of Congress, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and above all the NDP, it is now. The events of the last two months in Saskatchewan are unbelievable. Through it all union leaders and their NDP friends paid no heed to the rights of the individuals, the economic hardships they were creating, the laws of the province. Their only concern was to carry out the demands of the CLC and the NDP.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan today is speaking for all of Canada. We are speaking for the workers whose union leaders would not allow them to return to work, and for their wives and their children who suffered as a result. We are speaking for the suppliers, for the small businessmen, for all those depending on the construction industry when we say that the CLC, the SFL and the NDP triumvirate will not be allowed to bring our economy to its knees for the political gain of the NDP. This is an example which hopefully Ottawa and every province in Canada will follow, and if they do we will return to the democratic process of having our country ruled by elected representatives rather than by Canadian-American labor unions. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is a sobering thought when one realizes that the Canadian Labour Congress and the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour with their counterparts in the NDP would destroy their country and their province if it meant a reconstruction period under an NDP government. Until labor leaders across Canada and Saskatchewan learn to co-operate with the government of the day regardless of political affiliations, I can see nothing but despair for the many thousands of trade unionists who are represented by this irresponsible leadership such as we have seen in Saskatchewan in the last two months. Instead of the labor movement having the NDP fight their battles in the Legislature, organizing their demonstrations in the streets, they should take a good, hard look at themselves and ask what this affiliation with the NDP has done for them. It is true it has used their funds to fight elections, it has destroyed their political neutrality, it has closed the door to harmonious dialogue with every government in Canada today. The sooner the labor movement casts off the burden of the NDP and returns to a neutral, political role as an equal partner in building a better Canada the better it will be for all concerned.

In case there are those who will not believe the ties between labor and the NDP exist, I would like to refer to several speeches that have been made. I would remind you first of all of a comment made by Donald MacDonald, President of the CLC, when he addressed the NDP National Convention last fall. He said while defending the NDP trade union alliance that it was inconceivable that the NDP could ever come to power without the support of Canadian trade unions and that the NDP should be a party that organized labor should be able to call their own. Then I would like to refer to a clipping in the Star Phoenix, a report of the British Columbia New Democratic Convention when more than 500 delegates endorsed a motion supporting continued partnership with organized labor. What is true in British Columbia is just as true in Saskatchewan. The Nutana South

**June 30, 1970**

NDP Convention called upon the party to reaffirm the party's affiliation with labor and directed any future NDP government to act in a firmly partisan manner in the field of trade union rights. From this the blame can be and must be laid squarely on the shoulders of the Saskatchewan NDP for the unemployment and the labor unrest and its effects on our economy. Is it any wonder that the businessmen, the farmers and every other segment of our society have turned against the NDP for their callous disregard of law, order, dignity and the upholding of our democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these steps taken by the NDP to completely dominate in a clearly partisan manner, how can the labor movement have friendly, forthright and non-partisan relations with the government in power. Surely the day will come when shortly the labor movement will see the errors of their ways and I believe that for many of the individual workers that day has already come. But unfortunately the labor leaders through the use of coercion, force and threats have the upper hand at the present time and it is for that reason Mr. Speaker, that the Government must act to protect the best interest of the union members.

I was intrigued with an article in the Saskatchewan Star Phoenix of June 24th, under the heading "Plumbers seek strike end."

Barry Barker representing the plumbers' negotiation committee said today the union was doing everything possible to get its members back to work under the terms of the expired agreement.

And then a little further in the release it said:

The members of the plumbers' union were meeting today to discuss a proposed demonstration of all building trade unions and the Canadian Labor Congress on Monday.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, union leaders who have at heart the best interest of their workers, who had been on strike for two months, could find something more constructive to discuss in the way of getting their members back to the bargaining table and back to work than to plan demonstrations against the Government.

It is with statements and actions like this that it is hard to believe that the unions wished to bargain at any time in good faith. It is unbelievable the callous attitudes that these union leaders in Saskatchewan have taken to the unemployed and the depressed construction industry. The very leaders, who during the winter months, have criticized the Government for doing nothing to try and solve the unemployment situation, who cried for public works projects, to alleviate the situation were the very leaders who when the program was announced refused to allow their men to go to work.

Now I would like to review very briefly because it has already been covered by others some of the events that have transpired since the strikes were called. On April 8th most of the plumbers and pipe fitter locals went out on strike without any Liberal meddling. They went out on the direction of the NDP, of which the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) was one. Although negotiations were carried on for 30 days no agreement was reached and then after the 30 days votes were carried out under The Trade Union Act. Of the 15 Saskatoon shops that voted, seven voted to return to work, seven voted to stay on strike, one vote was tied. In Regina, three voted to go to work and five to stay on strike and this is fine. If some want to stay on strike that is their right but surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, if some wish to accept the last offer from their contractor and go to work then that is their right also.

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

**MR. GUY:** — We heard a great deal today from the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) talking about the right to strike and no one denies the right to strike. Why didn't the Member from Regina Centre say anything about the right of those members that voted to go back to work, about going back to work? Where was his fair play and his justice when that came up? Oh, no he was too biased to even consider the poor workers that wanted to get back on the job. He said that we have the right to strike, but he will not admit, and he has never admitted in this House that people have the right to work if they so desire. And this is one of the basic principles of democracy. But the Member does not believe in it. What happened to those members who voted to go back to work? Are they working today? No, they are not. The unions refused to allow the strikers that voted in favor of going back to work to do so and through threat, coercion and fear tactics they kept them off the job and on the picket line.

Following this at the request of the Department of Labour and the Premier, negotiations resumed again. Since then more votes were taken and similar results occurred. It is significant that in all votes taken, they were conducted among all the members of each of the locals and not restricted to the striking employees of the firms represented by the negotiating committee, which meant in fact that those working kept voting to keep those not working on strike and the union calls this fair play and democracy.

After the last vote in Saskatoon they saw a vote in favor of the local returning to work. The plumbers returned for one day before the might, muscle and threat of the union machine forced them to quit. And we have already heard the letter that was sent to each member but I think that maybe we should repeat it again:

Any member who returns to work without the sanction of

the union executive board and strike committee will be subject to charges from the local union.

And the union calls this fair play and just. During the negotiations it became perfectly obvious that the unions had no intention of signing an agreement on the six per cent guideline, even though the strikers starved to death in the meantime. They are far more concerned what a six per cent settlement would do to their image across Canada as well as their fear of the CLC than they are about getting the men back to work in Saskatchewan.

The story of the electricians' strike is similar. When they took their vote under a labor-relations board, eight of fifteen shops — more than half — voted to accept this final offer and return to work. But again the IBW with its justice and fair play refused to let them. When the people of this province hear these facts, the ad placed in Saturday's Leader Post by the SFL talking about democracy, fair play and justice and the free man, takes on a very hypocritical look. Just ask the strikers who voted to go back to work, but who were not allowed to go. Just ask those who saw working plumbers voting to keep them on strike. Ask those whose families are hungry. Ask those who were forced to carry pickets under a hot sun. Ask those who were threatened by goon squads. Ask those who had their wives and children threatened. Ask those who were called out on work and not allowed to go back, what they think about the democracy and the fair play of the union movement.

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

**MR. GUY:** — You can ask them also what they think about the MLAs from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), who support the unions in these despicable practices and you will find that they are happy that the Government is fighting their battle for them, and are telling them that we are providing for you and we will see that you will have the opportunity to go back to the work that is provided, without oppression or fear of reprisal from your union leader.

Suggestions by Members opposite that we had no intention to carry out our \$20 million crash program is ridiculous. In fact today we are awarding tenders and giving our approval for a total of \$6.6 million immediately. I am not going to take the time of this House tonight to read the awards that have been awarded but they total \$6.6 million and they will be in your newspaper tomorrow morning.

You know during the last few weeks, because we were hopeful and we had faith that the settlement was in sight, the Department of Public Works called tenders for 15 additional projects valued at \$3 million, so that we would be sure to have as many projects as possible ready to go. Following this, the next \$4 million

that are on the drawing board will be tendered at regular intervals to provide a continuous cash flow into the economy. I would remind you that this is only from the Department of Public Works' Budget. Other agencies will have many more millions of dollars to contribute to the economy now. Although we are faced with a short construction season, I can assure you that your Government and the engineers of this province will get just as many projects underway as the industry can absorb, so that there will be a maximum of winter work available this year. If the \$20 million is not sufficient, we will call upon the Provincial Treasurer for more money so that more additional work can be provided for the winter months.

Our records of spending the funds that we are allocated is a good one compared to the former Government's. And if we fall short this year, the blame can be laid directly on the doorstep of the NDP-SFL alliance that did nothing to try and alleviate the impact in the construction industry before it became acute.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that debate on second reading of this Bill is nearing its conclusion. So I would like to sum up briefly why the Government has called this special session as it is obvious that Members opposite have missed the point.

You know as I look across the way I am utterly appalled at the attitude of Members opposite towards the crisis which exists in this province today. And I mentioned that earlier tonight when there were only two or three here who had the interest to listen to the debate. You know they wanted to speak on every topic except this emergency legislation. They tried to muddy the water with irrelevant subjects, almost as if by ignoring the whole debate they would not have to stand up and be counted.

**MR. STEUART:** — Let me give their speeches again.

**MR. GUY:** — Well I don't mind staying here all night. However I would remind Members that the Liberal party was elected in 1964 and re-elected in 1967 in spite of what Members opposite would have thought at that time.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Try it again.

**MR. GUY:** — All right we will before too long, before you even get warmed into the saddle that you are going to occupy after Friday. We will give you the opportunity to show your stuff. You know we were elected to provide responsible government, not for the chosen few, but for the majority of the people of this province. And even though at times we have had to make some unpalatable decisions we have adhered to this policy. I can assure this Legislature and the people of this province that in spite of the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) we intend to carry out this mandate, and no special group, whether it be the construction management, the labor union, the Canadian Labour



of Congress or the NDP, will deter us from this purpose.

