

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Fifth Session - Sixteenth Legislature  
36th Day

Monday, April 5, 1971

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

**STATEMENT**

**SETTLEMENT OF RAIL TIE-UP**

**HON. D.G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'm sure all Members of the House join with me and with the Government in expressing a great deal of satisfaction with the rail dispute, the unfortunate rail dispute that has already cost the farmers of this province probably \$2 million or \$3 million, has been settled.

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

**MR. STEUART:** — I have today sent a telegram to the Hon. Bryce Mackasey, the Minister of Labour in the Federal Government, congratulating him on a successful intervention to bring the two parties together and to head off this unfortunate strike. I also think that the actions of the Saskatchewan Legislature probably played some role in bringing the two parties together and helping to avert a worse situation than has already developed. I don't think the Members opposite need to get too excited - somebody over there shouted 'this proves something that maybe the lack of compulsory arbitration or the present method works' - I think it just points out once again that if it hadn't been for the work of the Hon. Bryce Mackasey and the fact that he has certainly indicated, probably better than any Labour Minister in our history, the ability to solve these strikes at the last minute through personal intervention, we should have had a serious strike. But what happens if you don't happen to have a Bryce Mackasey in Ottawa? I think it really points up the need for some better mechanism than now exists to protect the interest of the public and the farmers of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, we join with the Government in expressing our satisfaction at the fact that the rail dispute has been settled and in our commendation of the Hon. Bryce Mackasey. Members may be interested in a text of the wire which we sent this morning which reads as follows:

The Saskatchewan New Democratic Party wishes to commend all persons involved in collective bargaining and mediation leading to amicable settlement of rail dispute announced this morning. Settlement will remove concern widely felt in the province about possible consequences of rail tie-up. People of Saskatchewan are grateful to all who negotiated in good faith and reached the agreement announced.

**April 5, 1971**

This was sent to the chief negotiators of the Canadian National Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and to Mr. Mackasey and also to Mr. John Skoberg who played an active part in the portion of the negotiations.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I believe that notwithstanding the comments of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) the triumph in this sense was a victory for the processes of collective bargaining and mediation . . .

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — . . . Yes, this was certainly a victory also for the Hon. Bryce Mackasey and for his approach to labor relations and I hope that his approach to labor relations will be commended by all Members of the House, not only this morning but this afternoon and tomorrow and whenever we again consider matters related to labor relations.

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

**HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House that I was in contact with the Wheat Board this morning and also we are all quite happy that the strike has been settled. I want to indicate to the people of Saskatchewan the serious situation that is still facing the farmers of this province when they realize that there are 12,000 boxcars between here and the West Coast to be unloaded. This grain has to be cleaned and then prepared for shipment. At the moment there are 15 ships at the West Coast waiting for loading and nine more coming in this week. I think the most serious aspect of this strike beyond the fact that it has affected the whole economy of the province, is that once again it has affected the confidence of the buyers of Canadian grain throughout the world. I hope that no more of these strikes ever happen. If they do we may be in difficulty with contracts with Japan in the future and we could also be in difficulty with contracts with China.

**MR. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North):** — May I just have one word to say in this connection in reply to something that the Minister of Agriculture has said. It seems to me like a pretty sorry spectacle of the Minister of Agriculture still trying to salvage something out of a work stoppage which never took place. The Minister of Agriculture is attempting to present an opinion to this House that indicates a serious grain backup on the Prairies. This grain has been backed up there for a matter of six weeks to two months because there was no destination for it and there were no facilities to handle it. I get a little bit tired of this kind of sanctimonious twaddle. You make me sick!

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

## POTASH HAUL ON NO. 9 HIGHWAY

**HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, I have an important announcement to make regarding the potash haul on No. 9 Highway. A few days ago International Minerals and Chemicals and Mr. Kleyson, the trucker, came to see the Department of Highways, whether we would take off part or a portion of the ban on No. 9 Highway for the potash haul. The slowdown had then already occurred and they have considerable potash sold which has to be delivered to Northgate and also by rail. In order to comply with the request we have made an agreement with IMC that in order to supply the spring market, and partly because of the impending rail strike at that time, IMC will continue the hauling of potash by truck from Esterhazy to the United States Border at Northgate during the spring restriction period. It is recognized that the road will be extensively damaged and that major costs will be involved in repairs. These are the areas that are yet not paved. In consideration of permission to run trucks through this period of weakness with gross weights up to 350 pounds per inch width of tire, IMC undertakes to bear all the road maintenance costs during the normal spring restriction period. This period is defined as extending from April 5, 1971 to the date upon which restrictions are removed from No. 16 Highway between Wawota and Kipling. The road maintenance cost referred to includes the cost of all labor, equipment and materials whether mobilized by IMC or the Department of Highways. The Department of Highways cost will be computed on the basis on the Department's current force, account rental schedule and direct labor cost plus fringe benefits. Materials will be counted at on site costs. By mutual agreement materials may be replaced rather than purchased. It is recognized that this is a public highway and the objective is to maintain it in a condition suitable for normal public highway traffic. At IMC's option the truck operation may be terminated prior to the end of the spring restriction period. It will be the obligation of IMC to continue to finance maintenance and repair of damaged areas until they are restored. It is anticipated that there will be some massive road-bed failures and associated major repair areas. IMC's cost responsibility will include restitution and reshaping work on these areas so that normal paving can proceed. Restitution is apt to involve deep excavation, drying, backfilling and compacting. Some major restitutional work will be limited to an aggregate length of 15 miles. The restriction to 350 pounds per square inch will also be lifted to all other truckers using No. 9 Highway.

Again, I want to say that all the damage that will be done by the trucking will be the sole responsibility of IMC and the restitution as well. I want to emphasize this so that nobody will say that it will cost the people of Saskatchewan some money to keep IMC operating. There is no doubt that the reason or part of this reason is because of the slowdown of the rail strike, not only to the potash industry but to the farmers as well.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. D.G. MacLennan (Minister of Labour) that

**April 5, 1971**

Bill No. 57 - An Act to amend The Essential Services Emergency Act, 1966 be now read a second time.

**MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, in again debating this Bill, I think some comment should be made in relation to the settlement of the rail dispute which was briefly commented on this morning. I think that any fair observer would say that the manner in which the settlement has been accomplished, reveals the superiority of reason, the superiority of mediation techniques, conciliation including the gamut of good labor relations in a better labor department than the compulsion that is revealed in this Bill.

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

**MR. DAVIES:** — If anything, what has occurred as a result of the efforts of the Federal Department of Labour has shown that these techniques should have been applied much earlier. Because when one thinks of the almost 18 months of frustration and delay that took place in these rail negotiations, it is not difficult to understand the feelings of the rail workers concerned. I want to point out to this House again because there has been a good deal said by Government Members in this regard, that we are talking about the members of a union that was formed in 1886; it had its first appearance in this country before 1890; this union's long history has never listed a work stoppage in this country. I think it is extremely important in a discussion of this Bill to see that there is a superiority in the collective bargaining process in all of its manifestations. That is what we are talking about here today. Because the Bill that we consider negates and abrogates the principle of collective bargaining. The techniques of the Federal Department of Labour and Mr. Mackasey are the techniques of collective bargaining, that is, collective bargaining in the stages where further discussions between parties are assisted, not hampered by the Government of the day.

I point out that with all due respect to the Hon. Mr. Mackasey, whose record I have previously commended, along with his Department, the settlement of disputes does not depend upon one man, it depends upon the institutions that one builds up within a proper department of labour. These are precisely, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of techniques that are withering and languishing in the Department of Labour today as a result of the sins of an omission and commission of this Liberal Government. As we have pointed out from this side of the House, in the years that have intervened since this Government came to power, instead of there having been a strengthening of the Department of Labour, a strengthening of those very processes that has brought about a settlement of a rail dispute, we have seen a denigrating and a decrying of these processes. We have seen a total Government reliance on the process of compulsion, and that is - and let us make no mistake about it - what this Bill before us deals with today. There is all the more reason because of the success of a Federal Labour Department techniques, to doubt and to regret the contents of the Bill we are debating this morning.

To be clear, we are talking about two disparate points of view in the discussion of this Bill in relation to the dispute which has just been settled. We are talking about a point of view that believes that a better way to solve labor disputes

is to be found in a refining of the methods of collective bargaining as we know them. Another point of view, the point of view of this Government, believes that the way you settle labor disputes is by the ham-fisted method and by the bludgeon. There is no question in my mind but that this will never work and can never work. In the first place it means the end of collective bargaining. But second, perhaps, and most important, it means the end of an important democratic process that the working people of industry will never tolerate anymore than people have tolerated injustice and compulsion at any time in history. The net results of the approach advocated in this Bill is unrest and violence and trouble. Pursuance of the Mackasey method, if I can call it a Mackasey method, because indeed it is a method advocated, not only by him but many others in labor relations in this country, is the forwarding of collective bargaining, the strengthening of labor peace. But certainly not the elimination of labor disputes, but the elimination of all but a very small percentage of labor disputes. The lesson of this last week, Mr. Speaker, is that we must reject the principles that are contained in Bill 57 . . .

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

**MR. DAVIES:** — . . . and to re-create the excellent media that we now have for the settlement of disputes by strengthening them, not weakening them. I must say again because this point seems to arise so often in our debates, that there is not one country in the democratic world that relies on compulsory arbitration as a medium for the settlement of labor disputes. My friends may say again, "Australia," if they want. But if one looks at the record of Australia, looks at the number of disputes, well over twice the number of disputes in the last several years compared to those of Canada, you will understand what I mean.

Again at the risk of repeating myself, but it bears repeating to people who will not listen, that the methods we shall have to follow to find a better way as the cliché puts it, is to find that path on the basis of what has been urged by the most solid labor relations investigations in North America. I commend again the thoughts and the attention of this House to the kinds of solutions that are advocated in the Woods' Commission Report. I suggest that when the Federal Government of this country looks to legislation, that the Members of the House of Commons will give a high priority on a discussion of the methods that were advocated by the Woods' Commission and which I should imagine should inspire the kind of new and improved labor relations in structure contained in legislation.

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke last Friday night in this debate I spent some time analyzing the motives of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party in bringing this legislation before us. I also spoke at that time about the needs of a modern labor department in government and I gave examples of the abysmal failure of Saskatchewan Liberals to provide either a good climate for labor relations or a favorable environment for wage earners. I also had something to say at that time respecting certain unfair principles that are contained in this Bill.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier has been talking a lot about completely impartial labor courts that he says would dispense forced arbitration. He has laid great stress on this in practically every speech that he has made in this province

**April 5, 1971**

during the past year. Perhaps lately it is because there is so much criticism about the way this Government controls the setting up of such boards under Bill 2.

Mr. Speaker, you have to ask yourself if Liberals are at all sincere about trying to provide impartial tribunals, why have they not taken that opportunity to rectify the deficiency of Bill 2 in the present legislation? Why doesn't Bill 57 say something about this aspect? Mr. Speaker, I say that the fact that the Bill hasn't commented on this reveals what I suggested last Friday. Liberals want to control wages by controlling the nomination of a board or essentially so because the naming of the chairman of the board under this legislation puts the decision on these matters in the hands of the chairman. No, Mr. Speaker, we've had a great deal of talk from the Premier and others of his rank about impartial tribunals and the fact that they have not provided for these in Bill 57 is just some additional evidence in condemnation of this bad and evil law.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, and certain other of his MLAs have said that collective bargaining in Canada is a sick institution. Yet as I have pointed out - and the former Minister of Labour adds his comment and says, 'Yes, it is' - he has not taken the advice of the Woods' Commission. He hasn't taken the advice of his own Labour Commissions of 1966 and 1969 that would have sought to improve the processes of our labor laws. In fact, the Premier and this Liberal Government, have proceeded entirely against the sense and the feeling of those reports.

Mr. Speaker, presuming that collective bargaining is ailing, is this any excuse for outrageous courses that will do away with the patient himself? Because this is what the contents of this iniquitous Bill that we face today means.

Mr. Speaker, surely any intelligent course dictates that in labor relations we should not throw out the baby with the bath water. We should be bolstering, we should be assisting collective bargaining. We should be helping it to overcome any weaknesses, not by killing it through the lethal doses that are contained in this legislation. You don't help a sick patient by prescribing a capsule of cyanide.

Mr. Speaker, let me also make this plain. This Bill is a gross violation of a solemn promise by this Government, that is, that its unprecedented savage provisions for forced arbitration would be used only where disputes threaten public services in emergency situations. This was the pledge that was given in profusion in 1966 and has been ruthlessly violated ever since. You can read the records of the debates on Bill 2 in 1966. Time, and time again, the Premier and his Ministers upheld the principle of their proposed law on the basis that it had been introduced only because of an alleged dire necessity and that it would only be used in cases of dire necessity.

The introduction of this Bill is a conclusive proof that the promises of the Liberal Party cannot be trusted. This Bill is a complete set of evidence of a monstrous perfidy and a breach of trust. This Bill is the final example of Liberal psychotic treatment and regard of all labor issues and of all labor organizations and all members of those organizations.

Mr. Speaker, on what crisis does this legislation depend, on what alleged crisis? Mr. Speaker, it must be apparent to any fair person that there is not, nor has there been, any real

crisis that justifies this shameful Bill. The Premier, in his public utterances, blames last year's construction strike. He also blames the hospital workers for this legislation. Well, last year he widened the net to include construction workers. No amendments are now necessary to cover them. But let's not forget that these disputes took place. The construction workers' dispute would have been settled but for the interference of this Government. Even more glaringly evident is why hospital workers had to strike in the first place. Why? Because the Government refused to lift workers' wages out of the miserable poverty level that they are still in, refused to restore wage parity with other provinces, refused, above all, to honor the most modest recommendations of a conciliation board that was set up by its own Liberal Department of Labour, chaired by a member of its own Liberal Party. The Premier and his colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are directly responsible for hospital workers having instituted a work stoppage in the face of total frustration. What irony and what discrimination. Less than six weeks after the hospital workers had been forced back on the job, had been compelled to accept settlements of less than \$170 a year increase in pay, the Government acted to award the Province's doctors an average of \$3,000 a year increase in pay. No forced arbitration there, Mr. Speaker, no tribunals, no threats, no declamations against these professionals! no, no, not at all. Negotiations and settlement.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the doctors might have deserved a handsome settlement but why the double standard. Why the compulsion for one class of people and negotiations for another?

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

**MR. DAVIES:** — And why indeed, Mr. Speaker, are we confronted with a despicable piece of legislation today which puts workers in a straitjacket while it deals differently with professional types? And why indeed try to justify the idea of this Bill by talking about the control of inflation? Does this Government want to control inflation at the expense of workers whose wages are at or near the poverty level? Because this is exactly what this Government has done. That is a trenchant reason why it should no longer be trusted with the reins of government let alone with the handling of labor relations.

In this whole period, Mr. Speaker, we have heard this Government and we have heard its leaders, call down every article of abuse on wage-earners that they can lay tongue to. But, as well, in the same period we have seen next to no action to help consumers by implementing the proposals of the Batten Commission report.

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

**MR. DAVIES:** — Not one step has been taken by this Government to check the high prices of retail goods. Remember all the sections in the Batten Commission report which told about the practices that made families in Saskatchewan pay an average of \$60 a year more than families in other parts of the country. This, in a province where we pride ourselves as being mainly producers of food.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, continually rails against

**April 5, 1971**

labor. In the meantime it has done nothing whatsoever to effect provisions in the Barber Commission on farm implement prices. Action in this direction might have helped the farmers, whereas all of this sham fight that we have seen against inflation by slandering the workers of the province, achieves nothing, just a complete zero.

Mr. Speaker, the record shows beyond a shadow of doubt that the unions of this province have not asked, and have not secured, exorbitant increases in earnings or conditions through collective bargaining. The record shows, to the contrary, that wage earners in this province have fallen badly behind their fellow workers in other provinces. They don't need this despicable compulsory enforced procedure to lower their wages further. What they need is a fair progression of collective bargaining to correct the inequities that have already arisen as a result of the one-sided treatment in labor relations by this Government.

If anything is needed at this time, it is not weaker, but stronger union bargaining power in this whole background. But as I have said, Liberal interference and Liberal coercion in collective bargaining in Saskatchewan has brought lower earnings and poorer conditions.

**HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works):** — Bosh!

**MR. DAVIES:** — Well, I know that the former Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is an expert on that subject, but I want to tell him that any figures that he might take the trouble to find in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics will show him that what has happened during the past six years is that the disparity between the earnings of Saskatchewan workers and those of our neighboring provinces, let alone the Canadian average, has widened considerably. That is a matter of record and I challenge him to contradict it.

By this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we shall be permitting this Government to further thrust down the total wage package in this province and increase the discrepancy with the earnings of workers of other provinces, including those of our neighbors, Manitoba and Alberta. You know, the Premier and his followers are falsely representing this Bill as one which will in some way, help farmers. Mr. Speaker, lower purchasing power of approximately \$1 billion in the aggregate, which has been lost by the deplorable actions of this Government, in its labor policies have contributed to the poor incomes of farmers in this province. Because workers here and elsewhere, now buy less beef, less pork, less farm products because of policies that have been engineered both by the Premier of this Province and his Federal counterpart, Prime Minister Trudeau, through the deliberate policy of increasing unemployment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the meaning of this Bill, in brief, is not simply worse conditions and worse pay for working people. This Bill will hurt every farmer and every businessman in this province who depend upon employee purchasing power, or on high employment or fair standards.

Mr. Speaker, the less than 30 per cent of the wage earner section that is organized in Saskatchewan is hit first by Bill 57. But so is the unorganized section. Because conditions of



pay that are set in collective bargaining for workers in unions filter down eventually to the unorganized workmen, their employers, to some degree, acknowledge the wage trends and the working conditions that exist elsewhere in organized industry. And this, Mr. Speaker, is why labor organization among workers is so important and why unions have such an extremely beneficial and levelling upward effect for workers outside of their ranks.

But on the other side, this Bill has a paralyzing effect on real collective bargaining. This is going to have repercussions, as I have suggested, not just on the organized wage earners but on the whole wage earning population. What this means is that a majority of our Saskatchewan population, wage earners - 240,000 of them - are crucially threatened and will experience damaging results because of the contents of this Bill.

I want to comment, Mr. Speaker, on another facet and that is the rationale for good labor laws in general. It is my contention, and I think this is borne out by all impartial observers, that better labor laws in a province like ours are essential as an ingredient to keep our population, to stabilize our communities, to protect our citizens and to increase their personal happiness.

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

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Speaker, we live in a pretty harsh physical climate in Saskatchewan. We've dozens of communities where amenities are, I think - to put it mildly - not too exciting. We have probably the longest winter in the whole country. There are always strong reasons for many of our population, including young people and their families, to be drawn to places like British Columbia or other parts of Canada, where apart from all else, the climate is better, wage conditions may be better and so on. Mr. Speaker, we keep people here and I know that we have kept people here for the following reasons. I personally know of many who have stayed in Saskatchewan because of more beneficial laws and practices. Apart from labor laws, once this Province was alone in hospitalization. This helped to keep many of our citizens who might have gone elsewhere and I think would have gone elsewhere otherwise. The same is true for our medicare program. This was certainly true with respect to the hours of work law, to minimum wage regulations, to vacations with pay law, and so on. There are a series of regulations and labor practices and laws which undoubtedly contributed to workers' satisfaction and kept them in Saskatchewan at jobs that paid in many cases less and in conditions that offered fewer amenities than the amenities offered by other parts of our country. And we know that in spite of this there was a migration of people to other parts of the country.

But I say that it is significant that this migration has increased so rapidly during the past seven years of this Liberal Government. This is proof positive of how when labor laws and good social laws deteriorate, population invariably also deteriorates. I point out that good labor and social laws in a province like Saskatchewan which has a rather harsh environment at times, in terms of climate and other things, means that we keep people who would long since have left this province. So that if we want to help to stem migration we shall do well in fact to have our labor laws a considerable cut above the labor laws in other parts of the country. If some people think this is humorous, I

**April 5, 1971**

say there is abundant evidence to show that it is true.

Once we had the best Trade Union Act in Canada and the best labor-management atmosphere. We had the best minimum wage, hours of work and vacation schedules, to name just a few of the beneficial labor laws. What's the situation now? Many of these laws have deteriorated in quality. Secondly, quite a number of our labor and social laws are duplicated elsewhere in Canada. Now we have the worst minimum wage in the country. Our hours-of-work law hasn't been changed appreciably since 1947, and most provinces are pretty well caught up to us in respect to other labor laws. In a word, we do not have attractions in beneficial labor laws that would serve or tend to keep our wage earners in this province. This is another reason why this Bill should never have appeared before us. Another reason why it will accelerate not only unrest, but the drift of people from Saskatchewan to other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in many ways this Bill is the straw that broke the camel's back. It is the crowning insult and indignity for thousands of our working population. Just as the autocratic and unconscionable conduct of this Government last year lost us thousands of valued and experienced tradesmen, some of them probably never to return, so this Bill is going to quicken an exodus which can only be called dismal and depressing in the extreme. Every government must have a basic integrity in the legislation it enacts. Law must be based on real needs. It must provide real solutions to real problems. The tragedy, Mr. Speaker, about Bill 57 is that it can solve nothing and in fact has created a problem where no problem in reality previously existed. Mr. Speaker, the ultimate wrong of this Bill is that this Government knows full well that its rationale is to divide, not to unite the population and that it is intended as a monstrous diversion and political gimmick.

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

**MR. DAVIES:** — This Bill is an affront to men and women who work in factories, in mines and in shops. It is an arrogant ignoring of the excellent record of productivity and labor peace that we have had in Saskatchewan and which have been so badly damaged by this Government. It is legislation, Mr. Speaker, which can only harm both relations within our population and the entire Saskatchewan economy. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one intelligent course for this Government to take. I would demand and ask that it do so now, that is, withdraw this Bill immediately. I shall not support it otherwise.

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

**MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park-University):** — Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 57 means that in a situation that is recognized as an emergency, the Government insists that a board of arbitration be set up with both management and labor appointing a member of their choice and if they cannot mutually agree on a chairman, refuses to stand idly by when a state of emergency exists.

Some would try to have us believe that we should not be concerned - that there is no need to have the machinery ready to deal with emergencies. The Member for Moose Jaw South

indicates this when he referred to the police forces in our province. Granted, they have never gone on strike but I'm sure the Members of this Legislature are aware that the police force of Saskatoon very recently withdrew the "no strike clause" from their agreement with the city of Saskatoon. Some may think that this should be disregarded, that it is not meaningful but I think that common sense decrees that proper mechanics should be available in the event such a strike should occur sometime in the future. This Bill is not a straitjacket for labor as claimed by the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies). It does not take away the right to collective bargaining. It does not take away conciliation. It does not do away with the right to strike.

Under Section 3 of the Bill, it is only when it is recognized that a state of emergency exists in the province, or any area of the province, that compulsory arbitration would come into effect. There is no question that this is a grave and drastic measure. But when we see the grave and drastic results that are being foisted on our people and our economy because of strikes, surely we must agree that this is reasonable legislation which, I think, is an honest endeavor to cure a veritable cancer in our society. When we speak of the right to strike, this is based on justice. But this right is certainly not an inalienable right. When the public interest is in jeopardy there should be no question that the right to strike must be superseded by the right to our people as a society to survive.

The NDP Opposition admitted to this principle when they sent a wire to Prime Minister Trudeau and Labour Minister Bryce Mackasey on April 2, 1971 recommending Federal essential services legislation be applied in the railway dispute. At least four other provinces, British Columbia, Quebec, Newfoundland, and Alberta, have recognized the need for, and the principle of, essential services legislation. The senior labor leader on this continent, George Meany, has stated that the strike is obsolete. Certainly both logic and common sense lead us to the conclusion that strikes should no longer have a place in our society. We can no longer think of strikes as we did ten and 20 years ago when in most cases comparatively very few people were affected. To eliminate the strike does not mean that the right to collective bargaining is done away with. Neither does it mean that the responsibilities and obligations of management and labor to bargain in good faith is in any way changed or removed. Under our present system, we are witnessing situations like our recent railway negotiations where the negotiations can go on and on indefinitely, with results such as we have today, where even without a strike we are expected to tolerate a slowdown that actually in its effect is the same as a strike and severe enough to strangle our economy. And don't let's kid ourselves, Mr. Speaker, this slowdown has cost our farmers and our people of this province thousands and thousands of dollars. Don't let's try to hide away from that.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Nonsense!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — That's not nonsense, that's an absolute fact and you know it better than anybody. You know what this booking off has meant. You know absolutely what I am talking about and there is no way to deny the cost to this province.

I agree, and we all agree, that negotiation is a feasible

**April 5, 1971**

thing, we must have collective bargaining but when we have the results going on with no control, no way out, we have to do something. Are we going to sit back and watch our economy destroyed for utter nonsensical negotiations. I say, No.

**MR. DEWHURST:** — Why are . . . ?

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — I didn't hear your question but it doesn't amount to very much. Now history proves that negotiations that are unduly prolonged simply lead to trouble. I think it should be a matter of legislation that after a reasonable length of bargaining time and including a reasonable time for conciliation, if no agreement is arrived at, then the matter should go to a tribunal, and this tribunal would be the final authority. There is no reason why the setting up of this tribunal could not be mutually agreeable to both sides. I think here if we come together, management and labor, at a time when we are not in the middle of negotiations, when the heat of bargaining is not on, that this certainly can be accomplished and it would be a credit to our people to do this. I think we are moving in that direction and it is a credit, I think, to this Government that we are moving in this direction.

When we agree that compulsory arbitration is necessary for essential services, we must have regard for what is essential. It is not just gas and electricity and hospitals and police forces. The present structure of our economy is not a simple one any more. Very, very few of our industries are in an isolated position. A shut down in any one of our industries can have a very far reaching effect. We have an example in the shut down of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting mine and mill in Flin Flon, and the resulting disaster that is facing everyone in Flin Flon because of this strike. Certainly we can't say that this strike is just an inconvenience. The Member for Moose Jaw South indicates that this is his idea of a strike. It's just an inconvenience. Believe me a strike in this present day and age is far more than that.

Here in our province we have an economy which is based on the export of the primary resources such as grain, potash and pulp and so on. These are bulk goods that are almost completely dependent on rail transportation so that when a railway strike takes place, such a large section of our people is affected that it is economic suicide for us to have to sit back without demanding collective bargaining without a strike.

The Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) suggested that because of the hardship placed on the strikers, they should be able to go on welfare. I say this is completely unacceptable and it is simply unbelievable to think that anyone in this House would suggest such illogical reasoning, especially from a man of the capability as the Member for Riversdale, to suggest such a thing is unthinkable. Does he or anyone else think that the very society which has no way to protect itself as a result of strikes and the wave of unemployment they cause outside of their immediate circle, should be expected to support the striker to the point that our economy grinds to a halt? If we pay welfare to our strikers, it would mean that our whole society would subsidize its own destruction. There is no question about a man's right to withdraw his services, no question if we are to continue as a democracy. This right must be recognized, but what is the purpose of a strike? It is meant to be a last resort in forcing an issue in order to come to an agreement.

Too often now we see it as a first resort. However, if it is to be used, whether as a first resort or a last resort, it must have limits if we are to see our economy survive.

I think we must agree that a new approach must be made to our system of collective bargaining with proper reasoning and understanding on both sides, both labor and management must surely realize that this can be achieved. But pending a new approach, measures such as we propose in this Bill must be considered as necessary. Certainly I am going to support the Bill.

