

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature
24th Day

Friday, March 19, 1971

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce to all Hon. Members the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale, 160 students from the Melfort Regional Division III School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Laurie Hawke; from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana Centre represented by Mr. Estey, 47 students from the Haultain School, under the direction of their teachers, Mrs. Hogg and Mrs. Caswell; from the constituency of Kinistino represented by their Member Mr. Thibault, 60 students from the Wakaw School; from the constituency of Gravelbourg represented by Mr. Coderre, 25 students from the Glen Bain School, under the direction of their teachers, Miss Janis and Mr. Hymer, their principal.

I am sure all Hon. Members will wish to extend to these students and to their teachers and bus drivers the warmest of all possible welcomes to the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan and to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here enjoyable and educational and wish to each and every one of them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Swine Building Grant Program

Hon. D. T. McFarlane: (Minister of Agriculture) — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to announce that the 1970 Swine Building Grant Program required that construction be commenced before December 31, 1969 to qualify for the 25 per cent grant towards the cost of construction.

I am announcing that the Swine Building Grant policy is extended and that grants will be paid on any barn that meets specifications and was completed by December 31, 1970. Farmers who have completed their barns before this date should get in touch with the Family Farm Improvement Branch as soon as possible. Their barns will be inspected and they will receive the grant subject to the submission of appropriate proof of cost.

I might note that this policy has resulted in a substantial modernization of our swine industry which had fallen considerably behind that of some other provinces. To date we have approved almost one half million in grants and about 670 barns.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 123

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon Mayfair) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 123 showing:

The total expenditure of provincial funds in the fiscal year 1970-71 to date to promote the services of Saskatchewan Power Corporation to the public.

Hon. C. L. B. Estey: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Mr. Speaker, I move the following amendment seconded by Mr. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):

That all the words after “of” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Funds earned by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in the year 1970 to inform the public of services being provided by the Corporation.

The reason for the amendment is that the motion reads “expenditure of provincial funds” and also our records are kept on the calendar year, not the fiscal year.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, does the Hon. Member have a copy?

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 124

Mr. Brockelbank moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 124 showing:

The total expenditure of provincial funds in the fiscal year 1969-70 to promote the services of Saskatchewan Power Corporation to the public.

Hon. C. L. B. Estey: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by Mr. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):

That all the words after “of” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Funds earned by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in the year 1969 to inform the public of services being provided by the Corporation.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 125

Mr. Brockelbank moved that an Order of the

Assembly do issue for Return No. 125 showing:

The total expenditure of provincial funds to promote the services of Sask Tel to the public in the 1970-71 fiscal year to date.

Hon. G. B. Grant: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, for the reasons cited by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Nutana Centre in regard to the Power Corporation, namely, for better clarification and to bring it into a calendar year form, I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald):

That all the words after “of” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Funds earned by Sask Tel in the year 1970 to inform the public of services being provided by the Corporation.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 126

Mr. Brockelbank moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 126 showing:

The total expenditure of provincial funds to promote the services of Sask Tel to the public in the 1969-70 fiscal year.

Hon. G. B. Grant: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald):

That all the words after “of” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Funds earned by Sask Tel in the year 1969 to inform the public of services being provided by the Corporation.

Amendment agreed to.

Debate continues on the motion.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I inconvenienced the House by having the question in the improper form, but I am sure that the House is aware as well as I am that there seems to be a continuing program of advertising, more than has been done in the past, with regard to these corporations.

I have checked in the Crown corporations and I found that there is a larger expenditure this year than in the previous year in all cases. The question that arose in my mind, Mr. Speaker, is: what is this added expenditure being used for? And I think the people of Saskatchewan are quite aware of the fact that they are being deluged with an advertising campaign such as they haven't seen in many, many years . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . with regard to Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Saskatchewan Government Telecommunications and other Government enterprises. It is interesting that the advertisements that we are seeing on television, hearing on the radio, seeing in the newspaper, are largely informative, but through them is a thread of political advertising.

Now the Members across the way may dispute that, but the fact of the matter remains that in answer to a question put in this House, one of the advertisements in the previous year was being prepared by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and a most recent example was being prepared by McLaren Advertising. So the advertising has been switched from the Crown corporation to McLaren Advertising which we all recognize as a Liberal advertising firm from Eastern Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This is the advertising firm which does the advertising for the Liberal Party across Canada in election campaigns, which did the advertising for the Liberal Party in the Saskatchewan election in 1964 and 1967, which does in fact now do the bulk of the advertising for the Government of Saskatchewan.

I think the people of Saskatchewan are thoroughly dismayed at the manner in which this Government spends the public funds.

Mr. B. D. Gallagher: (Yorkton) — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair is completely in order. He is supposed to be closing debate on this motion, is he not? If he is closing debate on the motion is he in order to do anything other than to answer questions which have been brought into debate? Who brought the questions to him? Nobody. I think he is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think that the rules and regulations in connection with what a Member may or may not say when he is closing a debate are reasonably clear, at least they should be, to all Members of this House. But it won't hurt to restate them.

When a Member rises to close a debate he may reinforce or explain the arguments which he used when moving the original motion.

The Member spoke not when he moved the motion, he merely moved it. It was his privilege to debate it at that time had he wished to do so. I fail to see how he can reinforce or explain arguments which he never made.

The person who closes debate has a further privilege; he may answer the arguments of others. I draw this to the attention of the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) the arguments of others were almost non-existent. I think the Member for Yorkton has a point of order that is well taken. I draw this to the attention of all Members of the House for future guidance.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in closing my remarks in this particular motion.

I might say that I am not surprised that the Members were brief in their comments. As a matter of fact they said nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The fact of the matter is I can understand why they don't say anything for the simple reason that they can't defend their position. Consequently I close off the debate, Mr. Speaker, and I can't be held mute in this House because the Members opposite won't speak. I don't think that would be proper, because they don't choose to speak. I can't make them speak.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That is an unfair thing and an unfair statement to make. You are not held mute in this House and certainly not by the Chair, because you had every opportunity to speak when you moved the original motion. You could have spoken for three hours if you wanted to. The Member could have taken up the whole day also speaking to the amendment had he wished to. I don't want any aspersions in regard to the rights of freedom of speech made against the Chair and I won't stand for any.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I cast no aspersions against the Chair and I assure you that I don't intend to take all day to debate this particular issue. I intend to be quite brief on it, in concluding.

Mr. Thatcher: — You had the chance yesterday!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Premier, you have had your opportunity. You didn't rise in this debate so just keep quiet.

The people are concerned about this type of political advertising and I am seeking these examples to show a comparison. They will prove the point that there is a lot more advertising going on in Saskatchewan and it is done by the Liberal political advertising machine, and that is unfortunate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 3 — Labour-Management Legislation

Mr. J.B. Hooker: (Notukeu-Willowbunch) moved, seconded by Mr. Schmeiser (Watrous):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government labour-management legislation designed to protect the public interest which incorporates the principles of the use of Independent Labour Courts and

awards binding on all parties as a means of settling all labor disputes in Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this Resolution I fully realize that if and when this Resolution is made legislation, it will be a complete departure from the labor laws that we have become accustomed to.

It appears to me that after the many problems the Federal Government has had in the past year involving crippling strikes, legislation would have been proposed to protect the economy of our nation. I maintain that a repetition of strikes and lockouts such as occurred in 1969 would be crippling, not only for industry, but for the unions and their members as well.

The Saskatchewan Government, I am proud to say, has shown in the past that we have the courage when the health and welfare of our citizens is concerned, to take positive action as proven by the passing of the Essential Services Act, to protect the health and welfare of our people. We have since extended this legislation to include other segments of an industry when the withdrawal of their services would jeopardize the very livelihood of others. Progress has been made by this Government. However, if we are going to bring some sort of stability to our chaotic condition, strikes and lockouts will have to be made illegal. I say that we must abolish strikes and lockouts because I feel that in this day of interdependence, strikes must be considered as being archaic, obsolete, immoral and intolerable. I feel that no one has the moral right to withdraw his services at the expense of his fellow man.

In making this statement, I am not forgetful of the rights and privileges of the individual. A person should be able to withdraw his services at any time, but by the same token no union or corporate body should be able to keep someone else from accepting that position.

I do not, Mr. Speaker, intend to take the time of this Assembly to go into the anatomy of a strike. I believe we are all aware of what happens prior to when a strike is called. We are also aware of the effects a strike has on the employees, the industry being struck, the economy of the area, and the inconvenience to the general public. I am the first to admit that during an earlier period, strikes were no doubt necessary, for in many cases our labor force was being exploited. However, the tide has turned and in some cases industry is being exploited by labor unions, not because labor bosses are concerned with the union membership, but because of the power struggle going on amongst the giants in the labor union movement; others are called for no other reason but political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to elaborate for a moment on labor unions and politics. We all know that the NDP and the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour are bed partners. The Federation was foolish enough to pass a resolution stating that project number one was to defeat this Government; that was back in 1964 and they are further away from their goal today than they were in 1964 when they passed this resolution.