The Opposition has asked a question. Why is this an emergency? And why should the construction workers be placed under Bill 2? Honestly we must admit listening to their speeches, they didn't recognize that there was any emergency in this situation. But I am sure that the contractors, the construction workers, their wives, their families, the small businessmen, the farmers, the supply trade and all those who live off the thriving construction industry, know why an emergency exists even though the NDP are oblivious to the facts of Saskatchewan life.

Next to the farm industry the construction industry provides the greatest cash flows throughout the economy. The effects that we have seen of increased unemployment, reduced purchasing power by workers and the loss of skilled workers have already resulted because of the impasse. It is difficult to see the reasoning behind the speech from the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) when he said that this Bill will make matters worse. Surely by getting the workers back to work most of these problems will be substantially improved.

In a new country and in a new province such as ours, when we are trying for development, we cannot afford the effect upon our economy of strikes in our essential services. And in our province every industry is an essential one. There has to be a better way of settling labor and management disputes and strikes which tear at the very heart of our economic survival. Until that time comes your Government has no alternative but to take the ways and means that are available to make sure that our essential services and the people of our province do not suffer unduly.

During the debate Members opposite also raised the question: why did we call the session now and not earlier? There is a simple answer to that question. We didn't want to interfere in the negotiations with management and labor until we had to but my Department had placed July 1st as the absolute deadline for return to work if we were going to get most of our projects for the winter construction period going. This date was upon us with no settlement in sight, so the session was called. The suggestion that it is related in any way to the NDP Convention is nonsense. We had better things to do than worry about a party that is becoming obsolete in this province.

In spite of a great deal of criticism from Members opposite it was significant that not one reasonable alternative was proposed to this Legislature. The amendments proposed, in fact, bear out what we suspected for some time. The NDP are completely out of touch with the problems of our economy. The Leader of the Opposition's amendment calling for an outside mediator is not practical when you consider the length of time the impasse has existed and the lateness of the construction season. The suggestion that the plumbers and the electricians go back to

work while mediation continues is not valid as vast examples have shown that as long as the employees are working and building up a strike fund there is not a realistic attempt made to sign a contract and negotiations go on indefinitely.

Hopefully within the next week, under the agreement that was reached today, knowing that Bill 2 is ready to be proclaimed we will see some advances in this regard.

The amendment proposed by the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) was even less an alternative. To refer it to a Special Committee of the Assembly would have prolonged the strike past the time that any construction could have been started this year. One needs to say little about the amendment by the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). The amendment to delay this legislation for six months shows the same concern for the strikers that was apparent throughout his whole speech. The fact that this is emergency legislation makes all three amendments unrealistic in achieving the object of helping the people of Saskatchewan by the strike before it is too late.

The question has been raised as to where the Government got the six per cent guidelines. If the NDP got up with what was going on they would recognize that this guideline was adopted two or three years ago by your Government, because we believed that it was in the best interest of the province to do so. That we were right has been borne out recently by the adoption of a six per cent guideline by Ottawa and has been accepted by all other provinces.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert):** — That's not true.

**MR. GUY:** — Oh, I forgot that there is a little island just east of us where there is an NDP Government.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Specifically repudiated . . .

**MR. GUY:** — They have not. Why didn't you say so this afternoon if you knew so much. I guess I was the one that went to sleep on his second page. If so, I am sorry that I didn't pay more attention.

The provinces have accepted this guideline because they know that this is right and Saskatchewan, as usual, was in the vanguard in anticipating the state of our economy. If Ottawa and the other provinces and industry had adopted this six per cent guideline when Saskatchewan did, the problems of inflation would not nearly be as acute today.

We know that the strikers are anxious to get back to work and we hope that the unions are anxious to see them go back. We know also in spite of what Members opposite have said that the farmers, the businessmen, the workers and professional

people are just as interested in seeing this impasse ended as we are, and we feel confident, even though Members opposite oppose seeing our construction industry start to roll, that again we have acted in the best interests of the majority of Saskatchewan people and that we have their full support.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to answer once and for all the accusation that the Liberal Government is anti-labor. I want to say to the union leaders and their membership we are not anti-labor but we are anti-NDP. As I stated earlier in my remarks until such time as we can strain the NDP out of the labor movement in Saskatchewan, and this includes the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) and the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) out of the labor movement, we find it is most difficult to discuss your problems with you. You can tell from the statements made by the Member for Regina North East this morning that the NDP Members have direct access to the results of meetings held in the Cabinet room with the Premier and the Members of his Cabinet, even though those meetings for the best interests of all are supposedly private and confidential. Actions like this make it difficult for us to find ground for mutual discussion with you. However, at this time until we can find a better way to resolve strikes in the construction or any other industry, we believe that our legislation is in the best interests of all the people affected by the shut-down in the construction industry and we ask for your support.

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

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 30**  
**Messieurs**

Howes	Grant	Leith
McFarlane	Coderre	Radloff
Boldt	Larochelle	Weatherald
Steuart	Estey	Gardner
Heald	Hooker	McPherson
Guy	Gallagher	Charlebois
Barrie	McLennan	Forsyth
Loken	Heggie	McIvor
MacDougall	Breker	Schmeiser

**NAYS — 23**  
**Messieurs**

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

## SECOND READINGS

HON. W.R. THATCHER (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 2 — **An Act respecting Allowances to Members of the Legislative Assembly, and to Certain other Persons, for the Second Session of 1970.**

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, this Act may be cited as The Sessional Indemnity Act, 1970 and all Hon. Members have it. I won't make any detailed explanation except to say this provides for indemnity payable to each Member of the Legislature for attendance to this present session of an allowance of \$150 and in addition to that the sum of \$75 as an expense allowance and it provides for an allowance to the Speaker of \$100, an allowance to the Sergeant-at-Arms an honorarium of \$75. This is the same remuneration as was provided at the 1966 session. I suggest to all Hon. Members that it is a reasonable indemnity having regard to the length of the session and with that short explanation, I would move second reading.

**MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood):** — Could I ask the Minister a question? There's no six per cent?

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. W.R. THATCHER (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 3 — **An Act to provide for the Postponement of the Tabling of Certain Documents.**

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — On behalf of the Hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this Bill, an Act to provide for the postponement of the tabling of certain documents. It is the usual routine Act which is necessary when we have a short session and the normal requirements of the normal session are deemed not to be advisable or not necessary rather and accordingly I would move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

## ROYAL ASSENT AND PROROGATION

At 10:05 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave royal assent to the Bills presented to him.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor then said:

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly.

I wish to thank you for the work that you have done.

**June 30, 1970**

In doing so, I wish to express my confidence that the legislation approved by you is in the best interests of the economy of our province.

This Fourth Session of the Sixteenth Legislature was called to accomplish one objective; that is the resumption of activity in the construction industry.

The efforts of the Members of this Assembly have been directed to a solution to the present labour dispute.

Legislation has been passed which will settle this difficult situation.

However, it is the hope of my Government that such legislation will not necessarily be proclaimed, as employees and employers may settle the dispute with the aid of a Government mediator.

I feel that the state of the provincial economy will improve with the injection of money through my Government's construction program.

Hopefully, the current agricultural crisis will also be settled in the near future.

In taking leave of you, I wish to thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the Session and wish you the full blessings of Providence as you return again to your respective homes.

The Hon. Mr. Heald, Provincial Secretary, then said:

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it pleases His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

**June 30, 1970**

**PROCEEDINGS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON BILL NO. 1: An Act to amend The Essential Services Emergency Act, 1966.**

**MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have the Bill read. We have one basic Bill before us at this session and I think in view of its importance we should have each clause read.

The question being put on Clause 1 it was agreed.

**Clause 2**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — A House amendment has been moved by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that clause (b-A) of section 2 of the Act, to be enacted by Section 2 of the printed Bill, be amended by adding thereto immediately thereafter the word "alteration" in the third line thereof the word "decoration". The debate continues on the amendment.

**MR. DAVIES** — What was the word again, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — The intention is to include painting. There was some question as to whether or not painting would be included. It is intended that it be included and so the word "decoration" after the word "alteration" would include decorating contractors and so on.

**MR. DAVIES** — Mr. Chairman, I find it rather difficult speaking only to the amendment at this point to feel that painting would be necessarily essential in the terms of this stringent Bill. But the word is not "painting", the word is "decoration". Now I would like to suggest to the Attorney General that "decoration" covers a gamut. Not only a matter of painting but decoration would cover almost any furbelow. Landscaping, my friend the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has suggested, and it is not hard to conjure up a range of matters that would be covered by the word "decoration". Someone adding, I suppose, a neon sign would be covered by this stringent Bill even though he had a union that had a contractual relationship with another employer wholly unrelated to the building that he was decorating with this neon sign.

Now I am sure that one could think of at least a dozen other characteristic frivolities that would be included with this word "decoration". And if he means decoration, why doesn't he say so? Why include more workers within the drastic provisions of this Bill?

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied and I think most Hon. Members will be satisfied with the description "decoration". It was intended here to include all construction services and I could use as an example the Auditorium, assuming that a number of the sub-trades struck the Auditorium as happened in the past with the plumbing and electrical contractors. Let's assume that the painting contractors struck the Auditorium, that the parking lot isn't finished at the present time, the landscaping is not finished. The intention here is to include all construction services but only construction services. It has been drawn to our attention that without the word "decoration" you didn't

necessarily include all of the construction or contracting trades necessary in the completion of a building. The intention here is to cover every trade which could be involved in the completion of a building and surely decoration is included in that. I think it covers it very well.

**MR. DAVIES** — I just want to point out to the Attorney General again in relation to this very building that some years ago some Italian craftsmen came, for example, to add the frescoes on the rotunda downstairs. No doubt they had their own contractual relation with some Italian trade union and I am trying to visualize a like situation if this group would be confronted by the legislation before us. It seems to me that if you are trying to cover the construction service that includes painting you should say painting. If you are talking about decoration, you might very well include several thousand additional workmen that couldn't conceivably ordinarily be covered under the word "construction". And I think that it is a most ill-advised amendment.