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

**MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, let me begin by reminding this Legislature that in 1964 the Liberal Party and the Premier made a firm promise and commitment to the wage earners of Saskatchewan that if the Liberals were elected to form a Government, they would and let me quote, "Maintain and improve workers' wages, vacations, hours of work, compensation and trade union rights and security." Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record.

In the area of wages, in the area of minimum wage, we find that in the Province of Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government the minimum wages are the lowest in the Dominion of Canada. In the area of annual vacations what we do we find? Not a single improvement to annual vacations since this Government took office. In the area of hours of work, despite their promise that they would improve hours of work, Members will recall that on a number of occasions I introduced a Bill to reduce the legal work week from the present 44 and 48 hours to 40 hours a week. Members on the other side of the House have consistently voted against that proposition. In the area of workmen's compensation, even the Members opposite admit that we have the worst administration and among the weakest Workmen's Compensation law and nothing is being done to improve the Workmen's Compensation benefits in this province.

In union rights and security for trade union people, the record of this Government is worse than anywhere in North America and perhaps in the world. Mr. Speaker, this is the record of the Liberal Party within a period of seven years. Mr. Speaker, if it is at all possible to appeal for reasonable responsibility and a measure of fair play to the Members opposite, I shall try to do this during this debate on Bill No. 57, but based on past experience, I realize that a large number of Liberal MLAs have closed their minds to the question of industrial relations mainly because of the poisoned leadership they have been getting from the Premier and other Members of the Cabinet. My appeal shall be directed to the more sane and sober, to the news media and the public who can distinguish between right and wrong, between good and evil. Mr. Speaker, I invite the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) and the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) to rise in their places and speak out against this Bill, and to join the Members of the Opposition to vote against it. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because of what they have said in the past. The Hon. Member for Regina South West uttered these words in this Legislature in 1968. Let me remind him and his colleagues. I quote:

The right to strike, the right of employers and employees

**April 5, 1971**

to disagree is a guarantee of freedom which we cherish. Government should stick to conciliation and stop there, and permit labor and management to practise free collective bargaining.

Neither side can ever hope to bargain freely when they are hampered by laws binding one side or the other to certain predetermined procedures and conditions. It is preposterous to claim that bargaining between parties is free when the third party - Government is sitting on the shoulders of the bargaining teams - pointing out that one or the other has certain privileges not available to the other.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with those remarks. If this is what he believes and he has said that he does believe this in 1968, then I submit that he has no alternative but to vote against this Bill, otherwise these were empty and hollow words that he had pronounced.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) - unfortunately he is not in his seat at the present time - to show his courage here in this Legislature and to vote against this Bill as he did at the last Liberal convention when the Premier advocated total compulsory arbitration. He said then, and let me quote, "The Liberal Party was getting an anti-labor image." He had opposed that move. Nothing has changed since last fall, in fact there has not been a single strike in this province since that time. I appeal to those two Members in particular, to start working now and persuade as many of their colleagues as possible to vote against this Bill. This Bill is wrong, it is undemocratic. I suggest to them, it is contrary to the so-called free-enterprise philosophy which they espouse. Don't give us the argument that it is only to be used by the Government where a state of emergency exists. This Government has shown its anti-labor bias. The Premier has stated loudly and clearly that he is opposed to any kind of a strike regardless of how oppressive or unfair conditions may be that employees may be working under. This Government has proven over and over again that it cannot be trusted with these kinds of sweeping powers. If ever a state of emergency exists, then I suggest that this Legislature should be called into session to determine whether or not there is a state of emergency. This power should not be given to a handful of ruthless and anti-labor biased men who cannot be trusted by labor, by management and by the public, and even by the Members of their own political party, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, may I quote a part of a speech made by a Liberal Member sitting in this Legislature. He made this speech on October 24, 1969. He mentioned three factors which have characterized industrial relations to the Province of Saskatchewan. He said, I quote:

The first factor which provides the setting for our labor relations in Saskatchewan and which has a direct impact on the legality question relates to the unequal voluntary character of our conciliation machinery in connection with disputes and settlements. There is no compulsion. Accordingly there are fewer legal requirements than are to be found in other provinces. The Government of Saskatchewan believes that collective bargaining should

operate without government interference and that The Trade Union Act should function only as a guide to the maintenance of solid and productive union management relations.

The second circumstance involves a relatively peaceful labor relations climate in our province when compared with the situation in the rest of Canada. Both unions and employers are responsible for this and are to be commended for their continuous efforts to maintain sound and harmonious relations. The overwhelming majority of union leaders and union members of this province are dedicated, sincere and hard working. Therefore, in the establishment of labor relations policy the government must be careful not to fall into the well-known trap of creating a cannon to destroy a fly.

The third point which must be noted to place a discussion in its proper perspective represents what might be termed an industrial relations truism. You cannot legislate human relations. The most elaborate legislative enactment imaginable cannot produce peaceful employee-employer relations. Labor management co-operation characterized by a greater concentration by both parties in common goals and aspirations is the only permanent and meaningful method of achieving an effective labor relations system.

These were the words spoken by the former Minister of Labour, the Hon. Lionel Coderre to the Regina Personnel Association. Mr. Speaker, I ask him and the Hon. Members opposite what has changed the labor relations scene in this province in the last 17 months to justify such drastic measures as are proposed in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, may I also take another quotation from the former Minister of Labour when he said in this House:

Some of the employers and management representatives run their business as modern day tyrants and operate in a way which suggests that they want to be modern in 1969, but under 1869 working conditions.

These people are pretty sharp when it is a question of manipulating dollars and cents but are truly naive and immature when it comes to the operation of sound and stable labor relations policy.

Mr. Speaker, despite these words which he uttered in the past, during this Legislative Session, over and over again labor has been the subject of continuous attack despite the fact that they know that in many instances the disputes are not the result of the trade union movement but are caused by management due to their irresponsible and dictatorial attitudes which they practise and the former Minister of Labour admits that.

Mr. Speaker, the most regrettable and irresponsible remarks made so far in regard to this Bill came from the Minister of Labour. His accusations against the labor movement and our party were full of hate and venom, truly words flowing from the mouth of a thoughtless person. He then concluded on a note that the reason this Bill is being introduced is to protect the public interest. This is hypocritical and mischievous. The reason this Bill is being introduced is to enable the Liberal

**April 5, 1971**

Party to play cheap politics and for no other reason. It is a game of politics that gives rise to public criticism of politicians and the loss of confidence particularly by the young people in our political and democratic system. He made reference to trade union participation in politics. The trade union movement, Mr. Speaker, has learned from long and bitter experience that it must take political action in self defense. Mr. Speaker, let me quote what I think may be a neutral person in this regard. Here is what a Catholic priest, Father Charles Owen Rice had to say on this matter. He said, I quote:

Labor unions cannot stay out of politics. Politics governs this free country and determines its laws. A political process elects the men who make the laws and the men who enforce them. Politics operates in the very active law, making itself and its pressures attend the deliberations surrounding very significant legislative proposals. Historically law and its forces have powerfully affected the health, even threatened upon occasions the very existence of the labor movement. Throughout most of our national life, law and majority opinion were hostile to trade unions and have tried to keep them weak and small.

Let me continue with the quotation.

Labour has to be politically active to prevent further erosion of its rights and try to win some of them back again. If labor were ever nullified politically the country would lose its strongest and most effective champion of decency and progressive legislation.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, it is the bad experience that the labor movement has had over the years with the Liberal and Conservative Governments that has forced unions to encourage its membership to support the New Democratic Party, its only political friend and ally in this country.

Employer organizations, like the Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, have over a century taken political action in support of the old line parties and have influenced the laws and the law makers of this country. Why should labor be required to remain politically neutral? On the other hand, unions do not compel their members to support the New Democratic Party. It is a voluntary program of support, of supporting its friends and defeating its political enemies. Mr. Speaker, indeed this Government, this Liberal Party in Saskatchewan has proven to be an enemy of the working class and of the trade union movement.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the present Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan), being a younger man than his predecessor would have taken a new approach to labor unions and labor problems. I had hoped that he would have taken a chapter from the lessons provided by the Federal Minister of Labour, Bryce Mackasey, who has worked with labor, has given leadership in improving labor standards within the Federal jurisdiction, and has been a defender of labor and labor rights. Regrettably,



however, the present Minister of Labour, as did his predecessor, has from the first day he took office been on a campaign of attacking labor in every speech and every press statement, distorting the truth and ridiculing the trade union movement. He loyally follows in the footsteps of the Premier who was described just a few days ago by a well-known labor Liberal Party member as follows:

The Premier believes in a policy of starting a battle with every conceivable group. His continual battle with teachers, labor and the Federal Government, has been just window-dressing and attempts to turn group against group to his own advantage.

This Bill in its present form gives the Government the power to take away the right to strike from any group. The right to strike is essential in a democratic society. Workers must be free to withhold their labor when conditions of employment are no longer tolerable, otherwise they will be slaves. Some people assume due to the wide discussion and publicity that takes place about strikes, that there is a large loss of time due to strikes. Well, if one examines the facts, the proof is otherwise. In recent years the number of man-days lost due to strikes is less than one-quarter of one per cent of the estimated time worked. Most of the time lost is due to illness, industrial accidents and unemployment. In fact, it is hundreds of times greater than the time lost in our industry caused by strikes. In Saskatchewan, over a 10-year period, the average man-day lost due to strikes and lockouts, 120 days were lost due to industrial accidents and illness and 190 days were lost due to unemployment. In fact in 1970, the figure is perhaps five or six hundred times as much time lost due to unemployment as was lost due to strikes and despite the fact that last year we had a larger number of days lost due to strikes than in previous years.

Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, the former chairman of the Federal Commission on Health Services, when he addressed a St. Thomas guild of Toronto, made this statement:

In 1960 close to 30 million man-days of labor were lost through illness in the labor force of Canada. To compare it to something we hear a lot about, let me tell you that in the same year 747,000 man-days of labor were lost through strikes. We hear a lot about this latter economic loss but very little about the former.

Organized labor's attitude towards compulsory arbitration is well known. They are against it. There is more to their opposition than many people realize. Its opposition to compulsory arbitration is not only because it is bad but because it means an end, Mr. Speaker, to genuine collective bargaining. The Premier, on the other hand, is reported to have said that collective bargaining is a sick institution. This is just not true, Mr. Speaker. Collective bargaining, as it has developed over the years, is a healthy institution and continues to be enriched but governments have a responsibility to help the system become even healthier by providing necessary supports of strong conciliation and mediation services and adequate research facilities. There are those who assume that a strike somehow represents a failure of collective bargaining procedure. Mr. Speaker, this is just not true. The right to strike is the

**April 5, 1971**

very heart and essence of collective bargaining as fundamental as the employer's right to say, No.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen what has happened in the totalitarian countries where the right of strike was denied. Not only was that right denied but in every one of those countries where this freedom was denied, every other human right and civil liberty were also taken away from the citizens. And I suggest that this is a further step in the direction of the denial of human rights and human liberties that this Government is resorting to.

Mr. Speaker, references have been made to Sweden and to Australia and their labor courts. I have already discussed in this Legislature the Swedish system of labor courts. It is not a system which denies the right to strike. What the labor courts in Sweden do is to deal with these disputes, with grievances in industrial relations during the period of contract enforcement but during the period of collective bargaining. The right to strike is an inalienable right under the Swedish labor court system.

It is true that in Australia the right of strike has been denied. There are those who like to use the Australian system as the argument in support of compulsory arbitration but anyone who has taken the trouble to examine the Australian system will recognize that it just does not work and that it has not prevented strikes and conflicts.

Let us look at a few comparisons between Australia and Canada. The number of strikes in this country as compared to Australia, in 1945 in Canada we had 197 strikes and in Australia in that same year there were 945. In 1950 in Canada, 151 and in Australia, 1,276. In 1955 in Canada, 159 strikes; in Australia 1,532. In 1960 in Canada, 274; in Australia, 1,145. In 1965 in Canada, 501; in Australia, 1,345. And the same record continues since that time. In other words in Australia under compulsory arbitration where strikes are outlawed, there are 10 and 12 times as many strikes in certain years and indeed on the average the ratio for every one strike in Canada, there are about seven strikes in Australia.

The record is conclusive that the compulsory system in Australia has not produced industrial peace but has in fact produced more industrial conflict. The other important thing for us to remember is that the Australian population is only about one-third that of Canada. Many studies have been made by the people in Australia, by economists, by psychologists, and they concede both in Australia and in other countries where this system is studied that it is not a workable system. It has not produced better industrial relations.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, three years ago 32 Canadians, eight of whom were trade unionists, visited Australia to participate in the Duke of Edinburgh Third Commonwealth Study Conference. A paper submitted by a representative group studying industrial relations in Australia indicated that the Australian experiment is hardly one that we should draw on for ideas of how to resolve industrial relations. The group, in a written report, stated that as a result of compulsory arbitration there has developed an impersonal relationship between the workers and management.

Absenteeism and disagreements are very great. There is an absence of arrangements to air grievances, with an apathy on the part of rank and file members and a remoteness between the different groups, with a tendency to hand over to the third party, problems that they ought to be able to resolve themselves.

The Canadian delegates reported that wildcat strikes and work stoppages are very numerous in Australia since the system fails to involve union members or plant management in the decisions that affect them. Communications break down completely at plant level and in spite of heavy fines, Australian workers are not deterred from taking strike action.

Mr. Speaker, certainly if Australian experience is what it has been it is not a system we want to see transplanted into Canada.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, Members have brought into this debate the current dispute of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Railway companies. Unfortunately, so far, the issues have not been discussed. I have already told this Legislature that this particular union since it started organizations in this country has never gone out on strike. It cannot be accused as a strike-happy union organization. We know that this dispute, their differences, were referred to a board of conciliation. We know that their contract expired more than a year ago. They have been trying anxiously to bring about a settlement. The unfortunate thing is that the board of conciliation that was established submitted three separate reports. Each member of the Board handed down a different recommendation. They also said that the problems that they were asked to adjudicate upon were beyond their competence. A great number of problems that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers had were in the area of safety. A few weeks ago a derailment in the Rocky Mountains occurred where three railway crewmen were killed. The safety precautions were not adequate. The whole safety question has been very much a part of this dispute because it's their very lives that they are concerned about, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to correct some of the statements that were made. Reports have been made in some of the newspapers that they are the elite of the labor movement, that their average wages are in excess of \$10,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, just last Saturday or Friday, a local member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers had this to say to the local newspaper:

Most of the employees affected in Regina work in the railway yard and earn about \$7,200 a year. We are satisfied with that but we have no other benefits. Mr. Demert said that the engineers needed improvement in sick pay, that the sick pay benefits are only \$65 a week and that they don't get any benefits until after an 8-day sickness. We are also concerned with the length of time we are held away from home at our own expense.

In the case of out of town runs when they are held over, they don't get any remuneration until after 16 hours of layover. Many times engineers are called on duty and have to work 12, 14 and 16 hours and almost without any time off are called on other shifts.

**April 5, 1971**

This is unfair in today's modern society. Engineers tell us that at times they don't get any sleep over a 48-hour period. This is unfair and unsafe not only to the men who are employed but to the public. Take in the case of the passenger services, a man who has to work without any rest over these long periods is not a person who will be the safest driver and operator.

Mr. Speaker, I note also that in the area of other benefits they are almost nonexistent. In the case of their pensions, I am told that their pension plan is totally inadequate. Not too long ago, in the city of Moose Jaw, an engineer died after working for the railway for 24 years and nine months. All that the widow received was the money that was paid by the engineer. He did not even get the interest on the money that he had paid in and no benefits at all from the railway company. There are no vesting rights. These are the conditions that these people work under, but none of the Members opposite have even tried to find out. The only thing that they do is accuse the Brotherhood.

Let me refer to the Leader-Post of April 11. This is a report on settlement in respect of the non-operating groups affecting some 56,000 workers. This reports a settlement including a company-paid life insurance plan of \$4,500 for each employee, up from the present \$3,000. May I report to this Legislature that in my union we don't have insurance plans that are anything less than \$10,000 but here we have in this old and established industry and where collective bargaining has taken place for all these years, life insurance benefits increased to only \$4,500. A paid-up life insurance plan of only \$500 after retirement, almost negligible, Mr. Speaker. \$500, what will it do these days? It might have been worth something 25 years ago but not now. Or take in the case of weekly indemnity, finally increased to \$80 per week, up from \$60 a week but in the case of railway engineers, only \$65. Medical and surgical benefits per month were improved to \$11.50 in the case of married, and in the case of single people, only \$5.50.

Mr. Speaker, in the case of the Locomotive Brotherhood of Engineers, all they had is seven holidays with pay. In most of the industries today there are 10 holidays but here in this industry only seven. Mr. Speaker, I think that these people were patient; I believe these people were sincere and interested in resolving their problem in a peaceful way. The record is conclusive. This union has not been a strike-happy union. They have just grievances and I believe their cause was a right cause, as indicated by the Federal Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey).

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that in the railway industry, if we are going to improve the transportation system of this country and if we are going to improve the lot of the working people in the railway system there is only one solution on a long-term basis and perhaps the immediate basis and that is to develop one transportation system instead of two, a public transportation system . . .

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — . . . I think it is time that this Legislature calls upon

the Government of Canada to take action to nationalize the Canadian Pacific Railway and let's develop a rational, meaningful and effective transportation system where we shall be able to provide the services, not only for the farmers but for all communities of Canada. We cannot have an economical, effective transportation system when many of the services are duplicated, a service where the Canadian Pacific Railway operates the profitable and lucrative lines and the Canadian National Railway is asked to take the non-profitable lines that are operating at a deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this Legislature - now that this dispute has been settled - should call upon the Government of Canada to take this action of nationalizing the Canadian Pacific Railway so that in the future these kinds of problems may be avoided as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that what is needed in the area of industrial relations in this province is more support for a better and a stronger Department of Labour. Our Department of Labour is weak. It is understaffed and under-financed. We have very few skilled people, virtually no conciliation services, Mr. Speaker, since the death of Mr. John Elchysen. All we have is one inexperienced person. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) that he do some checking with employers and in particular, industrial relations officers who come from other parts of Canada to participate in Saskatchewan negotiations. I have had three industrial relations men who have come to Saskatchewan to negotiate collective bargaining agreements within the last several months. No, they don't come from the United States. They come from British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario bargaining on behalf of the national companies they represent. They tell me that they have had conciliation services in the Province of Saskatchewan. They tell me it is almost unbelievable, the inadequate Saskatchewan service as compared to other provinces. They are very critical; they say, "What is the Government doing?" The criticism has not only come from the trade union movement, it is equally levelled against this Government by the employer groups, Mr. Speaker.

We check the facts, what do we find? You know in 1964-65 there was a staff of 78 in the Department of Labour and a budget of \$683,000 in that year. This year the staff of the Department of Labour, in administration, research labor standards, labor relations, apprenticeship, is only 69. The number of people employed by the Department of Labour has been reduced in seven years by 13 per cent, the budget increased by only 16 per cent. Yet the total Budget of this Government has more than doubled, in fact, it has gone up 116 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Why is this Government starving the Department of Labour? Then they say we have too many disputes and conflicts. You will have disputes and conflict when you don't provide the necessary services to help industrial relations, to help employees, to help management in developing meaningful industrial relations. As the former Minister has said, "Industrial relations are human relationships."

Mr. Speaker, we have just seen what the Federal Department of Labour with strong staff, with a Minister who is sympathetic to the cause of workers and the cause of the labor movement and working people, can do. Mr. Mackasey does not attack the trade union movement and the working people day after day. He comes to the defense of workers, but the Saskatchewan Minister

**April 5, 1971**

of Labor and the former Minister, day after day, make political speeches, haranguing and harassing the trade union movement and expecting the labor movement to be sympathetic to the Liberal Government. Well that's just not going to happen, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, there are other areas. Industrial relations break down because of inadequate labor standards the Saskatchewan minimum wage of \$1.25 is the lowest in the Dominion of Canada. The Provinces of Manitoba and of Alberta have minimum wages of \$1.55 and \$1.50 per hour. The national minimum wage is being increased to \$1.75 since this House opened. During the Throne Speech we were told that the minimum wage will be increased. We have waited for two months but has the Minister told us anything? The Minimum Wage Board has not met, Mr. Speaker, it has not held any hearings. In the areas of hours of work, annual vacations, sick-pay legislation, this Government has done nothing. They wonder why labor and working people have lost confidence and are critical of this Government. Mr. Speaker, I can tell this Legislature that a New Democratic Party will repeal the notorious Bill 2. It is an evil Bill; it is a savage Bill; it is a Bill that is going to destroy industrial relations rather than improve them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge, and I appeal to the saner elements, the saner elements to examine the record of their anti-labor legislation and to examine what this Bill proposes to do. I urge them to stop and think and to withdraw this legislation. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last fall the Premier said that labor courts would be considered by the Liberal Party. In January, he said after consideration, there will be no proposals for compulsory arbitration and labor courts during this Session. He said that if the Liberal Government is re-elected they will establish a further study committee to investigate labor courts. Two months later, despite the fact that we had complete industrial peace during this period, we get proposals for labor courts, for compulsory labor legislation for what reason? For no reason whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

The truth is that these people cannot be trusted. They say one thing one day and something entirely different the next day and something else the third day. Mr. Speaker, they wonder why the working people have no confidence in the Government and propose to take political action to ensure their defeat. I hope that the trade union people will rally and will organize to defeat this Administration. Because, not only will workers be faced with labor courts as has already been given notice, but the next thing will be a confrontation for the complete outlawing of the trade union movement because they don't believe in collective bargaining; they don't believe in the rights of workers to organize. This will be the next stop on the road to total dictatorship. This is the course the Premier and this Government has set.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support this Bill.

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

**HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, I shall not take too much time of the House in discussing this Bill but after having listened to the

Member from Moose Jaw South and the Regina North East Member, it amazes me again when they want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that this Liberal Government is going down the road to defeat because of this labor legislation. I should think they would be happy; that they would really be happy that Bill 57 and labor courts would be part and parcel of the Government's program. Well I want to tell these Members that the people of Saskatchewan will have this opportunity to decide whether they want Bill 57 or not because they will be part and parcel of the Liberal policy. We shall give the people of Saskatchewan a chance to vote. I can guarantee you, and I can't see that my constituency is any different than any other rural constituency and I should almost bet my last bottom dollar, if I was a betting man, that the majority in Rosthern will be much, much larger than it was in 1967 just because of this labor legislation.

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

**MR. BOLDT:** — Well you know the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) says, "This fine fellow, Bryce Mackasey, how he has co-operated in collective bargaining and never said anything bad about the unions." You know this man has cost the Saskatchewan farmers in the last couple of weeks, \$50 million to the farmer alone. And I think any politician that cost the farmers of Saskatchewan \$50 million should question whether he should be in office, I should question whether the Government should be in office that permits the kind of cost to one segment of the province. That is only related to the farm situation let alone the potash that has lost millions and millions of dollars in sales. This slowdown, Mr. Speaker, according to the Minister-in-Charge of the Dominion Wheat Board is costing the Saskatchewan farmers \$2.5 million per day. The slowdown has been in effect for at least 10 days and before the cars will be rolling there will be another 10 days. So I say that it's a \$50 million cost to the farmer in Saskatchewan. And there is no argument as to how this situation affects the \$100 million stabilization program that the Federal Government is going to implement shortly. This has, in effect, reduced the stabilization program to 50 per cent of its intended value. How long will the Federal Government keep on fooling around with walkouts, strikes, picket lines that do nothing but cost our taxpayers millions of dollars.

The Wheat Pool Vice-President sent a telegram only a few days ago - and I'm sure that all Members of this Legislature had a copy in their offices today - which states that the Saskatchewan farmer is extremely incensed at this walkout and the intended strike that was to happen today.

The NDP say that in this strike there must be collective bargaining. The Hon. Member for Regina North East talked about the negotiators from Canada who had come to Saskatchewan and criticized the Labour Department, they talk about foreign investment, they are very much opposed to what the United States' investment is doing in this country. Now I want to tell the Members of this House, who are running the labor organizations here in Canada, who are the people dealing with this proposed labor strike for the railway unions? I have a report here - I have taken clippings from a report on the Economics and Research Branch, Canadian Department of Labour - and it goes on to say that the International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers - there are 49 locals in Canada; membership, 2,165. who is the President? William E. Fergenburger from Washington, D.C.

**April 5, 1971**

He's the President. Now who is the Secretary of this union? John J. McNamara from Washington, D.C.

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

**MR. BOLDT:** — The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers divisions in Canada, 102; the membership is 7,186 and the grand chief engineer, who is he? Mr. Coughlin from Cleveland, Ohio. The Secretary Manager is a John F. Sytsma.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Bring our unions back to Canada.

**MR. BOLDT:** — The Secretary-Treasurer is a fellow by the name of John F. Sytsma.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Where does he live?

**MR. BOLDT:** — Engineering Building, Cleveland, Ohio. The Railway Brotherhoods of Maintenance of Way Employees, the largest in Canada, 193; membership 20,000. Who's the President? H.C. Crotty from Detroit, Michigan. Who is the Secretary? Frank L. Noakes, also from Detroit, Michigan. Then we've got the railway employees, the railroad signal men. Locals in Canada, 21; memberships in Canada, 1,210. Who's the President? A Mr. Chamberlain from Chicago, Illinois. The Secretary-Treasurer is a chap by the name of Drummond also from Chicago, Illinois. Then we've got the railway employees, who are railway carmen. Lodges, 88; membership in Canada, 16,124. The President is a fellow by the name of Mr. O'Brien from Kansas City, Missouri. The General Secretary-Treasurer is a Leroy Taylor also from Kansas City, Missouri. Then the railway employees, the clerks, 139 lodges in Canada; membership in Canada, 15,666. The grand President is a fellow by the name C.L. Dennis from Cincinnati, Ohio. The Secretary Treasurer is a George M. Gibbons from Cincinnati, Ohio. Now the railway employees, the sleeping-car porters, locals in Canada, 4; membership 300. The President is from Oakland, California and the Secretary-Treasurer is a William H. Bowe, New York, New York. The railway employees transportation communications employees, divisions in Canada, 10; memberships in Canada, 8,725. The President is A.R. Lowry from St. Louis, Missouri. The Secretary-Treasurer, L.H. Freeman from Lindal Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri. The railway employees' union, the United Transportation Union, AFL, CIO, CLC, and the NDP. Locals in Canada, 203; memberships in Canada, 27,657. The President is a C. Luna, Detroit Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. The General Secretary and Treasurer is a J.H. Shepherd, also from Cleveland, Ohio.

Now you know, gentlemen, this is one of the reasons we have the railway strike. These fellows are also politicians and they want to sell American wheat, not Canadian wheat. So they put the trainmen, the locomotive operators on strike and you know about 10 years ago, the United States, their wheat sales were around \$150 million bushels in the foreign market and as of late they have gone as high as 750 to 800 million bushels per year. They have just stolen the market away from the Canadian people and every time there is a strike it is to be the benefit of the American people. Now I tell you people over there, you clean up your unions, you get control of the Canadian unions by



Canadian people and you will not have these devastating strikes that hurt every individual in Canada. I support with pride, Bill 57. I am opposed to strikes just like the Premier, 100 per cent opposed to strikes. This is no way in this modern day and age that we can have a fine gentlemen like Bryce Mackasey who lets collective bargaining sit on the fence for days and days while farmers lose millions of dollars every day. Surely to goodness we have come to the stage where collective bargaining is outdated, we cannot have these costly strikes.

Mr. Speaker, I will support Bill 57.

**MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker . . . When you quieten down I'll start talking. I've got lots of time.