It is no secret that the Canadian Federation of Labour, at a founding convention held in Winnipeg in the early 1960s, allied themselves with the Federal NDP. It is also a well known fact that the labor bosses took control of the convention and

loaded the panels with their supporters when it was deemed necessary.

In fact, they controlled the convention so completely that they succeeded in placing their members on the NDP Council. This ought to be proof positive that politics and not the welfare of their membership gets priority in the labor movement of the day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — When we speak of labor unions, Mr. Speaker, we are only speaking of about 26 per cent of our total labor force. Of that group, 65 per cent of 1,346,114 workers are members of unions with American affiliation who have their head offices in the United States of America; 31 per cent belong to Canadian unions with head offices in Canada, and the remaining 3.7 per cent belong to local independent unions. In other words, Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of our organized labor force are paying dues directly to the parent unions in the United States of America. According to an official of CUPE, \$35 million of membership dues found their way into the coffers of the powerful unions in the United States and only about \$17 million was returned to Canada. That was last year, Mr. Speaker. No wonder that they need these millions of Canadian dollars, when one considers the salaries paid to the labor bosses and the lavish parties put on by the various unions when they are successful in getting one of their labor leaders elected to the 35-man labor council.

At this time I think I possibly should elaborate on this by reading from the Toronto Globe and Mail, February 19, 1971, and this article was written in Bal Harbour, Florida. I quote:

At Bal Harbour and often not so sunny Florida, the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO meets in the garish surroundings of the expensive Americano Hotel. Somehow it seems in keeping with the lifestyle of some of the leaders of the AFL-CIO affiliated unions. In Bal Harbour, along the gaudy strip of Miami Beach where one almost expects to see dollar bills used to light dollar cigars, money seems to have gone out of style. The labor movement is no exception in the lavish display of wealth. This week the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades marked the ascension of its president, S. Frank Raferty to the elite 35-man council of the AFL-CIO with a luau, an Hawaiian feast. Judging by the size of the crowd of invited guests, including the 35-man press contingent, the costs of the meals, the flow of liquid refreshments and the little gifts, the affair could not have cost much less than \$15,000.

And this money, I suggest, comes from the pockets of the working man. When we speak of political power, we go on in this article and I quote:

The AFL-CIO still wields massive political power through the support it can provide in elections for its friends and the weight of the back of its hand for its foes.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP opposite have continually cried this Session, as they have in the past, that this Government is giving

away our resources to the Americans, that the American investments in Canada are going to control our economy. In fact they are so anti-American that in their party platform they say that they will disallow foreign ownership of farm land. Anti-Americanism in its broadest sense. I fail to see how a group of people can be advocates of hate when it involves American investment in Saskatchewan, and such intimate friends when the International Labor Movement is involved.

Mr. Speaker, if we are in danger of losing our Canadian identity to the Americans, it is not going to be because of the cold, hard cash they are investing in our resources. It will be because our economy will be brought to its knees by strikes, slow downs, work to rule, or any or all of the various means that unions have at their disposal.

Mr. Speaker, no country's economy is stronger than its labor force and no one needs to be told what happens to that economy when labor-management disputes create a chain reaction of strikes throughout our country. This, Mr. Speaker, must not be allowed to happen, and it is for this reason that this Resolution is being placed before this Assembly. In this Resolution, I am asking that strikes be made illegal. I expect violent and long-winded objections from the Opposition in this regard. Why shouldn't they object! It is from compulsory wage deductions by many unions that they get their campaign funds; it is also from the labor force they hope to get support at the polls. However, Mr. Speaker, many in the labor force are fed up to the teeth by being dictated to by a few. They are looking to governments to pass legislation that will assure them of a fair deal and at the same time relieve them from the dangers of being exploited by the power-hungry labor bosses.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — Some may say that this Resolution will take away the rights and freedoms of some members of our labor force. Rights and freedoms, Mr. Speaker, must be a two-way street. The general public have every right to expect governments to see that their rights and freedoms must also be protected.

A strike is a weapon meant to force management to accept the demands of an organized body. A strike in the hands of some segments of our labor force supplying essential services, such as utilities, health services, law enforcement, fire protection, is a powerful weapon. A strike today against, for example, the Acme Gear Plant, Massey Harris, is meaningless as it would only cause the plant to close completely and put the employees out of work. A strike in periods of high unemployment is ineffective. In times of labor shortages, it is a potent method of forcing negotiations. It has been known, but seldom if ever proven, that management and labor have knowingly provoked strikes so that they could pass on the extra costs to the unsuspecting public.

I may say that in the past in many instances, strikes played a very useful role in bringing about a much needed reform in labor-management contract negotiations. However, today that method has been exploited until it has become an embarrassment to the very group it was designed to help. Union leaders are strong because they wield political power. Their strength, Mr. Speaker, is also going to be their downfall. The outrageous

settlements in some instances have aroused the consumers to the point that they are going to demand an accounting. A repetition of strikes which we were subjected to in 1969 can be crippling to both industry and unions alike; they would also be a downward reflection on our present depressed economy. This must not and should not be allowed to happen.

We in Canada have too much at stake to allow a few powerful labor bosses from within, or without this country, to cause our economy to suffer for political expediency. If a government passes legislation that would make strikes and lockouts illegal, then it also becomes the responsibility of that government to enact legislation replacing strikes and lockouts as a means of settling labor disputes.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that it is about time that we, as a legislative body, start exploring other means of settling disputes that cannot be resolved by union and management. I suggest that the establishment of labor courts is a method that warrants our most serious consideration. Labor courts would be a new concept in labor relations in this country, however it is not entirely new. Sweden, for instance, has had some type of labor courts for some time. However, it did not make provision to have strikes made illegal. For some reason Sweden has had a rash of labor disputes resulting in strikes which were undermining their national economy.

It is interesting to note that the powers that be in Sweden have passed emergency legislation making strikes illegal for a specified period of time. Possibly they are realizing today that their legislation is lacking in some respects. Should temporary banning of strikes prove successful, I submit that provisions will be added to their legislation which would not allow that situation to happen again.

Mr. Speaker, we in our system of trying to provide equal justice for all, have civil courts with a judiciary body responsible for making the judgment as to who is right and who is wrong. If compensation is demanded by either party, that is decided upon by the courts. If punishment is found necessary, the decision is up to the courts to assess that punishment. Offences under the criminal code are handled in like manner. Why then can our problems in connection with labor relations not be handled in much the same way? Possibly we should review what happens today when labor and management cannot mutually agree on a settlement. They walk away from the bargaining table and play a waiting game hoping one side or the other will re-open negotiations. This failing, mediators are usually called and they try to bring both parties together and in many cases with a great deal of success. However, when all these avenues have failed, a strike is called and we know the effects that this has on the economy and the people involved. Often in prolonged strikes, arbitration boards are set up and their decision becomes binding on both parties. I do not intend to cast any reflection on the personnel of the appointed arbitration boards, or the decisions they hand down. However, Mr. Speaker, this method in my opinion is not good enough.

Labor courts, to be successful, will be measured partially by the ability of those elected or appointed to that board. Too much caution cannot be exerted in finding the right people for those positions. The terms of reference under which they will operate must be explicitly set forth, leaving enough flexibility for the court to delve into all aspects of the case.

I would suggest that they have the power to examine witnesses under oath, have access to records, be able to make comparisons as to productivity, working conditions, etc. They should have powers to assess fines or award compensation and their decision must be final and binding.

Mr. Speaker, should this Government set up labor courts, we must be prepared for a head-on confrontation with labor, especially those unions which are American affiliates. This would be a last ditch stand by the powerful sector of the Labour Union Movement. Without this right to strike, union organizations would cease to be feared as a potent political body. Unions would soon keep their union dues at home, working on behalf of their local members rather than assisting to pay the salary of some labor leader who at the present might be serving time in jail.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I should hope that the union dues saved would then be put to use hiring people trained in labor relations, who are dedicated to improving the lot of the employees rather than for the assistance of some political party. I should like to remind the Members opposite that too strong an objection to at least exploring a new concept to settle labor disputes may have an adverse reaction. The numerous strikes, many over trifles, have worn the patience of the public pretty thin. I am firmly convinced that our people are looking to governments with the courage to institute reforms, reforms that will put a stop to union practices that are rotting our nation to the core.

Mr. Speaker, I now move this Resolution.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief on this particular subject because my colleague has eloquently outlined much of our present position. I do think, Mr. Speaker, that the party opposite has become exceptionally what I would call small 'c' conservative. The worst type of thinking on this particular subject that the province has seen for some time. They have taken the absolute position of the worst part of what I think to be the Trade Union Movement, its very, very small 'c' conservative element. For example, Mr. Speaker, recently I took a clipping out of one of the magazines which puts forth the position of one of the leading labor people in North America and yet the party opposite obviously does not share his opinions in the slightest. For example in Time Magazine of September 7, 1970, headlined, "Big Stakes in the Auto Talks." I want to read this to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. I won't read the whole article but I shall read a few words because I think it outlines much of what our Members on this side of the Assembly feel and think. I want also to indicate to you that this is what other labor people in North America are also thinking:

AFL-CIO President George Meany, who just turned 76 last week, propounded an unexpected proposition at a steak and martini luncheon with a group of Washington newsmen. We find more and more that strikes really don't settle a thing . . .