**MR. HEALD**: — Well, of course, you have to remember that at all times the overriding caveat is that there has to be a labor dispute. This Bill doesn't apply at all unless there is a labor dispute. In your example where these people came from Italy or some place, perhaps they don't have as many strikes over there as they do in this country. In any event it only applies where there is a labor dispute and I think that painting, it is the considered opinion of my law officers and the Legislative Counsel, that painting is too narrow and is not definitive enough and it is not conclusive enough. That's why we have used the word "decoration". The word "decoration" is the Legislative Counsel's suggestion.

**MR. DAVIES** — I wonder, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Attorney General, what would happen if we had a group of painters come up to add a mural in one of the Government buildings. This I presume is a kind of decoration. Would you include this group or how could you exclude this group?

**MR. HEALD**: — If they were on strike, why not?

**MR. DAVIES** — But it might be, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Attorney General, again that with the other craftsmen on strike, this group would be included.

**MR. HEALD**: — No, no, not in the definition of labor dispute. It means any dispute or difference between an employer and one or more of his employees or a trade union. It presupposes the existence of a contract. In your example these are artists coming from where — Italy? Or Japan? Or United States? I don't suppose they've got a contract with a union. The other thing, of course, is that they have got to be named in the Proclamation, the Order in Council.

**MR. DAVIES** — I don't want to belabor the point except to again point out to the Attorney General that according to rumor and some

report there was a dispute here between the Government and a certain artist, I believe from Lumsden, two or three years ago with respect to a statue out here on the lawns. And I take it that this was a decoration and I am told because of this dispute — I don't know whether you would call it a labor dispute or what — that certain things occurred that were not all palatable to the Government. I want to point out that not everything can be resolved by force.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, it was a dispute alright but it wasn't a labor dispute.

**MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East):** — Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to ask the Attorney General in this description of people that would be covered: how many people are envisaged at the present time in the labor force that would be covered under this Bill? Mr. Chairman, we've had so many labor-management committees who have disagreed with the Government that I find it difficult to describe them but in this last report, the Labor-Management Committee on Construction Industry under page 4, they provide a definition. My second question is: what consideration was given by the Government in their description — and I particular disagree for this purpose and therefore for that matter for all purposes — to road construction which is not included? But the significant thing that they make specific exception to is work done by a person who is regularly employed in manufacturing, industrial or by a service institution for which he performs maintenance work on the premises of his employer. Certain, as the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) during his address this afternoon pointed out, really this Bill or this Section includes such people as cement workers and people that might be working in the steel industry, the fabrication of materials for construction. The provision that was agreed upon by employers and the unions and the committee would seem to be much narrower. Can he tell me why this broad sort of extension is included in this section?

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, in a general way our intention was to cover every union or group of employees that could possibly be involved in construction work. Now, did you ask me for the number of people that were involved? I can't give you that. You could get that from the unions but I can give you the . . .

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Well, surely the Government should know . . . you've got the Minister of Labour sitting right behind you, Mr. Attorney General . . .

**MR. HEALD** — Would you like the unions?

**MR. SMISHEK:** — No, I am asking the Government. The Government has an obligation to tell us how many people it will be covering by this Bill.

**MR. HEALD** — Well, you are a lot closer to the unions than I am but I am told that the figure is about 27,000. 27,000 is the answer you want. 27,000 and if you want the names of the unions, here they are: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers;



United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry of the United States and Canada; International Union of Operating Engineers; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America; International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers; Sheet Metal Workers International Union; Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers International Union; . . .

**MR. DAVIES:** — On a point of order. Does the Attorney General have a list to give us? It's a long list.

**MR. HEALD** — Yes, I could run it off but I want to read it into the record. Sheet Metal Workers International Union; Bricklayers, Masons and Plasters International Union of America; Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons International Association of the U.S.A. and Canada; International Brotherhood of Boiler Workers, Iron, Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers; International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers; Wood, Wire and Metal Lathers International Union; International Brotherhood of Teamsters Warehousemen and Helpers of America; Laborers International Union of North America.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Any Canadian?

**MR. HEALD** — No, they are all international!

**MR. DAVIES:** — How many are there?

**MR. HEALD** — Fourteen and I think they are all international unions.

**MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Chairman, it is conspicuous that none of these include people like, let us say, at the cement plant where I believe it is organized by Cement, Lime and Gypsum or people in sawmills who are frequently organized by International Woodworkers or anybody at Saskatchewan Steel Fabricators where I believe the Steel Workers of America have the contract. My point is that you have picked out the straight construction trades . . .

**MR. HEALD** — Just industrial unions actually.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And you have not included any of the industrial unions, a good number of whom I think are covered by this Bill.

**MR. HEALD** — Could be.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Chairman, this is what really disturbs me about the Bill and about the explanation that has just been given to us by the Attorney General. We have in the first instance, Mr. Chairman, a very formidable list of organizations. I think the Attorney General said it was fifteen.

**MR. HEALD:** — Fourteen

**MR. DAVIES:** — Fourteen. We have only two of these organizations that

are currently involved in the dispute. The Government takes a shotgun approach in this legislation to cover all, another 12 organizations, that are not involved at all in any type of labor dispute at this point in time. One would have thought that the legislation would have covered those that are engaged in bargaining where that bargaining has reached an impasse. But leaving that aside, the Attorney General now tells us that there will be included perhaps another half dozen, 10, 15 or more industrial-type organizations that might be on the fringe or periphery of the action that is suggested by this legislation here and he shrugs his shoulders and says, "Well, you know it could be. There might be some more. I think perhaps that's right." And when I hear the figure of 29,000 I now ask the Attorney General how many workmen, including the kinds of unions that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has suggested, will be covered when you take the workers that come into those organizations being considered?

**MR. HEALD** — I don't have the figures, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) tells me that he doesn't have this figure. It would be difficult. There are some unions alright that in some branches of their work could conceivably come within this definition, but it is not possible to give you any kind of a figure other than the figure that the Minister of Labour has supplied me with for the craft unions.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I would like to ask whether it is expected or it is the intention of the Government to cover such people as the employees at IPSCO who manufacture the pipe for the transmission of gas, and other services of people at Weyburn which manufacture the plastic pipe which is used for the, again in gas as well, insulation of wiring. This is part of the construction. Whether it is the intention to cover the cement plants at Saskatoon and at Regina which are in the glass or cement, lime and gypsum workers, or the clay products plant here which is in the cement or glass and ceramic workers because they are really manufacturing products for manufacturing purposes. Can the Attorney General tell us whether it is really the intention of the Government to include these people? I am thinking of Westank, Dominion Bridge, and the sort of thousands of people that are employed in the manufacturing end of various products which are used ultimately in construction. There are the woodworkers, the sawmills, and many more. Can you tell us?

**MR. HEALD** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Member's interpretation is probably as accurate as mine. You have to relate it to the definition. If it comes within the definition as contained in the new Section b-A, then it is covered. With your knowledge of the kind of cases that you describe, you relate that to the definition, labor, skills and materials, necessary for the construction, re-construction, erection, alteration, demolition or repairs of any building and now decoration, if we pass it, or structure. So, if you take the fact of your particular case and relate it to this definition, that's what you have to do. That's what you always have to do. It is not a question of the Government's intention. If this is passed, it is the Legislature's intention — the Legislature's intention speaks from this definition and I can't . . .

**MR. SMISHEK:** — But, Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the point. Very often in courts the question comes up of what was the intention

of the Legislature. Up until now the Government has argued its case that it is in the actual construction not in the manufacture of materials. And certainly I don't want to be caught in the hook of the dilemma that it was my intention as a Member of the Legislature to include the steel workers, the cement, lime and gypsum workers, the onus lies on this Government. It is you people who are bringing the legislation in, not us and let's place the responsibility on the Government, not on this Legislature because you people are not responsible, not the Opposition.

**MR. HEALD** — We are not shucking our responsibility at all. Materials necessary for the construction of any building or structure. If your example comes within that then it is covered. I would say it is covered.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — . . . Are you intending to do that, Mr. Deputy?

**MR. HEALD** — It is not a question of what we are intending. It is a question of what this section says. Read the section.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — No, but certainly you have a particular intention.

**MR. HEALD** — We intend to say what we say in this Bill. That's what we intend to say and we have said it.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Well, tell me: are you saying that the steel workers at IPSCO are going to be covered under this Bill. Give me a specific answer. Are the cement workers at Inland Cement, are you intending to cover them?

**MR. HEALD** — Yes, if it is material necessary for the construction of any building or structure, the answer is Yes.

**MR. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** — One word, which is almost certain to invite trouble and difficulty, I suggest, is the inclusion of the words "or structure". This says, "of any building", all of these things with respect to any building or structure. I wonder if the Attorney General would enlighten us more than he has by his remarks already this evening as to what is meant by "structure". Does a structure, for example, mean a mine? Does a structure mean a pipeline? And one could go on and on and on with things that would ordinarily be considered to be included in the word "structure" and this could widen the Bill very immeasurably beyond that which the Government has been saying it means.

**MR. HEALD** — Well the normal rule of statutory interpretation, Mr. Chairman, is that when a word like structure is used with building, it is the same kind of a thing as a building, building or structure being similar to a building. What were the examples that you gave?

**MR. LLOYD:** — Pipeline structures.

**MR. HEALD** — No, I think not. Not a

pipeline. Building or structure like a building. There is a rule of legal interpretation called a ejusdem generis which says that in a statute where you use more than one word, building or structure, the structure must relate to a specific word, ejusdem generis. It must be the same kind of description as building. I think for that reason a court would hold that a pipeline wouldn't be held to be a structure in this context. It is only my opinion.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to point out again to the Attorney General so that there will be no doubt about what we are saying here by the use of such words as materials, structure and decoration that this section is being stretched to an intolerable degree. In the first instance the Government comes before us with a Bill in its terms to break a log jam in a situation that would overcome the present difficulty in the construction industry so that work could be got going again. The resolution in its terms again of the instant dispute would be sufficient. But in doing this it covers not only the construction trade that are mentioned and other 12 organizations unconcerned with the present dispute, without any bargaining difficulties; it is covering a large range of organizations and a large number of workers that are completely removed from the ordinary periphery of the construction trade.