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

**MR. MEAKES:** — The weather is still bad you know. There is no hurry about putting a crop in. We can stay here as long as you people want to chatter. I'll wait until you are finished and then I'll start. You'll find out in a couple of minutes. I'm not going to take much of the time of this House.

There are just a few remarks that I want an answer to from the two previous speakers. The one remark in particular in which they were heckling my hon. colleague from Regina North East when he started talking about negotiators, industrial negotiators coming into Saskatchewan and they said where do they come from, from all parts of Canada, and the voices come from across the United States . . . Really the Hon. Members across the way are very, very ignorant of the facts. It so happens that the Member for Regina North East is a representative of a union which is all Canadian. There are no American connections, none whatever. I suggest that that was a very unjust and unkind remark to make of my hon. friend. They are a completely Canadian union. They disaffiliated a couple of years ago.

**MR. GUY:** — . . . what to do.

**MR. MEAKES:** — Just let me finish. If my hon. friend would just stand up and talk occasionally, of course it is pretty hard to tell whether he is standing up or sitting down most of the time, there isn't much difference in the height of his head.

You know the hon. friend, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) went on and he talked about all the international unions. You know I think of the fact that every director with the exception of one, International Nickel, for instance, are American directors, American citizens and as long as you have this kind of a situation you are going to have international unions. When I recall the company for which we passed a Bill on the other day, there was included with the other relevant material, a document tabled by the Provincial Treasurer which showed that practically all the shares are owned by whom - by a man by the name of Parsons and Whittemore, pardon me a man by the name of Landegger - no Canadian representation. As long as you have this kind of a situation of international finance you are going to have international unions.

Then the Minister of Highways went on and said that if the members of unions across here would clean up their mess it would

**April 5, 1971**

be better. I say let them clean up the mess of some of the absentee ownership of giant corporations that operate in this country and we should have a far better society too.

But in rising to oppose this Bill I do it with sadness and rage. In my opinion a Bill of this kind has no place in this Legislature or any other legislature. This Chamber and what we do here represents the struggle of a thousand years of the ordinary man endeavoring to form a workable democratic process. This Bill in my opinion is contrary to the whole democratic process and the whole philosophy of our democracy. You know a philosopher once said if all the people save one, thought alike the majority has no more right to impose their will on one than one has the right to impose his will on the rest of society. There may be arguments for acting to stop the strikes in essential services. I refer to such things as police, firemen and utility workers but if the right to withdraw their services is taken away from them then they must be given the protection that they cannot be bullied into less pay than if they had the right to strike. Even if I thought that not to support this Bill was political suicide (which I don't think), I couldn't vote for it. All my adult life I have fought for the right of minority groups. I treasure my right to be a minority in the rest of society. In many countries of this world we find the minority groups have not got the right of dissent and if for no other reason I could not support this Bill.

I am convinced that this Bill is bad for another reason. I am convinced that this Bill will not do what the Minister says it will achieve, that is achieve industrial peace. As I said in another debate nowhere in the Western world has industrial peace been achieved by tough labor laws. The Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) eloquently pointed out, for instance that in Australia where they had stringent labor laws, laws enforcing compulsory arbitration, their record, as the Hon. Member gave you the figures for, is very, very bad. As I said in a previous debate let us look at the Province of British Columbia. Here again tough legislation - what is their record? Their record is bad. British Columbia has had more strikes than any other province in Canada. It has had a whole series of long strikes and I might say that a friend of mine who worked in one of the refineries of B.C. was out for five and one-half months. What good did tough labor laws do them? I firmly believe that the answer, if there is any real answer to industrial peace, is a program whereby negotiations are carried on long before the present contract has expired. Once a contract has expired and no agreement has been agreed to, both sides get uptight, feelings become hard and the next thing that happens is negotiations break off and then comes a strike. I have come to the conclusion several years ago that the strike has become, if not obsolete then very close to it. The answer is negotiations, negotiations well in advance but if all this fails, with the exception of essential services, then I believe the strike is the workers' last way that he can protest his conditions of work.

As I mentioned before, several times in this House, this morning's news of a strike averted shows again that continued negotiations with Government involved can work. The only criticism that I should have of the Federal Department of Labour and Mr. Mackasey is that these negotiations should have started 18 months ago, long before the contract ran out. Nevertheless I say and I say with all sincerity that I think that Mr. Mackasey

is to be given great credit in averting what would have been a strike. Now one of the things that I learned years ago in dealing with human beings is that it is much easier to be successful in dealing with people if you lead them rather than drive them with a club. What has happened in this Legislature and the other evidence that my hon. friend from Regina North East gave this morning, shows clearly that this Government believes in the club. This is the reason for industrial unrest that has been in our province in recent years.

I say to the Members across the way, I challenge the Government to call an election. I have no fear of me not winning. I was at a meeting on the weekend at which there were people of all political faiths, a good many from other parties. I talked to every person who was there either before or after the meeting. With the exception of two people they were all behind us and I mean us on this side of the House in taking the stand that we are on The Essential Services Act. So I have no fear politically in not supporting this Bill. I have my conscience to live with. Many years ago when I first was elected to this Legislature I shall never forget the first morning after the election, instead of going out to work on the farm, I walked into the front room and sat down and I thought to myself, "Meakes you opened your big mouth and you've got your foot in it, now what do you do?" And I came to the conclusion that morning and I have tried to live it. That morning I made a decision that the first person I had to satisfy in all the problems that were going to come before me as a MLA was to satisfy Frank Meakes. For if I can believe that I am doing right then I will do that regardless. In other words I like to use a mirror when I shave in the morning, I like to look at myself and believe that at least what I did, I thought was right, that I didn't do these things for political motivation and so, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in not supporting this Bill.

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

**HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the amendment of The Essential Services Act I plan to show clearly why I wholeheartedly am supporting this Bill. The Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) suggest that we are ruthless and power hungry. Ruthless - I can't accept that, I think I am just as honorable a Member of this House as any Members opposite. I have done my duty to my country as best I can in every way I can. I need take no back seat to any Members opposite. Power hungry? I believe in the democratic process and the people of Saskatchewan will decide what is the right thing. I have not at any time rigged elections to get elected into office as some Members of some labor unions have.

The Hon. Member for Regina North East also said, "What changes have taken place this last year that should make this Bill essential and necessary?" The changes that have taken place are that we had a crippling strike in Saskatchewan which lasted some 40 odd days last year. So crippling that some of the people who were on strike, some people who were locked out because of the strike, could not work the required number of days in order to draw unemployment insurance and had to go on the social aid rolls. That is sufficient, Mr. Speaker, for us to take some action. There is now a strike going on at Flin Flon. It is not under our jurisdiction but I want to illustrate what is happening, less than 500 men have closed down the plant and

**April 5, 1971**

have forced the lay off of about 2,000 people. There has been the grain handlers' strike which has dealt a crippling blow to the economy of this province because of the slowdown. Then there is a postal strike in Britain that crippled Britain completely.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What has that got to do with Saskatchewan?

**MR. CODERRE:** — You have had your chance, but, I am saying that here and there throughout our society in this world there have been strikes that have crippled countries, crippled the economy of some nations, crippled the economy of our province, surely we are responsible enough, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and be counted and take action to help alleviate, not disallow strikes, but if there is a strike, to set up some machinery that can settle a strike.

The Hon. Member for Regina North East mentioned something about voluntary support of unions. Mr. Speaker, there is a lady in Saskatoon who was trying to exercise her non-support of the union and she has been penalized greatly for it. The right to strike, Mr. Speaker, has not been denied and is not being denied by Bill 2 or by the amendments in Bill 57. It is not being denied but if in the opinion of the people of the province through its Government there is a state of emergency that exists because of a strike which will jeopardize the rights and freedom of some people, the health of some people, then we, as a responsible Government, responsible to the people of this province, should have the machinery to rectify these things. I, too, believe in the right of a minority but for every right we have, Mr. Speaker, responsibility.

The Hon. Member, Mr. Meakes, did mention the right to strike has become obsolete but what are we doing about it? At least we are providing with the amendments of this Bill, a method whereby if there is a strike, the means to resolve the differences are available. I should like to say as well, Mr. Speaker, that under the present terms of The Trade Union Act, it provides that both parties to an agreement can if they wish provide themselves with a 'no strike' clause. They can provide themselves with binding arbitration in the event of a dispute during the term of the agreement. They can provide themselves with binding arbitration in the event of break down in negotiations. But regardless, Mr. Speaker, what provisions are available, many have not availed themselves of these provisions. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, we as a Government in consideration of the general public assume our responsibility and a consistent responsibility in bringing these amendments in. Surely after the terrible losses to the provincial economy just seen by the curtailment of grain movement, I think just here alone such an act is warranted. Some of my friends opposite will say, 'well this can not affect a rail strike.' I agree with this but it would set an example, as it has been already accepted in other provinces. Bill 2 and its principles has already been accepted in other provinces because we led the way. Well we in Saskatchewan are ingenious people, we think of new ways, new innovations to solve our problems and let's start solving the problems of labor and let's lead the way, let's not delay, let's set the example.

My friends opposite have tried to get on the band wagon now

by advocating legislation to provide action in respect of rail strikes. They advocate that if a state of emergency arises, the Legislature should be called. You know, it's just like closing the barn after the horse is stolen. Mr. Davies had said, "Surely we could find better ways." I say to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, yes, we can find better ways but in the meantime until we have had an opportunity to study the full implications, all aspects of it, let's have something on the books that will provide this machinery now. We as a Government, Mr. Speaker, are assuming our responsibility as a responsible Government should. The Government feels, and rightly so, that we should be prepared in event of disaster or danger. All studies, Mr. Speaker, in regard to labor-management relations recognize mutual understanding between two parties so bargaining. But where good will and mutual respect does not prevail then it is the duty of the conciliation officers or, anyone else for that matter, to give assistance, if needed. But very often, Mr. Speaker, the help has not been requested of the conciliators, the help has not been requested of other people, people in the clergy, law, judicial or otherwise. What then? A strike. I think a strike creates too great a hardship. We must have some machinery to put an immediate stop to it and I think this is too great a loss to our economy. We can't afford this, we must be prepared to do something. But what about this Bill? This Bill is a defence for the working man. Let us be grown up and accept change when change should be made. Don't be so static. Socialists, Mr. Speaker, have a tendency to become very static. They don't move. They don't want to change. Let's change, we are a changing society and there must be new ways and everyone is admitting that. This Bill is not the ultimate but a good stop-gap, administered by a responsible Government. And this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is not an election issue but if it should be, okay, we'll take it.

This law is a good law. It provides for parties to appoint their own chairman. If that fails then the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will appoint a chairman but they have already had that opportunity jointly. It provides for machinery, where if all else has failed to resolve their differences in a quasi-judicial manner. The law must be there until such times that the matter of probably labor courts are established which this party will establish after this Government is re-elected because it is a responsible Government. And everyone knows that any law or legislation designed to control strikes must recognize and respect the human, social, psychological, and economic realities that are relevant. A basic reality is that it is a good law and that it is enforceable. It will please many a mother and child to know that the pay cheque is there because a strike is not prolonged because of this Act. Surely we should have some machinery to resolve these disputes. It does recognize the right to strike and nowhere in the Bill does it deny that right. It recognizes the right to strike providing that it does not interfere with the welfare, the health, the life of the public. Once this does, a responsible government, Mr. Speaker, must act and will. We will act if the occasion arises.

Mr. Speaker, I supported Bill 2 in 1966, I will support the amendments of Bill 57 in 1971. I support the motion.

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

**MR. F.A. DEWHURST (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words on this Bill. This Bill, in my opinion, is the type of legislation

**April 5, 1971**

that we should never see in a democratic Legislature. It amazed me this morning that this was brought in by the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) and for the biggest portion of the discussion, he has been absent from the Chamber missing the discussion that has taken place on this Bill. I should have expected that the Minister of Labour would have been one who would have stayed close to his seat to listen to all Members, from both sides of the House, who are speaking today.

**MR. CODERRE:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think it is most degrading for the Hon. Member to refer specifically to a Member of the Government who is not in the Chamber because his debate is going on. There are occasions, as Minister of Labour, where he must be directly involved in negotiations. Surely the hon. gentleman knows better!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well, we're not going to enter into a lengthy debate as to whether the Members should or should not be in their seats, whether they have or have not been in their seats. This has been going on for years, ever since I can remember.

**MR. DEWHURST:** — I don't see that there is any point of order there, Mr. Minister of Public Works, but I understand where it came from so I'll continue.

I figure the Minister of Labour should have been in the House to listen to the debates on this motion but most of the time he's found it convenient to be absent for some reason or another. On one occasion, for a short period of time, there were only two Cabinet Ministers in the Legislature here this morning and they were the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and the Minister of Industry (Mr. Estey). The rest of them were all out for a short period of time but that is their business. They can do that if they wish to but I think a piece of legislation like this is one that we all should ponder over.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Where's your leader?

**MR. DEWHURST:** — Where is yours?

**MR. MacDONALD:** — We know where ours is, where's yours?

**MR. DEWHURST:** — I know where mine is, but I know where yours is too.

This last year we have seen this Government decree that a six per cent increase was all that could be put into any labor contract in this province. Any organization which had more than a six per cent increase, the Government wouldn't allow it to be settled on that basis, if the Government either directly or indirectly played any part in the organization which was going to effect a settlement with more than a six per cent increase.

I have yet to understand under what law or legislation or regulation that it decreed that the six per cent increase was the maximum. It was a type of decree which the Government thought of themselves, made up themselves and administered themselves. At no time has it justified to the people of this province or to the Legislature where they got that authority

from. They make their own laws by rules and regulations and not by the authority given to them by this Legislature, as far as I can find out.

I should like some of the Cabinet Ministers opposite who are of the legal profession to explain to this Legislature where the Government got the six per cent increase authority.

The Member of Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) in his remarks referred to a previous debate which took place the other night in the Estimates. He wasn't referring to this Bill when he was talking about unemployment insurance and social welfare for workers and so on. That was a previous debate and that's his privilege to debate that if he wishes to but he didn't mention a thing . . .

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**MR. DEWHURST:** — What's your point of order now? State the point of order.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — I'm asking the Speaker!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — The Member who is speaking now said that I referred to unemployment insurance when I was speaking. This is wrong. I should like this corrected.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I am sure the House will take notice of the correction made by the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University.

**MR. DEWHURST:** — The Member for Saskatoon City Park-University did not in his remarks mention to this Legislature the number of farmers who were put out of their jobs last fall by the actions of organized companies. It was the organized companies. In Canada we saw the poultry eviscerating plants set a quota as to what farmers could deliver of poultry to eviscerating plants, farmers had to cut back their production. A number of farmers, some of them in my constituency, who had spent thousands of dollars putting up facilities and equipment to raise more broilers because they felt they had a contract with various eviscerating plants were then told they had to cut back, that they could only deliver two-thirds or 50 per cent of what they were producing and what they thought they had a contract for. They were cut back. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) said, if I heard him right, that it was the marketing boards. That may be. I don't know who was responsible but there wasn't one word of protest from the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), from the Minister of Agriculture, or from anyone else, on behalf of the farmers. But today they are crying crocodile tears saying that the farmers have lost over \$50 million in a railroad strike which never materialized. According to the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, Mr. Lang, that isn't true. He said there was enough grain at Vancouver to take care of all the shipments at the present time - some six million bushels or more in storage. One of the policies that has been taking place is that we have kept the elevators half empty and our terminals half empty but no complaint from

**April 5, 1971**

our friends opposite. It appears that any time that the benefits of laying off workers, or cutting back on the farmers' right to sell are benefits to corporations, then our friends across the way are happy. They are gleeful because big corporations will get more money out of it but never once do they rise to the defense of the farmer or the worker when they are both caught in the squeeze.

I think it is time that we in this Legislature realize that a Legislature must legislate to protect those least able to protect themselves.

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

**MR. DEWHURST:** — We don't have to legislate to protect the giants. We must legislate to protect the workers.

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

**MR. DEWHURST:** — One hundred years ago in Great Britain, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware of, a lot of the children at the age of seven and eight years of age had to go into the cotton mills for four or five hours a day - a half a day - and when they got to be 11 or 12 years of age, they had to put a full day in the cotton mills in order that the owners of the cotton mills could get cheap slave labor at a few pennies a day to be able to sell cotton on the world markets so that those cotton manufacturers of England could become dominant throughout the industrial world.

The House recessed at 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before we continue with the order of business, I wish to introduce to all Hon. Members the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair, represented by Mr. Brockelbank, 44 students from the McNab School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Teal; from the constituency of Regina South East, represented by Mr. Baker, 81 students from the Central Collegiate under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Lemon; from the constituency of Yorkton, represented by Mr. Gallagher, 68 students from the Yorkton Composite School under the direction of their teacher, Miss Nancy Kruger; from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana Centre, represented by Mr. Estey, 40 students from the Bishop Murray School under the direction of Mr. B. Noonan and Mr. L. Holash; from the constituency of Humboldt, represented by Mr. Breker, 22 students from the St. Gregor School under the direction of their principal, Mr. J. Nett.

I am sure all Hon. Members will wish to extend to all of the students, their teachers and their bus drivers, the warmest of all possible welcomes to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan and to hope that their stay here will be enjoyable and educational and to wish to each and every one of them a safe trip home.

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



The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill 57.

**MR. DEWHURST:** — Mr. Speaker, when we called it 12:30 I was speaking on this Bill 57 - an Act to amend The Essential Services Emergency Act, to which I take strong exception. I was pointing out that a number of farmers last fall were told they had to cut back on their production which in turn put many of the farmers in difficulty and laid many workers off in the eviscerating plants but we didn't hear one word from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) at that time protesting, nor was the public able to see in any way, shape or form, where the Minister of Agriculture or any of his colleagues were doing anything to help to overcome this situation in order to obtain greater markets for the farmers' produce. This was a slap in the face to many of the farmers.

We also saw 40 meetings held last fall aided and abetted and a lot of the expense paid for by the Minister of Agriculture in covering this province to promote the Task Force Report on Agriculture. That again, if that report is carried out, will throw many farmers off the land, many on to the labor market. Many of the sons and daughters of our rural residents will then become people of the labor organization if they are going to exist because they all can't become big corporation owners. We're going to have a lot more people looking for work and less opportunity for them. So I feel this Bill is vicious.

Right in one of the clauses it says that "in the opinion of the Lieutenant-Governor" - it doesn't say that the case has to be established, they are just of the opinion that if "there are two or more labor disputes" and it doesn't clarify how serious the dispute must be, then the Government can "declare that all further action and procedures in any or all of the labor disputes are replaced by the emergency procedures provided in this Act . . ." To me that is the type of law which we don't need on our Statute Books or any other statute books.

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

**MR. DEWHURST:** — I feel it's the same as an orchestra playing and they're going to play a dance tune and everybody has to get up and dance. The chickens have to get up and dance with the elephant, one elephant with one chicken - there is no comparison. There is no comparison in our modern society between the power of a corporation, one of our international corporations, compared to a working man. If the working men don't stick together to solve some of their problems and grievances, then they are in serious trouble. That was why trade unions were organized many years ago. That is why today we see trade unions sticking together more and more because big corporations, through the manufacturers associations and so forth - and interlocking directorates - they know that they are not dealing just with one employer, they are dealing with a syndicate or an organization of many, many employers, of large corporations.

To me this is a type of legislation that one could readily have expected 25 or 30 years ago from Hitler and his gauleiters but we can't expect this type of legislation in a democratic legislature and I think it is wrong. I think the Government should withdraw this legislation . . .

**April 5, 1971**

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

**MR. DEWHURST:** — . . . and bring in legislation whereby workers can work together to promote their interests and whereby they have a free access to discuss their problems and their difficulties, not only with the employers but also with the governments responsible. To me the actions of the Government over the past two years indicate it has been giving only lip-service to the working people of this province be they organized laborers or unorganized. It has given lip-service but has closed the door on them on every occasion. At no time has it ever tried, in my opinion, to bring in legislation that will help the working people, either the organized or the unorganized.

I know I should be out of order if I had to go over the details of the number of cases in which the Government has shown its attitude to the working people of this province. It does not seem to understand that working people, be they urban working people or rural working people, organized or unorganized have a right to live in decency and have a right to be able to hold their heads up in society and be able to have their share of the luxuries of life which labor, along with management and investment, can bring to modern society.

It appears that all the benefits of industrialization should go to the bond-holders and the few corporate friends and none of it should trickle down to the laborers or the working people. That is the policy which has been pursued by this Government and the policies which have been fostered, aided and abetted and I cannot support this legislation because it is not legislation designed for a democratic society for free people, so I shall oppose it.

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

**HON. A.R. GUY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, since The Essential Services Act was first introduced in 1966, I have made a point of speaking each time that this Act has been in front of the Legislature. I have done this because I wish the people of Saskatchewan to know exactly where I stand in regard to this legislation.

The amendments which we are debating here today again afford me the opportunity to do just that. I shall try to avoid going over some of the arguments that our Members on his side of the House have put forth and have mentioned in their speeches. However, I should like to make one or two comments regarding remarks made by some of our Members opposite who made very weak efforts to try and justify their stand. Before I'm finished I think that all Members in this House and in Saskatchewan will see that their stand in regard to labor-management issues is one that is pretty hard to decipher at this particular time.

The Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) made the comment that the Liberals back in 1964 made a commitment to improve labor relations. But I want to remind Members of this House that before the Liberal Government even had an opportunity to get into the Legislature and to discuss or to look at labor legislation, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor, of which the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) is a paid-up Member, in fact an executive member, along with the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) took the SFL right into the realm of politics

and forced them to pass a resolution calling them to take every action possible to defeat the Liberal Government. Then the Members says, 'well since that time we haven't had very good relationships with the Liberal Government.' Well, what do you expect when Members who are sitting in this Legislature use their outside jobs as executives of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to pass that type of resolution, calling for the defeat of the Liberal Government before they even had the opportunity to show what their feelings towards organized labor was? Is it any wonder that there hasn't been a very good relationship between the SFL, the NDP and the Liberal Party? I can tell the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour if they would get rid of their members that are sitting in this House using politics as a sole argument for support of them then they would get some support from this Party.

Then the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) had the tears rolling down our cheeks. He stood up and he said, "This Bill has no place in this Legislature or any other democratic legislature in the land." And yet it was only a few days ago that he stood up and supported a resolution calling for compulsory arbitration and I'm going to have considerable more to say about that before this afternoon is over.

Then the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) didn't have anything better to talk about. He wanted to get on the record as being against this legislation; he didn't have anything constructive to say so he started criticizing Members on this side for not being in the Legislature when he is making his speech. Well, I can tell you there were more Members on this side of the House than there were on that side of the House. But it is plain to everyone that the reason that nobody is in this House is because he gave that speech every year since 1966 and we've got it memorized. We don't have to stay in the House to listen to the Member for Wadena.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should suggest that there is no more timely occasion than today with the results of the threatened rail strikes still vivid in our minds to discuss this particular second reading of The Essential Services Emergency Act. It is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, the railroad union of which the MLA from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) is a member would deliberately create a tie-up of all rail traffic while negotiations were still in process. They couldn't wait to bring about a work stoppage knowing how that would affect the farmers, the potash industry and everyone else in this province. But what is even more unbelievable now that the rail strike is being averted, that the Winnipeg Local of this same union said, "We will not accept their award and we are going to carry out a wildcat strike." This is the most unbelievable and irresponsible action but what can you expect from people like that. The Member from Moose Jaw North belongs to that same Local. In fact, it was probably a telegram from him this morning that has asked them to take this particular action because he wants to keep the labor front here in Saskatchewan in turmoil.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Members of this House are well aware of the Government's position in regard to The Essential Services Act and the need for compulsory binding arbitration to protect the interests of every person in this province. That was the reason why we brought the Act in in 1966 and that is the reason . . . And I'll have a few words to say about what Don Mitchell says about it too. Yes, I'll tell you what Don Mitchell had to say.

**April 5, 1971**

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Liberal Party . . .

**MR. GUY:** — That's according to Don Mitchell too. And he happens to be one of your own political friends. In fact he almost beat Allan Blakeney for the leadership. He would have, too, if you hadn't got into the act.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — . . . Wilf Gardiner for the leadership.

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

**MR. GUY:** — Where did that put you? Where did that put you? It put you in the seat next to the Leader and you'd better not leave because I've got some words to say about you, too.

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

**MR. GUY:** — That's the reason we brought this Act in in 1966, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reason that we have introduced amendments from time to time. And that is the reason that we have used this Act on several occasions for protection of Saskatchewan citizens. There has never been any doubt as to where the Liberal Party and the Government in Saskatchewan stands in regard to The Essential Services Act and the use of compulsory arbitration. I thought, Mr. Speaker, until recently that there was no question as to where Members opposite stood in regard to this legislation. They voted against the Act in 1966; they voted against the use of the Act on every occasion since then; they voted against the amendments each time they have been introduced into the Legislature; and this pattern is being followed in the speeches we have heard to date on the present amendment.

However, it will be interesting to see how they vote when second reading of this Bill is concluded. The people of Saskatchewan are asking: has the attitude of the NDP changed toward the use of compulsory arbitration? And I think the people of Saskatchewan deserve to know. It was most unbelievable and amazing the other day when the Saskatchewan NDP caucus passed a resolution urging Parliament to order the locomotive engineers back to work and to implement binding compulsory arbitration. The people of Saskatchewan are asking: what was behind this resolution, was it in the best interests of the Saskatchewan people that this resolution was passed or was it a deathbed repentance and of more concern for the political future of the Saskatchewan NDP? I understand from newspaper reports that the decision to pass this resolution perhaps was not unanimous in the NDP caucus. So again, I think the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know which of the Members opposite support compulsory arbitration and which of the Members opposite do not support it. They will have the opportunity to show this when this amendment comes to a vote because this is calling for compulsory arbitration in essential services. And this is exactly - and they can't weasel out of it - the same principle as was embodied in the resolution which they sent to Ottawa. Therefore it will be obvious to the people of Saskatchewan if Members opposite vote against second reading of this Bill dealing with compulsory arbitration, that the sending of the telegram dealing with compulsory arbitration was nothing more than a bare-faced political ploy to save their political skins.

Not only the Saskatchewan people are concerned about the intent of the telegram but Don Mitchell, one of the five advisory members to the NDP caucus is concerned. Today at a press conference he called upon the caucus to withdraw support for compulsory arbitration and to disassociate themselves from the telegram which was sent. He said that the convention last July determined the role that the NDP would follow in regard to compulsory arbitration and that they turned it down flat. He says that the program that was announced for the next election, the program for the '70s you will recall, stated definitely that the NDP were opposed to compulsory arbitration and would immediately abolish Bill 2 and any other legislation associated with it. So he is concerned why all of a sudden this same man who came out two months ago with a program for the '70s that opposed categorically compulsory arbitration, would turn around last Friday and send a telegram to the Federal Government calling for compulsory arbitration. Then in the afternoon he denies it.

So there you are. It is no wonder that the people of Saskatchewan are confused because Members of their own party are confused. And these aren't Members who are backbenchers or who have little authority in the party. This was a man who gave him a very close run for the leadership. This was a man who would be one of the most honest spokesman that that party has ever had. He is a man who is prepared to put politics aside for the true philosophy of the NDP and follow the old Socialist line right down to the tee. So he is concerned today that Members opposite were willing to support compulsory arbitration and he wonders why.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Too bad he is not here to hear these nice things.

**MR. GUY:** — And more than that he is not only just wondering, he has stated categorically - and I know that he will carry it out - that if the NDP caucus do not withdraw their support for compulsory arbitration and disassociate themselves from the telegram that their leader sent, he will resign forthwith from the council of the NDP.