I'll finish it for you.

. . . said the titular head of the American labor movement.

Where you have a well established industry and a well established union, you're getting to the point where a strike doesn't make sense. By Meany's reckoning the right formula in such circumstances is for both sides to submit all resolved issues in collective bargaining to binding arbitration.

His remark might easily have been aimed at the suspended negotiations between the nation's largest industrial union, the independent 1.6 million members, the United Auto Workers and the nation's largest manufacturing industry.

The article goes on, Mr. Speaker, but roughly Mr. Meany is only putting forward to the labor movement what has already been put forward to this Assembly by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker).

I think, Mr. Speaker, to follow this thinking through for a little while that it has also become most obvious to many people that it is not so much the industrial strike which actually takes place between both union and management which is disturbing to much of the public, Mr. Speaker, but it is often the settlement that is arrived at between the management and the union which is then imposed upon the public, Mr. Speaker, and results in great damage to the economy.

In a number of the industries which we have in this country, it is well recognized, Mr. Speaker, that they are able to pass these labor costs on to the public and in actual fact they have not negotiated from a position of strength with the union which is working their manufacturing operation, and in actual fact have settled at substantially high wage rates which they were able to pass on to the consumer, resulting in a substantial increase to the union membership. The profit picture of the company has remained probably about the same but it has eroded our competitive position in the rest of the world and in our own country and gouged the consumer to a very large extent.

I think that's why, Mr. Speaker, we need a bit of good common sense used by both the unions who are demanding the wage increases and the companies which are operating.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — But if, Mr. Speaker, they are unable or unwilling to show this restraint, both business and labor, then it is time that we have some type of action in this country to ensure that they will give the consumer some consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I think the indication of the results of much of this is now being brought home by the problems of unemployment which we are experiencing simply because our industry is no longer competitive and unable to export our products. It is also being brought home by the very, very low level of profits of some of the companies and therefore they are not expanding or creating new jobs. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious that one of the things that our economy is now suffering from to the greatest possible extent is not only the industrial strife between the labor union and management but the imposition of what the settlement often is upon the unsuspecting public. This is why I think, as our Member has

indicated, that we are in need of a new deal — if you want to call it that — of some type of labor court which is going to settle these disputes in a fair manner so that the public also gets some type of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that any of us are saying that we have an ultimate or final solution to the whole problem but I think we are indicating that we are at least willing to look to a solution and it is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the NDP enunciations on the subject, the various conventions and the policies they have come forward with, the only thing that the Opposition stand for is the present maintenance of the status quo.

I support the Resolution wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, in rising this afternoon to enter this debate I want first of all to say a few words about the remarks of the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). I am disappointed in him I must say because I should have thought from his training that he might have ventured a few comments which would be in tune with our times. He had the audacity, you know, to suggest that the policy of the New Democratic Party on labor matters is small “c” conservative. I thought, what a travesty. He talked about this Resolution being a new deal for labor affairs or something of that nature.

I want to tell the Member for Cannington that all he needs to do is to get in touch with his Federal Liberal Labor Minister at Ottawa, Mr. Mackasey, and ask his opinion because everything that is in the Resolution before us this afternoon is a direct opposite to all those propositions that have been urged by Mr. Mackasey during the last two years.

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . Ask about John, if that's the case.

Mr. Davies: — The Member from Cannington is talking about George Meany. Well, I think everyone knows that there has been a dispute between the United Auto Workers and the AFL-CIO. This may have actuated Mr. Meany's remarks on that single occasion. But I want to say that for this one occasion that you have found (and I only know of this one) there must be at least a dozen when he has said the direct opposite. Moreover, the policy of the AFL-CIO as expressed in convention by something like 3,000 or 4,000 delegates has time and time again been in opposition to compulsory arbitration. So there is no question about the feeling of the American labor movement.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Cannington talks about the wage settlements of unions doing great damage to the economy. You know, both in his remarks and in the remarks of the Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) there was not one single criticism of the excesses of corporate capital in America today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — He says that the settlements of unions have eroded the

competitive position of Canada — that industry has been unable to export. If the Member would only study the figures that came out only two months ago, he would find that the export position of Canada last year was at an all-time high. Never before in our history has the export business of Canada been as good.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — So it is rather nonsense to suggest that union settlements have resulted in the kind of thing that he charges.

Mr. Weatherald: — Why are . . . Bill. Something for nothing in Ontario.

Mr. Davies: — And surely in the long term, union settlements have benefited our economy. Where would this nation be in terms of labor standards, vacations, minimum pay, and all the upgraded conditions that we know union agreements provide had it not been for the fact that the employees of this country are, in some measure, organized into trade unions.

Now, the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) was on much the same theme. I think the remarks he made when he proposed this Resolution illustrates the twisted and the perverted thinking on labor policy of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — He talks about this Government having made progress in labor relations. I should like to know where he can find a single trade union member in the Province of Saskatchewan who would echo that thinking, because it is not only trade union people who feel very keenly about the loss of liberties that they have suffered under this Government, but a great many other people who understand the workings of democracy who fear because of the kind of things that are urged in the Resolution before us. The Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch says that strikes were necessary once, but they are not necessary now. Strikes are called because of jurisdictional disputes, I think he said. He said that this in the main is the cause of strikes today, strikes called because of political motivation. We had, Mr. Speaker, a Return from the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) on a question I asked in this House, tabled just a week or two ago. It supplies ample evidence that the strikes that took place last year in Saskatchewan, as the most immediate example, did not take place in one single instance because of a political motivation. In fact the great majority of man-days lost were lost by union who have never taken any political action or conducted any political activity during their lifetime.

I think it is absurd, it is nonsense to suggest that union people don't run their own affairs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — If he has seen a convention of the Canadian Labour Congress, with 1,600 working people from coast to coast present, I am sure he wouldn't make a damaging charge of that kind.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch has again ventured that painful old saw about all the money going from trade unions to the United States. I want to say again to the Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch this; of the \$35 million that does go to the headquarters of international unions, much more than that amount is spent in Canada and this has been so throughout the years. It would not have been possible for many of the unions in this country to have organized in the first instance and successfully resisted corporations that have their headquarters in the United States had it not been for assistance from their American brothers and sisters.

Again we have seen in the remarks of the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch a great deal of criticism about international unions, not one word of criticism about the machinations of international corporatism in the world today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — I should have thought that he would have said something about the Barber Commission Report. The Barber Commission Report said that farmers in some cases are paying \$1,600 more for a tractor in Canada because of the manipulations of international finance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Companies that are located in this country as well. Not a word about this. Yet this is the very thing that the farmers, whom he represents in his constituency and whom the other Members across the way represent as well, are concerned about at this time.

Speaking about the economy being brought to its knees by strikes. Now how ridiculous can we be? The fact of the matter is that for every one day lost in strikes in this province over the last ten years there were 190 days lost by unemployment, probably more during the last year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — For every one day lost by strikes there are over 13 days lost by accidents in industry. Yet when I appeal to the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) and other Members of the Cabinet to do something to reduce this shocking accident toll, what do we get — nothing but excuses for the Compensation Board, nothing, nothing, nothing!

There are 117 days of sickness lost in this province annually for every one day lost by strikes. What are we getting from the Liberal Party in this province to better our system of health care? I think it is very obvious what we are getting. We are getting reductions in service and on the other hand deterrent fees. I think that I am more than prepared, Mr. Speaker, to talk to the Members opposite in terms of a modern system of labor relations. But I resent very much the words of the last two Members who have spoken and who have attempted to justify what is not a reform Resolution but a reactionary Resolution

in terms of forward-looking thinking.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — I feel very strongly, too, the kinds of criticism that they level against the working people organized into trade unions in this province and elsewhere. Yet they say not a word against the corruption of corporations, not a word against the evils of the corporate system. They have advocated nothing in the way of restraints on the unbridled right of corporations to combine and control. All they do by a Resolution of this kind is to encourage bias, ignorance, discord and violence which is in keeping with the politically motivated labor policy of this Liberal Government.

On this score, Mr. Speaker, I am firmly of the opinion that the Resolution before us reflects again the basic tactic as well as the policy of the Liberal Government. This is not to find a better way of handling management-labor disputes, not to improve collective bargaining procedures, not to update ways and means for expanding consultation between industrial parties, but to use Saskatchewan labor problems as a kind of a Roman circus.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Because just as the Roman emperors used savage entertainments and innocent victims to distract the attention of their poor from real misery and hardship, so this Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, has sought to channel the understandable resentment of Saskatchewan citizens over their economic plight by the creation of a labor bogey and the use of savage policies and savage action to attack employees' unions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — This policy, Mr. Speaker, has not sold one bushel of wheat. It hasn't saved one five-cent piece for Saskatchewan farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — It has done absolutely nothing to get to the root of the troubles that are plaguing the Saskatchewan economy, nor to curb the big corporate institutions that both the Barber Commission and the Batten Commission pointed to as the authors of gigantic swindles on both workers and farmers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, this policy has reduced wages below parity levels on the prairies as well as in comparison with workers elsewhere in Canada. This policy has caused the migration of thousands of our most skilled workmen to other parts of the land. It has created unprecedented industrial unrest because of its one-sided nature and application. It's a policy that paralyzes collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is the singular achievement of the democratic world in rationalizing relations between employer and employee. Liberals substitute harsh, deadly and repressive legislation of the type that is natural and familiar in the totalitarian system.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before the House is obviously in keeping with the Government's device of utilizing labor as a catspaw in its political manipulation of voters. It seeks to put the compulsory arbitration of labor disputes already imposed by Bill 2 on a permanent footing, spelling the end of collective bargaining for every union and every employer in this province.