One can think, for example, of a group of workers producing paint, or roofing, or brick or roofing paper, or wallpaper, nails or steel material. And what about the materials that are necessary, because that is what it says, construction services means labor skills and materials necessary for the construction, etc. I take it that this means also that the materials like gasoline and diesel fuel, because I don't know how you run compressors or industrial machinery without having certain kinds of energy like this involved.

I don't intend to say any more except that the monstrous coverage of this section is apparent by the explanation that has been given to us by the Attorney General, indicating to me that in the absence of very concrete answers the Government has not thought through this section at all, has not realized what it would cover and now appears quite unconcerned as to whether it will cover another 15,000 or 20,000 workers. Again, in terms of the Government's original intent this seems to reveal the fact that this wasn't the intent at all. It is taking a shotgun approach to cover, if necessary, any number, any undisclosed number of workers regardless.

**MR. HEALD:** — Mr. Chairman, the intent of this section is of course very clear. Regardless of how the Member for Moose Jaw South distorts it, I think everybody realizes what we are trying to do. We don't want to settle by this legislation the strike of the electricians and plumbers on Tuesday, June 30th, and then on Thursday, July 2nd have the bricklayers or the plasterers, or the painters, or somebody else go out on strike after my friend, my colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) has let all these contracts. Our laborers are back to work. Our plumbers and electricians are back to work and then someone else goes out. What we have tried to do is cover everybody in the construction trade so that when we start these buildings, when the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) starts his Base Hospital the day after tomorrow, they will be able to keep going so that you won't have someone else out. You talk about a scatter approach,

we want to get on with the job. We want to get the people back to work and we don't want to have another handful foul the whole works up again. That is the rationale for this section.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — I almost think that I am beginning to hold my breath about that Base Hospital construction. I want to come back to the question that I asked initially of the Attorney General because, in the deliberations of the committee that was established by the Government, I understand that one of the things that a good deal of time was spent on was getting a definition of the construction industry. In this regard there was a great deal of consultation with the employers' association, the Canadian construction industry, the building trades' organizations across Canada, including the Canadian Labour Congress. It was after a good deal of discussion and consideration that there was agreement on the definition as set out in page 4 of the recommendations. Yet the Government chooses to completely ignore what the employers' organizations in the construction industry, what the trade union organizations in the construction industry, and others have come to an agreement on and signed a unanimous report. Let us keep in mind that it was the Government's committee that was established, and yet the Government completely ignores the recommendation of a definition by this body.

Can the Minister tell me whether, in fact, the Government even bothered looking at their recommendations? I notice that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) has provided the Attorney General with a copy and it appears that this is the first time that he might even have had a look at the thing. Yet the Attorney General, I gather, assumes responsibility for this draft. Why is it? I think that it is difficult for us to understand that when a committee that was established by a government comes in with recommendations and unanimously signs a report after a great deal of consideration to the matter, the Government ignores the definition of this as set out and sets out something of its own. It would be much more broader, it would be much more embracing.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) will agree with me when I say that when the sink plugs you get a plumber, when the stove has a short circuit you get an electrician, and when you want to draw statutes you hire a lawyer. Now this is a legal description of construction services. The definition of the committee to which the Hon. Member refers is the laymen's concept. We are here to try and draw a legal definition which we think will hold water in court and this is our job. This is the job of the law officers of my Department, the Legislative Counsel and myself. And this is the definition that we recommend to the Legislature.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — I want to remind the Attorney General that the secretary of this committee was a lawyer, who was the Deputy Minister of the Department of Labour, Mr. Parrott. Now let's not start playing games.

**MR. HEALD:** — The Deputy Minister of the Department of Labour does not draw statutes. The officers of the Attorney General's Department and the Legislative Counsel draw statutes, not the Deputy Minister of Labour.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know of anybody that argues, I can't imagine a group of plumbers arguing over a joint as much as a group of lawyers who will argue over a point. And I think that the Attorney General is well aware of that otherwise you wouldn't have lawyers I suppose in courts.

I just want to say again that I think it is an extremely serious matter because he has said to us that the Government is anticipating a series of disputes that are getting in the way of this large program that the Minister of Public Works has suggested will be unfolded before long. I don't know where these disputes are going to be, whether they will be among the carpenters, among the painters or any other group. Again we have all of the construction trades included. I don't know why all of them should be singled out, but as the Attorney General said, in its wisdom it has swept them all into the pot. It does seem to me that this Legislature is entitled to know the exact definitiveness of these people that are going to be covered by this drastic and oppressive legislation. And we don't know! And the Attorney General has told us that he doesn't know. It is pretty obvious that the Minister of Labour doesn't know, backing up the Attorney General with apparently a few facts that have not been revealed to us at this time. But it does seem to me that we are entitled to know the numbers and the totality of the effect of the inclusion of the words materials, decoration, structure and perhaps one or two of the other words in the definition, in some precision. This has not been given to us at this time. And if the law officers of the Crown anticipated this, I would be surprised because at a very late date we have already inserted another part of the definition, namely, the word "decoration", which I think the Attorney General would be free to say is perhaps too broad for the original purposes that he himself has envisaged.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, one of the things that I was curious about was that the Minister included the Teamsters Union into this group of 14. To the best of my knowledge the Teamsters Union primarily does the hauling of materials. Is it really the intention of the Government that in any transportation of materials that the trucking industry and the employees employed in the trucking industry be embraced? Remember this. Very often not only do they haul construction material, they might have a bucket of bolts on a truck to be hauled at the same time as they may be hauling groceries and other things. So automatically the truck drivers in the Teamsters Union come in under this definition.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well the International Brotherhood of Teamsters was included because, according to the information from the Department of Labour, their charter is wide enough — and I quote — "Province-wide trucking and construction." Now whether they do this or not I don't know, but the charter apparently is. 395 of the International Brotherhood Teamsters, apparently their charter is wide enough to include construction. That is why they are included.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Yes, I am interested that really the Minister singled out unions in this group. Does it really mean that the Teamsters Union taking any of their trucking operations or hauling things

other than construction material — and construction material may only be a part of that — that they are automatically going to be covered by this Bill 2?

**MR. HEALD:** — No, I think just as far as it relates to construction.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask one thing for clarification. Do I understand the Attorney General to say the following: that it is the intent of the Government to include within the definition of Clause (b-A) these 14 unions that he enumerated? Could it be the intention of the Government to include other trade unions in the industrial trades as has been brought out, that is to say that the list is not an exhaustive list?

**MR. HEALD:** — No.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — So in other words we are looking at 14 unions for sure, a possibility of others, if in the opinion of the Government at a particular time it can sneak in under the definition under construction services.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, it is not question of sneaking anything in, it is a question of looking at the definition. It is a question of what is included in the Order in Council at the time, which is contemplated later on. In the light of the present situation I suppose we are looking at plumbers and electricians, but I was asked a question and I thought the information the Member for Regina North East sought was: what other unions could possibly be included if there was a labor dispute involving those unions as being construction unions? The list that I gave him was provided to us by the Department of Labour as being construction unions within our interpretation of the definition.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I think all the questions raised by my colleague from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) and my colleague from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) are intended to try to circumscribe the sort of the breadth of this Bill. Now we want to know how wide it is going to go afield. And what they are trying to really say is to get the Government to commit itself on the record, as I understand it, although it is 14 too many unions to limit itself to the 14 unions that you have enumerated.

**MR. HEALD:** — No, the Government will limit itself to the definition which this Legislature passes. The definition that I am recommending to you is the definition here in this Bill, construction services. The Government in passing an Order in Council at a later date, assuming this is made law, will have to restrict itself to the definition of construction services. It will have to keep within that definition in respect of any Order in Council that it passes. If it doesn't I am sure that the labour union involved will haul us into court and one of your fellow candidates for the leadership, Mr. Taylor, will probably appear for them in court and argue, and perhaps successfully, as he very often does, that it doesn't come within the definition of construction services. So we have to stay within this definition.

**MR. DAVIES:** — I just want to say, Mr. Chairman,

that there have been some rumors to the effect that the Attorney General might someday, early, come on the Bench. I just hope that he doesn't have this particular clause come before him. I am sure that he won't know what to do with it.

**MR. HEALD:** — I want to assure the Hon. Member if that ever happens I will be glad to disqualify myself and make him happy.

Amendment agreed to.

### Clause 3

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney General this: what would be the situation if one of the periphery-type industries with its union organization involved in servicing materials to the construction industry, say, roofing, brick, nails, wallpaper, tiles, was to be in negotiations with their own employer, where they were servicing, say, two or three per cent of their output to the construction industry in this province, and entered into a labor dispute with their own employer, what would happen if there was only two per cent of the output of this particular periphery industry that was involved? Would this Act be brought into action? Would the Government to make it effective apply compulsory arbitration in the whole dispute of the industry, even though a very minimum part of production of that industry was involved in the servicing of materials in the construction industry of this province?

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, it would be difficult. I suppose it would depend on the circumstances again. You would have to look at the wording of Section 3, "Where at any time in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council," and then you go down to (b), "the economic welfare of the province or any area of the province could be in serious jeopardy by reason of a labor dispute involving employees." If your example of the peripheral union or trade — he said two per cent of the total amount of production — well the Lieutenant Governor in Council would have to bring himself within that definition, where in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, "a state of emergency exists in the province or any area of the province . . . the economic welfare of the province could be in serious jeopardy."

I can't speculate on what in your specific case the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council would be. But he would have to relate the emergency to "the economic welfare of the province or any area of the province."