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

**MR. GUY:** — Well I'll have to disagree with my Deputy Premier because I think Don Mitchell is a man who has more political savvy and he certainly has more political honesty than any of the other Members on that side of the House. And do you know what he ended up in his press conference suggesting? He suggested that the only reason that that telegram was sent was for political purposes and he was right. And he was right.

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

**MR. GUY:** — When Mr. Blakeney sent the telegram he went on to try to explain to this House that they believed in the fundamental rights to strike but in some cases the right must be subordinated by the larger interest of the public. Well, we should like to know what public. It looks to us that it is probably the NDP public that they are so concerned with. The NDP have been noted over the years for using any issue at any time for political

**April 5, 1971**

benefit that they feel could arrest the defections from their party. I want to recall for just a few minutes the reaction of Members opposite when we introduced a motion last year calling on the Federal Government to invoke compulsory arbitration in management-labor disputes affecting the grain handling industry - the same problem that we had last week when this telegram was sent to Ottawa. I wonder what the reaction was. Well let's look at what the Member for Regina North East said. He is a Member of this caucus who sent the telegram calling upon compulsory arbitration. Mr. Smishek, Regina North East said:

Mr. Speaker, the resolution introduced by the Hon. Member is nothing else but a political ploy designed to test the Opposition.

Oh, No, he wouldn't send a telegram to Ottawa for political purposes would he? No, Sir. Then he went on and he said:

They know (meaning the Liberals) that we are opposed to compulsory arbitration as a method for the resolution of industrial disputes.

And yet today, did he stand up here and say that he was opposed to his Leader sending a telegram to Ottawa calling for compulsory arbitration? Did the Member for Regina North East have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and deny that he was in favor of that? He's got his head down now and I don't blame him. He should hang his head in shame. One minute he says he is opposed to it and the next minute he is part of that great happy group that sends a telegram calling for it. He was against it last year; he was for it last Friday and now today he is trying to weasel out of Bill 2 by saying, "Oh, No, I don't believe that compulsory arbitration is a very good thing." Why then, if it wasn't a good thing last year and it is not a good thing today, why was it a good thing on Friday when he knew that the future of the NDP was in jeopardy? Why didn't the Member stand up and tell us that?

Now we've got some other Members over there who made some pretty strong statements in regard to compulsory arbitration. They spoke in this House today. I think of the Member from Moose Jaw North or South - I can't keep track of him because he moves from one to the other wherever the political winds blow - which is it, North? North, yes North, and he says - this was in debate last year - "I expect, Mr. Speaker, that the Government hoped to use this resolution for some devious political purpose at some future date." He says that about a party that has been in support of compulsory arbitration ever since we became the Government. Yet he assigns some malicious, political purpose. Well, what about the Member who is acting as whip over there? He was against it last year. Where did he stand last Friday? He stood 100 per cent behind his leader and he called for compulsory arbitration for his union, the union that he is a paid-up operating member of, and he said, "Take the irons to them, Jim, for compulsory arbitration." What he was really saying, Mr. Speaker, is, compulsory arbitration can sell them down the road if it means that I am going to get re-elected to the Legislature in the next election.

But now that the strike is over, the threat is gone, so he stands up in this House and he says, "Oh, no, I am against compulsory arbitration." Well I hope that he will go out and he will tell the voters in his constituency and I hope that he will tell the members of his union who have been watching him

in the last week and explain to them how he can be against compulsory arbitration last year and again today, but he wasn't against compulsory arbitration last Friday. How do you explain that? Oh, yes, we had Mr. Blakeney participating in the debate last year and he said, "My basic point is that while we should like to see the free flow of grain, we suggest that his solution won't work, in other words, we suggest that compulsory arbitration won't work." This is what he said last year. What did he say on Friday as Leader of their party? He said, "We've got to have compulsory arbitration and get those fellows back to work." Why? Because he is the Leader of a political party that was faced with being washed right off the face of Saskatchewan if he didn't come out in support of compulsory arbitration. Where is he today? Oh, now he has wavered again. He is back to the theme that compulsory arbitration won't work, it is not good. So those are three of the leaders.

Now we've had other Members speak on the issue. I think it was the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) who got up today and made his little speech. Well, what did he say a week ago, one year ago? Mr. Meakes stood up in his seat last year and he said:

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

Mr. Speaker, he was ashamed to participate in a debate last year calling for compulsory arbitration but was he ashamed to back his Leader last Friday when they sent the telegram to Ottawa calling for compulsory arbitration. It is funny how this shame happens to move back and forth with the political winds in this province. Then he had the audacity to stand up here today and say, "You know I examine my conscience every morning in front of a mirror, I stand there when I'm shaving and I look at myself and I say, "Have I done what is right for the people of Saskatchewan." I tell you he has some difficulty. Last Friday he stood in front of the mirror and he said, "I believe in compulsory arbitration." Today he stood in front of the mirror and he said, "I don't believe in compulsory arbitration." I tell you that the fellow behind the mirror will think that he doesn't know what he is talking about. Well, it must be a two-way mirror. Then we got over here and then we have the Member from . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He was shaving in a public washroom.

**MR. GUY:** — It must have been open. Somebody was answering him back from the other side. Oh, yes, now we have the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault).

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He looks in the mirror too.

**MR. GUY:** — No, he didn't look in the mirror, but Mr. Thibault said, "I certainly don't want to go and tramp labor into the ground. For what? Just for political gains and no other reasons? It is not a question of justice. It is just can we obtain a vote by doing it? This is what I resent, and I resent it with all the power that is in me."

**April 5, 1971**

Last year he resented the suggestion that compulsory arbitration was desirable. It was a political ploy that those Liberals were using. Did he stand up last Friday when his Leader announced that he was sending a telegram to Ottawa? Now we know that the Member for Kinistino, on occasion, has stood up and been counted alone from the Members on his side of the House, but why didn't he do it last Friday? After the statement he made last year why didn't he stand up and tell this House that he has not changed his mind, that he is still violently opposed to the use of compulsion? He should be a Waffler.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I could go on. I have one here from the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood), but he is not in his seat. Oh, he said that while he was prepared to go right down the line for the farmers in their fight to keep their grain moving he didn't think the best way of doing this was by getting up and supporting the "ham-fisted, irresponsible position" set out in this Resolution, calling for compulsory arbitration. Yes, last year he wasn't in favor of this "ham-fisted, irresponsible position" of compulsory arbitration. Where was he last Friday when his Leader sent a telegram calling upon the Federal Government to use compulsory arbitration in exactly similar circumstances when we were suggesting it last year? Was it ham-fisted now? Was it irresponsible? No, it is only irresponsible when the Liberal Party suggests it, never irresponsible when Members opposite are trying to save their political skins.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan have got to recognize one thing. Here is a party on this side of the House to your right that has never changed its mind. It knows what is in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan are going to be amazed and dismayed and completely upset when they look at the role of the Members opposite who have no concern for the farmers of this province or for anyone else in Canada, as long as they can keep their political skins intact. Well, as I say, I could go on but I am not going to. I think I have shown the people of Saskatchewan the attitude and the irresponsible actions of Members opposite and I am not surprised that they are sitting there with their heads bent. This is enough to make anybody disillusioned with politics when you see the actions of Members opposite.

Within 12 short months they changed their position three times and every time it is because of the political consequences which they fear. One cannot help but note, in passing, that each year at this time some of our unions which support our friends opposite go on strike and leave the poor farmer, the potash producers and others dependent upon the grain industry, with a tie-up, which costs the people of this province millions of dollars. Last year, to a man, Members stood up and voted as I showed you, against the resolution and made strong speeches. Why, the people of Saskatchewan are saying today, have they passed a resolution this year calling for it when they refused to support it in similar circumstances a year ago?

They are asking, and rightfully so, does it have anything to do with the impending election in Saskatchewan? You know it was interesting last Friday night, Mr. Speaker, just after Mr. Blakeney had made his announcement to the news media and appeared on CBC television stating that his caucus were proud to send a telegram on behalf of the caucus calling upon the Federal Government to invoke compulsory arbitration. He was followed on that particular newscast by Mr. Ross Hale, the President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to which our friends Mr. Davies



and Mr. Smishek belong.

What did Mr. Hale say about compulsory arbitration? Well, he stated and I listened very carefully because I wanted to hear if he agreed with his Leader, Mr. Blakeney. He said, "We need Mr. Bryce Mackasey here in the Province of Saskatchewan. Why? Because he does not believe in compulsory arbitration. Now there was Mr. Hale, President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour one minute behind Mr. Blakeney, stating "We are opposed to compulsory arbitration," while his Leader and the Leader of the NDP say, "We are all in favor of compulsory arbitration."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that Members opposite should tell us whether they are for compulsory arbitration or whether they are against it. The people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know whether they were using the telegram to Ottawa as a political ploy or whether they really believe that compulsory arbitration should have been used in that regard. I think, particularly, that our Federation of Labour Members, Mr. Smishek and Mr. Davies, should stand up and tell us whether they support Mr. Hale or whether they support Mr. Blakeney, because you can't be supporting both of them at the same time.

If they support the position of their Leader, Mr. Hale, then they should stand up in this House and immediately repudiate and ask that they not be associated with the telegram that their Leader, Mr. Blakeney forwarded to Ottawa. It is bad enough to have the grain industry, the agricultural industry, the potash industry, the pulp industry and others tied up as a result of irresponsible action of labor union leaders, without having to put up with cheap NDP politicians trying to use this disaster and emergency to attempt to gather political advantage. As I pointed out, one of their most distinguished members, Mr. Mitchell, also deplores this action.

Members opposite must stand and be counted one way or the other. The time to do that is now on second reading of this Bill. If they vote against this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we shall have irrefutable proof that the telegram asking the Federal Government to invoke compulsory arbitration was for political gain rather than any interest that they had in settling the strike.

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

**MR. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, since 1964 it has been the burden of this Legislature to consider restrictive and coercive legislation on a large number of occasions and all Hon. Members will recall those occasions well.

Since this Government has assumed office there has hardly been a session in this Legislature that has passed, when we have not been required to direct our attention to measures which have been designed to restrict and to make less effective the efforts of Saskatchewan's working men and women.

Amendments to The Saskatchewan Trade Union Act have made the certification process and the organization of workers into trade unions a good deal more difficult. At the same time provisions of The Trade Union Act have made the decertification

**April 5, 1971**

process a great deal easier. Measures have been introduced which tie the hands of workers in a number of specific industries and specific classifications. In a number of cases actions by this Government were initiated during, or as a consequence, of a current industrial dispute. Other restrictive legislation has appeared and under these circumstances numerous workers have been affected for no apparent reason, Mr. Speaker, except what would appear to be a preconceived prejudice by this Government.

When The Essential Services Emergency Act was passed in September of 1966 this dispute was between the employees of The Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Crown. However, Mr. Speaker, without provocation, hospital workers and others were also included in the Act at that time. We, in the Opposition, said at that time that the Government was provoking a situation which would ultimately result in difficulties at a future date. We suggested that the Government could not justify their action in placing hospital workers in a kind of straitjacket which The Essential Services Emergency Act provided.

Hospital workers in Saskatchewan, in 1966, Mr. Speaker, had a remarkable record for tolerance and responsibility. We pointed out to the Government at that time that these workers had never gone on strike. We pointed out to them that never had a strike vote even been taken. We asked this Government what conceivable reason they had for the arbitrary action that they were taking with respect to a group of the lowest paid service workers in the whole of Saskatchewan. Without attempting to justify their legislative action this Government used their majority in the House to force compulsory arbitration upon a group of industrial workers who were guilty of no wrongdoing, Mr. Speaker, nor was there any indication at that time of any impending problems.

However, Mr. Speaker, it was apparent to a number of us that the Liberal Government opposite was looking to the future and it was apparent that they had a clearly defined plan of attack which a number of us suspected at that time.

Let me just quote to you from a speech that I made in the House on The Essential Services Emergency Act during second reading in 1966. At that time I said this:

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that without provocation, hospital workers have been tried and sentenced in advance, which would lead us to believe that a hard line is to be expected in future negotiations with these employees, with the Department of Health holding a tight rein on finances and demanding that hospital boards use restraint with respect to increased costs.

I say that this is unfortunate as many of these people referred to in the legislation are at a lower end of the wage scale.

This was from the 1966 The Essential Services Emergency Act debate.

Mr. Speaker, Members on the Government side of the House at that time claimed that I was being unfair to them in suggesting that the Government had any sinister or ulterior motives. However, Mr. Speaker, in a matter of a very few months the Premier and his Government clarified their position beyond all doubt. It will be remembered that the hospital workers in

Estevan soon learned what it was that this Government had in mind when they attempted to negotiate a new contract. It will be remembered that a Conciliation Board was finally established to recommend on the matter of wages concerning the Estevan hospital workers.

Let's look at what happened, Mr. Speaker. After deliberating for a considerable amount of time, the Conciliation Board brought down an unanimous award which the Premier immediately rejected out-of-hand. This was an award which was approved by both management and the union and rejected by the Premier. This action by the Premier was so unfair and so unheard of in labor management circles, Mr. Speaker, that it received the attention of the entire country.

The Ottawa Citizen, as far away as Ontario, commented editorially with respect to the hospital dispute. I believe that at least a portion of that editorial deserves to be written into the records here. It says this:

Now, at the request of the hospital, he, the Premier, has invoked a 1966 Essential Services Emergency Act to get workers to return to work and submit to arbitration binding on both sides - hospital and union - but not it would seem on Mr. Thatcher, who may once again reject that award. Worse, because his Cabinet has authority as a last resort to appoint the Arbitration Board chairman, he might well be counting on getting the kind of arbitration award that he wants rather than a just settlement.

Premier Thatcher is worried about getting a pattern for other wage negotiations coming up, but the hospital workers earning \$1.38 to \$1.65 an hour have considerable catching up to do. The Premier has been treating them as guinea pigs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since this Government assumed office in 1964, they have engaged in a vendetta against the organized workers in the Province of Saskatchewan. As I predicted in 1966, this Government has used Bill 2 to enforce wage settlements and enforce working conditions upon unwilling people. Instead of being a partner in negotiating agreements, Saskatchewan workers in the final sense have become the victims of a chain of circumstances over which they have had very little control.

To review the record again, Mr. Speaker, hospital workers prior to the Estevan dispute which was precipitated by the Premier, never in the history had withdrawn their services, nor had the situation ever deteriorated to a point where a strike vote had to be taken. And yet within a few months of this Government assuming office, and with the passage of restrictive and dictatorial legislation, problems in this area began to manifest themselves. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there is a degree of discontent among these workers in this particular area which is widespread. If there are problems in the future and there may very well be, then the responsibility rests squarely upon the shoulders of this Government.

On the Provincial scene, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat again, that those 20 years of CCF rule between 1944 and 1964 represented an era of relative labor peace in the Province of Saskatchewan.

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

**April 5, 1971**

**MR. SNYDER:** — We had a record with respect to good industrial relations which was the envy of every other province in Canada. Time lost as a result of strikes in Saskatchewan during that period of time was minimal. I think that Members will all recall, if they want to be objective, that the Department of Labour responded to the needs of the times with active conciliation and mediation proceedings. Our province, through just labor laws, made it possible for management and labor to resolve the vast majority of contract disputes without any interference, whatsoever, by a third party.

This element of good will and mutual trust, Mr. Speaker, is a thing of the past in Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. SNYDER:** — Whether the problem be one between hospital workers and hospital boards, between teachers and trustees, or between other industrial workers and their employers, this Government can be counted upon to coerce and interfere from the sidelines on almost every occasion, Mr. Speaker.

Almost without exception in every dispute of any major proportion of recent years, the Premier or one of his colleagues has been on hand to aggravate and to inflame the whole situation.

It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that many years ago prior to the emergence of the farmer labour party and later the CCF, that the Liberal Party was one of the defenders of the labor movement and the working men and women. During election campaigns it will be remembered that Liberals and trade unionists on occasion shared public platforms. Even as late as 1971, in certain remote areas of Canada, Liberals still represent themselves to be the spokesmen for labor. However, since this Saskatchewan Liberal Party fell into the hands of its present leader Saskatchewan Liberals have exhibited a contempt for working men and women which is beyond belief.

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

**MR. SNYDER:** — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must ask ourselves, why the Premier and his colleagues have assumed such an attitude of contempt for Saskatchewan's working men and women. I expect that some of the problems can be related to the complete lack of understanding which Members opposite have for the position of those who bargain with their employer collectively. If this was the only reason for the Government's action and attitude then I should perhaps be able to forgive some Liberals.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that this is not the principal motivation behind the constant vendetta which emanates from Liberal Members opposite. Political advantage is the motivating influence when the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) rises in his place and gives his annual performance, or when the former Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) attacks the trade union movement, or we hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Guy) with the presentation that he made today. This Government has taken advantage of what they feel to be a wise manoeuvre in an attempt to set teacher against trustee, set hospital worker against hospital board, but more specifically to generate distrust between the farmer and the wage earner

in Saskatchewan.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the political advantage which he hopes to gain, arrived in this Legislature with his own particular prejudices. His own performance in his home town of Moose Jaw is very well known. One of my constituents, whom the Premier will recall, remembers vividly an occasion when he worked for the Premier, who was then the owner of the Moose Jaw hardware, when the Premier stormed in and gathered about him his employees and demanded to know which of them it was who had scratched the top of the dining room table in the furniture department. Well, when none of them assumed responsibility for the damaged merchandise, then Ross, the boss, retaliated by cutting off everybody's Christmas bonus. This represents the kind of employer-employee relationship which are best understood by the Premier today. The mailed fist, Mr. Speaker, - the big club - these are the kind of subtle bargaining methods which are best known to the Premier. I suggest to you that if he had any concern for or any understanding of any basic rights for employees then I should find it hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that employees from his hardware store would have been obliged to put up hay at the ranch at Caron during slack time in the hardware business.

The legislation which is before us today follows a pattern of previous anti-labor Bills which have been forced upon the unwilling people of Saskatchewan in the past. Each amendment to The Trade Union Act or of The Essential Services Emergency Act represents a further erosion of the hard-won rights of the wage earner of Saskatchewan. Instead of a return to the era of industrial peace which we enjoyed in 1964, this Legislature will only serve to widen the gap and deepen the rift if it passes this legislation that is before us today. This legislation gives complete authority to the Premier of this Province to decide when an emergency exists. He may then bring the full force of the Act to bear upon those who are involved in a contract dispute and I ask Members opposite to consider the kind of power they are placing in the hands of a man whom they themselves know to be exceedingly abrupt and extremely intemperate on many occasions. I ask you Members opposite to ask yourselves if you would wish the Premier to have the kind of direct control over your livelihood as this legislation confers upon him to control the lives of other people.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and notwithstanding the fact that the recent railway dispute is unrelated to the motion that is before us, I feel obliged to offer a few remarks in this connection. This matter has been discussed in a previous resolution and I expect a discussion on that was out of order at that time. I trust I shall have the opportunity to make a few remarks at this time concerning the recent rail dispute. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I hope to take the liberty of making just a few references to a number of matters which have been mentioned in this House in connection with the dispute.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) when he was on his feet had something to say about the interference of international unions. He made some reference to Canadian railway unions and he claimed that somehow by some remote method the American influence had somehow been responsible for railway strikes in Canada in order he said, I believe, to cripple grain sales in order that the Americans can sell more wheat. I think this is one of the most fantastic statements that I have ever heard

**April 5, 1971**

emanate from the Treasury benches opposite. I am sure that the Minister of Highways had really a deeper understanding and a better line of reasoning than the one that he presented to this House. If I were he I should disassociate myself from remarks that he had made in this connection.

I think it has to be recognized by all people who are in touch with the situation that there is no question but what the Canadian labor movement and the railroad Brotherhoods are autonomous groups. They make their own judgments; they are masters in their own households. For the Minister of Highways to suggest anything else is an affront to the House and I am disappointed that the Minister takes the position that he has in an attempt to create an issue out of whole cloth.

Just let me continue and take just a moment to express exception to the inferences that have been made to the extent that this particular work stoppage has been initiated by a handful of selfish, high-paid, irresponsible locomotive engineers as some Members opposite have chosen to suggest. It is evident that those who are offering these kinds of vocal criticisms of this group of workers have not taken the time or made any effort to acquaint themselves with the facts surrounding that recent dispute. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite chose the organized workers in this case as their political target and the facts of the case will have little bearing on their judgment I am sure. Very briefly I want to relate a few of the pertinent matters to this House.

Fact number one, Mr. Speaker, is that never in a hundred years, never in over a century of collective bargaining for their membership has the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers ever withdrawn their services. They have never gone out on strike in a period of something in excess of one hundred years of operation on the Canadian scene. Never in over a hundred years had this group of workers ever taken a strike vote or have they chosen to withdraw their services. This is the first incident which has progressed to the point where a withdrawal of service has ever been threatened. This, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is hardly a picture of a selfish and irresponsible group of trade unionists.

The second point that I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, is the fact, contrary to a number of reports by way of the media across the country, wages were not the only or even the principal consideration in this particular dispute. In effect, Mr. Speaker, the Conciliation Board which reported to the Federal Minister of Labour after approximately four months of deliberation failed to deal with all except two matters which were in contention. This report was referred to the Minister on the 16th of March after failing to deal with 17 other contentious items. The failure of the Board to deal with these matters was explained by the chairman of the Board, Mr. R.A. Gallagher, in this way and let me quote it to you. This is a quotation from the chairman of the Conciliation Board, Mr. Gallagher. No relation to the Member opposite I trust:

While the Board held a good number of hearings with the parties and received extensive argument on all foregoing requests, it was not long before the Board came to the realization that the issues being dealt with by the parties were of an extremely difficult and technical nature, requiring for their proper solution an understanding and appreciation of many of the facets of

railroading and an exercise in these facets not possessed by individual members of the Board. In saying this the members of the Board are not endeavoring in any way to escape their responsibilities, nor to ignore the heavy burden and onus upon them to endeavor to bring about the resolution of these issues in an area of life so vital to the welfare and economy of this country. But there is a very great danger which the members of the Board can see in having persons with little or no knowledge or expertise making recommendations to the parties which may cause great confusion and difficulty and may not really serve the best interests of either of the parties. As will be seen from what follows, the customs, practices and work rules under which the parties carry out their working lives are of the utmost complexity. Their requests, which are the subject matter of the dispute between the parties, touch upon some of the most fundamental and far-reaching working conditions. To be able to deal with these requests meaningfully would require a knowledge and an understanding of railroading which could only be gained by an intensive study and practical experience, all of which would require a great number of hearings by the Board and possibly extending over a period of many months. Under the circumstances this Board is of the opinion that it would best serve the interests of the parties if it confined its recommendation to two of the basic issues between them. With respect to these two issues it is the Board's view that the knowledge of and expertise in the field of railroading referred to above is not essential to a proper assessment of such issues, nor is it essential to the making of proper recommendations with respect to them.

Mr. Speaker, the only two matters which were dealt with and recommended upon were, item one, term of the agreement and number two, wage increases. From this, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be understood that there has been a continuing element of frustration arising out of the fact that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers has been working over a year without a contract. During this time a conciliation board which was charged with the responsibility of dealing with a large number of matters which were in dispute was activated by the Federal Minister of Labour, Mr. Mackasey. Approximately four months later the Conciliation Board brought down a report which contained three separate and three conflicting statements or proposals - one by the chairman, another by the company's nominee and still another by a nominee appointed to the Board by the Union. Accordingly, the matters with which they dealt remained unsolved and the 17 other major points in contention were not even dealt with.

Among those matters which were not considered by the Board were such complex items as held-away-from-home, rest-on-the-road-service after ten hours, cancellation of assignments, turn-around-points and a whole host of matters which will mean very little to any Members opposite or I expect on this side of the House who have no understanding of the jargon or the technical nature of the problems. But against this back drop, Mr. Speaker, I hope that Members opposite can see their way clear to give a greater indication of their own responsibility and their own maturity when they make reference to what has been indeed a very complex problem. It was not, as has been suggested, a handful of selfish, high-paid, irresponsible locomotive engineers who

**April 5, 1971**

who have taken a careless course of action. The plain and simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there was no other course of action open to this industrial group at that particular time.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that most Canadians have breathed a sigh of relief in learning that the dispute has been settled, if indeed it has been settled in advance of a strike deadline. I suggest to you that the Saskatchewan Liberal Party represents the only group in Canada that will regret the fact that the rail strike has been averted and another election issue lost to the Saskatchewan Liberals.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me make one point that I have attempted to make in connection with this whole matter on a number of other occasions. I believe it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that settlements which are imposed upon unwilling employees or employers are no substitute for the due process of collective bargaining. The kind of industrial peace which is enjoyed in Sweden and to which some Members have referred in recent days and during this debate, comes about not from iron-fisted compulsion, Mr. Speaker, but from good labor laws from a co-operative attitude by Government and as a result of mutual trust between management and employees.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that when industry decides to increase their earnings they do it without fanfare, they do it without negotiation and without the requirement to justify their action to anyone. On the other hand, when wages have failed to keep pace with rising living costs and workers are required to justify their demands then, on occasion, they find it necessary to use the strike weapon to terminate a failure in the bargaining process. Hopefully this happens on a minimum of occasions.

The amendments which are before us, Mr. Speaker, will not serve as a solution to industrial disputes but instead they will increase existing friction and will further erode the climate of industrial relations in Saskatchewan. For the reasons I have already indicated, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the Bill on second reading.

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

**MR. R. HEGGIE (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I move to speak on Bill 57, being an Act to amend The Essential Services Emergency Act of 1966, because of its extreme importance at this juncture in our history. I do not disagree entirely with certain Members of the Opposition who have spoken on the Bill, that the Government must be careful not to intimidate labor or use bias in its dealings with organized labor. But what my honorable opponents seem to overlook is the fact that conditions and social customs have changed. What was relevant 20 years ago or 50 years ago has no relevancy today. There were many times in history when strike action by the trades union movement was the only method available to it, to bring their grievances to the notice of their employer. In the 19th century and in the early part of the 20th century capitalism and big business were all powerful and they refused to bargain and strikes in many instances were illegal.

After World War I, the general strike became a powerful



weapon in the hands of labor leaders to raise the wages of workers and obtain rights for workers. It was between the two world wars when big unions like the Steel Workers of America and the United Auto Workers, (which were industrial rather than craft unions) demonstrated the awesome power of union activity. General Motors was struck in the late thirties by the United Auto Workers and they demonstrated once and for all the power of unions to bring down a giant corporation to where the factory wheels did not move. Since World War II there have been more strikes in the steel industry and in the automobile industry, in the farm machinery industry, in the Maritime shipping industry, in the transportation industry and many other of the huge industries that are the lifeblood of the country. It soon became apparent that these strikes were not local affairs but were national in scope and affected everyone and every class of citizen, regardless of how remote their interests in the strike were. It was in the 1960s that strike action reached its zenith of militancy. In Canada, United States and Britain, for example, there were always some unions on strike, and some vital part of the economy had ground to a halt. Let us consider the decade from 1960 to 1970. It was during this decade that the right to strike was given to a wide variety of trades and professions which formerly had never considered strike action. The civil servants got the right to form unions and bargain collectively. Firemen got the same rights. Many police forces began to bargain collectively. Post office employees struck for the first time in 1968 and repeated again in 1970. Hospital workers now consider strike action legitimate. Now the upshot of all this is that strike action has crept into every nook and cranny of our public and economic life where everyone is affected and in many occasions hurt and injured by irresponsible strike action. Consider all these in the context of enlightened free enterprise, of enlightened public enterprise, of enlightened co-operative enterprise. There is a genuine concern nowadays by all these managerial bodies to be concerned about the workers, to ensure they get fair wages, annual holidays, group insurance and sundry fringe benefits. A far cry from sending 10-year-old children down the mine or into the cotton mills, as the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) referred to this morning.