The clear effects for truly harmonious relationships in industry between workers and their employers would, by such an extension, I suggest, be nothing less than dreadful. Instead of the present situation in which all but approximately 2 per cent of Saskatchewan's 600 union agreements which are now negotiated without work stoppage, the ground would be prepared for eventual discord, confrontation and clashes which always come about when free men are constrained by compulsion.

Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous occasions over the past year when the Premier has publicly stated his intention of introducing legislation at this Session of the Legislature to effect the machinery proposed in the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch's (Mr. Hooker) Resolution. Over and over again the Premier stressed that labor would be the foremost issue in this Session. But just before the Session started, the Premier announced that there would be no labor courts instituted for the time being. He did hint that possible studies would be made of methods that are used by countries like Sweden. Why then, Mr. Speaker, is this Resolution before us? Nothing stands in the way of the Government making the fullest examination of procedures that are used in other countries. Indeed there is currently a mass of information which has been secured by investigations of reputable and respected jurists and researchers such as Mr. Justice Nathaniel Nemetz of the British Columbia Superior Court, and Dr. Frances Bairstow, Associated Director of McGill University's Industrial Relations Centre, on Swedish and Australian principles and labor relations respectively.

Mr. Speaker, we can only guess about the reasons why the Premier announced that the Government would not proceed with labor court legislation at this Session. Probably the Premier is aware that there is a growing disquiet and anxiety, even in his own party, over his rash and dangerous labor policies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The Government, therefore, must want to delay the worst amendments until after a provincial election. Why then does this Resolution appear on the Order Paper? The only intent must be to again allow Government Members to rip and to tear labor institutions for their own reprehensible political purposes. Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us simply parrots the previous statements of government leaders. But what may perhaps be forgotten is that government intentions and declarations in this respect are an outright denial of the promises that they made to the people of Saskatchewan when Bill 2 was first introduced in September of 1966.

At that time, the Premier and the then Minister of Labour and others categorically said that forced arbitration would never be used to the detriment of labor but would only be used in the event of emergencies seriously affecting the public, arising out of disputes in utilities and hospitals. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake what has transpired since is that the Government

has broken its promise.

Look at the record, Mr. Speaker, The Premier, when he introduced Bill 2 in September 1966, had this to say, and this is a quotation from his speech at that time:

This legislation will never be used by our government to bully, to oppress or intimidate any union that is engaged in legitimate negotiations to advance the reasonable interests of its members.

Later on, when concluding the debate on the Bill, he said this:

I hope we will not have to use this legislation. It will be on the shelf . . . if emergencies arise where the public interest is at stake, it will be used.

When the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch spoke in the debate in 1966, what did he say? He said this:

I think the people should have the right to strike in some cases.

And he went on to say that restrictions should be employed in the case of utilities.

The then Minister of Public Works, Mr. Gardiner, also indicated that the Government would use Bill 2 type legislation only in the case of work stoppages in utilities where the public weal was in serious jeopardy. He said this, and I hope the Members on the opposite side won't be offended by my using the name of Mr. Gardiner:

This legislation need never be used. I am prepared to suggest that it will never be used.

The Minister of Welfare, Mr. MacDonald, said this:

The process of collective bargaining represents the principle of free enterprise in its purest application. The right to strike is an integral part of that process. We believe that Government interference in the process of collective bargaining should be kept to a minimum. We have acted in accordance with that principle.

The Minister of Labour at that time, Mr. Coderre, said quite profoundly and not badly I thought:

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

And he added a little later on in his speech:

The right of workers to strike and of employers to lockout are generally considered, subject to certain restrictions, as necessary for the unimpeded operation of the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Speaker, you will see beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Government in 1966 pledged the use of compulsory arbitration only in cases where they could show serious public jeopardy as in a dispute in a utility or hospital and its employees. The

Government faithfully promised not to use such legislation to interfere or to intimidate employees engaged in legitimate negotiations. I say that these promises have been ruthlessly violated. Now, the right to strike and bargain collectively would by this Resolution be illegal for employees in any occupation or in any industry.

The Government has spoken favorably for forced arbitration to end all employer-employee disputes. It may have merely delayed the question at this Session, that is all. The Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch said in 1966 that he was in favor of the right to strike except in cases involving utilities. Now he presses for forced arbitration as a means for settling all labor disputes.

The Liberal Party of Saskatchewan is not entitled to public trust, on the basis of a long list of broken promises. Labor was promised better pay, more jobs, no coercion, larger security. What has labor received? Reduced earnings, fewer jobs, massive coercion and mass insecurity. The Resolution before us is the placing of another of the bars in the grim structure of Liberal policy on labor, Mr. Speaker.

I want to remind the House that both the Government's Review Committee on The Trade Union Act reporting in 1966, and the Labour-Management Committee on the Construction Industry reporting in 1969, unequivocally recommended against the kind of oppressive measures encountered in Bill 2. I remind the House that the most far-reaching investigation on labor relations ever known in Canada — that of the Federal Woods' Commission on Labour Relations — stated constantly and consistently that the path of interference, state coercion and compulsion that has been taken by this Government in its labor laws, is contrary to the public interest and the development of orderly and peaceful relations in society.

It has always been my contention that, apart from all else, the attitude and actions of this Liberal Government on the rights of employees is ill-advised and harmful because it refuses to realize the realities of our times and the best information and research that is available to this point. In a word, it is not just stagnant policy, it is completely retrogressive. Moreover, its continuance will sooner or later, I suggest, plunge the province into social strife of incalculable severity.

This afternoon the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) said that he didn't expect that the unions would take this lying down. This, I suggest, is an admission that he expects the kind of disturbances that have been avoided by true collective bargaining and that has resulted in violence and difficulties when governments choose the repressive approach.

There are citizens who deplore strikes of all kinds. They look for facile answers like the compulsory courts recommended in the Resolution. They wrongly regard a management-labor dispute as a kind of civil dispute involving a few individuals. And, further, what they forget is that work withdrawal is an exercise not only of a basic and vital right, but is a safety valve in society. Without it, violence of an outright and manifest nature becomes a justifiable alternative. The right of collective bargaining, including the right to withhold labor, are not simply a necessary evil, Mr. Speaker. They are integral to the preservation of a decent, orderly society. Surely the lessons of history are simply replete and abundant in this regard.

I know that some of my Liberal friends like to cite incidents on the picket line charging everything to strike violence. Undoubtedly, incidents do take place, but on the whole they are relatively few. And they are infinitely preferable to the determined and studied violence which occurs when rights are denied or obstructed. We have only to think of the terrible events of the past 10 years, all over the world, to understand what this means.

What my friends in the Government will not see is that you cannot have real collective bargaining without the right to strike. They will not see that collective bargaining is a fundamental column upholding a true democratic society. What they cannot comprehend is that in destroying true collective bargaining they demolish that pillar and create incomparably greater troubles in the process.

The subjective and sensational publicity, Mr. Speaker, that has been given strikes in Canada rarely treats with what is obvious to anyone even remotely associated with workers or industry — that is, collective bargaining processes are one of our best examples of success in human relations. Because 98 of every 100 union agreements are signed without work stoppage after the normal give-and-take of the bargaining table has been ended.

In our own province, the ratio of work stoppages has been far less than the Canadian average. Department of Labour reports have revealed, year after year, the inherent responsibility shown by Saskatchewan unions in seeking conciliation and mediation. On the average there have been 190 days lost by unemployment annually in Saskatchewan for every one day that has been lost in the last decade or so because of strikes. And yet this Liberal Government wastes its energies and harms the future of Saskatchewan by a continuous attack on organized employees, although even the former Labour Minister has declared Saskatchewan's strike rate loss only one-twelfth of the Canada-wide average.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is clear for any thinking person. What is at stake in a discussion of this kind is the collective bargaining system itself. I want to again emphasize that this operates not only for the benefit of workers directly and indirectly affected, but for the peace and the security and harmony of society. This is what will be destroyed by the processes that are recommended in the Resolution before us. Implementing the Resolution would be equivalent to giving a ten-year-old child a loaded elephant gun to hunt a mouse in a gunpowder factory.