**MR. DAVIES:** — I think of course that the Attorney General has put his finger on what disturbs me and a great many people, including Members on this side of the House, that the decision is a matter for the Provincial Cabinet. You might very well have a situation, Mr. Attorney General, where an industry that is in negotiation, where only a part of their production was affected in that area, yet the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Cabinet, thought it placed the province in serious jeopardy. The proclamation is then issued and it over-rides completely the favorable and friendly negotiations that are going on harmoniously between the company concerned and its employees.



So we have a situation where there is no labor dispute of these particular employees. The Government inflicts the labor dispute on them by a proclamation because in its own judgment the goods produced, or the lack of them servicing the part of the interest of the province, place the province in some serious jeopardy.

**MR. HEALD:** — I am not sure that I understand you. I am not sure that you have it right. I will make a comment and then you can tell me whether I am reading you loud and clear.

The fact that there is a labor dispute within the definition of this Act within one particular small trade — and we will call it the two per cent trade — doesn't mean that the emergency procedures of the Act will apply to all the other trades. It will only apply to that trade. The Order in Council of the Cabinet setting up the emergency procedures of the statute applies only to that trade or sub-trade and not to all the other trades. The other trades don't have labor disputes, therefore they are not involved in the Act at all. They can carry on. But what it would do is prevent or prohibit the two per cent trade from tying up the whole building, the whole operation, because it would put them back to work. Everyone else in your example is already working, they don't have a labor dispute. That is your example, isn't it? Well, as I understood it what you are complaining about is that one small trade could put other people who didn't want to be under the emergency procedures and didn't have a labor dispute, could put them under the emergency procedures. Well it won't do that. It will only put the trade that is in dispute.

**MR. DAVIES:** — What I am saying is this, Mr. Attorney General, that where some materials necessary to the servicing of the construction industry might be absent as the result of a labor dispute in another industry, where only part of that produce of that industry is going to the province, the degree of the Province becomes effective, even although none of the parties, none of the bargaining parties want it at all. I am not myself completely clear on the range of what could happen. All I am suggesting is that such is the coverage that has been suggested by the remarks of the Attorney General under Section 2, that one can envisage a good many unfortunate applications of this Act in areas where it would be most regrettable that the Act should be applied at all, and yet the structure of this clause, it seems to me, would permit this.

**MR. HEALD:** — Only, Mr. Chairman, if there is a labor dispute of that trade. Everything here relates to a labor dispute. This Bill doesn't apply at all unless there is a labor dispute. I would remind you that the definition of labor dispute in Section 2(f) is as follows:

‘Labour dispute’ means any dispute or difference between an employer and one or more of its employees or a trade union,

so that, if you only have one labor dispute, then you only have one union, or one sub-trade, that is subjected or exposed, if you like, according to how you look at it, through the provisions of The Essential Services Emergency Act.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, the other

question that I would like to pose to you what might be the definition of an area? Could a hamlet or a village be considered as an area? Say that in a particular hamlet or village they were manufacturing, and it is possible, that some construction material could be manufactured in a hamlet of 100 people or a village or something larger than that, and the employees were organized in an industrial union manufacturing such building material, would that be in your judgment considered a wide enough area to include them under this Act?

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the intention here is to cover the possible situation where you had a labor dispute, say in the city of Saskatoon or in the city of Prince Albert. You have these different locals here. For example, IBW Saskatoon Local, Prince Albert Local. You could have a situation involving and it might be affecting the economic welfare of the Saskatoon area but not the economic welfare of the entire province. Or it might affect the economic welfare of the Prince Albert area but not the entire province. So that is why the words were used, "in the province or in any area of the province." "The economic welfare of the province or any area of the province". You could get into a situation where you had labor disputes or labor difficulties in one city or one district in the province and that is the intent of it.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Are you saying that, in a small location, particularly in the light of our discussion of the previous Section 2, that it is not the intention to have people who may be employed in the manufacture of material — and there might be twelve people employed in that hamlet — to be brought under this Act?

**MR. HEALD:** — When you are going into intentions you have to look at it. We are dealing with Section 3 now and it says, "Where at any time in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council," so it is the collective judgment of the Lieutenant Governor in Council which decides under this Section the economic welfare of an area. I can't speculate whether it would be a hamlet or a village or a town. I think it would more likely be an area like Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Estevan, Weyburn, Swift Current or Moose Jaw. That is the kind of area that I would visualize.

**MR. DAVIES:** — I would like to suggest this also to the Attorney General with respect to hospital workers. We have in the last six or eight months had some pretty bad disputes with respect to our hospital workers and I don't want to rehash any details of the debate that has taken place during this session and other sessions including the one this spring, but I think it is a fact that it is recognized that our hospital workers are in pretty poor shape economically and that the action of Bill 2 hasn't helped them very much. According to the figures I have, and I haven't heard these effectively disputed, the hospital workers have fallen far behind the place that they formerly occupied a few years ago when they were about third in the light of the salaries of other non-professional hospital workers across the country and they have now fallen to about sixth in terms of the other provinces. So that the application of this legislation has been, I think, damaging and harmful. But it also seems to me that the workers concerned are in a completely untenable position in respect of bargaining for other reasons perhaps than strictly the applicability to this Act. But I am here

suggesting that the workers on strike at Estevan and Prince Albert hospitals had to bargain with local employers who could not conclude agreements because this Government would apparently not sanction the increases that some of the negotiating teams of the hospital employers thought was fair and just. It seems to me that, if the Government is going to insist on apply emergency legislation, so-called of this type, to force arbitration legislation that it should consider a basis of negotiations for hospital employees on a provincial basis, then the whole business of forced arbitration would at least bring to a head the difficulties, the economic difficulties of hospital employees on some kind of a provincial scale. At the moment the localities are in an intolerable position in negotiating with their hospital employees, and the hospital employees with their hospital boards, whether private or public, because of the position that the Government has placed the board and the employees in. This situation I think would change somewhat if the situation were placed on a provincial bargaining level between the unions and the hospital associations, so that the Government could not escape its responsibility and could not tip-toe between the compulsory arbitration legislation and negotiations and the hospital boards and somehow place responsibility elsewhere than where it rightly belongs, and that is with the Provincial Treasury and with this Government. I would like to ask the Attorney General at this point whether, in the light of the application of this forced arbitration legislation, in the future hospital workers will be able to bargain at provincial level with the hospital associations and with the Government involved, Mr. Attorney General, at that stage so that it cannot escape its responsibility of providing decent livable rates for hospital workers.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, first of all, so far as the hospital workers are concerned, the provisions of Section 3, subsection (1) are not changed in respect of hospital workers. However, I would point out to the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw South that in subsection (2) once the Essential Services Emergency procedures apply to hospital workers, there is provision by these amendments. There wasn't before but there is provision now by these amendments, subsection (2) of Section 3, so that two or more labor disputes could by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor be dealt with by one board of arbitration. So to that extent I take it that, while you don't agree that they should be under this Bill, nevertheless the proposal that you are making, certainly insofar as this Act is concerned, would permit the kind of technique that you recommend. Now you are talking about conciliation without going in front of the Act, without going under the Act, but once it comes under the Act, it would be possible for the Lieutenant Governor to declare that these disputes be dealt with by one board of arbitration. So to that extent it meets your suggestion in that regard.

So far as the other part of your suggestion is concerned, that would be a matter of Government policy, I suppose, and I wouldn't be able to comment on it tonight.

**MR. DAVIES:** — You are saying, Mr. Attorney General, that it would be possible under this Act to have negotiations at the provincial level, I am now talking about the stage of the emergency legislation being applied, where the hospital association was one party and the contesting unions the other and the Government sitting in beside. Now I don't know to what extent you agree.

**MR. HEALD:** — No, I think you misunderstood me. I didn't say that negotiations would be conducted on a province-wide basis. What I did say was that once the procedures of this Act, The Essential Services Emergency Act, apply to hospital workers, once they apply to hospital workers then it would be possible to consolidate the board of arbitration.

**MR. DAVIES:** — On a provincial level?

**MR. HEALD:** — Yes, because that's what subsection (2) says:

Where at any time in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council there are two or more labour disputes involving employees mentioned in . . .

Then it includes hospital workers . . .

The proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor under subsection (1) . . . shall be decided by one board of arbitration.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — There is one frightening comment I might make here on this section and on some of the others. The whole Act presupposes that there can't be an industrial dispute unless the employees are represented by a trade union and I suppose that is in fact the case, but you will find that where there is a dispute, then a trade union must appoint this and this. I just toss that out . . . if you are looking at the Act some time . . . that may, I suppose, practically always be the case.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, my information, Mr. Chairman, . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Please, if I might interject for just a moment. One or two Members have spoken from their seats this evening and the proceedings, as we all know, this evening are being recorded and it is not possible to pick up their remarks on the tape when you speak from your seat. So Members might stand if they want their remarks recorded.

**MR. HEALD:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, my only comment in answer to the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) would be that it is our information that they all are represented by the unions.

The question being put on Clause 3, it was agreed to.

#### **Clause 4**

The question being put on Clause 4, it was agreed to.

#### **Clause 5**

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out here that what is being done in the amendment to the 1966 legislation will involve a change in the traditional bargaining practice among the majority of the unions that are affected. I am now referring, I think, to all of the list of the 14 unions that were given to us here earlier because these unions as a matter of practice

would engage in individual negotiations with the employers. Now what will happen, as I see it, is that, if there is a group of employees in dispute, even although they traditionally do their own bargaining with the employer or employers concerned, they will be shoved into one pot and the bargaining will then go on in the atmosphere of compulsory arbitration, that is to say before the arbitration board. In this kind of an atmosphere, I don't personally believe that this will be a good thing in terms of the present practice of the trades concerned because I think that the electricians, if they wish to, and the plumbers, if they wish to, and the carpenters and the bricklayers and the painters and the sheet metal workers and whatever the trade, have the right to negotiate the conditions for the members of their craft. Now what this will do is that, if these various trades are in dispute, then there will be a majority of the representations, I suppose, because I don't see how else it could be done that will name the representative of the employees to the arbitration board. I notice that the wording speaks about the majority of such trade unions and I presume that this can only be done through the bargaining representatives of each of the trade unions that might be involved in disputes with various employers. Now if you think of the nitty-gritty that accompanies this kind of an exercise, if the unions did this as they customarily do it, Mr. Attorney General, they would have to go to their individual trade unions for the authority to decide on one person, presumably, hopefully anyway, with a recommendation to put before them. But you can see that the process itself could be very well legitimately time-consuming in terms of the choice of that person, and I think the five days, is it? that is given here might be very little time indeed. And the democratic choice of the employees to each of their bargaining instruments, that is each of their trade unions, would be a difficult matter and it might and I would suggest would in some cases very well be the case that they might not choose the person that they would, if they had proper time to reflect.