Mr. Speaker, labor relations nowadays is a whole new ball game. The rules have changed and so have the attitudes, Mr. Frank Meakes notwithstanding. You can't compare labor relations today with labor relations 50 years ago. The right to strike is not an inalienable right or a basic freedom in 1970 as it was in 1870 or even in 1940. Times have changed but the NDP doesn't seem to realize it. They hang on to the worn-out clichés when the public has long ago passed them by. In 1971 we don't need justice and common sense to settle wage demands and labor relations. We have just got to move into the realms of labor courts and binding arbitration for the good of the workers and the managers alike. I dare say most workers would be glad to have their wage demands reviewed at regular intervals by labor courts and if within a reasonable time there is no voluntary settlement of a strike, the labor courts would move in to settle the strike for both sides.

Our society is far too complex nowadays to depend upon the clumsy, cumbersome strike action to settle nothing. We condemn war as using physical force to settle issues. The big arm of labor is using the same tactics to get what they want and sometimes what is really not just and fair. Everyone knows that

**April 5, 1971**

the St. Lawrence seaway workers used the big strike action in 1966 to get almost a 35 per cent wage increase. Everyone in Canada from all walks of life knows that this was the signal for the galloping inflation which followed and was not stopped until 1970 by the Trudeau Government.

The amendment to Bill 2 merely streamlines and speeds up settlement of labor relations which everyone in Saskatchewan - and I daresay in Canada - will applaud as a progressive step in labor relations.

I, therefore, in the light of modern conditions, will support this Bill with the further hope that when the Liberal Party is returned after the next election, labor courts based on the experience of other countries, will be adopted and become part of the Saskatchewan scene.

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

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I have watched the performance on Bill 57 for awhile and as a farmer I want to say at the outset that I will oppose Bill 57, because I have watched the performance of the boys across the way for seven years and their direction. They are geared to create turmoil at every step of the way. It's the sort of - I call it a malicious attitude. I can remember my mother talking about when she worked in the weaving mills at the age of 12 in order to bring bread home for the family. The weaving mills in the city of Manchester in the State of New Hampshire, that's where she worked and I'm not kidding - at the age of 12. She lost part of one finger in one of the looms at that age. Yes. So, after assessing and watching these people perform we see a Premier with a sledgehammer - the sledgehammer approach, for one reason alone, to be able to stay on his little throne, not the Liberal throne, a Thatcherite throne.

I heard the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) a moment ago mention the medicare strike. I want to tell the boys across the way that all the way through that strike, even with the present Premier kicking in the doors of this Legislature - and there's the picture of it - at no time did our leader or anyone suggest compulsory bargaining. This shows the stature of this group and the stature of the other one.

One thing that I want to say is that it's amazing that they don't seem to learn anything and they don't forget anything. I want to tell this House that the settlement of the railroad dispute is very sad for the Members across the way. You can see it written all over them, that they had the rug pulled out from under them and they are looking around to find something else for a political issue. Well, you may have to go back to the pulp mill but that's no good any more. It's worn out and you'll lose on that one. And all the way down through the history of this Government, since 1964, you have created unrest. You had it between the farmer and labor. You managed to sell the idea for a time. The teachers against the trustees and the teachers against the parents. You had that one well mixed up and instead of settling you let it ferment to the state where you had plenty of trouble. Then you took the hospital workers and sent them back to work. Did we do that with the doctors? No. But the hospital workers were forced back to work. Then you have, just lately, a little quarrel going on between Manitoba and Saskatchewan over some untruths that were proved in this House.

All for one reason - to protect the throne of the Leader (Mr. Thatcher). Lately I heard that the Premier was going into the horse business. I heard he had nightmares over Wilf, and he tried to figure out a way to use Bill 2 on Wilf Gardiner . . .

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

**MR. THIBAUT:** — . . . and he said how am I going to do this. Now he says everybody sitting in that Cabinet is wishing he is sitting there by the grace of Ross. And I'm going to call the Minister of Industry (Mr. Estey) in and tell him. Now, I'm going to ask Wilf first that he must lower his credibility because in that nightmare I saw Wilf sitting on my throne, and the only way is to lower his credibility and then I am safe.

So he called Wilf in and said you go out with only one project and then . . .

**MR. MacDOUGALL:** — What's this got to do with Bill 2?

**MR. THIBAUT:** — I'm just pointing out why you want this Bill, and then he said "you go out and tell the people one project and after you've got everybody mixed up, I'll come along and be the holy little boy and say you can have as many projects as you like, but Wilf will be down here instead of up there." We're just pointing out the unrest of this group, created by this group. So when Wilf decided, this \$16,000 or lose my job.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. MacDOUGALL:** — What's this got to do with Bill 2 that we're discussing?

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! A Member has risen on a point of order.

**MR. MacDOUGALL:** — I'm just asking what this has got to do with the Bill that we are discussing? I mean it's pretty wide-ranging, Mr. Speaker, you have to admit.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I do have to admit that when the Member brings in the question of a former Member of this Legislature and a former director of Homecoming '71 that he is taking rather a long bow, although I wouldn't overlook the fact that at some future stage in his career that particular gentleman might find himself working in some particular activity that might fall within the scope of The Essential Services Emergency Act. I should ask the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) to try to relate his words to the amendment to the Act that is before the House at as early an opportunity as possible.

**MR. THIBAUT:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason for using these examples is to point the finger at the Government across the way that all the way through their activities, this was to create unrest and to what extent do they want to go? And in this case,

**April 5, 1971**

Gardiner was another example of unrest and the Minister had to choose. He said now you get rid of Wilf. He said, oh no, but if you want to stay in the Cabinet, you have to get rid of Wilf. Then, by golly, that didn't work. You couldn't slow him down so you got the Deputy Premier to phone Mrs. Gardiner, and say now look, you need bread on your table . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — That's another form of compulsion, Art!

**MR. THIBAUT:** — That's another form of compulsion and I want to say that all the way through the history of this party . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I think that the Member is getting too far afield when he starts bringing in the wives of other people, and I want to ask him to bring his words into order and speak to the amendment to The Essential Services Emergency Act that is before the House.

**MR. KRAMER:** — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, is not the bread on one's table, isn't that pertinent to labor issues?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The Members in this Legislature have been granted the widest latitude of debate on every subject under the sun. Now if you are to correctly and strictly construe the laws and the rules of parliamentary procedure, the only thing Members would be able to debate would be the actual amendments in the Bill and those parts of the Act which it seeks to amend. You discuss principle at the second reading stage of the Bill. The second reading of a Bill is a discussion of the principle of the Bill. The principle of the Bill is, shall this Act or shall it not be amended in the form and in the manner set forth in the Bill. I should suggest that if the Member wishes to criticize Homecoming '71, he had or has all the opportunity in the world to do so during the Estimates at the proper place and at the proper time, or if he wishes to go further than that, he can put a relative substantiate motion on the Order Paper. I think that the Member has been given a great deal of latitude as indeed all Members have. I don't think that anybody can say that the debates in this House have ever been restrictive but I am telling the Member that he's far out in the northwest pasture in his remarks at this time.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Would it be in order to suggest that the Hon. Member's remarks are related to the attitude of the Government when it introduces this Bill, its attitude to labor as exemplified, Mr. Speaker, by its attitude toward a particular director.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the general attitude of the Government and general criticism of the Government is not a correct matter to debate on second reading of a specific bill. If you are going to criticise the action of the Government, you have the Throne Speech Debate and the Budget Debate in which to do that, moreover you have the Estimates in which to criticise or to laud or commend the administration of the various departments. Now, there comes a time when you must be specific, when you must get down to the specifics of thing. And the specific thing that

we have before us at the present time is the proposed amendment to The Essential Services Emergency Act. I doubt if a broad and general criticism of the Government or the Administration would be in order at this time. I hope that members will agree with me. It is the specific matter that is before the House - the matter of the amendment to the Act.

**MR. THIBAUT:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know I am not a professional parliamentarian. I came from the farm and I like to express myself the way I know how.

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

**MR. THIBAUT:** — And I came to this Legislature for that purpose. I don't say that I've been in order all the time. I like to respect the Speaker.

At the outset I said that I was going to oppose the Bill, the amendments to Bill 2, and gave you the reasons why, the reasons why, was the attitude of the Government across the way. That's why I was going to oppose the Bill. If this is wrong, Mr. Speaker, I think I've made my remarks the best I could but I want to say as a farm Member that the sooner this Government goes to the people and that the Liberal Party gets rid of a Thatcherite Government, we shall not need Bill 2 and Bill 57.

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

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, my comments on this Bill No. 57 - an Act to amend The Essential Services Emergency Act, I can assure you will be very brief because my colleagues on this side of the House who have already spoken have covered very adequately our stand and their arguments as well have proven why we have taken this stand.

It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that freedom of speech and opportunity for our people to negotiate must always be preserved and maintained if we wish to live in a free society and that only when all other means of settlement have failed should measures which are recommended by the implementation of this Bill ever be considered to be applied or adopted.

I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that as much effort was being placed in the preparation of a bill that would investigate thoroughly as to the causes of strikes and that this was the prime area of such great concern to our Provincial Government. If this was the case, I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that strikes would be a problem and that measures as drastic as we are having to debate on would need to be introduced or even suggested.

I am sure that it is continued high cost of living, the continual rise in all essential necessities that require increases in wages to meet these rising costs that are our major problems today. This, Mr. Speaker, is the problem which should be approached, and, if this were done, the necessity to introduce Bill 57 would not be required. The introduction of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, will not by any stroke of the imagination eliminate the hardships inflicted on many of our citizens today nor will it cure the problems confronting them.

**April 5, 1971**

I believe that it will only say to them, "Remember before you take any action to assist or improve your standards that the Government has the power to bring in compulsory arbitration, and your privilege of free collective bargaining can be taken away from you." I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very dictatorial move and one that is neither necessary or should it ever be used except only under the very extreme cases in a free society.

For these reasons, I oppose the Bill and I urge all Members to reconsider their stand if they are planning on supporting it, I urge you to stop and realize the shackles that the Government is placing on many segments of our society today if this Bill No. 57 is passed.

This type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, will only create more trouble, more hatred, more distrust among all areas of society, because people want fair play. They want an equal opportunity to express themselves and they want a privilege to debate their problems and issues with their fellow men. In many cases this is to consider the problems to its fullest extent, and to iron out the differences collectively. I can only say that when a bill such as this Bill is introduced, it takes away all the initiatives and privileges because you know before you start that the dictatorial method of compulsory arbitration will be the end result, regardless of what group of Saskatchewan workers are involved.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is very unfair to impose legislation such as this on many workers in our province who have never been on strike, never been on strike in their lives. Why, Mr. Speaker, with records such as this should a government impose such rigid legislation, while they have in no way provoked this loss of their rights? When a government takes such action as to pass this type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, it proves to me that it is operating under the firm hand of pressure and force. This Bill gives far too much strength to any government, and if it is passed, it invites continued strife and disharmony.

I urge all Members, Mr. Speaker, to vote accordingly and oppose this Bill.

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

**MR. R.H. WOOFF (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, to me repressive legislation such as Bill 57 has never been the answer to difficult and complex problems. I made the statement before in this House that I believe it is high time that a better way of settling differences than strikes be found and perfected. I have also said that these ends would only be attained by an improvement of the democratic negotiation type of approach, something that I must say the present Government has not tried but at times seems to have definitely hindered.

There has been a constant attempt on the part of the present Government to drive wedges between the natural allies of farmer and labor. A labor force in a strong buying position are the best revenue producers for the agricultural section of Canada that we have. During the last war, farmers sold beef in quantities and at prices that brought the producer parity price for the first time in our history, but not because of the quantity of beef that was being shipped overseas did this happen,

but because of full employment at good wages, labor was able to buy beef in quantities and at the prices that never in their lives had they been able to do before. And these two sectors of our economy would have worked together in much greater mutual trust and harmony over the years had it not been for those influences that sought constantly to exaggerate and inflate any differences that might exist.

Mr. Speaker, often because of forces for which labor is in no way responsible, the farmer finds himself in a price-cost squeeze. Yet because agriculture finds itself in the poverty position, it is a very, very poor reason for the Government beating labor into a similar position. Poverty added to poverty still adds up to poverty, only a much wider area and brings greater dissension and greater disaster to the economy as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, if people of good will, people who believe in harmony, people who believe in the democratic process are going to be forced to use measures that are unacceptable to either or both sides as a negotiating base, then it augurs ill for our nation. If Bill 57 and similar legislation is the only answer that this Government has got to the problems that face us at the present time, then all I can say is it augurs ill for the province and ill for the nation. And I plead with them, Mr. Speaker, that they withdraw Bill 57. I cannot support it.

**MR. W.A. FORSYTH (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in talking on this Bill the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) intimated that the Liberal Party was geared for turmoil. I heard him say that and I just couldn't understand what he was getting at. Out of a labor force of 350,000 people roughly, we're talking about 57,000 unionized employees, many of whom certainly have not shown any proclivity for strikes. We're getting all the static from the Members on the opposite side that we are causing turmoil because we want to limit strikes. This Bill does not prohibit strikes. It brings strikes to what seems to be the necessary conclusion, the conclusion which is imposed on both employer and employee by this legislation.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — It encourages strikes.

**MR. FORSYTH:** — If this encourages strikes I should be the last person to support this Bill. What this does is prevent strikes becoming a millstone around the neck of the economy of this country, a millstone around the neck of the agricultural community, particularly of Saskatchewan.

The Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) said in his remarks that he felt his colleague had covered this Bill adequately. Now, as far as I can see there are at least 50 per cent of the clauses in this Bill that have not even been touched by the Members opposite. For instance, this whole section dealing with lockouts has not been mentioned and the definition of lockouts is very specific. I think they might have at least mentioned this. And Section 8 which is very, very restrictive on employers - what can be more drastic than a clause which says:

Where an employer in respect of whom an order has been issued carries on business contrary to the order, the

**April 5, 1971**

Attorney General may apply to the Court of Queen's Bench to have the order made an order of the court.

And this refers back to the previous clause which says:

. . . order prohibiting the employer from carrying on business in the province after a specified date.

Now there is really nothing more drastic than that and what I am pointing out is that this is not one-sided legislation, it is not legislation against labor and it is not legislation against employers. It is legislation in the public interest to limit the effects of strikes. It does not prohibit strikes but it puts a logical end to the time which they can cripple the economy of this province.

Going on to page 4 of this Bill we find the prohibitions backed up by very large fines of \$1,000 per day and these do not apply only to the people who own the business but under (1C) every director, officer or agent of a company is liable to this type of penalty, and this is not the type of legislation I should like to see. It is the type of legislation that seems to be necessary because more and more citizens of this country, both on the employer and the employee side, are demanding and looking to Government to carry the ball and that is exactly what we are doing here. We are bringing in legislation which is equally binding on employer and employee in the interests of the large number of citizens of this province who are neither members of unions nor are they employees.

I should just like to make a quick reference to what the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) so nicely calls the big corporations. There really aren't that many big corporations in existence in Saskatchewan. Most of these businesses which are unionized employ five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten employees. They are small contractors, small sub-contractors. These are people who would suffer intensely if they went to the point of having to have this Act invoked against them. We are not legislating in favor of big corporations, small corporations, big labor, small labor. We are legislating in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. It is a two-way street and I believe that this legislation, while I regret its necessity, is the only legislation that we can look upon at this present time to solve the problems of the economy of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — I was surprised to hear the Hon. Member who just sat down (Mr. Forsyth) say that they were legislating this Bill because they felt there was the need in event of an emergency. If there were, then I don't think the House would be divided. The fact is that in Saskatchewan for some number of years, as has been pointed out by Hon. Members of this House on this side at least, that there have been very few strikes. We have not had too many difficulties with labor and that's all the more reason why it seems to me that this legislation before this House is not necessary whatsoever.

If the Hon. Member who has just spoken and other Members in this House on the Liberal side, to the right of you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, felt that there should be some laws in this



Province in order to forego strikes or to stop strikes from coming about - and there will be some in spite of this legislation, you're going to have some strikes - then the Government could have brought in some legislation that would have helped in a different way. Such legislation would have provided that the people who are in the working force, whether they are in unions or whether they are not in unions, receive increases from time to time compatible with the devaluation of the dollar. It strikes me as strange, that here you have a Government so unconcerned about the working man, such as we have in the hospitals in Prince Albert, who are the lowest paid people in any industry in Saskatchewan, when they make justified demands the Government enacts bad legislation claiming an emergency, in an attempt to stop employees from making the kind of demands that surely they are justified to make.

Do you realize, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that just a year or so ago before that strike that these people were working in hospitals for as low as \$1.24. They got an increase and I think the minimum now is somewhere around \$1.40. It is now suggested that the situation is serious, that there is an emergency; the Government feels it must do something to bring in a bill to stop people from striking. Why doesn't this Government bring in a bill to stop the prices from going up? What about high interest rates? Remember when the Ottawa Government said that it was necessary to control inflation and how they made it difficult to get jobs and many people were thrown into unemployment. Why didn't the Governments there or here, whoever was responsible, and I think it is the Government in Ottawa, legislate to say that the financial institutions must also impose some restrictions on themselves. No, the interest rates went up! Profits went up. There were no emergency laws providing controls on them but it is always against the poor fellow who is trying to make a living.

Now, I am not working, I am a farmer, I used to work. I worked on a railway 12 hours a day. I remember when I was a youngster and read the history of labor and I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, labor has never had a fair deal from governments. In the early days when men had to work long hours with low pay, as I did, and when they organized themselves into unions yes, on this continent, when wives and sons and daughters were dynamited, nobody said anything and nobody went to jail for these crimes. Workers were treated like cattle and that's the way you still want to treat these people who are trying to get decent standards of living. You bring in legislation because you are scared that they may make demands that to you seem to be unjustified.

Well, I ask you, when a person is low paid or where there is some other kind of injustice in his employment, does he not have the right to speak up? And if you disagree, then you don't agree with modern industrial owners. The president of the Manufacturers Association only a year or so ago - and I think I quoted it in this House and I'll say it again, said:

. . . that workers are entitled to use the strike weapon because that's the only way that they can prove their point or make their demands. That it is their right.

This is the only thing that they've got, is the strike weapon and you are going to legislate to deny these rights.

**April 5, 1971**

It has been stated that the agricultural economy has been hurt. Well, everybody is hurt when there is a strike but I want you to know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in agriculture we haven't even got the workers organized and I wonder what the Government would do if the workers who work on farms were organized. I don't know what you'd do. You'd probably put them all in jail. That's what you would do. If you're ready to go ahead with this kind of vicious legislation, denying - as my hon. friend said - the right of free men, what is the next step? The Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) stated today that they believed in compulsion all along. Right? But what did they say in 1963? "When we get into power we will get rid of compulsion. But what are you doing today? What have you done at every session of this Legislature? You brought in more and more and more compulsion.

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

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — The Hon. Member says we are defending workers' rights for political reasons. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am not standing up here to speak for political purposes. You know my reasons. I am speaking as a citizen of Saskatchewan. I'm saying that this is some of the worst compulsion ever seen in this Dominion of Canada.

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

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — And I'll say that true Liberals of the past, such as Gardiner, MacKenzie King or any others, who believed in the freedom of man, who were true Liberals, would turn over in their graves and condemn this Government for what it is bringing into this House today.

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

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — And so, I, as a farmer, along with thousands of other farmers who still believe in democracy and in freedom, will oppose this Bill.

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

**MR. W.S. LLOYD (Biggar):** — Mr. Speaker, there are a great many problems which face people which grow out of the increasing organization of groups in society. One of those big problems growing because of that is the problem of irresponsible use of power. It is the problem of power which may be applied unfairly and without equity in effect. This power may be applied by private corporations. It may be applied by governments. Here in Saskatchewan the big concern of the people of Saskatchewan is the irresponsible use of power by the Government of this Province.

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

**MR. LLOYD:** — Bill 57, I submit, Sir, is simply a symptom of that larger disease, the tendency of this Government to use power, to use it politically in an irresponsible way. This Bill once again demonstrates the willingness of the Government to make what I call "irresponsible use" of power. The overall objective

of the Government, as advanced by this Bill, I think becomes plainer each year. This Government has an overall objective, the getting into its own hands the complete control of the wage level of this province. I think in act, after act, after act, this Government has indicated that's what it wants to do. It wants to get into its own hands the complete control of the wage level of the province. Oddly enough, income from other sources is to them sacred. Only the income obtained by working people must be controlled by the Government. Here you have the double standard again applied so frequently by this Government sitting opposite. I have said before, Mr. Speaker, and I want to repeat, led by the present Premier this Government is mad with power and it lusts for more. This Bill is a result of that lusting for even greater and greater power.

The Government mood and the Government motive in advancing this Bill must, I suggest, be suspect. Currently there are no strikes in the Province of Saskatchewan. Currently there are no strikes, no indications of strikes as has been pointed out time after time by my colleagues. Our record with respect to strikes shows that our labor force has been exceedingly responsible when it comes to the use of this particular weapon.

I suggest that this is a Bill which is sired by hatred and dammed by despair. We need look no further than back to the words of the New Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Guy) this afternoon, to note the extent to which this Bill is sired by hatred. It is sired, it is fathered if you like, by hatred of a group which dared to criticize the Government of the province and the Premier. Because this group dared to criticize the Government and the Premier it is suggested in this Bill that they need to be subjected to legislation which is punitive in nature. Being unwilling to lick the boots of the Government they must be punished - that's the creed in this new Saskatchewan. Hatred also because there has been a singular lack of success by the Liberal Party in electing Members to the Legislature in any constituency in this province in which there are a significant number of working people. When the Government speaks it always puts all the blame on the working people and on their organizations and never attaches any blame to any other group with respect to work stoppage.

I have said that it was dammed by despair. That despair has been indicated in many ways in recent weeks. Despair on the part of the Government because it has failed to find a positive issue to which the elector of Saskatchewan will give support. Despair, because the Government now knows that the people of Saskatchewan have got the measure, but good of the Liberal Government. They have got their measure in terms of deterrent fees imposed and not removed. They have got their measure because of new taxes and increased taxes whether we look at provincial taxes or municipal taxes. They have got their measure because of the growing and disastrous unemployment in the province. They have got their measure because of the incredible loss of population in recent months particularly. They have got their measure because of their support of the Federal Government's Agricultural Task Force. They have got their measure because they have been playing poker and shooting craps with Saskatchewan's natural resources. There is added despair because of the damage that has been done to the image of the Government and the Premier, in particular, by the attacks and the allegations so far unanswered by a former

**April 5, 1971**

Cabinet Minister, a colleague of theirs.

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

**MR. LLOYD:** — As a result of this kind of hatred and this kind of despair, the Government has resorted to an old military trick of creating a diversion. As a result they have resorted to the old tactics of authoritarian kings and power mad rulers. They have looked for a scapegoat. They are trying to manipulate public opinion to hate that scapegoat and consequently we have a Bill such as this one before us.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill and the companion speeches, some of which we heard today and some of which we heard the other day, indicate the intention of this Government to curtail rights. We need to look at this broader aspect, I suggest, of the Bill in order to measure our support for it or against it. This is a Bill which will curtail rights of working people which have been recognized in every Western industrialized nation. It is a Bill to curtail rights which have been established after bitter disputes but finally enshrined by law in almost all of those Western industrialized nations. This is a Bill to curtail rights which have been recognized as proper rights by almost every study that has been made throughout the entire world. One can read the studies and reports of the International Labour Organization and get concurrence for those rights. One can read reports made, wide reports. One can read studies made in other provinces of Canada. One can read the studies made here in our own Province of Saskatchewan, two of them instigated by the present Government, and they have all concluded that these are rights which it is proper for the working people of the province to have. These studies all conclude that these are rights with which interference by Government which is proposed in this Bill, is improper, unfair and harmful. This Bill proposes to wipe out years of experience and volumes of study about industrial relations, about joint decision making on the part of employers and employees, and about the role of Government in promoting good industrial relations.

Mr. Speaker, certainly I, for one, have no objections to the idea of a more active role by Government on behalf of all the people, including the disputants in matters of this kind. There are better ways in which the Government may use its energy and its resources to promote industrial peace and protect the rights of all the people than the one that is being introduced. My colleagues have gone into this in some detail and I need not and will not repeat. There is, for example, better fact finding on the part of Government agencies. Better fact finding so that the issues in dispute will be clearer. Let's have work by the Government to determine with more precision and objectivity the levels of profits, the levels of productivity of industry, the wage comparisons and the conditions of work. We need, the rest of us need, to know and deserve to know more about these. Secondly, let's have more emphasis on experience and trained and respected mediators drawn from the ranks of both Government and non-Government. We have as recently as last night a dramatic evidence as to the value of just that kind of work. Thirdly, let's have more activity on the part of Governments between the negotiations, by the role of meetings, and greater understanding between employers and employees and greater understanding on the part of the public of the problems involved.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out again, these are problems of human relations. These are problems of economics. You do not cure the problems of human relations and the problems of economics by legislative compulsion such as that which is proposed by this Bill.

We suggest, too, that we look at an even broader aspect of Government activity in connection with this Bill. I suggest that the objective of Government ought to be to increase the effectiveness of broadly based organizations of people. Surely this is a good thing, a good work in which governments ought to indulge more than we do; to increase the effectiveness of broadly based organizations of people. Let's give to these broadly based organizations of people a greater collective power in order that they may more adequately influence the decisions that help for them and for the rest of society. I am speaking of organizations of people who work in factories, in forests and in our shops, if you will. I am speaking also of organizations of farm people.

It is important that Government promotes the strength of organizations like these because such organizations are part of the cutting edge of democracy. These act as catalysts in our society. They disseminate power throughout society so that there isn't so much in the hands of Government. They help to protect the total public from the authoritarian power of governments and corporations.

It is responsible government to promote the growth and the power of such organizations. This Government's attitude and this Government's actions fail to encourage the growth of such organizations; it is to weaken such organizations; it is to erode such organizations' influence; it is to oppose such organizations, to destroy such organizations when they seem to oppose the Government of this province. And that is a statement that can be demonstrated by this Government's action or lack of action with regard to farm organizations, with regard to co-operatives. You can't injure, we need to recall, such organizations without weakening the basic structure of society, without demolishing some little bit of democracy. It is because this Bill does weaken that basic structure that we on this side feel it must be opposed.

At the very minimum, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is bad because it seeks to mislead people. It seeks to mislead people into believing that the passage of this Bill will result in fewer strikes. That is a statement which is not proven by experience any place in the world. It is not proven by recommendations by any group that has studied the problem. This Government should not be misleading people by suggesting that this Bill is going to lead to fewer strikes in our province. This Government is misleading people when it seeks to suggest that this Bill will lead to better bargaining in good faith. In fact it has been argued, on this side very effectively, that the reverse of that is true. It will not lead to bargaining in better faith but the reverse of that. What the Government has done in this province is to try to sloganize words like 'labour courts' and 'compulsory bargaining.' It has tried to sloganize and popularize these words pretending that the slogan provides a program for action and that, of course, is not true. Another way in which the Government has misled the people.