Any discussion of Bill 2 or the Resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, must take into account the fact that they are the core of Government labor policy, on which the dictation of government in wage negotiations both private and public, labor standards, and the industrial relations atmosphere in general depends. The net effect is depressing again, for the Saskatchewan people and the Saskatchewan economy.

Mr. Speaker, what Saskatchewan needs desperately is a restoration of the proper environment for bargaining, accompanied by action in the entire labor spectrum to stimulate harmony and personal employee security. The steady worsening of this climate will continue to hurt the province badly, as its wage

earner sons and daughters seek better things elsewhere. Surely this message is written so large upon the wall that even the most obdurate Liberal should recognize its plain meaning.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several years or more, the Premier and his associates have continually referred to the Swedish Labour Courts. I notice this afternoon that my friend, the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch, has once more mistakenly referred to the Swedish Labour Court as some kind of a compulsory institution. They are very apparently, all of these gentlemen, of the opinion that the Swedish Labour Court is a tribunal for compulsory arbitration. Time and again, we have told them that they are badly in error. Glimmerings of reason may be at last asserting themselves as at least one Minister has somewhat haltingly admitted that the Swedish Labour Court may have nothing to do with deciding settlements in union contract disputes.

The facts are really so well known that I hesitate to take the time of the House to tell the Premier that Sweden, many years ago, adopted a highly centralized form of negotiations between employer and employees, and that government interference in this system is completely absent. The right to strike is universal and forced arbitration simply doesn't exist within the process. The Premier has done this province a disservice in misrepresenting the facts.

A word about Australia, because compulsory arbitration of disputes at certain levels does exist there. I want you to see quite plainly, Mr. Speaker, that it is functioning there very badly. First, let me point out that Australia has a system of basic protection for workmen which has, I think, compensating benefits. Important compensating benefits. Second, Australia has a conciliation and mediation method which is applied very vigorously. These, I think, may offset to some extent the bad effects of compulsion in collective bargaining in that country. Third, the rate of time lost by strikes in Australia, in spite of all these legal restrictions, including forced arbitration, is higher than in Canada.

I have a letter dated the 20th of January 1971, from Dr. P.H. Cook, Secretary of the Australian Department of Labour and National Service. This letter provides a table showing that, among other figures, almost one-half day was lost by strikes for every Australian wage earner in 1969. This rate is certainly higher than the average for most years in Canada where compulsory arbitration is not a practice.

In 1968 and 1969, there were respectively 1,713 and 2,014 strikes occurring in Australia according to Dr. Frances Bairstow, who spent 1970 in Australia examining their industrial relations machinery. In Canada there were, for the same years, 496 and 425 strikes respectively, although Canada's wage earning force is almost twice that of Australia.

Dr. Bairstow has commented, "Industrial relations in Australia are sick." She said this in an article if you wish to check, in the June 20, 1970 issue of the Montreal Star. In the same article she said, speaking about Canada's system of industrial relations:

As fraught with pitfalls and obstacles as is our own system, one cannot help but observe how much healthier it is for the parties to learn to confront, to argue and

to live with one another . . . this is preferable to a system which depends . . . on legal counsel and government decision-making.

I point out that Dr. Bairstow is a very respected and competent official in the field of labor relations and she is not alone in her viewpoint. She is amply upheld by the Hon. Bryce Mackasey who must be credited by any fair person with having capably guided successful settlements in a number of difficult and major industrial disputes in Canada.

An Hon. Member: — A Liberal!

Mr. Davies: — Yes, he is indeed a Liberal! And I do wish, Mr. Speaker, that my friends on the other side of the House would read him a little more, because if they did we should never have the kind of resolution before us that we are debating this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Mackasey has made prominent speeches over the last year on the subject of labor relations and in these speeches he has forthrightly condemned the legalistic and restrictive approach in labor policy. In Montreal, November 25, 1970, he made a speech as reported later in the Toronto Daily Star in the issue of the following day. After he had stated the worker's right to strike, the Hon. Mr. Mackasey was quoted as saying he would quit the Liberal Party if it ever tried to remove the worker's right to strike.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — He went on to say:

Legal restrictions of the strike right will not get to the root causes of labor unrest or keep dissatisfied workers from walking off their jobs.

In the same speech he said:

What the legal minds forget is that industrial relations is just human relations on a bigger scale. You can't legislate peace and harmony.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Mackasey has also from time to time dealt with the Australian system — and he has dealt with it critically. Contrasting other systems, including the Australian method with Canada's, he said:

Our system is basically sound; our problems are not with the system itself, but with the uses and abuses of that system. Our system is still potentially the best suited to Canadian values, tendencies and their way of looking at life.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Liberal Saskatchewan Government should call on Mr. Mackasey for advice and they should heed that which he has already so soundly given. The Federal

Labour Minister is, by the way, quite a firmly convinced free enterpriser. But he time and time again points out what the Liberal Government of this Province refuses to see or to understand. That is, an attack on genuine free enterprise would have been effective by the destruction of real collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, if you compel hundreds of thousands of wage earners to conform to the ukases of an authoritarian tribunal, it is but a question of time before like coercion will similarly compel owners to follow orders on matters, which to this time have been exclusive and jealously guarded management rights. I say, make no mistake, any erosion of workers' rights is erosion of the entire structure of rights. It is peculiar that such a vociferous defender of private enterprise as this Liberal Government pretends to be cannot see the logic of this position.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently urged in this House measures which would go far to update, upgrade and develop our industrial relations system. I have shown that present industrial relations either in Saskatchewan or Canada are far from deplorable. But there is undoubtedly room for improvement. There is also acceptance of the need to improve, among thousands of people who are closely associated with bargaining in Canada, in governments, in industry and among organized workmen themselves.

If this Saskatchewan Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, was truly anxious to reduce conflict and improve relations, the way to a constructive move ahead has already been clearly indicated. Early beneficial results would be comparatively easy to achieve.

First, I should commend the attention of the House again to the Woods' Commission Report. Within this report is not an essentially new approach, but an imaginative reassessment of varied methods, substantial additions to old ones and a vastly increased consultative, information-gathering and research apparatus. This Saskatchewan Liberal Government has totally ignored this report and others like it in its anti-union pursuit and obsession.

Look at our expenditures on labor relations by this Government, Mr. Speaker. They are completely inadequate and completely out of keeping with the increase of three times in the total provincial spending since this Liberal Government came to power. Out of the \$3.4 million that will be spent by the Department of Labour for the coming year, less than \$44,000 goes to Research and Planning. This is the very area which should not be starved for funds in a decisive area of Labour Department function. This is little better than 1 per cent of the Labour Department budget. A like example is found in the amount spent on conciliation and labor relations by the Department of Labour — less than \$97,000 for the entire gamut or under 3 per cent of the whole Labour Department budget.

Mr. Speaker, I say no wonder this Government disables labor relations with its limping sway while neglecting to move objectively and positively in a search for improvement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The Premier, I say again, should hearken to the words

of Federal Labour Minister Mackasey. He was speaking on another occasion to the Faculty of Business Students at the University of Calgary on February 1st of this year. At that time he said this:

Traditionally, North American Labour Departments have been kept short of resources and low on the totem pole. Traditionally, they have restricted most research to standard forms of statistical measurement, looked after their regulations and looked beyond only when forced by unforeseen events, and provided conciliation services to labor and management on a fire-fighting basis only.

I should like to commend again the attitude of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Mackasey) to the Members of this House and in particular to the Liberal Members of this House, Mr. Speaker. I should be glad to make a copy of his speech available for the edification of Government MLAs.

I do not agree at all times with Mr. Mackasey, but I like his general approach. The Minister tells us what he is doing to build, not to destroy, collective bargaining. He tells, for example, about the new preventive mediation approach now being elaborated by the Federal Department of Labour. The Federal Department's upgraded conciliation process, according to Mr. Mackasey, was able to bring about peaceful settlements in 92 per cent of the disputes referred to them, remembering that other disputes of course would have been settled without recourse to the Department. Of disputes referred to the Department, a 92 per cent average of success! How much different, Mr. Speaker, this approach from the one involving our Saskatchewan Liberal Government in 1966, when they imposed Bill 2 on the power workers. It is a matter of admission and record that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation never asked for the conciliation services of the Saskatchewan Department of Labour. Nor did the Government propose the services of an independent mediator. Nothing could be more illustrative of the barren attitude of Saskatchewan Liberals in labor matters . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — . . . barren I say again because of their concentration on making a political issue of labor.

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious that we don't need the all-in sweeping compulsion in labor relations called for in the resolution we now debate. Collective bargaining still works well in the great majority of instances in spite of current government interference and coercion in Saskatchewan which we saw in 1970. What we need is some real attention to the demands and needs of a modern Labour Department. What we need above all is a change of direction by this Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about the concern which has been expressed by farm people over what you might call 'strikes of national character'. I here refer to ones in which farm people are more directly affected. What requires to be done here is for our Labour Department in Saskatchewan to seek co-operation with the Federal Department of Labour in seeking possible remedies to overcome problems by discovering the hang-ups and the problem areas in developing disputes. We also need communication between the union people concerned in this economic section and the Federal-Saskatchewan Labour Departments and

farmers. Anyone who has the slightest acquaintance with the facts knows that grain handlers and dockworkers, for example, have had legitimate grievances. But they have often been met with stonewall opposition when there was little reason for it. I think that Federal Government officials have conceded this on more than one occasion. If we are going to talk about better ways, we had best begin by getting the facts and by getting communication. Only in this manner can understanding and solutions be achieved.