The whole thing is, of course, again, if I may get back to the commencement of my remarks that bargaining quite often is through bargaining representatives of each one of the crafts or trades concerned that this alters the traditional and characteristic courses for bargaining and I suggest would make it difficult for the individual unions to function, would cause some discord in the process of appearing before the board and would inflict a situation upon the trade unions which they had not been undergoing before. I may also say at the same time that, while I have been speaking of the employees and their unions, their individual unions, the same kind of situation can be envisaged for each of the employer groups with whom each of the individual unions that I am suggesting are part of this whole are concerned with.

That's one question, I think, Mr. Attorney General that I would like to mention under this clause.

**MR. HEALD:** — Would you like me to comment on that . . .

**MR. DAVIES:** — Yes.

**MR. HEALD:** — I discussed this, as a matter of fact, with some representatives of the unions, not on an official basis. But when we were talking about these matters both yesterday and

today, I got the very definite impression — and I think it was from the plumbers and I think it was Mr. Busch, although I wouldn't be sure because I talked to a number of them — but it was my impression that they intend or at least they are very seriously considering the advisability of trying to negotiate henceforth on a provincial basis rather than on the basis of . . . what is it? four different locals in the plumbers' union, for example. Regina, Prince Albert, Saskatoon — one union, yes, with four different locals. Those would be four different labor disputes under the definition and I think it was Mr. Busch, and certainly one of the representatives of either the electrical workers or the plumbers, who said that there was a lot of merit in trying to consolidate the negotiations and have one provincial contract. Now if that's the case, if that's the way they are moving — and I get the impression that at least some of them are moving that way — if that's the case, and I understood you to say, Sir, two minutes ago that you thought it would be a good idea if the hospital workers negotiated on a province-wide basis. That's really what this would permit, that once we get into the emergency procedures of this Act the Lieutenant Governor in Council would have the power in effect to consolidate into one a number of these disputes.

Now let me give you the rationale or the reason why we thought it necessary to include this clause in the Bill. The position with the plumbers, as I understand it, is that there are perhaps 30 or 40, between 30 and 40, different labor disputes within the definition of labour dispute in this Act involving four different locals of the union, Regina, Prince Albert, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw. If you didn't put a section like this in which would permit the consolidation, you could end up with perhaps 35 or 40 separate boards of arbitration under The Essential Services Emergency Act for plumbers alone and then you might end up with another . . .

**MR. DAVIES:** — May I interrupt just to say that I am not now referring to a number of unions within the plumbers' organization. I am referring to the fact that there could be five unions in dispute, the plumbers, the electricians, the carpenters, the decorators. Now, according to the clause here all of this could be lumped under one arbitration board.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, I doubt very much if that would happen. I think the intention is for example to consolidate the plumbers' dispute and consolidate the electrical dispute. We might in these circumstances consolidate the two into one. It does allow for some flexibility there but I think you could imagine all sorts of complications but I think that you have to look at . . . the Lieutenant Governor in Council would have to look at each individual situation. What we are trying to get away from here is 35 or 40 boards. We wouldn't have enough judges, for one thing.

**MR. DAVIES:** — But I think you will agree, Mr. Attorney General, that this would give you the power, whether or not you would use it in that way, to have one arbitration board that would cover all of those disputes of different unions under one. Now do I understand you to say that with the instant disputes of the electricians and the plumbers that you will be forming two arbitration boards?

**MR. HEALD:** — No, that decision hasn't been taken. It could very well be one and under this legislation, as I read it, it could be one. You're right.

**MR. DAVIES:** — So that where you have a dispute that would involve six or seven different unions in the construction industry at one time, you would also cover them by one arbitration board, or could?

**MR. HEALD:** — Yes.

**MR. DAVIES:** — And if you did this, I suggest to you that the difficulties that I have tried to picture would very well arise. Would the Attorney General comment or give me an answer on that?

**MR. HEALD:** — Would you ask the question?

**MR. DAVIES:** — I am just suggesting that if you did that, if there were say — and this isn't an extraordinary example — 10 construction unions involved in a dispute at one time and you covered them with one arbitration board and forced on them the necessity of selecting one representative on the arbitration board, with all of the meetings and the business of trying to make that selection within five days, that and the other difficulties that I have suggested, this would be inimical to the traditional bargaining pattern. You agree, Mr. Attorney General, that these would be difficulties and that they could be created by your actions.

**MR. HEALD:** — No, I don't think so. I think five days is ample. I think the employers would be in the same position. If there were a number of employers they would have only five days also to name that representative. I would point out to the Hon. Members that under subsection (7) of that Section it says:

The arbitration board shall hear:

(a) evidence . . . and

(b) argument thereon by the employers and the trade unions or by counsel on their behalf.

So all of the unions, notwithstanding the fact that in total they had one representative on the board, could, of course, each individually make representations to the board.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Ten lawyers.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, or ten gentlemen like yourself, representatives of the union, you or the Member Regina North East (Mr. Smishek).

**MR. DAVIES:** — What ten lawyers . . . ?

**MR. SMISHEK:** — I'm the one from Regina North East. Mr. Chairman, it seems to be apparent that really someone really doesn't see the problem that could be created. Take the union, take the two disputes at the present time or several, as one may want to

look at them, there may be no difficulty among the plumbers' organization, the three strikes that are on right now. The three local unions have agreed on a single arbitration board to join the 40 odd employers in one board and to have a case heard in respect of the entire industry. They may want a particular person to represent them on the board and there may be no difficulty on agreeing to who should represent them on the board, and the same thing applies in the case of the employers. But then on the other hand the IBEW, because their case may be different, their issues may be different, their demands may be different. There is progress of negotiations up to that point and things have been agreed to and may have been resolved. By enjoining them into one board, you are creating a chaotic kind of a situation, I see, with the 14 trades that have been mentioned. I am familiar with some of their different methods of bargaining. Now take as an example, the Teamsters' Union. They don't negotiate on the similar kind of a basis as the construction industry because they have many long-distance drivers. They not only ask for a flat-rate basis of wages. They also have mileage rates, they also have stand-by pay and so on. So the issues may vary a great deal. Under the provisions of this section, Mr. Minister, even though the unions may be able to agree to have a single person, the five-day limit would make it impossible for them to be able to agree on a single member to represent them, and the time question would create a problem for them. Therefore the Government, under the stringent provision of that would be free to appoint a representative of their behalf, without even giving the union a chance to be able to meet and consider a single member to represent them. Well I would hope that in the actual application and interpretation of this section, that, you know, each union, each industry will be treated singly. Certainly as far as the chairman, that's a different matter. But I would hope that you wouldn't lump everybody together into one group and by that basis because you can have really a multitude of disputes which you would give the board an impossible sort of a task to handle. I plead for that kind of an interpretation. Certainly I am sure that the plumbers could agree among themselves in the four local unions in the province I am sure that the IBEW can do the same thing, but if you throw everybody into the one pot, all that you will do is really to create a situation that will be chaotic and impossible for the board and for the unions to cope with.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, of course there is no intention of creating a chaotic situation and there is some substance to what the Hon. Member says. Of course we have to interpret these sections in a reasonable way and we have to apply them in a reasonable way. I would say this, though, that during the last few weeks I haven't experienced any difficulty in the plumbers and the electricians getting together and presenting a request to the Government. I haven't noticed much difficulty in the plumbing and electrical contractors having too much difficulty in getting together in seeing the Government and making united requests. I think the communication is quite good between those two unions and between those two groups of employers. For example, this morning when they made representations to the Premier and myself and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), Mr. Gilbey was there, the representatives of the plumbers were there from all over the province, representatives from the electricians were there — I think they had an international representative there — so that the communication is quite good and when they have to, you know, they do their job and they can



get together. I don't have any fears at all about the communications between the various unions or between the contractors. However, I do concede that there may be cases where you would have such a multiplicity of trades, such a multiplicity of unions, that it might be desirable not to consolidate completely. You might consolidate partially or you might accept the representations of both the unions and management that it be a separate board.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps we are reaching a measure of understanding here as the Attorney General and I talk about the thing. One of the things that really worries me is the five-day limit because it may not be that easy. I would hope that it would have been possible to perhaps sum up by talking about dragging the time out, but the Lieutenant Governor might be able to extend the time if within five days agreement can't be reached. For a very practical purpose that might be eight days or ten days.

**MR. HEALD:** — Sure, sure. A classical example of that is what's going to happen now. We have already given our undertaking to both parties. We won't proclaim the legislation insofar as we are going to proclaim the legislation when it is passed, but we are not going to pass the Order in Council until one week from tomorrow on the undertaking of all parties to negotiate with the services of Mr. Elchyson and the undertaking that the workmen will go back to work immediately. Now there is an example of the kind of flexibility that is permitted by this legislation. I think, in the context of what you said about five days not being long enough, if these kind of representations were made by either or both parties, all that has to happen is that the Lieutenant Governor in Council pass the Order in Council immediately, so that the five days doesn't start to run. If you wanted eight days and there is general agreement on this, you wouldn't pass your Order in Council for the first three days and then the five days would run. There is all sorts of flexibility built into Section.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think what my colleague has had to say and the answers that the Attorney General has given shows again that this particular clause is rather ill thought out. I think it will be a very difficult application in certain situations. It seems to me that the people should not have to depend upon the goodwill or the whimsey of the Executive Council or the Cabinet. There should be a firm time fixed or else the legislation should say, "or such longer time as may be considered desirable," at least to give some sort of leeway. At the moment it is within five days of the date fixed in the proclamation and it might be the proclamation was issued in such a way that some pre-notice might be given to the parties. But I hardly think that's the kind of machinery that should be stated in a statute.