I think we need also to look at the Government's gyrations

**April 5, 1971**

with respect to labor legislation in recent months in this province. You will note that we were told, first of all, that there were going to be labor courts established during this Session. Secondly, we were told that there were going to be no labor courts established during this Session. Thirdly, we were told that there were to be visits arranged to countries like Australia and Sweden after the election. Suggest that was cancelled because the Government became convinced that such visits would simply contradict the claims which they put forth. It would contradict their claims as to the effectiveness of slogans like labor courts and compulsory bargaining. Fourthly, we were told the other day that there were to be labor courts after the next election without any study or investigation. Fifthly, we have this move with respect to compulsory bargaining. I suggest that when you look at all those changes of direction, the whirling dervish was a piker by comparison to this Government's pronouncements with regard to labor legislation.

No planning, that's what all these changes indicate. No planning, no consultation, no serious consideration of where they are going. The Government acts on impulse, it gets some response by its political antenna which is attached somewhere to the Premier's visceral organs and on the result of that he attacks, from day to day. This is political response, as I said earlier, to hate and despair on the part of the Government and it needs to be resisted.

You know, I think there is one thing they are overlooking and overlooking seriously when they give this broad public appeal. They are overlooking the decency and the respect for fair play of Saskatchewan farmers and that is going to be their downfall. Because there is in the Saskatchewan farm people, as most of us know them, a great sense of decency with respect to the rights of other people. There is a great respect for fair play, and the farmer will reject it on the basis that it lacks either decency or fair play.

This is one more step down the road to compulsion. Perhaps it's well to note some of those steps which we have experienced in Saskatchewan in the last six or seven years. It is perhaps well to remind ourselves that with each step the Government takes, the temptation to take another step gets greater. We had, first of all, the step taken when the Government, almost immediately after election, said to employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, "Thou shalt not take part in politics." That order so far as I know has not yet been withdrawn or retracted. Secondly, we had legislation making the Power employees subject to compulsory arbitration. Then compulsory arbitration was extended to hospital workers. Then it was extended to teachers. We have had compulsion as indicated in recent months to school trustees. When school trustees, as some boards have, have stated in public that "we agreed to reduce our mill rate because we were afraid of what would happen as a result of Government retribution if we didn't do what the Government said." We have had it suggested by a former Minister, a colleague, a Liberal candidate, that contractors had been compelled to make certain payments - this has not been denied or commented on by the Government - unless they did things that the Government wanted them to do. Now we have compulsory arbitration to be applied to all of the workers in the province; to be applied at the whim of the Government; to be applied without any public discussion in advance. To be applied without any open discussion in advance. The whole question raised for people of the province

with this record of compulsion of one group after another group is: "Who is going to be left to complain when they come for you?" That is something people will be thinking about.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this Government is mad with power and it lusts for more and its lusting increases. I said when Bill 2 was before this Legislature a few years ago that, "This Bill is evil. This Bill 57 is worse than the evil of Bill 2." I said of Bill 2 that it was a "compost heap of the most reactionary legislation in Canada" and that's what it was at that time. Now, years afterwards, this compost heap has ripened and rotted and is to be applied to all the workers in the Province of Saskatchewan; applied by the will of the Government in the middle of the night if you like, without any public discussion, without any need to account for its decisions before the Bill is applied. It will provide more strife, it will provoke more tension, it will add to division between groups in the province. It will accelerate the hemorrhage of skilled workmen leaving the province. Because of all this, Mr. Speaker, the Government ought to withdraw. Those on this side will reject it.

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

**MR. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina South East):** — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to say too much in this debate but after listening to some of the speeches across the way this morning and listening to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) with regard to losses that have been incurred because of the so-called walkout or proposed strike that was to take place, I believe there should be some answers given with regard to the happenings of our wheat and markets over the years as well as how it affected the economy and who was really to blame. This morning, Mr. Boldt, the Minister of Highways, mentioned that we had lost something like \$50 million since the threat or the walkouts had taken place in the past few days. He referred particularly to the American-based unions and he made quite a list of them as to the Presidents and the Secretary-Treasurers in the United States. I know that many of these unions have a reciprocal arrangement whereby they probably elect a president of Canadian origin one year and an American one the next year. This is what happened in a lot of those that he had mentioned. Now there may be others who have their head offices down there with many members in Canada. But we in Canada also have presidents and secretaries that dovetail into the various workers' organizations in the United States as well. He claimed that this strike was forced on us by the American workers. The reason for that was that if they called the strike here, the Americans could sell their wheat and the farmers wouldn't sell theirs here. He stated that seven years ago the American people sold 150 million bushels of wheat in foreign markets and now they sell something like 700 million bushels of wheat a year. I am sure he knows full well that the reason why they didn't sell in the export markets years ago was because they wouldn't sign agreements with iron curtain countries. We in Canada did that in the late '50s and under John Diefenbaker, a Conservative Prime Minister. The Liberal Government in Ottawa opposed this from 1945 to 1957 or 1958 from selling our wheat to foreign markets in iron curtain countries. Who were the ones that encouraged the sale and brought a measure of prosperity to Saskatchewan and Western Canada? It was the CCF Members in Ottawa who continued to

**April 5, 1971**

advocate this so that our grain would be sold to the countries behind the iron curtain or satellite countries as they were named at that time.

I realize that this is somewhat aside from the present Bill but the Minister of Highways spoke on this so I felt I should touch on it too. We find on one hand the Members across the way are continually supporting American interests which come here and can do what they like, but when they find that someone is tied in with our unions, there is nothing but condemnation. I just want to point out to the Minister who spoke this morning that had it not been for our great CCF Party in Ottawa and ours in this province, the wheat and other sales of grain would not have taken place over those years. This brought prosperity to the West. Let's not condemn the workers saying that they are the ones, particularly from the States, who called this strike to stop our wheat from going overseas.

He also discredited Mr. Mackasey who took a real interest in these negotiations. I think this man should be paid a great tribute. I think he is a man, whether he is on the other side representing a different political party, who stands up for the rights of workers. He has the courage of his convictions; he does believe in collective bargaining; he believes in the process of good negotiations and lets them take their natural course; he believes in the right to conciliate; he believes in the right to arbitration; and he believes in the right of employees to walk out or strike when all means of full collective bargaining have been exhausted. I believe this man means well and I think it is through his efforts that the negotiations were settled and we weren't faced with an impending strike which we all know could affect our markets, in particular, agriculture, potash and so forth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this House passes this Bill you are taking out the very heart of collective bargaining, the heart of unionism, you are destroying the greatest segment of our democratic society and you are destroying a hard-earned right which took bloodshed over the years to acquire. You are putting future generations into chains once more as they existed a couple of centuries ago, during the Industrial Revolution in Britain, and the same existed in continental Europe. Once more we are going back to those days in this 20th century, and probably going back as was mentioned earlier to child-labour conditions.

I want to say that you are passing this Bill and putting in the hands of a very few people, in business and industry, the controls over the working people without any recourse whatsoever. This will start the erosion of fringe benefits. You will find that there will be longer hours of work during the day and during the week. Eventually holiday pay will be cut back and reduced. Had it not been for organized labour, Mr. Speaker, our standard of living in this province and in this country would be half of what it is today, half of what it is today, because unionism does put more purchasing power in the hands of the working people.

When you look at the very low minimum wage of \$1.25 in this day and age you can readily see that this doesn't even meet the cost of living even in the past three or four years. When you think of the hospital workers and the wages they get, and how they had been forced back to work, being lowest paid



workers with \$1.30 or \$1.40 an hour. It is a crime that such conditions in our province are still in existence. This Bill will reduce, in the main, the income of all working people whether they be blue-collared workers or white-collared workers. Those in unions benefited by higher wages and it had an effect on unorganized labor as well. When the union people got increases it also affected the executive positions who automatically got them as well.

I want to go back to Mr. Mackasey. I believe that our Party and our Leader did a good thing by initiating telegrams to him to help solve the pending strike problem. And I think perhaps it was because of our taking immediate steps that we got action and perhaps the strike had been settled because of us.

Now I realize the other side are in a great state of confusion. On the one hand, as I say, they talk about American investment and on the other hand they don't want any union workers here from the States. I don't know, I often wonder what side they are on and what they will do during this election campaign. They are really confused. I believe, last Friday, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was definitely poised to call an election. However, I can only surmise, that he waited until Monday to see what would happen in the railway strike. And of course the strike didn't come off. You remember he said, "This Bill will become the main issue in the next election." Now he has no issue. The strike is settled. His balloon has been burst. Three or four weeks ago he said the pulp mill is the main issue. Now he says it is this Bill 57, this no-strike Bill. Well I don't know what he is going to come up with next week as an issue, but I can tell you what the two main issues will be in the next election and we shall tell the people about them, namely to do something about agriculture, and to solve the unemployment problem.

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

**MR. BAKER:** — Yes, we shall fight the election on these two issues. They are the real issues and they would like to get away from them, but they can't any more. They can't any more. And with us taking on these two issues to the people, you will find that we shall have between 70 and 75 per cent of the seats in Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. BAKER:** — Yes, it has been mentioned that this is really repressive legislation. It is backward legislation, destroying the rights of the majority of our people, namely the workers in our society.

I believe that bargaining has always been a two-way street. When two groups sit down and really want to negotiate in earnest there isn't anything they cannot settle. When you realize what took place last spring, where there was interference in the process of bargaining in our province, when construction workers and others were on strike, for a period of time, the blame can only be put at the doorstep of the present Administration. This didn't need to happen. We must permit increases where it is necessary. Purchasing power must be put in the hands of the

**April 5, 1971**

workers to buy the things that are manufactured and even produced by the farmers.

What happened in 1944 when the CCF Government went in? They immediately brought in a decent minimum wage plan. Wages were raised. What happened? The business economy began to flourish. They had more purchasing power to buy the things that were produced. The same thing happens today. If the working people haven't the means to buy the things that we produce and manufacture, then business suffers as well as the whole industry. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill should be withdrawn. I think the new Minister who has brought this in would do a great service to himself and even to his own constituents, because I am sure he has many from there who are union members in this city or who are sons and daughters of families from his area who don't believe in this type of repressive legislation either. So I should urge that this be done and that we do not pass the Bill in order to keep our bargaining agreements in good faith for management and labor. And that we do not destroy the greatest democratic freedom we have, which took centuries to get. In passing this Bill you are destroying the right to strike. In other words, you are destroying collective bargaining. Once you take out the right to strike the heart of unionism is gone. So we are going back to the history of the early 1800s. In other words, history is repeating itself, so that those who follow us will have to start fighting again for these rights in generations to come. Again it will take bloodshed over the years to win them back. Let's not do this. I'm sure that those of you across the way, if you vote for this today, you will regret it for having done so.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bill.

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

**MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, this Bill which we have before us represents a further step along the road to total Government control over the people of this province. It is another long mile along the path of coercion. What's particularly depressing, Mr. Speaker, is that no reason has been advanced for this step, no reason has been advanced as to why tens of thousands of people should be deprived of this basic human right, the right to offer their labor and the right to withdraw their labor, the right to withdraw their labor as they see fit. This surely is a basic human right. It may be a right which has to be abridged in particular circumstances in times of war and in times of public emergency. But to take this right away from tens of thousands of people of Saskatchewan, or to threaten to take it away from them for every day, for every year while they work in Saskatchewan is totally unjustified.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I shall have more to say a little later about situations of genuine public emergency.

But I want to emphasize to Members of this House that this is not the first time that Governments in Canada have sought to take away the rights of individual citizens, the rights of whole classes of citizens, take away these rights completely and permanently. During the last war we saw the Japanese-

Canadians have their rights taken away completely and permanently, their rights to their property, their rights to live where they previously lived. And I hope we admit that that was a mistake. We saw in the days of Duplessis, the Government take away the rights of Jehovah's Witnesses without any semblance of justice - the right to act as a bail bondsmen, the right to conduct their worship services - and I hope we admit that that was wrong. We saw the Duplessis Government take away the rights of organized workers to organize and to strike. We saw this at Murdochville and Louiseville and I hope we admit that that was wrong. I should wish that Government Members opposite would admit that the present Bill before us which proposes to take away the rights, the collective bargaining rights of tens of thousands of people in this province, I should hope that they would admit that this was wrong.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, when Bills like this are introduced, the battle against them is always one which is a difficult one to wage. We are fighting another battle in a struggle which has gone on for a hundred years, as the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) has pointed out. We have seen the battle ebb and flow; we have seen trade unions win victories of the type of legislation when they got the right to organize freely in Great Britain, which followed the Taff Vale dispute in Britain; we've seen a great surge of anti-unionism rise in the United States at the time of Sacco and Vanzetti; we have seen after the Second Great War another recognition that we as a society owe much to working people and we saw rights then flourish, the right to organize and the right to bargain. And we have seen in the late 1960s a wave of reaction; we have seen sawdust Caesars in this jurisdiction and that, decide that they were going to lead the fight against organized labor. We have seen men forced to work as we see under this Bill, men being forced to work, not on terms which they have bargained for, not even on terms based upon impartial arbitration - I shall come to that in a moment - but, on terms dictated by the Government. This is clear from the 1970 experience with Bill 2, it is clear that Bill 2 does not offer impartial arbitration. That was made abundantly clear last year. What is offered to the workers of Saskatchewan is working under terms dictated by the Provincial Government.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That I suggest is a massive deprivation of freedom. Now how did we get into a position where we are asked to nullify free collective bargaining. Let me say a few words about free collective bargaining. I believe in the long run free collective bargaining offers the best way of settling labor-management disputes in our society. With free men collective bargaining offers a way that this freedom can find its application in our society.

I remember that there was a time when Members opposite used to say that they were in favor of free collective bargaining. We all remember the initial speech in this House of the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) who was very eloquent in defense of free collective bargaining. Now these rights, Mr. Speaker, are of very ancient origin. The Common Law of England decided centuries ago that people had a right to work

**April 5, 1971**

or a right to withdraw their labor. Centuries ago it was decided that no contract could be made which could force a person to work when he didn't want to work. And about 100 years ago this concept developed into the idea that people could join together to offer their labor, to bargain for the terms and if they wished, to withdraw their labor. At that time it was begun to be recognized that the right to strike was a basic civil right.

Mr. Speaker, the right to strike was a basic civil right. And I do not ask you to accept my judgment on that. I ask you to accept the judgment of the Hon. Paul Martin whose words were precisely that, "the right to strike is a basic civil right."

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I should have thought that Members opposite would have decided that they could take some guidance from the Hon. Paul Martin or from the Hon. Bryce Mackasey rather than from our Premier who has never indicated any understanding or feeling for the process of collective bargaining.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — But if they are unwilling to take any guidance from the Hon. Paul Martin or the Hon. Bryce Mackasey, may I quote another authority, quote at some length:

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

The same authority goes on to say:

The real solution to the problem of strikes is to solve the disputes leading to strikes before they reach the crucial stage.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — If I may continue to quote, Mr. Speaker:

To a marked extent this characterizes the disposition of industrial disputes in Saskatchewan. Despite the many problems associated with the rapid growth on the non-agricultural sector of our society and the accompanying increase in the industrial labor force, the number of disputes which result in strikes in Saskatchewan, is a small fraction of the total number of disputes.

Mr. Speaker, who do you think I am quoting as authority, an authority which might commend itself to some Members opposite? I am quoting the Hon. Lionel Coderre, when he spoke in this House in 1966. And I should have thought that Members opposite would have agreed that the Hon. Paul Martin, the Hon. Bryce Mackasey, and in this House, the Minister of Labour, the Hon. Lionel Coderre, had something to offer to the House. But we now find that they have fallen away from these mentors and have accepted another mentor.

Into this relatively tranquil atmosphere, in 1966 which I have described and which the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) so eloquently described, was introduced in 1966 what I can only call the drug of compulsion - Bill 2. And the Government opposite has proved itself to be a real addict of this drug.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, contrast this Bill which is before us with the Bill which was offered in 1966 and with the arguments which were advanced for it. At that time when it was put forward the argument was that it would deal with a particular dispute. Indeed at that session in 1966 the Premier offered Bill 2 as a bill to deal with a particular dispute and I want to refer you to page 117 of the Hansard of that session and the Premier said this in effect: "We will pass this Bill but we won't proclaim it and if a settlement is arrived at before we need to apply the Bill, the Bill will never be proclaimed."

Now this surely is saying that Bill 2 in its original conception was designed to deal with one industrial dispute. Similarly, the now Minister of Welfare, Mr. MacDonald, expressed his devotion to the principles of free collective bargaining. He expressed the view that government interference in labor disputes was a bad thing. He expressed the view that government interference should be kept to a minimum. He justified Bill 2 as being appropriate only when the welfare of the community was threatened with irreparable harm. And, Mr. Speaker, those are his words not mine. Irreparable harm because of, in his words, "strikes in enterprises such as hospitals and certain public utilities." Let me quote his statement because this was Bill 2 in its original conception. This was Bill 2 not out of our mouths but out of the mouths of Members opposite. Here's what Mr. MacDonald said about Bill 2:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to very clearly put the position of this Government. We believe that Government interference in the process of collective bargaining should be kept at a minimum.

Note that he believes that, Mr. Speaker.

We have acted in accordance with that principle. We left no doubt about this conviction when we passed the amendments to The Trade Union Act. The process of collective bargaining represents the principle of free enterprise in its purest application. The right to strike is an integral part of this process. However, it cannot be denied that when strikes threaten certain enterprises such as hospitals and certain public utilities, the welfare of the community as a whole is also threatened with irreparable harm.

**April 5, 1971**

So, see what we're saying - "in a free enterprise society, in a free society, there must be collective bargaining," says Mr. MacDonald, the Member for Milestone. He says that it's part of the free enterprise society, in this words, he says:

It is free enterprise in its purest application.

That, Mr. Speaker, is in 1966.

Now what has happened to free enterprise in these five years. What has happened to the pristine purity of this principle of free enterprise? Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, that it has fallen victim to the drug addiction of Members opposite.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — From this early beginning we have seen the Government become more and more addicted to the idea of compulsion. We saw the session of 1970 which brought further tens of thousands of people under the cloak of Bill 2. We saw the threatened special session of the fall of 1970 and we remember that well because it was designed to force pulp workers back to work at wages less than, and increases in wages less than, pulp workers were getting all across Canada. And what was the purpose? The purpose was to see that the profits of Parsons and Whittemore, the New York developers, whose profits we were told were already in the millions, were even higher at the expense of Saskatchewan workers.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — At no time was it denied that the ceiling which the Premier had put on the wages of the Prince Albert pulp mill were below the increases being received by pulp workers in British Columbia, in Alberta, in Manitoba, in Ontario, and all across Canada. And yet because the Premier wanted to fatten the coffers of Parsons and Whittemore, he was prepared to say to pulp workers in Saskatchewan, "Thou shalt not get increases equal to what pulp workers are getting elsewhere in Canada."

This, Mr. Speaker, indicates just how far the drug of compulsion can go. And we now see the Bill expanded so that it applies not only to workers in utilities and hospitals, not only to workers in the construction trades, but to each and every organized worker in Saskatchewan. By decision of the Cabinet alone, every organized worker and every employer employing any such worker, loses his right to bargain freely with the other, loses his right to make a deal that they want to make, and comes under the all encompassing compulsion of Bill 2.

I want to point out what's in this Bill because Members opposite talk as if the Bill offered impartial arbitration. They talk as if the alternatives were the right to strike or impartial arbitration. I want to point out that not only are the workers deprived of the right to bargain for their wages, they are deprived of the right to have those wages set by impartial arbitration.

We know and know well, and we know from 1970, that the Government will not permit impartial arbitration. The Act requires the arbitrator to make his decision on the basis of the evidence submitted to him and the arguments put to him. The

board is to hear evidence and to hear arguments and to make its decision. But, Mr. Speaker, the Bill also permits the Government to appoint anyone they like to be the arbitrator.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you what happened in 1970. I remind you that when the Bill was introduced in this House in June of 1970, the Premier in effect said: "We will not have a strike. We will have impartial arbitration. We will tell the arbitrator to make up his own mind, we will tell him to make up his own mind on the basis of the evidence, we will tell him to make up his own mind on the basis of the argument but we'll damn well tell him the award can't be over six per cent." Now, that's practically what he said and that, of course, makes a total mockery of anything resembling impartial arbitration.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Both the Minister of Labour and the Premier in 1970 dictated to the arbitrator what the limits were even before this so-called impartial arbitration started, and that, Mr. Speaker, cannot under any circumstances be called impartial arbitration. To take away a workers' right to strike and give him that travesty of impartial arbitration is to wipe away his rights to bargain for his labor.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, when the Bill was first introduced in 1966, a great deal was made of the fact that the right to negotiation was taken away and the right to fair and impartial arbitration was substituted. Much was made of the fact that the chairman of the arbitration board was going to be a judge. It was said that this would provide some safeguard, that the person appointed would have some measure of impartiality. And at that time, Mr. Speaker, we asked that the judge be a judge of the Court of Appeal or a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, or a District Court judge. We asked for those because those are Federally-appointed judges. But the Government insisted that they also be permitted to appoint judges of the Provincial Magistrate Court, judges whom the Government opposite appoints and judges whom the Government opposite can remove.

Mr. Speaker, that's what was offered and time after time, I think, in every case that Bill 2 was used, in every case a Provincial judge was used. It may well be that one District Court judge, Mr. Kindred, was used - I don't know that, but persistently Provincial judges have been used and I can name them and so could the Members opposite.

But, Mr. Speaker, even the argument that the arbitrator is going to be a judge and therefore has some basis for being impartial is now being removed. Nothing would prevent the Government from appointing any arbitrator it wishes. We might well see Mr. Ralph Purdy, the representative of the Saskatchewan Employers' Association, showing up as an arbitrator. We are seeing this pretence of impartiality in arbitration wiped away.

Mr. Speaker, I have not heard from the Government any suggestion that there was any valid reason for removing the requirement that the arbitrator be a judge. It will be recalled also that in 1966 and again in 1970 we said, 'well, if the

**April 5, 1971**

arbitrator is to have all of these vast powers over 10,000, 20,000 or 30,000 people in this province, surely he should be a person who is selected by an impartial person. We said that he should be selected by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan. We used the same arguments that I used in another debate in this House on Bill 19, that where the Government has an interest in the outcome of the dispute, as it well could in any number of disputes under Bill 2, then the arbitrator who is to make the decision ought to be impartially selected.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And I pointed out that in the arrangement with the Swift Current Health Region it was provided that the arbitrator be selected by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan. I pointed out that when businessmen make a deal for arbitration, the arbitrator, if he can't be selected by the parties to the disputes, is selected by a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench.

I say to Members opposite, if you do believe in impartial arbitration, at least provide that the arbitrator be selected by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan or by a judge of the court of Queen's Bench.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, we've heard lots about labor courts lately. The Premier and other Members of the Government opposite have said that they like the idea of labor courts. I won't refer to the debate in this House on another Resolution but I shall refer to remarks made outside the House on various occasions by the Premier. All I can say is that if he believes in the idea of labor courts, which he voices outside this House, and if the Minister of Labour does, and if the Minister of Health does, then they ought to vote against the Bill which is before us.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Because we all remember how often the Premier has said that these labor courts will be completely fair and impartial and how much care must be taken to see that these judges are totally impartial. They should have the status of high court judges, they should be appointed for life, they should be selected with great care. And now he puts before this Legislature a proposal for compulsory arbitration for all of the workers of Saskatchewan and what little hope they had in having an impartial arbitrator by reason of his being a judge is taken out of the Bill. In this Bill the chairman is far from being an impartial person. Is he a member of the judiciary? - not necessarily; is he appointed for life? - far from it. He is just going to be an ad hoc chairman appointed for one arbitration board for one dispute. He may indeed be Mr. Ralph Purdy.

**MR. MacLENNAN:** — Quite an idea.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Member for Last Mountain says, "Quite an idea." I am sorry if I suggested that to him because I expected the first appointment of a chairman will now be a representative of the Saskatchewan Employers' Association.



Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no possibility of an argument in favour of this. This can't possibly be argued, for example, that judges would not be available, because they had used judges of the Provincial Magistrates' court and it is now known that the Premier can appoint one or two or five or ten judges of the Provincial Magistrates' court. And he could have as many judges available as he wanted for this purpose or for any other purpose under those Acts. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that chairmen who are judges could be made readily available; notwithstanding the fact that there has been no difficulty so far as I am aware in getting a chairman in the past, that modest safeguard which workers had is now being swept away. Mr. Speaker, this is far and away the most sweeping labor legislation to repress working people that we have ever seen in Canada.

**MR. CODERRE:** — Bosh!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Member for Gravelbourg says, "Bosh." The Member for Gravelbourg cannot name any province in Canada which has labor legislation which provides for the compulsory arbitration of all labor disputes by this type of a tribunal. There simply is not any parallel in Canada. The Government of Quebec has no overall legislation providing for the compulsory settlement of labor disputes.

**MR. CODERRE:** — . . . provision for.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — If the Member for Gravelbourg is suggesting that this is possible under The War Measures Act we are now having the clear admission that this is an introduction by Provincial legislation of The War Measures Act into Saskatchewan. The British Columbia legislation is the closest thing to it. It provides that under certain circumstances, certain labor disputes can be referred to the British Columbia Mediation Commission. But, Mr. Speaker, that Commission is a permanent Commission. It is headed by a chairman who was previously a distinguished high court judge and it is in no way parallel to the sort of ad hoc boards which the Minister can set up under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, no possible justification can be advanced for the change. If the Premier was at all sincere in his idea that decisions of this kind should be made by impartial tribunals then he would have left the legislation as it was. He would have selected this judge he talks about, this very impartial judge. He would have appointed him as a judge of the Provincial Magistrates' court and given him the permanent responsibility of being head of the arbitration tribunal. He hasn't done that. He has left himself in the position of being able to appoint anybody, any political hack, anybody who has no experience with labor legislation, anybody who has had no experience with arbitration as the chairman of one of these arbitration boards. Now, Mr. Speaker, who will be appointed? Why will people other than judges be appointed? How will this power of the Government be used? Well, Mr. Speaker, we have it on the highest authority that Ministers in the Thatcher Government are to use their power so as to collect money for the coffers of the Liberal Party. We have that on the highest authority.

**MR. STEUART:** — What's the highest authority?

**April 5, 1971**

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — A Member of the Ministry himself, a Member who was the Minister of Public Works handling tens of millions of dollars of contracts in this province ought to know a thing or two about how contracts are administered. We have it on the highest authority that contractors, I think he meant road contractors, but certainly contractors, have been deprived of their progress payments until they made their contribution to the Liberal Party which the Premier thought appropriate.

**MR. STEUART:** — On a point of order, I think earlier in the debate that you ruled on this type of discussion and I do feel that this has nothing to do with Bill 2.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would ask the Members to direct their words to the amendment to The Essential Services Emergency Act and whatever clauses it contains. I think that is only reasonable.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I shall read the next words of my notes. If road contractors can be coerced and blackmailed in this way is it not reasonable to think that road contractors or their employees will be blackmailed by the Government exercising the power of appointment of the arbitration board chairman?

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Is it not reasonable to believe that any Government that would blackmail contractors in the way that Mr. Gardiner says this Government has blackmailed . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. STEUART:** — I don't think the word, "blackmail," I don't think he has got the right - if he wants to prove it, then let him prove it. I think he should withdraw.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! We have one Member accusing another Member of blackmail.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Government, I didn't identify any individual Member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I think it is time this House got back into order. The Chair has allowed the widest possible latitude of debate and I have a lot of things that I am going to read to you and I am going to take a little time to do it. I draw your attention to page 130 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Guidance. Order!

Now the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) called for order and asked the Chair to rule on a point of order. I suggest that the very least he can do is listen to what I have to say. If he doesn't I will throw this debate wide open and everyone can say what they jolly well please. I ask for a small degree of

attention, now that is the least I can expect. You have asked me to defend you and I will jolly well decide whether or not I will do it and how I will do it too.