I should like to see these avenues explored, Mr. Speaker. I am sure they would be fruitful. This is one of the ways we should travel if we want to secure real solutions — instead of trying to impose compulsion in collective bargaining and by sniping at workers who take the entire spate of abuse in the Saskatchewan Liberal Government's attack.

I want to say something about one more matter. The position of our agricultural population in Saskatchewan depends and will increasingly depend on the attitude and the posture of Governments at Ottawa. More and more of the MPs in the Federal Government will represent wage and salary earners. Many of them will be unionists. Close to 7 million of our present labor force are wage and salary earners, compared to about 500,000 farmers. We want and we must have close co-operation and good will between farmers and wage earners if we are serious about doing more for our 85,000 Saskatchewan farmers. I say that the road will be harder if farmers are represented as being anti-labor as I am sure that they are not, basically.

There are admittedly problems now with reference to labor-management disputes. The solutions as I have said can be secured, or the present situation can be improved, through determined Federal-Provincial Government assistance, and I also believe with consultation and communication between farm and labor organizations.

For all of the reasons I have tried to bring to your attention today, Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is dangerous in its intent and gravely harmful in its ultimate effects and results. It is contrary to well-tried usages and practices in a democratic society. It springs from ignorance, illogical thought, and narrow political motivations. It can only accomplish infinitely more real damage than doubtful benefits. I commend the House to the alternatives I have suggested. They will be conducive of results because they conform to Canadian ways and forms. The resolution before you does not. I urge you to emphatically reject it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — I notice that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw, Mr. Davies, has taken somewhat of a negative attitude to the recommendation of the Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker). The Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch feels that there is a reason that the Government should get involved in it in trying to resolve in some way or the other some of the disputes that are costly to the individual workers. Mr. Davies also said that there seems to be a perverted method to deal with labor matters. I don't believe that any matter is a perverted approach if it is done with an open mind in trying to

resolve the problem, and this is what this Government has done for a number of years. What concerns me most, Mr. Speaker, is where does the individual member of the labor force stand? What protection has he got? I believe that the Government policy so far in establishing some of the changes they have made in The Trade Union Act and others has been to protect the individual workers, to help the individual employee.

Bill No. 2, when it was introduced some years ago, was introduced to this House because of an emergency. It has been requested by labor and has been requested by the Government; as yet, management has not applied for it. Therefore it is an instrument, a tool that can be of some help to resolve the difference when they are deadlocked, and when the individuals are out of work, unable to go back because of the stubbornness of a few people, a few employers at the bargaining table or a few business agents, while the majority of the work force are walking the picket line.

I shall outline briefly some of the reasons why I am concerned, some of the reasons why I believe there must be some machinery established. What the machinery should be I don't know, but courts of some sort is one way of adjudicating disputes. Now what machinery should be used, I do not know what to tell this House. I think we can find it if we look at it objectively.

Mr. Romanow: — You're concerned . . .

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — My dear friend from Saskatoon, the corporation lawyer, the labor corporation lawyer will have his opportunity to express his views. In the meantime, he should give me the courtesy to say a few words. But what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that when we had a strike last fall under the Acts, under the laws of this Province, some members of the union had requested a vote and the majority of these individuals, union members in individual shops, had voted unanimously to go back to work . . .

An Hon. Member: — What strike?

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — The strike of the electricians and plumbers last summer!

Some shops had voted unanimously to go back to work. After an affirmative vote they did go back to work. Later on they were assessed by the union, \$35.00 a week for all the time they were working. They had abided by the law; the law says if they voted to go back to work it was their prerogative to do so. They acted on their prerogative, still they were penalized by it. This is too bad.

Mr. Romanow: — . . . on the total vote of Saskatchewan!

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — You say total vote! But what chance had the individual, is he going to be pressured in by a small majority within the minority? How? An individual should have his rights protected. And I think a labor tribunal will protect that right. I have here, Mr. Speaker, letters from some individuals who have written me in respect of injustices that have been done to them. I shall assume full responsibility when I read these matters into the House. It has been requested by the

party who brought me these letters not to mention their names. One member of a union, for reasons best known to himself or herself, requested under the terms of The Trade Union Act to withdraw from a union. On the basis of the request for withdrawal, the case ended up in court, ended up in the Labour Relations Board. She was advised in December of last year that the union would be withholding her membership until such time as a fine was paid. I shall read you the letter in question:

Further to our letter sent to you November 1970, the Trial Body met in the union office on Friday, November 13 (and it seems to be a nil day for the poor lady or party) and reviewed the evidence submitted by business agents and by secret ballot found you guilty under subsection (8) of the constitution. The Trial Body's decision is that your union card be taken and withheld until such time as you have paid the Local the sum of \$6,000 that has been incurred by this Local in fighting the action that you initiated. When this money is repaid, you shall be returned to full membership with all the rights that this accords. If you wish to appeal the decision, you may do so under Article 16, subsection (6) of the International Constitution. Your employer has been notified that you are no longer a member of a union in good standing with this union.

Now this means that this party who earns an average of around \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year certainly should have something left to live on. Before she is entitled to work, \$6,000 in fines has to be paid. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, that this Government took upon itself a few years ago that no individual could have his membership card withdrawn or could lose his job . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Are you rising on a point of order?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to table that letter since it does not really give any . . . I don't know what he is talking about. Certainly it is the kind of a letter that he can table and provide the information.

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — The letter in question, as I have indicated to this House, Mr. Speaker — unless the hon. gentleman calls me a liar, which I don't think he will — I assume full responsibility for this letter. I will not reveal the name of the complainant to this House because the galleries are full of people, the press is here, and there are other people here, and I don't want this lady to be subjected to any more intimidation of any sort. I assume full responsibility for what I say. I can tell you though that the letter quoted from was signed by Robert J. Lapoint, president of the Local.

Mr. Smishek: — Can you give us the Local?

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — SEIU 333, 52 York Building, Saskatoon.

I don't want to see this person intimidated anymore. But she has been fined \$6,000. Now if this Government had not changed the law a couple of years ago in The Trade Union Act this lady would have lost her membership and she would be

without a job today. The only thing is at the present she cannot be dismissed as a result of this decision referred to in the letter. So I ask this House, Mr. Speaker, to find ways to protect an individual from coercion of this sort. And in the field of labor-management relations, which is a very, very delicate situation, surely this House, Mr. Speaker, has an open enough mind to try to find ways. What better way is there than the establishing of a tribunal, of a labor court, which would deal with specific matters in respect to labor-management relations, in respect to the breach of contracts in this field of labor-management relations, in respect in respect to a complete breakdown in negotiations. I've sat at bargaining tables in the past, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while labor and management were at the same table, where the employer or the management was absolutely abusive to the labor representative. I have sat at the table where labor representatives turned their backs completely on the employers when they were trying to resolve their differences. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they can't sit at the same table and talk to each other, surely it is our duty as legislators to find machinery, means or methods, to resolve these differences.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say on this. I should like to be able to review for this House the Swedish experiments of labor courts, the Australian experiments in respect of labor courts. Surely if we take the experience of what has happened in Sweden, experience of what has happened in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and USA, we can come up with a good mechanism that will resolve these differences. With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, before the Minister takes his seat I wonder whether he would permit a question. He made reference to this particular union. I wonder if he could tell us approximately when that letter was written. Is it a current one or was it several years ago? Was there any action, in fact, taken by the union in respect of this employee?

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — In answer to the question, I felt obligated in conscience not to let the name of the party out. I have given the name of the union. I have given the name of the place. If I give the date, all they have to do is go back to their files and find out who it is. It is a Service Employees' International Union, affiliated with AFL-CIO and CLC. The dateline is 52 York Building, Saskatoon, dated November 16, 1970, and the person who signed the letter was Robert J. Lapoint, President of Local 333, SEIU, so I might as well tell you the name of the party in question. It is a lady who is working at St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon, Miss Lillian Lacmanack, 321 Avenue I, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. You've got her name, but so help me, I say to this House, if there is any intimidation to this party, I'll not leave one stone unturned until I get the parties who intimidated her.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Would the Minister permit a question before he takes his seat?

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — No!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Minister has disclosed

most of the information in the letter; would you table the letter now?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. The debate is adjourned.

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — I said no. I want to keep it in my possession.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Resolution No. 2 — The War Measures Act

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):

That this Assembly commends the Government of Canada for its prompt action in controlling terrorism in Quebec by the use of regulations under the War Measures Act and by subsequent passage of The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, 1970.

Mr. F.K. Radloff: (Nipawin) — Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make on the Resolution moved by the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall).

All people of Saskatchewan should commend the Federal Government for their prompt action in placing The War Measures Act into effect after FLQ terrorists kidnapped Quebec's Minister of Labour, the Hon. Pierre Laporte, and the British Trade Commissioner, James Cross.