Now on another point. I still think notwithstanding what the Attorney General had to say that the whole clause to this point is quite unsuitable and will make difficulties in certain situations. I want to point out that what we have now in the current dispute is a pretty well-defined list of issues arising after a few months of discussion, where the area of dispute is so well defined that it lends itself to recommendations, representations before an arbitration board. This won't apply in

the case of disputes that arise in any point of time. One might have to do with seniority, another might have to do with holiday pay, another might have to do with hiring halls, and each one of these is a very complex question within itself before any tribunal of this sort in labor relations.

I say again that this particular section is not a welcome section.

But to go on to something else that the Attorney General has said and that is, if there were a number of disputes in the trades, that he would be hard-put to find judges of the courts of the province to form the third member or the chairman of the arbitration board. I think here again under Clause 5 that this, too, is something that the Government should have taken into consideration. I think that the two appointees, that is the appointee for the employer and the appointee for the union or the trade unions concerned, should have the right to make their choice of a chairman of an arbitration board within their complete discretion. It escapes me why the Attorney General should think it necessary that a judge at that point of time would need to be, by the agreement of the parties, appointed. It restricts them and I don't need to tell the Attorney General that from time to time it is rather difficult to get members of the judiciary to act on boards of prime importance. He could very well have a number of the members of the judiciary acting on boards of rather inferior importance to some large issue who weren't able to act on the more important type of board because of their activity in a rather small area board.

**MR. HEALD:** — You have made three points and I don't want to stop you, but I would like to comment on them. If you keep on going and make several other points I am afraid that I will forget what I was going to say about them. Would you mind if I comment on what you have said thus far?

First of all you make the point about judges not being available. I don't think that is correct. I think that they are available. If they have been engaged in any inferior matters then that is the responsibility of the unions and management to have asked the Minister of Justice and me to agree to their appointment.

It has always been put to me when we are asked. I don't think that in the last number of years since I have been Attorney General I have ever refused to pass an Order in Council appointing one of our judges where he has been requested by both parties. And they do request as you know some of these judges quite often. I don't know of any case where the parties have been turned down in their request for a judge, and we have been able to co-operate as we think it is good for the judges to deal with these matters where they have the confidence of both parties, so we have tried to co-operate.

So I don't think that it is a factor. All that I was saying is that if you have 35 or 40 you might get into a difficult situation. Now you were talking about complex matters in collective bargaining agreements. I hope that you are not under the apprehension that the collective bargaining agreement has to be solved in the five days. All that has to happen in the five days is the appointment of the individual representative on the board. That is all. I am afraid that you and I are going to have to agree to disagree. I think that five days is a reasonable period of time.

**MR. DAVIES:** — I think that we are talking about different things, Mr. Attorney General. First of all what I am saying is that the range of matters of 10 or 11 unions under one arbitration board could be so great that it would tax the ingenuity of the cleverest judge. That is what I am saying.

**MR. HEALD:** — I don't think that that would ever happen. That's why I was agreeing with what the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) said. I would agree, I would concede that in those circumstances I am sure that the Lieutenant Governor in Council wouldn't designate one board. There would have to be a continuity or community of interest. I think in the present situation there might well be one board. But certainly in the example you give of ten or twelve . . .

**MR. DAVIES:** — But on the other score I was saying simply on the matter of ordinary propriety that if two nominees agree that they want a Dean of the College of Law of the University of Saskatchewan, they should not be circumscribed to accepting as chairman a judge of the province. That is what I am saying and to this you haven't given me a reply.

**MR. HEALD:** — No, I didn't want you to go too far because I knew that I would miss one. I am glad that you reminded me. You now say that you don't think that it should have to be a judge. This if I may say so is rather surprising that you take this attitude as a representative of the trade union movement in this province, because there is hardly a month that goes by that I don't get a request by a trade union and an employer for the services of a judge. They want a judge because they like his objectivity. They like his independence, they like his impartiality and they like his integrity. That is why it is here.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the Attorney General knows what I mean, knows quite well what I mean. While judges are requested, people are appointed to arbitration and conciliation boards in this province very month of the year who are other than judges because that's what the parties want. In the trade union agreements that appoint their own arbitration and conciliation board by the agreement they provide for the chairman within the bounds of their own trade union agreement.

All I am saying here is that you are saying to the parties that they can't appoint anyone else than a judge. I am not saying, and the Attorney General knows I am not saying, that judges are not objective. I agree that this is their training and in many cases they perform a valuable service, but this is not to say that many other persons either do not perform an excellent job in this capacity. I am saying that what the Attorney General is doing is keeping this down to a rather small group of people. I also want to point out this to the Attorney General that it is only a few years ago that the Federal Department of Justice, to my recollection, was complaining that a number of judges were spending too much time on conciliation boards and arbitration boards. And it was somewhat difficult at that time to get appointments. Now this situation seems to have changed. It may, however, revert to what it was before. But certainly I don't think that, where the people are making a choice in disputes that they are trying to resolve themselves,

by this legislation, they should be confined to any one group in society.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess we can agree to disagree again. I would point out that that isn't any change in the Act. That is the way that the Act was in 1966. We are not making any change here. There was a provision that it be a judge of the courts of the province. I suppose the Government feels very strongly that, in something which is very important to the people involved and because it is a binding arbitration, this is an additional reason for ensuring. Many of the boards that you talk about are not binding arbitration, some of them are but some are not. But I think that we want to ensure that there can be no suggestion of lack of impartiality, lack of fair play, lack of integrity, and this is why we have stipulated a judge of the courts.

**MR. DAVIES:** — There are two other points that I would like to make with the Attorney General on this Section, Mr. Chairman. One of them, of course, is one that has been made before under the 1966 legislation, that is the appointment by the Government of the chairman of the board in the event of the absence of agreement for that appointment by the parties.

I want to say again that I think that the legislation should provide for the appointment of the chairman, that is a member of the courts at this point, in the absence of an agreement between the parties, by someone else other than the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I am not going to dispute in general what the Attorney General has had to say about impartiality of judges. I think that their training may induce them in that direction, but I do not believe quite frankly that everyone leaves his bias behind him when he becomes a judge. He may do his level best but his training and his inclinations may very well predispose him to decisions that are not in the interest of working people. I think it very likely that the Government might be tempted in any point in time to appoint as a chairman one whose predisposition in its opinion might incline it to the decision that it would want made in a particular case, say the 1966 case with the Power Corporation workers. If the Chief Justice of the Province of Saskatchewan were to make this appointment I think it would do something to make this legislation somewhat more palatable. Not a great deal more, but at least it would convince people that there was a better chance of getting a better board by that means.

Now when this question was raised by myself, I think, in 1966 and again in 1967, I received the answer by the Premier, I believe at that time, that this matter had been checked and had been refused by the Chief Justice of the Province. Subsequently in a question that I put in the House another answer was given somewhat to this effect: the Chief Justice had said that he did not wish to act himself as the chairman in cases of this kind. I don't think that I would blame him for giving that kind of an opinion, but I cannot see where the Chief Justice would think that it was an onerous duty to name the unbiased person that was suggested here in this clause, where there is a lack of agreement between the parties on the appointment of a chairman.

The other point that I want to mention is this: Under

Clause 11 the employers and the trade union shall assume their own cost of the arbitration, should share equally the cost of the chairman or any other general expenses of the arbitration board. It seems to me that it would somewhat increase again the palatability of the legislation, if indeed that could be done and I somewhat doubt it, but I mention this anyway, if the cost of the chairman would be undertaken by the Government. I point out that in the conciliation boards under The Trade Union Act the cost of the board or parties to the board is paid for by the Government.

I would think here that it would be proper if at least the expenses of the chairman were undertaken by the Government. Indeed I think all the expenses of the board members should be.

Does the Attorney General not care to comment on this?

**MR. HEALD:** — I will be glad to comment. I didn't think that you asked a question. Sure I will make a comment and my comment is that there are many ways in which the board can be set up. As I said in second reading yesterday, when I was talking on the second reading debate, I reminded all Hon. Members of the way in which the Government of Alberta in its wisdom has dealt with the setting up of this kind of emergency tribunal. In the Province of Alberta it set up an emergency tribunal to deal with these kind of disputes and not one member of the board, all three members of the board, are appointed by the Minister, the Minister of Labour. Now that is one way of doing it. I could appreciate or understand the concern of the Hon. Member if we were suggesting that, not because I don't have confidence in the Minister of Labour, but I think it is fair comment in anyone involved in political life that perhaps we don't have that degree of objectivity that others have.

I said yesterday also in my speech that I challenge anybody, any of the Members opposite to stand up and say that any judge of any court in the Province of Saskatchewan would not be objective and would not be impartial and would not be unbiased, and nobody accepted my challenge. I have complete confidence in any one of the judges in this province to do an impartial and unbiased job.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Is the Attorney General saying that really they are the only fair people. Surely that is not the case. There are other people who are in fact more expert in this field. Let us take a look around in some of the nationally known people in industrial relations, people like Goldenberg, Taylor, Dr. Crisco. These are people who have given more attention, more consideration to the area of industrial relation than any judge in this country. Now why must it be limited just to judges? Even in the Province of Saskatchewan we have had people that have become very conscientious, very interested in this whole field. I think that it is an unfair preposition to the employers, to the unions, to the public generally, to limit the appointee just to them.