**MR. STEUART:** — That's entirely up to you.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** — When the House rose for supper, we were in the process of debating second reading of proposed amendments to The Essential Services Emergency Act. At that time, a point of order was raised by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer. I apologize to the House and the Provincial Treasurer for losing my temper on that occasion, but one good thing came out of it, you all got your suppers two minutes earlier.

One other attribute a hair trigger temper has, when one makes one's confession, one only has one sin to confess from which cardinal sin all of the others have accrued . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** — . . . which saves time.

I wish to draw your attention to Beauchesne Citation 134, page 118.

In the House of Commons the member will not be permitted to impute to any member or members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case.

I further draw your attention to Citation 154, subsection (3):

The imputation of bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged misrepresenting the language of another or accusing him in his turn of misrepresentation charging him with falsehood or deceit or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind, all these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference.

I have here the transcript of the debate, and I hardly think that the word 'blackmail' which appears therein is entirely parliamentary. I should further draw your attention to Beauchesne Citation 150 because I want to draw a distinction now between accusations that are broad and general and those which are specific and personal:

If a member should say nothing disrespectfully to the House or personally opprobrious to other members or in violation of other rules of the House, he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings or injurious to the character of others. He is protected by his privilege from any action for libel as well as from any other question, or molestation.

That embodies succinctly and in a very few words the privileges of the House, the right and privilege of free speech and the protection that a member has when he is a Member of this Legislature. With that privilege, I think, also goes the responsibility of not making irresponsible charges or charges without foundation.

**April 5, 1971**

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your ruling and I think that on reflection the particular choice of language that I made was stronger than I should have wished and if I imputed anything improper to Members opposite, I withdraw.

I do want to remind the House that the previous Minister of Public Works has drawn to the attention of the public of this Province the particular fund raising practices of the Liberal Party as he understood them. I think that there is no doubt that he indicated that contractors had funds delayed and that is surely the politest word one can use to describe this particular practice which he described, until they had made appropriate contributions to the Liberal Party. The question that I was asking, and asking very earnestly, was whether or not it was reasonable to think that contractors or other employers might be similarly persuaded or trade unions might be similarly persuaded by the power which the government would have to appoint anybody at all as chairman of an arbitration board under this Bill. Can this Legislature rest content to give to the Government opposite, which has been engaging in the practices described by Mr. Gardiner, the power to continue and expand that particular operation by having as its new weapon the right to so persuade any employer or any trade union by having the right to appoint anybody at all as chairman of the arbitration board.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It is submitted I say, that that power, however upright, and no government should possess that power over all of the employers and over all of the employees of Saskatchewan. Least of all should the Government opposite have been made public and exposed by one of its own Members in a most flagrant way!

Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn to another aspect, a general statement of what I think is in Bill 2. We will oppose the amendments to Bill 2; we will oppose them because they provide for compulsory arbitration of all labor management disputes involving organized workers. We oppose it because it provides for this compulsory arbitration in advance even at the start of negotiations. The machinery is set up for compulsory arbitration before the parties sit down at the bargaining table. It means that whenever management and labor sit down at the bargaining table they know that at the end of the road there will be compulsory arbitration, if the Government wishes it and if either the employer or the employees want it. This makes an institution of compulsory arbitration. Experience has shown that whenever compulsory arbitration is part of a built-in and regular process, collective bargaining is slowly strangled. I refer now to the settlement of disputes involving wages and hours by compulsory arbitration.

I think I shall digress for a moment to discuss compulsory arbitration a little more fully. If we are to discuss compulsory arbitration with any understanding, we must make some clear distinctions. It is sometimes said that unions regularly agree that disputes arising during the life of the collective bargaining agreement, for example, should be submitted to arbitration. The argument runs that if unions agree to arbitration in this

case, why not in settling wages and working conditions. Mr. Speaker, the analogy is totally false. It is true that collective bargaining agreements regularly provide for arbitration of grievances. But in that case, the arbitrator is called on to apply and only to apply the rules already agreed to by the parties and set out in detail in the collective bargaining agreement. The arbitrator interprets the rules for settlement, he doesn't make the rules, and the rules are made by the parties themselves.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Now that's the situation when we use our arbitration as a method of settling a dispute that arises during the course of a collective bargaining agreement. Incidentally that is the use made of labor courts in Sweden. But when there is no existing contract, and when negotiations are proceeding to find the basis of a new contract, the situation is totally different. In this case there are no rules. The arbitrator, if this dispute is subject to arbitration, not only interprets the rules, he makes them. It is this rule-making which unions say should be the result of free collective bargaining. In our society there is no agreement as to how the total wealth of society should be divided as between businessmen or doctors or construction workers. In our society, this is decided by negotiation, by bargaining and, in part, by the operation of the marketplace. Working people say that the price they receive for their labor should not be controlled and set by any arbitrator in any society where the price these same working men pay for cars or gasoline or houses is not controlled and set by any arbitrator but is determined by negotiation and bargaining.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — They say that no arbitrator should control the fair wage to be paid to a carpenter unless an arbitrator also controls the fair profit for the contractor and a fair price for the house, and a fair rate of interest for the mortgage company. Surely this can't be contradicted. It is a form of serfdom to say to organized workers: "You must live in a society where prices and profits and interest and rents and professional fees are free, free to be whatever results from bargaining and negotiation, but you, the working man, cannot have the price of your labor set by negotiation and bargaining, you must accept a wage dictated and controlled by an arbitrator appointed by a government." I say that is a form of serfdom and I say that is what the Members opposite are legislating.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Unions say that working people have done nothing to warrant their being selected as the victim of this special status of serfdom. It will be argued that in some cases, the results of a strike are so drastic that the Government must intervene. My view on that question is that intervention can only be justified if collective bargaining has been given a full and fair opportunity to succeed undeterred by any threat of impending arbitration, if opportunity has been provided for conciliation and mediation so that all avenues for a freely bargained settlement have been explored and that the strike in question is one which would genuinely lead to a social or economic crisis of

**April 5, 1971**

substantial magnitude.

Mr. Speaker, what principles can be drawn from my previous remarks? I think they are these: in arbitration almost everything depends on who makes the rules on which the arbitration is conducted. There is no justification for forcing working people to sell their labor at prices set by arbitration. There is no more reason for that than there is to force business to sell its products or professional people to sell their labor at prices set by arbitration. In a free society, free collective bargaining is the best way to reach agreements between employers and employees. No case can be made for undermining free collective bargaining by setting up a system of compulsory arbitration in advance of any serious dispute. Under certain circumstances where there is genuine threat of social or economic crisis of substantial magnitude, legislative action may be appropriate. Where legislative action may be appropriate, it should apply for one dispute only and should apply only after all other methods of settling the dispute have been thoroughly canvassed. Mr. Speaker, I think those are the reasonable conclusions which can be drawn. I am proud to say that such legislative action was never found necessary in all the 20 years of CCF Government in this province.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I earnestly suggest to Members opposite that it will rarely, if ever, be found necessary if a government has diligently pursued all the methods of conciliation and mediation open to it . . .

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — . . . in a genuine effort to facilitate bargaining and avoid coercion. In our judgment there is all the difference in the world between this Bill and the arbitration provided by the parties themselves under a collective bargaining agreement. There is all the difference in the world between this Bill and the one-shot legislative intervention which could conceivably be required, although as I say wasn't in 20 years, to deal with a particular major labor dispute. The situations of arbitration pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, or one-shot legislative intervention don't destroy collective bargaining, Bill 2 does.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — These items which I have mentioned, arbitration pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement and one-shot legislative intervention, do not place tens of thousands of workers under the threat of action by the Premier and his Cabinet. Bill 2 does. Those things do not lend themselves to the Premier's particular mode of fund raising. Bill 2 does. These do not strike at the essential freedoms of working people of this province, Bill 2 does. Bill 2, Mr. Speaker, is coercion, pure and simple. Bill 2 is unnecessary to deal with any dispute that we can see, real or apprehended.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is unnecessary to deal with any situation at hand. This Bill is unnecessary to deal with any reasonable apprehended situation. This Bill is an intrusion on the rights of tens of thousands of Saskatchewan people, it is unnecessary, it is unconscionable. I will oppose the Bill.

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

**HON. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate but listening to some of the remarks this afternoon, I could not help but feel that this was rather a black day in the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan. We listened to some rather . . .

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

**MR. MacDONALD:** — In fact we saw the depth of the remarks of the Members opposite sink to a new low, some of the depth of the mud, the garbage, and the slander that they resorted to this afternoon would disgust anyone.

Let's review a bit the circumstances that led up to this particular and vicious attack this afternoon. Let me review the circumstances. On the eve of what the NDP considered to be a Provincial election or an impending election, a Bill that was announced in the Throne Speech was introduced in this House. That Bill stated very simply that in the midst of a Provincial emergency, compulsory arbitration would be imposed to protect the public interest. Then all of a sudden an unusual occurrence happened. Ten days ago the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers walked off their jobs. Overnight, a national emergency developed in the Dominion of Canada and particularly in our three Western provinces. Farmers hard-pressed for the last two or three years were unable to deliver their crop, in fact, many of them were sinking further and further into debt. Now for the first time in a number of years it appeared that they would be able to sell their grain, that things were on the upswing, that optimism was rampant in the country. All of a sudden they heard the news that the locomotive engineers were walking off the job and overnight they reacted in anger and justified outrage. Boxcars were standing idle on the Prairies and at the West Coast, ships were in the harbor; there was a potential loss of markets and the farmers were violently opposed to the whole situation. The NDP looked at this and stated that it was a national emergency. A typical concrete example of the realistic need and approach of Bill 2. Mr. Speaker, their political instincts dominated their principles. All of us are aware that they collaborated in a telegram from this Legislature. The Government of Saskatchewan demands - demands - this Legislature unanimously demands that the railway unions, the employees and the management of the CPR and the CNR take whatever steps are necessary to resume immediately full movement of Prairie grain to Pacific terminals. That this Assembly demands the Government of Canada, particularly the Minister of Labour, forthwith call all parties together to bring about a speedy resolution of this dispute.

**April 5, 1971**

Then, of course, the Leader of the Opposition got into the act and what did he do? He issued a public statement, demanding compulsory arbitration. Demanding compulsory arbitration to put these locomotive engineers back to work. This was a statement read in every newspaper, on every television and radio in Western Canada. He stated, in effect, that there was a state of national emergency and that emergency powers and emergency methods were needed. He called upon compulsory arbitration, the very thing that we have just listened to him try to do away with. Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden he found himself, this afternoon, in a little trouble. Because the history of the NDP has strongly disapproved of this principle, at the last Provincial convention, at all national conventions. The only reason for issuing that statement was that they were hoping that they could save their political skins with the farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan.

But, Mr. Speaker, the reaction was rather violent, but it was rather interesting that violence came not from the public but from within their own party. And is it any wonder that Mr. Blakeney, the Leader of the Opposition, walked into this House this afternoon, and sunk to the depths of mud, garbage and slander. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, was that he all of a sudden got a copy of this afternoon's paper. That's right, he called very Member on this side of the House, every Member of the Government, a blackmailer.

Mr. Speaker, I resent that. But here is the reason. All of a sudden he got hold of the afternoon paper and listen to what it said:

Don Mitchell who was a candidate in the 1970 NDP leadership contest, and a Member of the party caucus, Monday, called on the caucus to retract its request for compulsory arbitration in the work stoppage of locomotive engineers.

Called on them to retract the statement for compulsory arbitration. Mr. Mitchell, a member of the Waffle wing of the party and consistently one of its main spokesmen, said compulsory arbitration is clearly contradictory to party policy, both federal and provincial.

The 1970 convention explicitly opposed compulsory arbitration he said in his statement issued on Monday. Is it any wonder that they were trying to save their political skins. The statement announced his resignation from the NDP legislative advisory committee. All of a sudden he talks about our Members of our party. Here is a caucus party representative and listen to what he said. This is the interesting part. Why did he resign?

Mr. Mitchell was referring to a telegram sent by the NDP last week to Ottawa urging the Federal Government to get rail shipping movement moving again and to use compulsory arbitration if other negotiations failed. The threatened strike has since been averted. 'Our party caucus is creating confusion and bitterness in the community, of being inconsistent on basic principles.'

Basic principles of the Socialists. That is the only thing that I could ever say about the Socialists. When they spoke normally, the Socialists had enough guts to maintain that principle, but they don't. All of a sudden they backed off and they no longer have the guts.



'I was regrettably unable to attend the caucus which discussed the matter. The position taken is so clearly contradictory to party policy, both Federal and Provincial, that I must now call for retraction by the caucus.' Mr. Mitchell said that the fact that the strike has been averted and the Federal Cabinet has not been forced to act, despite hysterical cries of compulsory arbitration from the Legislature is a testimonial to the effectiveness of free collective bargaining.

Hysterical utterances! I wonder if the farmers of Saskatchewan recognize it. I am sure they do, at least all of the farmers that I have talked to.

The last few days in the Saskatchewan Legislature has been characterized by antics of two groups of politicians each trying to one up the other, in successive anti-labor declarations to divide workers from farmers.

Oh, to divide worker from farmer! Mr. Speaker, imagine! Here stands the man in the ND Party for principle, for Socialism, because they haven't enough guts to stand up for their principles, for the hope of political advantage, for the fear of an election, for the fear of losing every NDP rural seat in Saskatchewan. They back off their principles.

I wonder what the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) and the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) who consistently fought for labor rights and watched the Members of his party withdraw for one reason - for political advantage, for the fear, the absolute fear in going to the people of Saskatchewan. They stood up for compulsory arbitration in order to win the few rural seats in this province. I continue to quote.

The CPR was tearing up branch lines which others were trying to save for rural communities. Instead of challenging the railway's powers, the governments are driving a falsely mounted wedge between workers and farmers.

Then he goes on:

What is the most incredible, is that the NDP caucus should be on this band wage . . .

Whose band wagon are they trying to get on? The Liberal band wagon.

. . . should be on the band wagon of dividing a community. A party whose basic support lies with exploited groups . . .

Now he is talking like a real Socialist.

. . . whose program explicitly supports the ND Party, whose members have faithfully and consistently defended the rights of working people and farmers against big business. It is not sufficient to say that our caucus has played into the hands of those who divide workers from farmers. You have to say more. We must now recognize that our MLAs are actually a part of the strategy, to divide the people, to weaken their forces, to make them easy prey for big business.

This is a Socialist, a member of the party caucus. Mr. Mitchell said:

**April 5, 1971**

The caucus was ignoring the policy set out at the last convention and it sold out the party faithful. Sold out the farmers, sold out the rural supporters. He said that he could not advise on party programs when they are prepared to abandon their principles and re-sacrifice the people we pretend to represent.

This, Mr. Speaker, from the party advisor to their caucus. No, Mr. Speaker, Bill 2 is there for one purpose. To respond to our provincial emergency just as the NDP have called upon the Federal Government to respond to national emergency.

Let me tell you that three times in the last three or four years we have called on this Bill. Once at the request of the labour unions and once to suggest that a power strike was a provincial emergency. To suggest that a strike that has tied up the whole province for three or four months isn't a provincial emergency is nonsense. Surely the people of Saskatchewan that elect representatives on the Government side of the House, have enough confidence in us to realize that this Bill will only be used with wisdom and with prudence.

Mr. Speaker, I make no hesitation in standing up and supporting this Bill.

**MR. N.E. BYERS (Kelvington):** — Mr. Speaker, like the former speaker, it was not my intention either to comment upon this particular Bill today.

I am a Member from a rural constituency which produces a good portion of the labor force of this province. Because the future of our young people on the farm is very, very grim, due to the prospects for agriculture in the future due to such things as the Task Force Report and the evil things it portrays for them, they are, of necessity, forced into the labor force. Therefore, there are a few things that I want to say about this Bill today.

I have been rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, that several Government Members have risen in their places today and said that the real excuse that the Government has for extending the provisions of Bill 2 now before the House, is that in their opinion the whole process of collective bargaining has become obsolete, that it is an archaic method of settling wage levels and working conditions, and as such, in their opinion so they say, the collective bargaining ought to be thrown upon the junk heap. We get arguments stated in general terms such as this - as a puny, weak excuse, for bringing to this Legislature this very vicious type of legislation.

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

**MR. BYERS:** — The other argument that is faintly trotted out is that somehow the Government Members regard international unions as evil bogies. There are, I suggest to Members opposite, labor unions in this country which are national in character and those which are international in character. Let us not forget though that the history of the trade movement in this country and on the continent of Europe is very old and has been a long time in developing. It is true that the international concept of union organization has its roots going back into the old craft unions from Europe of an earlier time.

For us to say, to any group of people, that they must

organize on a specific basis, I consider that to be an unfair thing for Members of this Legislature to advocate.

I mentioned that the Government Members tend to regard the collective bargaining process as obsolete. Let's look at some other things too, Mr. Speaker, that are related to this Bill which Members of this party have either advocated or have threatened to use as levers to weaken the power of those people who work for a wage or salary for their daily bread.

We have heard utterances from the Liberal Party since this Government came to power, that unions ought to be made legal entities, so that they could be sued. Our Leader mentioned that unions were declared not to be legal entities by the Taff Vale Case in England of 1905 or 1906. The working people of this province ought to recognize that if this Government was re-elected after another election, that another step in more repressive legislation that this Government might consider taking is to make labor unions "legal entities." If unions were made legal entities, this would mean that in the event of a strike, the employer could sue laborers for financial losses due to that strike. Thus, any gains made by negotiations or other means could very easily be wiped away.

What our friends here sometimes overlook, Mr. Speaker, is that even the corporate interests in this country which they so ably represent, have recognized on many, many occasions and have admitted publicly, to use a common phrase, that collective bargaining is a necessary evil. That comes right from the lords of the capitalist system, that collective bargaining is a satisfactory method, in the long run, for the settlement of wages and other working conditions. But here we have, today, a Bill which will for all intents and purposes nullify that procedure which has had a fairly good record of success previously, both in this country and in this province.

I wonder why, and I am sure many people do too, why the Government resorts to bringing forth repressive legislation of this kind. The percentage of our population today who are in the labor force is a higher percentage than it has ever been and it is going to get larger not less.

What we sometimes forget, Mr. Speaker, is that when a person joins the labor force, whether he becomes a teacher or a plumber, a bricklayer or a painter, that when he has entered the labor force he is now in the process whereby he sells his life one day at a time. Nothing else does he have to offer for the earning of his daily bread and the providing of amenities for himself and his family, but the labor and skill which he can offer in the market place. But what we in this party have said repeatedly and what the Government Members obviously reject repeatedly is that those people who invest their life in a business have just as great a claim to the resources of this country as those people who invest their money and little of their effort, and most of those people who invest their money come from outside this country.

The collective bargaining process, we consider, a basic human right. It is one of the fairest means that we have found to see that the worker has some means to obtain a fair deal in the market place for the service that he has to offer.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that by bringing in this particular legislation, by extending its scope, that we were in

**April 5, 1971**

the midst of some of the greatest labor strife in the world. It has been said here and it ought to be well known, that we enjoyed, in this province, for a good many years, a period of relative peace with respect to the negotiating and settlement of labour problems of different groups. That was true. That situation existed because through the Department of Labour, the Minister of Labour under a previous CCF Government had in the Department top-notch people who were skilled in the art of conciliation and mediation and there were adequate funds made available for this particular service so that labor problems could, for the most part, be resolved amicably and with a minimum of disservice to the country. And that is, I think, one of the reasons why this Government must resort to this particular legislation. If I might just refer to a reason advanced last June by the then Minister of Labour, the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) when he was asked what actions he had taken, as I recall the off-cuff gist of his remarks, he said that he hadn't had time to get really involved in settling the disputes that were common at that particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this Bill and if I were a true Liberal I should oppose it, too. I think it is a negation of the free-enterprise system which they claim and profess to represent. This Bill is going to evoke a situation where the Provincial Government is going to be involved in every single local squabble that might develop in the field of negotiations throughout this province. It is another example of this Government's determination to control the major salary and wage bills in the province. It has been said in this debate, and let me repeat it because there is a similarity between this particular Bill and the Bill before the House with respect to the whole negotiations' procedure respecting teachers in this province. Whether you apply this type of machinery or whether you set up a deadline to be followed before compulsory arbitration is applied, the only way that troubles can be settled for the most part is for workers to withdraw their services and then you impose this iniquitous Bill upon them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the application of this particular Bill from the standpoint of our labor supply in the province. I think that the imposition of this Bill will force still larger numbers of workers to leave Saskatchewan in unfortunately larger numbers. I might say that we haven't had all that much co-operation in this country over the years in helping to build up a supply of highly skilled workers. Might I say in this House that it was into the 1960s in this province after we had thrown the Liberals out of office in Ottawa that we started to get some help from the Federal Government to build up some technical institutes to train a better skilled labor force in this province. Now that we have been able to build up a good pool of skilled labor we certainly are not going to attract them to live in Saskatchewan with this restrictive legislation over their heads. I have always attempted to encourage our young people and our working people to invest their life in Saskatchewan and I might say that even in the last seven years of Liberalism, I have encouraged our young people to stay in Saskatchewan trying to reassure them that this was just a passing fancy Liberalism that would go away in due time and there would be a better life ahead for them.

Mr. Speaker, I find nothing honorable about this Bill; I believe that it will do more to enslave our workers; it will encourage a further migration of people from our province; it

is my belief that this Bill will encourage more strikes than we have had to date; it is a Bill that is not worthy of support in this Chamber, in any city or in any rural constituency in Saskatchewan. I will oppose it most strongly. I think it is a Bill that will after the next election eliminate most of the Liberal members comfortably, if it is passed. In spite of that, I urge all Members to oppose this with all their might and main.

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

**HON. A.C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I shouldn't want the opportunity to go by without speaking on this Bill for fear someone may misinterpret my motives as not in sympathy with the Bill or afraid to express my opinion on the Bill. I'm going to chat very moderately, very quietly. If you had been with me talking to farmers, and meeting in coffee parties and on the streets, and asking them about this legislation, you would have your answer. Everywhere I went the past few days, farmers and businessmen, Yes, and labor men were asking of me: "Where is this all going to end? When is Ottawa going to have the courage to take the necessary steps demanded in today's economy? How long must we live under an atmosphere of uncertainty where a handful of men can have a strangle hold on the agricultural industry and the whole Government is powerless to do anything about it? How likewise they can bring, not only the agricultural industry, but the potash industry to its knees, or simply wreck the total economy." They said to me, "You know we've heard a great deal about foreign capital in Canada, we've heard a great deal about the evils of foreign ownership," and they said, "there's something to be said for that and there is a nervousness about foreign control." But they asked, "has foreign ownership of the resources ever caused a catastrophe like we face here? Has foreign ownership ever brought the potash industry to its knees? Has foreign ownership brought the plight of the farmer to the state that he is facing now?" They said the thing here is for action. They are asking when. I'm going to tell you to get out and listen to the people. If you expect to come back here I'd say, get out and get your ear to the ground and listen to what the people are saying.

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

**MR. CAMERON:** — Every place where I mentioned that the Premier was very definite in his viewpoint, that he would bring in labor-management courts to this province, we got a resounding reception. It is not only labor that is at fault, I think in this particular railroad strike probably management was more at fault. I think I can speak with some understanding of management of the railroads because I negotiated with them all summer struggling to get a bit of a freight rate reduction for our potash industry. But we had to do it and the only way we could do it is to threaten them with severe taxation or as the Vice-President of the CNR told me, they are negotiating with a gun at their head.

How long must the innocent victim suffer at the hands of irresponsible groups? In today's society you have on the one hand a powerful voice in the union organization. You have a powerful voice in the corporate management and when these two extreme forces come head-on, what happens? Everyone in between, and the little fellow is the fellow who suffers and he has nothing to do with it. Their only plea is this: what in the world is the use of having a democratic government if they

**April 5, 1971**

haven't got the courage to do the things that must be done? I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) was right by what I read in the press the other day. He too assessed this and said compulsory arbitration must now come. Then today I hear him in here saying this Bill is a pretty dastardly thing. I must say I hold the Leader of the Opposition in some considerable respect. But when I heard him repeat tonight and not knowing what was said today, that a former Member of the Legislature had made public and exposed these evil doings of the Liberal Party then surely we couldn't put the welfare of labor into the hands of a board to which this Government appointed the chairman. Anyone who read the headlines will agree it was an allegation. There has been nothing made public; there has been no expose; it is the voice of a past Member who is disappointed in losing his job.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He's a candidate.

**MR. CAMERON:** — He's a candidate. Tonight I heard the Member read in the paper what the former NDP had to say or a former Member of the Legislative Caucus when he says, "You know in conscience I must now quit the NDP." You know it reminded me of only a few years ago when the new NDP was formed, and the Member from The Battlefords then, like an unwilling groom at a wedding, said, "I don't want to be an NDP." You know I have met more people who fought in the CCF, in the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, who say under today's leadership and what they see in Canada say, "I do not want to be an NDP." I want to read to you tonight. Here is the leadership that this NDP is giving. This is a statement given in Peterborough, Ontario, and I am going to read it:

The New Democratic Party's waffle wing has put the Party on the spot with its resolution endorsing the absolute right of Quebec's self determination, the Federal Party's Deputy Leader said Sunday.

David Lewis is one of five candidates in the . . .

**MR. KRAMER:** — On a point of privilege. Now number one, I don't know, we heard a great deal about order and so on and I think you did call this House to order as to speaking directly to the Bill sometime ago. Now as far as a statement referred to, putting words in my mouth, as to what I did say at a convention . . .

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

**MR. KRAMER:** — I want to say what I did say. I said I don't want any part of these initials. I prefer to be a New Democrat and I don't want to use this set of initials and it is because of the ignorance, not only of the people opposite, the people in the Press referring to the Party as the NDP Party. This is the most redundant bloody thing that I have ever heard of. This is my objection.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Oh, are we happy to hear from you?

**MR. CAMERON:** — I am amazed to hear the Member for The Battlefords

say that the NDP initials is the bloodiest thing he ever heard of.

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

**MR. KRAMER:** — Once again, Mr. Speaker, the aging Member for Maple Creek has bad hearing and I sympathize with him but I didn't say that. I said that I objected to the redundancy when people stand up in their place and refer to the NDP Party. The initials NDP refer to New Democratic Party. When you talk about the NDP Party, you say in effect, New Democratic Party and from a former school teacher over there, I thought he would understand. Maybe I've spoken a little louder now and maybe the aging Member from Maple Creek will understand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well I draw the attention of the Member for The Battlefords that it is considered to be unparliamentary to revive a debate that has taken place at a previous time, obviously at the time when the CCF adopted the name NDP some years ago. Perhaps we had better get back on the Bill which is an amendment to The Essential Services Emergency Act.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had taken note of the Member's feeling towards the NDP and it is certainly shared by a great many others. He talks about the aging Member for Maple Creek. Perhaps I should tell the House this. I left the House last week and you know I was gone five days and during those five days I aged five years because I noted the Press said, "This Member of 67 from Maple Creek." Let's put the record straight. This Member for Maple Creek is 62, not 67. You know, coming from the Highlands as I do, the Scotch is best under slow maturing, to hasten something lessens its quality and that is why I object to this. I thought I'd better put the records straight.