The Member for Biggar, former Premier and former Leader of the New Democratic Party, states that he abhors the action taken by the Ottawa Government. From the Member for Biggar's (Mr. Lloyd) remarks in the Legislature on March 13, his sympathy is clearly stated. The Member for Biggar supports action of dissident radical minority groups. Of course he regretted that they had to resort to kidnapping and murder and bombings. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the remarks of the Member for Biggar, Mr. Douglas, and other NDP spokesmen, that if these subversive minded FLQ people had achieved their goals, the end would have justified the means. Let us not kid ourselves; if the police had not corralled the FLQ sympathizers, there is considerable doubt if the murderers would have been brought to justice. The national Leader of the NDP and other NDP leaders, and leaders of dissident groups, can talk about the loss of freedom and loss of rights, but again, I remind these people that all other Canadian people have rights and privileges that cannot be put in jeopardy for the benefit of a selfish few. The Member for Biggar states that the Resolution asks us to welcome handcuffs in order to prevent our hands from shaking.

The Member from Biggar also went on to say, "To endorse this sort of a resolution encourages people to ride roughshod over the rights of innocent people," and that "supporting the Resolution would discourage people from using creative arts to point out faults that flourish in society." I think it is ridiculous and absurd that people can speak in this regard. How can one condone murder, kidnapping, bombings, threats of violence, terrorism, mutilation as works of art?

Mr. Speaker, our consideration of this kind of creative art by irresponsible, unbalanced, degenerate minds is leading to chaos, disorder and confusion. Despite every precaution and vigilance, guns, ammunition and explosives are being stolen and stockpiled for future actions by those people advocating revolution by violence, fanatical people of no principle or no responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, dissatisfied minority groups have all the opportunity required to have their problems considered in a democratic society. We are governed by a democratic government. It is a government responsible to all people. The Canadian Parliamentary System is as good or better than any other system used throughout the world. Minority views often times receive more consideration than those of the majority. Certainly we do not need a cultural revolution as forced upon the people of China by the Red Guards of Mao Tse Tung. Canadian people can be proud of the action taken by the Government at Ottawa under the leadership of the Prime Minister. All Members of the Saskatchewan Legislature should fully support the Resolution before the Assembly. Actions taken today can prevent the catastrophes of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.G. Leith: (Elrose) — Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this debate when the Resolution was proposed, I intended not to speak to it but only to vote affirmatively. But after the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) spoke to the Resolution, I felt that some comment ought to be made about his remarks in this debate.

The events of that week that brought this matter to our attention and of the period that followed, that is, until the ransom and the rescue of Mr. Cross, are already part of Canada's history. But I wonder if a completely objective view of those events is even yet possible. Perhaps, as the Hon. Member for Biggar has suggested, the affair in a generation or so may be seen in an absolutely different light. Certainly in the detachment of 100 years' time, it's very hard to feel the grief and the disgust and the fury that was the general sentiment on the assassination and the cold-blooded murder of Thomas D'Arcy McGee. We have to remind ourselves that his too was a political murder.

Before I continue, Mr. Speaker, I want to make reference to a certain newspaper article. This article was carried in the Leader-Post of Saturday, March 13 under the heading, "Resolution praising Government opposed by Lloyd." Mr. Speaker, the article is quite long and contains the reporter's impressions of the ideas expressed by the Members from Estevan, Biggar, Nutana South and Gravelbourg. But this article carries another idea, Mr. Speaker, to which I wish to draw your attention. The fourth paragraph begins with this sentence:

Mr. Lloyd, former Premier and Opposition Leader, said he regretted the conditions under which he was giving his last address of any length.

The fifth paragraph:

Industry Minister Estey and George Leith (Elrose) were

the only Government Members left when Mr. Lloyd finished his speech.

The sixth paragraph:

When Public Works Minister Coderre said he was sorry Mr. Lloyd was leaving the Legislature advocating violence, Mr. Estey and Mr. Leith left the Chamber.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't presume to speak on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Industry (Mr. Estey), but I don't want any further misunderstanding arising from the report of my actions on that occasion. The article seems to imply that two members on this side of the House supported the speech and the ideas of the Hon. Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd). Again, I am not able to speak for the Hon. Minister of Industry, but let me say that I applauded the speech because it is probably the last serious speech that he will make in this House. This Hon. Member has sat here since 1944, as Minister of Education, as Premier, and as Leader of the Opposition.

His speech represents his point of view, and I think it represents the point of view of many other Members of his party and it represents the attitude of many other Members of his party to the difficulties and divisions in this country today. We agree in many ways with his analysis of the causes of violence. We agree that the social problems in our society do contribute to the possibility of violence. We agree that it must be our constant care to eradicate those conditions of our society which create resentment and hatred and the despair of reform that characterizes this kind of violence.

But having said all this, some other things ought also to be expressed. It is very easy for the Hon. Member to say now that only a handful of people were involved in that unfortunate expression of opinion in Quebec. He seems to skip, very lightly, over the history of the past few years. He didn't mention the long series of bombings in Montreal. He doesn't mention the explosive violence of the Montreal taxi drivers' confrontation. He didn't mention the repeated publicity of the Quebec radicals training in Algeria for revolutionary warfare. He doesn't mention the epidemic of armed robberies particularly against money institutions in the Province of Quebec.

I wonder why he chooses to pass so lightly over these occurrences, even though they seem so obviously connected with this dark central theme of political kidnapping and political murder. The Member for Biggar has mentioned the example of Mr. Woodsworth in the Federal House. Of course we all have to admire in retrospect the stand that Mr. Woodsworth took in our parliament on the question of our entry into World War II. I think we know that his decision came out of a deeply pacifist and gentle nature. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he could have voted that day in that particular way if he had known then of the systematic horror of the German concentration and death camps, which was only completely revealed at the end of that war.

Nobody who has ever read anything about Mr. Woodsworth could ever be convinced that he was not in deadly earnest and that he was not acting in conscience. But at that particular time it was the duty of our nation to bring force, and as much force as was necessary, to halt the spread of evil and darkness over the whole world.

The Members on your left, Mr. Speaker, who may wish to vote against this Resolution should remember this: the freedoms and civil rights which we now enjoy are possible only because through the centuries we have accepted a system of law and a general code of behavior. The relative success of that code is certainly due to our gradual delegation of some of our personal freedoms to higher authority. We have exchanged our right to club our neighbor over the head and to steal his wife and his cow. We have exchanged this kind of freedom for the expectation of and the right to protection from the same indignities being enforced on ourselves and our own persons and properties.

In almost every area of activity, Mr. Speaker, we have chosen more and more to exchange the absolute liberties that we once had as cave men for customs and usages and laws. In this country we don't drive down the left side of the street. In Moose Jaw, I understand that you can't even walk down the left side of the street. Some of the laws are absolutely necessary for the conduct of civilized social intercourse; others are merely ridiculous.

The rules which make possible the economic life of the world are indispensable. But how much more important and basic are the rules by which we seek to impose upon ourselves the order and harmony which is becoming more and more necessary for our continued existence in this crowded globe.

These rules, these self-imposed restrictions and restraints, make up the fabric of our national life. One hundred years ago, our forefathers decided that these lands would become a federal nation and they decided to adopt the British Parliamentary system. I believe that this system has served our country well. It has allowed for change, both in the type of government itself, and in the social and economic life of our country. But obviously, the changes that have been wrought over the years are not satisfactory to certain elements in our society. These persons and these groups see our system and our society as corrupt, hypocritical and impermeable to the forces of real change. Other groups, particularly in Quebec, have despaired of the present Federal system and they want to take that province out of Confederation.

The groups that want to change the political system, or want separatism, are not criminals, Mr. Speaker. They have the freedom to work for both these ideas. They do not have the freedom, however, to advocate the overthrow of the government by force. They do not have, and they must not have, the freedom to kidnap and to murder and to bomb to further their political ambitions. By adopting and advocating the tactics of violence they seriously jeopardize not only their own civil liberties but the rights and freedoms of anybody else.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that after the invocation of the War Measures Act, every Canadian was subject to its strictures, but millions of Canadians were willing to give up, temporarily, some of their civil liberties because they recognized the threat to the laws upon which our society is based.

Mr. Speaker, there is every kind of violence in our society. Murder and kidnapping are not unknown in our nation. But, Mr. Speaker, these kidnappings and the subsequent murder strike at the very roots of our organized existence. These crimes were not committed in the heat of passion, nor were they committed for money. They were cold-blooded acts of calculated aggression

against our institutions. They were perpetrated by people who would not wait for changes and who do not accept the principle of peaceful change. They were perpetrated by people who despise our institutions and despise the authority which we have vested in those institutions.

Mr. Speaker, our laws and our customs must be able to be changed to meet changing conditions. The tender young shoot of individual liberty that the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) spoke about can only flourish and grow in the protection of these institutions.