**MR. DAVIES:** — I would like to say one more thing. The Alberta legislation is most strictly circumscribed. It certainly wouldn't cover the kind of employees that we are covering by this amendment.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one comment. The Attorney General challenged anyone of us to stand up and say that any one judge was partial or was not strictly impartial. It is obviously a little difficult to say that a judge is not impartial, but I am perfectly prepared to stand and say that there are a substantial number of judges who in my opinion have very little competence in the field of taking four or five contracts between electrical workers, carpenters, plumber, operating engineers and iron workers and five different employers and unscrambling them and coming up with any sort of a rational arbitration board decision. This is not a job for an amateur. This is not the job for a lawyer who has been appointed a judge and who has never done any trade union work in all of his practice. This is a job requiring a high degree of expertise and I am suggesting that if the Attorney General wants a list I will give him a list of judges in this province who do not boast that expertise.

**MR. HEALD:** — Mr. Chairman, by the argument from the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), that would mean that if a lawyer practised law and then was put on the Bench and he had never been in a criminal court, he shouldn't take a criminal case because he didn't have any experience in criminal law. By the same token if he had never handled any expropriation cases he shouldn't handle any expropriation cases in court. Now the Hon. Member well knows that some of the best experts after they have been up on the Bench for a while are those who were not involved in criminal law before, were not involved in expropriation law before. I think it was Judge Friesen who just retired the other day — I am not sure that he had that much expropriation work in Swift Current where he practised law — but when he got on the Bench he got to be an expert.

And the other answer to your argument is that they have the resources of experts. They get, as you know, involved in very, very complex accounting cases involving millions of dollars. They have the power to hire accountants to advise them. They have the power to hire engineers where they get into a law suit involving damages perhaps for structural failures on a building. They can hire engineers. The same is true here, they can acquire the expertise or they engage the expertise. The thing that is the most important as far as I am concerned in all of these arbitrations, Mr. Chairman, is impartiality, lack of bias and a sense of fair play.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Just to continue this argument. Of course in respect to Judge Friesen he was an old municipal man. Name me a mayor of the city who is a lawyer who doesn't have any knowledge of expropriation. If you had a lot of Judge Friesens around, no problems. But there aren't many Judge Friesens around. I am very glad to say, very glad to hear the Attorney General say that a lawyer after he has tried a half a dozen cases or so may become expert.

**HON. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare):** — He didn't say that. He said acquires.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — He said after a number of cases. I am aware that the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) has been enjoying the

conviviality of his friends and he may be therefore interrupting more than usual. I am sorry I didn't hear the comment from the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) . . .

I will make my point again if I may without the assistance of the learned gentlemen from Milestone and City Park-University both of whom are convivial gentlemen.

I want to make the point. I believe that there are people in Saskatchewan who are better qualified than judges. And I believe that if the parties want those people it is not the role of the Government to prohibit it. This is what this Bill does. I am perfectly happy with the clause at the top of page 4 which says that when the Attorney General appoints a chairman it shall be a judge. What I am saying is that subsection (5) on page 3 should not require the parties to agree on a judge. If they want another party, if they want the President of the University or if they want a Professor of Economics from the University, or if they want a lawyer who has a lot of experience in this field, it seems to me that that is their business and not the Government's business. I suggest that this is just one more attempt by the Government to regulate not only collective bargaining but also arbitration in a way that neither party wants.

**MR. HEALD:** — Mr. Chairman, of course I would point out that this isn't new. You said one more attempt. We are rehashing now the argument that we had in 1966 and that is fair game because the section is here. We made the decision at that time and the Government hasn't changed its views. We think that a judge is desirable. It is the same section as far as this is concerned as it was before. We agree to disagree I guess.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, the Minister is overlooking the fact that the situation dealt with by this Bill is a far more complicated one than the 1966 Bill. The 1966 Bill was one to arbitrate the differences between one employer and one union, under one union contract, in one situation. He now presents to us a Bill which provides for an arbitration which may involve five or six unions and ten employers in 14 locations involving six contracts, and he says that's the same situation, and you require the same skill to do the first job as to do the second. I say that he is quite wrong.

**MR. HEALD:** — Mr. Chairman, I have every confidence that the judges in our province can do that. If you don't that's fine. As I say we agree to disagree. I have confidence that they can do the job and do a real good job to the satisfaction of everybody.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the point. The point is why the Attorney General should force the parties to take a judge and not have the person of their choice.

Clause 5 agreed to.

## Clause 6

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

**Clause 7**

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, this provision here is a particularly onerous provision and I want to call it to the attention of the Members of the House and I want to object to it in the strongest terms.

This says, and I refer you to the Clause that we just passed, subsection (10) a couple of inches above it on the page, "Upon receipt of the decision of an arbitration board under this section the employers and the trade unions shall put the decision into effect within thirty days."

Now suppose the employer does not put this into effect. What can the trade union do? Suppose the arbitration board says you shall have 10 cents per hour and the employer will not pay 10 cents per hour. What would be the ordinary reaction of a trade union under those circumstances? The reaction would be to pull the boys out on strike. I want you to observe what happens when they are pulled out on strike, because Sections 5 to 16 apply and Section 11 is one of them. The union then becomes required or becomes obligated, liable to pay a fine of \$1,000 a day if it pulls the boys out on strike.

You will say, "Well surely there is something to penalize the employer if he doesn't follow this, if he doesn't put the decision into effect within 30 days." And I invite anyone to find anything in that Act that puts any penalty on the employer. There is nothing here which says the employer will have to \$1,000 a day, nor even 10 cents a day. It is a straight one-way street. The employer is obligated to do this but if he doesn't do it there is no penalty. The employees are obligated to do it, but if they react otherwise it is \$1,000 a day. That is the Government's idea of fair and impartial arbitration!

**MR. HEALD:** — This Section hasn't been changed since 1966.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We are well aware that it hasn't been changed. But this Section before didn't require the employer to put this into effect. I don't see anything resembling subsection (10) in the old Act but it might be there, but I didn't catch it. Perhaps you would refer me to it then.

**MR. HEALD:** — Section 4, subsection (9).

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I wonder if the Attorney General would advise why he wishes to impose penalties of \$1,000 a day on the trade union if it does not obey the arbitration board decision, but impose no penalties on an employer of any kind if he doesn't.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well that penalty of \$1,000 is for calling a strike, of course. The employer can't call a strike. The employer is guilty by Section 11 if there is a lockout, the same penalty.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Right, but of course that doesn't quite meet the point. All the employer has to do is refuse to follow the decision of the arbitration board and not pay the money. Then what remedy



does that leave the employees? They presumably simply have to go under the old contract without any type of remedy of any kind.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, they have the remedies they have under the other Acts.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — As the Attorney General well knows the ordinary remedy . . .

**MR. HEALD:** — The Trade Union Act.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — . . . ordinary remedy that any trade union uses is the right to strike, and surely, surely if the Attorney General has deprived employees of their right to strike and has substituted an arbitration board and has then said to the employees, "You shall not strike and if you do, you should pay \$1,000 a day," surely if he is going to deprive unions and employees of those rights, he ought at least to put in some penalties which impose upon the employer some obligation to follow the decisions of the arbitration board.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, of course Section 11 provides for the penalty of \$1,000 and it applies not only against a strike by employees, it applies to a lockout against employers. Those are the two offending things that would call down the raft to the extent of \$1,000, or could. And Section 11(1) says:

Every person who call or authorizes or counsels or procures a strike or lockout.

Strike would be by the employees and lockout would be by the employer who was guilty of an offence in the summary conviction and is liable to a fine of not more than \$1,000 for each day.

The penalty is the same.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The problem here, of course, is why would the employer bother to lock out? All he has to do is not pay. He just ignores the arbitration board. And this is by no means, Mr. Attorney General, a hypothetical case. I invite you to look at Section 10, subsection (2) of the Act which takes away the right to strike for 12 months. There have been cases in the last year or so where trade unions have been subjected to this Bill and it seems to me I have heard instances, although I can't detail them, where the trade union has wondered what would happen if the management decided to ignore the seniority provisions, the grievance procedures, the whole bit in the union contract. It will be known to many Members that many of the union contracts do not contain any method of a grievance procedure, they don't end in binding arbitration. It is not part of the law of Saskatchewan like it is the part of the law of almost every other province, and we have an employer who is totally immune from strikes and apparently totally immune from any penalty applied by the Government.

**MR. HEALD:** — Well, of course, as the Hon. Member well knows, the employee has certain preferred rights against the employer for non-payment of wages under the other statutes.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It would be a nice trick to collect for an employee under The Wages Recovery Act pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement that was never signed! And this is the situation under subsection (10). We'll let it pass. I have made my point.

**MR. DAVIES:** — There is one other point too, I think, Mr. Chairman, pursuant to what my colleague has said in that the trade union is prohibited as I recall it from striking a year from the proclamation date but under Section 8 — I'll read it:

The employer shall not during the period commencing with the date of the proclamation and ending on the day the decision of the board of arbitration is given, alter the rate of wages or any other term or condition of employment of employees on whose behalf the trade union is entitled to bargain with the employer under The Trade Union Act that were in effect on the day prior to the day when the proclamation was made.

**MR. HEALD:** — What section?

**MR. DAVIES:** — Section 8. What this does it seems to me is simply to say that while the board of arbitration is on, so to speak, and until it renders its decision, no change is made in the old rate of wages, but the day the decision is made, it releases them from that obligation. I think this confirms what my colleague has said.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — It's a terrible oversight, a one-sided Act.

**MR. HEALD:** — I don't see anything wrong with it.

The question being put on Clause 7, it was agreed to.

### Clause 8

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — May I just ask a question purely for information here? I take it then that it is proposed that the Lieutenant Governor will not give his assent to this Bill tonight but that . . .

**MR. HEALD:** — No, that's not the intention. The intention is to assent the Bill. The undertaking that the Premier gave was that the Order in Council which would . . .

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The proclamation?

**MR. HEALD:** — That's right, would not be issued for a week.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Alright.

**MR. HEALD:** — But we intend if the Bill is passed to have His Honour give assent this evening.

The question being put on Clause 8, it was agreed to.

**BILL NO. 1**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Therefore Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan enacts as follows: An Act to amend The Essential Services Emergency Act, 1966.

The question being put on Bill No. 1 as amended, it was agreed to.