The Premier of Quebec, in my mind, was quite right to seek the added powers that he considered were needed to protect the provincial and national government against the actual and threatened violent aggression. The Prime Minister of Canada was absolutely correct to act on that request and to act decisively. All through the ages of our political evolution, there have been challenges and threats and attempts to overthrow and undermine our hard worn freedoms. Society does have the right and does have the obligation to protect itself against violent revolutionary change.

All of us in this Chamber are dedicated to improving and enlarging the personal freedoms of the people whom we represent, but each of us ought to be equally vigilant to protect the foundations on which these freedoms are laid.

Mr. Speaker, I hold it as a cardinal principle that an attack upon the rule of law in Montreal is an attack on that rule of law as it applies to me. The Hon. Member for Biggar has been around a long time. I think he knows, and I think he should admit, that the march toward absolute individual freedom and absolute civil liberty has not been a series of unbroken triumphs. There have been serious setbacks and these kidnappings and the murders are actions which cannot fail to trigger some extremist reaction.

Perhaps this is what the cells of the FLQ really want. Perhaps they wanted the reaction to the kidnapping to become so repressive and so severe that further violence would ensue.

The classic pattern would have been to incite further violence and to invite further repression until our life would be intolerable and we should be ready to welcome a Maoist kind of dictatorship. I believe that was what they wanted and I believe that this chain reaction was short-circuited by the steadfastness and decisive action of the Governments of Quebec and Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — I personally regret, and I am sure that every Member regrets the temporary loss of civil liberties. But if anyone ever again makes another threat of insurrection, real or apprehended, against our rule of law, then please God let there be a Pierre Trudeau or somebody like him at the head of our national government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — The Member for Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) has

mentioned the CBC interview with Bernadette Devlin. I too was dismayed when I heard the young Irish radical say that she could not condone the slaying of Pierre Laporte, but that neither would she condemn the murderers. I understood her to say that the kidnapping and execution was a mistake, but that it was a mistake mainly because neither of these actions advanced the cause of liberation and socialism in the world. Her reaction to the question about Laporte's death is a chilling reminder of what Socialism means to many radical elements in various parts of the world. It seems to mean to that group that almost any crime against persons or property is permitted so long as those actions do not hinder the march toward a Socialist world. It seems to mean that riots and arson and murder have been accepted by some of these radical elements as political tools.

Mr. Speaker, nobody would suggest that our society is perfect and that no changes are necessary. But I think we all, including the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd), ought to acknowledge that the result of violent overthrow of our present government would be either anarchy or stern dictatorship. I don't want either of these alternatives.

The War Measures Act has been withdrawn and replaced with milder legislation which will be adequate for the foreseeable future. We continue to be a nation, and we continue to enjoy what I think is the highest degree of civil liberty in the world. Because the actions of the Government were designed to protect the nation and to protect our liberties, and because they were undertaken only to meet the threat of insurrection, I strongly support the motion and urge all Members of the House to do the same.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.H. MacDougall: (Souris-Estevan) — Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate I was a little amazed when the Member for Biggar rose to speak and said that he would oppose the War Measures Act Resolution. I said to myself, "Well what else is new?" I really didn't expect anything different.

He quoted from the Saturday Night Magazine, an article by Robert Fulford against the War Measures Act. He also quoted other passages from the Toronto Star. For every commentary that came out in favor of the T.C. Douglas stand, I am sure that you will find 10,000 others which supported the Federal Liberal Government's position.

Did the Member for Biggar, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, see anyone arrested in Western Canada, Ontario, the Maritimes, the Northwest Territories? I should say, no. This was just another red herring designed to disguise the true feelings of the NDP. I expect that all the NDP are in favor of the position taken by the former leader of the Opposition and I should expect them to come out and want to let these terrorists to go free. I want the NDP to show their true colors in this vote. And if they are free to vote over there as I think they should be, I should like to see some of them stand up and support the stand that the Federal Government took.

I would like to quote one short article from a recent Saturday Night, February 1971, and it was written as a letter to the editor by a Richard Gregoire from Montreal. I am just

going to quote about three short sentences:

. . . as I find indeed very difficult to believe that anyone living outside the Province of Quebec and also the great majority of Quebecers lost any rights or liberties whatsoever. I certainly do not deny the fact that the War Measures Act give unquestionable power to the civil authorities because it does. But the Government did not use all the power which the Act gave them. They used only those powers which they deemed necessary in order to cope with a specific crisis with expediency.

Mr. Fulford seems to forget, or maybe he does not want to mention, that I as well as most Quebecers had my rights denied, my rights to peace and security. It was these rights that the Federal Government was trying to protect when they passed the Act.

I won't read the rest of the article, Mr. Speaker, but I refer it to any Hon. Members who wish to read it to finish that story because I think it is well worth reading.

With these few remarks I would close debate.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 27

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

NAYS — 22

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

Resolution No. 1 — Early & Effective Action To Fight Unemployment

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan early and effective action to fight unemployment, provide jobs and stem an alarming migration of workers and their families from

Saskatchewan to other Provinces, as well as accompanying heavy losses to the Province's economy, on lines that would include:

- (1) Publicly financed or assisted public housing, and public assistance for the construction of schools, hospitals, public parks, recreational programs and similar projects;
- (2) Improvement of labor standards protection, including the minimum wage, to assist the buying power of thousands of people on low incomes;
- (3) The institution of special methods to aid industrial development and expand technical and vocational training and upgrading.

Mr. E. Whelan: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has told the people of this country that by planning unemployment he would cure inflation. What a terrible price to pay. There will be serious mental breakdowns; the young people will turn to pilfering and shoplifting because they have no money; malnutrition because low standard diets will exist; the feeling of complete despair that overcomes and dominates the home of a family where the breadwinner is unemployed. All of these are the part of the price we pay for the Prime Minister's planned unemployment. To those who live in the lap of luxury whose parents are millionaires, it is easy to say, and it is not hard to make the decision to plan unemployment. But it is young people — they are the particular group that are mostly unemployed — who are being sacrificed and whose contribution to our society is being made nonessential. Mr. Speaker, to their desire to build our country we are saying, "Sorry, not needed." They travel the highways, scrounging food. The young people, the future leaders of our country, are embittered by our society that deliberately plans their idleness. They say to us, "You have no plans." I say, the government has no desire.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Let me give you one instance. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office has a claim centre that will be rebuilt. This is their only contribution, their only initiative in this area, their only plan for employment and construction. What are the needs, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, they should plan one building as a safety centre, because there is a need to save the lives of people, to rehabilitate those who are injured in automobile accidents and to provide employment. Let's look at the facts: Saskatchewan Government Insurance has millions of dollars invested in a building to serve the public in the interest of safety. Why should it be done? First, the present Government Insurance Building has been outgrown by the operations, both at the downtown office and the building on Broad Street. People come to see Government Insurance personnel by automobile. Mr. Speaker, there is no place to park in the downtown area. The safety centre could house the following groups: (1) the claims centre; (2) a research bureau that would determine the cause of accidents, which was recommended by the Highway Traffic and Safety Committee years ago; (3) it could house the entire Government insurance personnel; (4) it could house the Highway Traffic Board; (5) the

Treasury branch that issues operators' and owners' licenses; (6) the Saskatchewan Safety Council; (7) the traffic courts, to alleviate the shortage of space for this type of activity in the city of Regina; (8) rehabilitation personnel who would work on the rehabilitation of people involved in automobile accidents; (9) a Vehicles Inspection Branch, which was recommended by the Highway Traffic and Safety Committee years ago; (10) a Driver Training and Inspection Branch; (11) a Highway Traffic Court Clinic; (12) a Highway Designs Branch.

Mr. Speaker, under one roof, all of these offices dealing with the motor vehicles in Saskatchewan could be co-ordinated in one building, easily accessible to anyone arriving from out of town. Is it economical? At the present time we have a large sum of money invested in low-interest bonds while we are renting office space for many of our departments. Other departments that are renting space could move into areas presently occupied by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance, the Highway Traffic Board, the Treasury and so forth. If those who rent us space get 10 to 12 per cent return on their money, then it is natural to assume that we should make a better return on our own government office buildings than if we leave the money lying idle in bonds. Mr. Speaker, the long-range objectives of this proposal would be: (1) to alleviate accidents and reduce deaths; (2) to rehabilitate those hurt in accidents; (3) to provide a safety service to the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the immediate advantage of this proposal would be to provide employment in the construction of the safety centre; and secondly, to provide facilities that are convenient and practical for the general public.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no planning by the Government, no initiative, no imagination to alleviate unemployment. For Crown corporations we have discovered there are no committee study plans for unemployment. Therefore, we view with alarm their predictions that they will alleviate unemployment by providing jobs in the Civil Service and in Crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, leadership is needed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — They keep saying, "Give us your plans." Government Insurance facilities are not good enough. The Highway Traffic and Safety Committee has made recommendations regarding research, vehicle inspection, highway design, driver examination, driver training, traffic court clinics, and little or no action has been taken. Mr. Speaker, this Government's attempt to fight unemployment has been feeble, pathetic and ineffective and the public is out of patience with it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on the motion of Hon. J.C. McIsaac, Minister of Education.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.