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

**MR. CAMERON:** — But I did want to say in all sincerity what the Bill is doing is very simple. I was surprised to see how labor in Saskatchewan asked to be put under the protection of Bill 2. When the nursing home was paying wages that were shamefully disgraceful and their workers had no voice and no way of getting redress, they appealed to the Cabinet to bring them under Bill 2 to settle the dispute. When the electricians' strike was on, a handful of people specialized in certain types of wiring, went out on strike, tied-up the whole work. We let it go on. What happened? The wives of these same laboring people were coming and camping on the doorsteps of the Legislature and pleading with the Premier to do something to put their men back to work. I'll never forget one lady, she was a robust lady and I'm sure she was as vocal in the home as she was out there. She said, "We are here in the cold and we are asking that you put these men to work. What are they doing carrying placards?" she said. "There's that husband of mine over there and I'm sick and tired of having him around home and in the kitchen." She said, "He should be back working instead of carrying one of those things that he is carrying here in front of the House." This is the attitude of people. They recognize that in a complex society in which we live today there has to be a mechanism by which Governments can take quick action. All that

**April 5, 1971**

this Bill is doing, whether you call the Session together or whether you don't, the Government must take the ultimate credit or condemnation for what is passed in the House. If you call the Legislature together and you put the worker back to work by a special Bill as the Leader of the Opposition says, the Government must take the responsibility for having done that. Well, the Government is in essence the Cabinet so what is the difference if you have the legislation passed and the power resting in the hands of the Cabinet. Therefore, the provision in the Bill is very explicit. Only the case of where an emergency exists that is harmful . . .

. . . a state of emergency exists . . . that the public interest or welfare may be in jeopardy.

I think that if we are successful in setting up labor-management courts, I think it will be the most outstanding piece of legislation that we have considered for some time. If we get this successfully established, then I see no reason for Bill 2, no reason whatever. I see no reason for the new amendments to The Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act. Here in the interim we are using this but when we come in, and I hope very shortly, with labor-management courts with independent judges and out of the realm of politics, then I think we can begin to dispense with some of this legislation.

It is pretty severe legislation. They are pretty severe powers that are placed in the hands of a Cabinet. I think I'd grant that, but let me tell you this: the people of Saskatchewan today are resting much easier because they know we have Bill 2 and because they know these amendments that are coming in and that if an emergency is created in Saskatchewan, they won't be left to the winds as we were in Ottawa. If Ottawa had the courage to do what we are doing here for the people of Saskatchewan, they too, as this Government will be, will be re-elected with astounding support from the people.

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

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to enter this debate, of course, on the side of those who oppose the amendments to Bill 2. Before I do get into the main thrust of my remarks, I want to just challenge two or three of the statements made by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), the gentleman who just finished taking his seat.

The Minister was telling the Members of the House that in the last three or four days he has been travelling around the country. He says he has been listening to rural Saskatchewan and one of the points that he endeavored to make, Mr. Speaker, to this House was the question of foreign ownership for Canada. The question was apparently put to him, so he says, repeatedly by people, "What harm have foreign corporations done to the Dominion of Canada as compared with strikes, such strikes as the rail strike that he talked about?" He asked the rhetorical question, leaving the clear implication that foreign ownership is foreign ownership but at least we don't have the type of economic chaos or difficulty created by a decision of a foreign dominated corporation as we do sometimes, so he tried to make us believe, by the decisions taken by a trade union.



I should like to remind the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources that it wasn't so long ago that Ford Motor Company in the United States told the Ford Motor Company of Canada that Ford Motor would not be able to sell a large order of small mini trucks to Red China, although that company was located in Canada and decided to do so, thereby causing layoffs of thousands of working people.

It wasn't so long ago that a mill plant in Moose Jaw was forced . . .

**HON. D.G. MacLENNAN (Minister of Labour):** — On a point of order! I take strong exception to his injecting a new debate, the debate that he is discussing now will be on one, I expect, on foreign investment and if he, Mr. Speaker, would stick to the Bill, I am sure all would appreciate it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well, again I ask all Hon. Members to stay with the amendments to The Essential Services Emergency Act, which I think has application strictly to the Province of Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Mr. Lewis in Peterborough?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Lewis . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry . . .

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I was thinking of my other spiritual mentor. Mr. Speaker and Mr. Lewis.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall abide by the decision, of course, and make the point simply that I think the Minister of Mineral Resources was in error when he said that the decision of foreign corporations do not affect Canadians. I think that they do and I tried to point out those two examples.

The Minister also endeavored to tell the House that there was no difference having a piece of legislation like we do now, that allows the Cabinet alone to decide when there is an emergency in a labor dispute. He seemed to indicate to the House that it was of no difference or of no moment that the decision should be made by the Cabinet of a particular government. As opposed to that we in the New Democratic Party believe that if you're going to have to impose this type of legislation, which we oppose, that it should be brought to the floor of the Legislature for public debate.

I say to the Minister of Mineral Resources that that is, in fact, a travesty of what I understand democracy to be. I say that when there is an emergency or a crisis in any matter, and particularly a labor dispute, which may necessitate the taking away of civil liberties of working people, the proper place to make that decision of abridgement of civil liberties is not in the dark hidden chambers of a cabinet room but on the floor of this Legislature in the Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan.

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

**April 5, 1971**

**MR. ROMANOW:** — And I say to the Minister of Mineral Resources that the fact of the matter is that that's one of the arguments that we have been advancing against this piece of legislation. That it allows the determination of what is a dispute essential to the public good, to be made by a Cabinet, a Cabinet that has shown itself to be politically biased and politically motivated in all the things that it does with respect to labor and working people. The people of Saskatchewan are not prepared to take it any more, when it comes with respect to this Bill.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is based, in essence, on the principle of compulsory arbitration. The Minister of Mineral Resources and other Liberals throughout this debate would have us believe that the principle of compulsory arbitration in a blanket, all-encompassing form, as set out in the Bill 2 amendment that we're debating, is something that is accepted by most of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the case. I do believe that compulsory arbitration is a blanket, all-encompassing form, as proposed in this amendment to Bill 2 and as Bill 2 is itself, is accepted by all the people of Saskatchewan. In fact, I say to the Minister and to the Government opposite that not only is this legislation not accepted by the people of Saskatchewan, but there are many, many prominent Members of the Liberal Party in the Government opposite who also totally disagree with the principle of compulsory arbitration.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — There are, after all, Mr. Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) a few Liberals with a conscience, even in the Province of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I wish to point out to the Minister, who is now taking his leave, that there are many Liberals who, in fact, deny the principle of compulsory arbitration. I have in front of me a Saskatoon Star Phoenix clipping, June 4th, 1969, from Ottawa. The headline in the Star Phoenix says:

Buckwold defends the right to strike. Mayor S.L. Buckwold of Saskatoon said the right to strike should not be outlawed and should be preserved and continued.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this mayor, a responsible member of the Liberal Party opposite and a responsible man in the city of Saskatoon in the Province of Saskatchewan, does not support the principle of compulsory arbitration that his counterparts and fellow members are trying to foist on the people.

I have another clipping, November 22nd, 1966, to prove to you, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals do not approve of the principle of compulsory arbitration. This clipping reports a meeting that took place in Montreal of the Mount Royal Liberal Association. Hon. Members will know that the Mount Royal Liberal Association happens to represent the federal riding of the Prime Minister of the country, the Liberal Prime Minister, Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

The guest speaker was one, Mr. Jean Marchand. Honourable members will know that Jean Marchand, not only being a Liberal Cabinet Minister of considerable importance in the Cabinet, was also a trade unionist of long and many years of experience in the trade union movement. Mr. Marchand in the course of his debate on the question of the right of strike, said this:

It's just not true that labor problems are created by trade unions which really aren't powerful enough to call a strike unless their members have a real problem arising from the climbing cost of living.

And then he went on to say that the real problem stems from the fact that there is no one to speak authoritatively for management.

My colleagues and my leader, Mr. Blakeney, talked about the possibilities of a chairman being set up under this compulsory arbitration board in Bill 2 and he mentioned the name of one Ralph Purdy. Regrettably, my leader didn't see an article where Mr. Purdy himself is purported to have opposed compulsory arbitration in the Star Phoenix on November 14th, 1970. This man is well known for his reactionary views, in my opinion. What does he say about the labor court idea? The headline says, "Labor court idea panned by Purdy." And what does he say about compulsory arbitration? He says this, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan):

Labour courts and compulsory arbitration are not the long-term solutions to Saskatchewan labor problems, Ralph Purdy, executive director of the Employers' Association of Saskatchewan says.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — We've got the extreme right wing, the extreme element of the Province of Saskatchewan that says that compulsory arbitration is not acceptable to him. Yet this Government decides that it is going to "out right" Mr. Ralph Purdy and ram compulsory arbitration down the throats of the working people of Saskatchewan. That's even a tough job for the Minister of Labour to do but he's done it with respect to these amendments.

I know that there is some dissension among the Liberals opposite on the question of compulsory arbitration and the attitude of the Liberal Party with respect to labor problems. I happen to know personally that there are Members in that Caucus opposite who do not agree with the Premier's stand on compulsory arbitration and Bill 2. Now, those Members, I think there is more than one person whom I refer to, resent the fact that free working men in our society are going to be told by Bill 2 when they are going to be able to work and the working conditions that they have to work under.

I know that there are these Members who resent it, Mr. Speaker. But I am afraid that the Party Whip and the stranglehold that the Premier of the Province holds on his Members, as shown by the statement of Wilf Gardiner, on the financial contributions of the Members opposite, will probably not tell the true story in this vote. But, he did have a chance when one Member, in fact, did stand up and tell the people of Saskatchewan what he thought of the Premier and the labor policy of

**April 5, 1971**

the Government opposite.

This is an article of December 1st, 1970. The Liberal Party held a convention:

George Leith, MLA for Elrose, remained seated during the vote that was taken by the Premier. Mr. Leith told reporters the question posed was: do you think the Government has been unfair to labor over the last few months? And he said: "I don't think it's any secret that I wonder if our Party isn't beginning to have an unfortunate anti-labor bias. I felt I really ought to express my opinion publicly as well as privately," Mr. Leith said.

And he was one of the MLAs, one of the 34 people sitting on that side who had the guts to stand up and vote against compulsory arbitration right at a Liberal convention.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — And if the Party Whip and the stranglehold of finances wasn't so tight by the Liberal Party opposite, I know that there would be Members opposite who, like the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) would stand up and say, No, to the principle of this Bill of compulsory arbitration.

The editorial comment is by no means very strong in support of the Liberal stand. I am one who does not agree with many of the things the Saskatoon Star Phoenix says editorially but they do happen to have a good editorial on the question of collective bargaining. The headline in the editorial says simply, "Private solution best." It talks about the dangers in trade union disputes. It says this:

But despite the serious blows, strikes and labor disputes have dealt the Prairie economy, the dangers and disadvantages of such a move . . .

(The move referring to, Mr. Speaker, compulsory arbitration)

. . . outweigh any short-term advantages.

The editorial goes on to say:

One danger is that once again we have an enlargement of governmental control of the private business sector something which has already reached alarming dimensions. In this case it is control over private employer-employee relations.

That's the Star Phoenix saying that Bill 2 and the purposes of compulsory arbitration are bad. Saying this is not the New Democratic Party, not the Saskatchewan Liberal, not the Commonwealth, but the Saskatoon Star Phoenix panning the proposed amendments that are before you, Sir, tonight.

So I say to this House that in fact there is no support in the country. There is no support in the Liberal Party opposite with respect to the amendments that are proposed to you tonight.

What then is the real purpose of the amendments to Bill 2? What then is behind the Liberal Government introducing these

amendments, Mr. Speaker? There is no other way to say it but that the purpose behind this Government bringing in Bill 2 amendments is for cheap political advantage. Cheap political advantage to get them off the worst electoral hook that they have been on since 1964.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Liberals feel that they need a good labor dispute kicking around somewhere in order to get the people's minds off the lousy job done by the Liberal Party on agriculture; to take their minds off the lousy job done by the Minister of Labour with respect to unemployment in the Province of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — To take the minds off the fact that 33,000 people have left this province thanks to the Government opposite. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments to this Bill are designed to create a cleavage between farmer and labor. The Liberal Party has used Bill 2 ever since it was introduced in 1966 to peddle division, to peddle animosity and differences between our working people in our cities and our working people on our farms. They have been trying to use it for an electoral clout. I say that this attitude is despicable. I say this philosophy which is behind this Bill 2 amendment is a philosophy of divide and rule which has been the only philosophy the Liberal Party has ever had.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Some Hon. Members opposite may not believe me when I say that this is what's behind this Bill, when I say that the Premier's tactics is to set one group against another group. I happen to have in front of me, Mr. Speaker, a transcript of a statement purportedly made by one, Mr. Wilf Gardiner. It's been said again, and I want to put it on the record, by the son of a former Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan. I shall quote what he has to say about Bill 2 and compulsory arbitration and the Premier. These are the words of the son of a former Premier of the Province, a Minister of Public Works, a high-ranking civil servant, a man who was unceremoniously dumped - and there is no other way to describe it - by this arrogant Government opposite. What does he say the Premier's philosophy is with respect to trade disputes? He says this:

The Premier believes in a policy of starting a battle with every conceivable group and then when he makes up with them, appearing to be a generous man. His continual battles . . .

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — There is more.

. . . with teachers, labor and the Federal Government, have just been window-dressing, Mr. Speaker, and attempts to turn group against group to his own advantage.

Then Mr. Gardiner said - and I was reminded of this quotation when my colleague from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) talked about it

**April 5, 1971**

when he urged true Liberals on that side to vote against the amendments - Mr. Gardiner says this about the Liberal Party:

The traditional support of the Liberal party for policies of understanding with labor, co-ops, and other people-oriented movements has been forgotten by Premier Thatcher and this Government.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — This philosophy of divide and rule in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is one that all people of Saskatchewan will abhor. For I, too, feel like my former leader, the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) that the people of Saskatchewan have a very deep-rooted sense of justice and fair play and they see an unfair, iniquitous Bill when it comes up. I think that Mr. Wilf Gardiner was not only telling the truth when he said that about the traditional support of the Liberal Party and pitting one group against the other, I think that he even told the truth more when he said two days later, "Gardiner predicts Thatcher downfall" and that will come after the next election.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, Liberal Members opposite, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) who took part in this debate, would have us believe that the question of labor disputes and the difficulty created last summer in respect to the strike at the Centre of the Arts, is really one of the major reasons for the introduction of this Bill 2. They would try to paint this in as justification for these amendments, a "catastrophic" situation with respect to strike crisis in 1970. Strikes, that I might add, Mr. Speaker, have been increasingly numerous under the Liberal Party opposite.

I say that the situation was not as drastic as the Liberal Party opposite would say. I want again to support my argument by saying that these amendments are not needed if you base it on the business of what occurred in July of 1970. Again, to quote as my authority in support of that proposition - Mr. Gardiner. Oh, Members opposite don't like it. Mr. Gardiner was a Member of the Cabinet, who, I presume, was privy to Cabinet decisions. Mr. Gardiner was a Liberal who was in when the Premier was concocting the original Bill 2. Mr. Gardiner was a member of this Cabinet when he was in on the decision making and if there is anyone who should know about labor, it should be he.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I tell the Minister of Labour it certainly isn't he, right now having any say in the councils of the Government. Mr. Gardiner says about that particular strike and about that legislation - and I am trying to use this to knock down the argument advanced by the Minister of Highways and the Liberals opposite. The question was put this way to Mr. Gardiner. Just listen to this: "Mr. Gardiner do you feel it was necessary to delay the opening of the Centre of the Arts last spring?" What did this former Cabinet Minister, son of a former Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan say? He answered and I quote:

I understand that there was no necessity for the action by the Government. Last spring the opening of the Centre of the Arts could have proceeded in spite of the labor difficulties of that period.

So I would say I don't think it was necessary for that delay. I ask you to take particular note of these words, Mr. Speaker. He said this:

I think possibly Mr. Thatcher used that as a weapon against the labor people in that particular dispute.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Now that is a shameful statement. Mr. Speaker, that is a statement that condemns every Member of the Liberal Party opposite, when a former Minister of the Crown says that a government in the position of trust and responsibility uses a piece of legislation against the working people of our province of Saskatchewan and was unjustified in doing so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some Members opposite, in the course of this debate, have tried to make a point of the position taken by the Members of the New Democratic Party respecting the rail tie-up. Specifically the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall), I don't know if he took part in this debate from any standing position but if he did it would certainly impair his thinking power, I am sure of that. Members opposite and others in the Liberal Party would have us to believe that in fact there was some inconsistency in this approach. Mr. Speaker, I should just like to turn our attention for just a minute to the question of compulsory arbitration as set out in this Bill and the question of the rail dispute.

Mr. Speaker, I want this House to know, and the people to know, clearly that what irritates this Liberal Government more about the position taken by the NDP is the fact that the Liberal Party was caught sleeping in this crisis.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What irks the Premier and the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) and the Liberal Government opposite, is that when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) rose in his place to take the initiative to put the matter before the House, the Liberal Government was sleeping. Up until that day there was nothing by the Premier. Up until that day the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) was about as silent on that trade dispute as he is on the Federal Party's Task Force on Agriculture. Up until that time the Minister of Labour didn't even know that there was a dispute going on in Vancouver in respect to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

So, I want it first to be put on the record that that is what irritates this Government most about that particular telegram that they were caught sleeping politically.

Secondly, they are angered because of the Resolution being put before the House. They are angry that Members of Parliament, such as the Member from Moose Jaw, Mr. John Skoberg, a member of the New Democratic Party, have prodded and bullied and teased and assisted Bryce Mackasey, the Liberal Labour Minister, in

**April 5, 1971**

every way, finally resulting in the resolution of that dispute. Mr. Skoberg attempted to get an emergency debate going before the Federal House and this irritates the boys opposite.

But what of the Liberal party in respect to this episode, this strike? They have been following three steps behind the New Democratic Party throughout and they are angry at us for that. They have been three steps behind all the time. Now they are mourning the fact that there is a settlement on the way at the West Coast and with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, let the people of Saskatchewan not be fooled. The Liberals don't want strikes to be settled. The Liberals don't want industrial peace.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Liberal Party want strikes so that they can play up their policy of division and cheap politics which these amendments are.

At the time that we got up in our place, Mr. Speaker, and we said there was an emergency, we asked the Liberal Party to look into this emergency. What was the Liberal Party in Ottawa doing? March 30, 1971, this is a story, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Otto Lang. Everybody in this House at the instance and the leadership of my leader said that there was an emergency. Mr. Lang, who comes from the Province of Saskatchewan and represents the farmers, what did he say that day?

Nevertheless Mr. Lang counsels calmness and hopes the railway personnel will return to work while negotiations on the dispute proceed. He notes that intemperate demands by prairie people might inflame feelings among strikers and delay their return to work unnecessarily.

I don't know whether he was right or wrong but I want to tell the Members opposite that they ought not to be pointing a finger at us because if there was anyone who is behind the crisis in Vancouver, it was the Liberal party, Federally and Provincially, with respect to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, some Members opposite say that somehow we have been inconsistent in our stand in respect to compulsory arbitration and the rail tie-up. I say that is a wrong and false statement and I shall very briefly, again, explain to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) why we say that statement is wrong.

We say, Mr. Speaker, that free collective bargaining is the touchstone of democracy. Free collective bargaining is the principle upon which labor relations are based.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to say to the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) that if I can ever get across to the Member for Souris-Estevan and convince him of anything, we shall win this province with absolutely every seat going, even the hard Liberal ones.



The position of the New Democratic Party is that free collective bargaining is the touchstone of our democracy, Mr. Speaker, in labor relations. We say that every effort to settle trade disputes should be made by free collective bargaining. We say that government facilities should be made open and available for mediation, conciliation, every step along the way to help free collective bargaining. Above all, we say that there is no need and we cannot support blanket overall legislation such as Bill 2 and these amendments before you, that make a judgment call before even collective bargaining has broken down.

There will be, as my leader has indicated, rare occasions where a dispute may affect the entire interests of an economy or a province or a society. When that situation occurs, then it is the duty of any government in the Legislature or in the Dominion of Canada, to look at the possibility of bringing in legislation before the Parliament of the day to justify an abridgement of civil rights, but not until that time.

The fact of the matter is that intervention can only be justified if, Mr. Speaker, 1. Collective bargaining has been given a full and fair opportunity to succeed undeterred by any threat of impending arbitration. 2. An opportunity has been provided for conciliation and mediation so that all avenues for a freely bargained settlement have been explored.

We have worked on that basis. That was the basis of the amendment in 1966 which urged a form of binding arbitration, if everything else failed, at the time that Bill 2 was presented in this Legislature. And using that as a precedent, we sent the telegram on the basis of the rail tie-up. I say that the New Democratic Party's record on the preservation of free collective bargaining is above reproach from anyone let alone the Liberals opposite.

I ask the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to remember that it was this CCF Government that in 1944 enshrined the principles of collective bargaining in The Trade Union Act of 1944. And it was this Government that went through 20 years without the necessity of an odious Bill 2 on the Statute Books in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion, that this Bill is bad for the following reasons. Firstly, as has been so eloquently stated by, I think by, all the Members on this side, this Bill destroys free collective bargaining. What is free collective bargaining? I define free collective bargaining as being composed of three essential ingredients. 1. The right to negotiate. 2. The right to associate in trade unions. 3. The right to strike, or if you will, Mr. Speaker, the right to withdraw the only thing that a working man has to sell and that is his labor.

Those three principles together equal free collective bargaining. It is like a three-legged chair, Mr. Speaker. If you weaken one or take one away, the chair collapses. What does Bill 2 and these amendments do? Bill 2 takes away that third important principle, the right to withdraw the only thing that the working man has to sell and that is his labor. It takes away the right without a fair hearing. It takes away that right, Mr. Speaker, without the trade union man having a chance to put his case before the Government of the day. It takes away that right and forces him back to work without even having the rights to be heard with respect to his own labor.

**April 5, 1971**

Free collective bargaining works if you want to make it work. But the Liberal Party does not want to make it work. The Liberal Party wants to curtail the right to strike because they want strikes to increase. I said to someone in the course of this debate that this Bill will increase strikes. The record of the Liberal Party in this area tells the story.

In 1966 there were 16 strikes in Saskatchewan. In 1967, 22. In 1968, 26, Mr. Speaker, an increase of over 10 strikes compared to 11 in the last year of the CCF Party. Why will strikes increase? Strikes will increase because there is no reason for an employer, absolutely no reason whatsoever, for an employer to get down to the serious business of negotiating to getting a voluntary settlement because he knows that he is going to have a pro company government foist a chairman on an arbitration board to get the dispute settled for him.

They know that it won't be very long before the Premier shouts throughout the entire press, of six per cent guidelines, of other mandates, bullying, teasing and putting the threats on, if you will, the chairman of any arbitration board in the Province of Saskatchewan. That, Sir, is a denial of the principle of free collective bargaining. And this Bill is bad for this reason.

Secondly, this Bill is bad because I think that it has misdirected the action to curtail labor disputes. We should be putting our resources and money into efforts to increase mediation and conciliation. We should be giving assistance to the parties that bargain collectively, so that they can find a resolution to the dispute. Putting it in another way, Mr. Speaker, the essential role for the Department of Labour, in my view is to take non-legislative initiatives towards the prevention of a breakdown. The critical point is to back up the negotiating process by the fullest of mediation and conciliation and technical research available.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I say this Bill is bad because it gives the Premier a carte blanche to subjugate all working men in the Province of Saskatchewan. There is no need to come to the Legislature and justify his position. It is a threat to every working man in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Fourthly, this Bill is bad because it is based and rooted in the principles of compulsion and coercion on both businesses and trade unions. Compulsion and coercion that is unnecessary and an anathema to all democratic legislatures in a free world.

For those four reasons, collective bargaining being destroyed, misdirected activity, the carte blanche given to the Premier, and the coercive aspects of the Bill, this Bill must be defeated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by saying that I fear that the whip will be too strong on the Liberal Party Members opposite. I fear that the majority will carry the day. I feel that we are going to have to have this matter determined on the hustings in the Province of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I think what really this points up, more than anything, this Bill 2 amendment, is the inability of this Government

to govern the people of Saskatchewan. What Bill 2 shows is an admission that they can't give proper conciliation and mediation to dissolve disputes and have the two parties living together in harmony.

They proved it by these amendments, because they want to curtail absolutely the right to strike. There can be no greater admission of failure in the area of trade relations than Bill 2 by the Liberal Party, introduced in this Legislature. It is a failure that is running true to form on the pulp mill. It is a failure running true to form on the Liberal Party being married to the Task Force on Agriculture which will take two out of three farmers off the farms in Saskatchewan. It is the failure of this Government to curtail the highest unemployment level this province has ever had under this Minister and the Liberal Party.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I say that when the next election is called, we are going to win that election on this and other issues.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Saying so doesn't make it so.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Just like the New Democratic Party is winning their elections in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — And if only saying so wouldn't make it so, as the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) says, but it is so, Mr. Minister. The NDP has a very commanding lead, it appears, in St. Rose in one of the by-elections there, I wish to announce to the House.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — And I wish to also point out to the Members of the House that that is a rural constituency in the Province of Manitoba. No results are in yet from St. Vital, but if the trend keeps on going there, all that Manitoba is doing is showing the way to what will soon happen in the next election in Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot and will not support this Bill.

**MR. G.G. LEITH (Elrose):** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I haven't heard all the debate that has gone on in the House, but I have heard rumors that my name and my position was mentioned and I wish to make a short statement that I think will prove of some interest to all Members of this House.

I want to say first that . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Can't hear you.

**April 5, 1971**

**MR. LEITH:** — Just try to listen and you'll hear what I have to say to you.

Gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. Attention was drawn to my name in this debate and to certain attitudes that I took at the convention in November. I don't feel in any way constrained to explain my actions at that time. However, I do want to say something to Members on this side of the House and to Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, in this debate.

If everyone knew everything, I believe all Members of the House would know that I have objected to certain parts of this Bill and certain principles inherent in it. I have objected to the power that it gave to the 13 men of the Cabinet to govern and regulate the economic lives of most of the people of Saskatchewan. I think what bothered me worst, Mr. Speaker, was that sooner or later, perhaps in 10 or 15 years, there will be a change of government and some other cabinet, perhaps certain Members over there might be in a position to exercise that power. This is what bothered me more than anything else.

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

**MR. LEITH:** — Can you think of a Walter Smishek, for instance, looking after this Bill? This was one of my worst worries and the worst danger that I saw in the Bill. This was, as I say, my main objection. I have no objection to compulsory arbitration, compulsory binding arbitration in the essential services. Who is now to say what service in this Province or in the kind of economy that we have is not essential to the well-being and the health of other people around them. Who is to say that the railways, for instance, have any right to stop the transport of our goods to the Pacific or to Thunder Bay. Who is to say that the power workers have any right to take power, light and heat away from me. Who is to say that someone in Flin Flon can jeopardize my livelihood and my health and my welfare. We are not islands unto ourselves, we are tied up inextricably with each other and for this reason after much careful consideration I have decided that I am going to support this legislation.

My friends opposite have made strong arguments against it and again I must say that I have some sympathy with them, but we must come to the absolute principle of the Bill; we must come to the decision now whether we can now get away with letting one big union, one big manager take what they want from the economy, and leave many of us defenceless and poor. The answer can be nothing but, Yes. I have heard many defences of management; I have heard many defences of labor. I want to say to the Members opposite that people who speak of poor defenceless working people in unions should remember that in 1964 there were 384 plumbers in the city of Washington, D.C. Mr. Speaker, do you know how many of them were black? There were two. Two black plumbers in a city that is almost 90 per cent black. Do you know that the American unions, especially the big trade unions are now the bastions of conservatism and middle class bourgeois. They don't make any pretense of helping the poor in society. They are just as rapacious and just as wicked and just as evil and grasping as management. I speak now for the great third force in our society, the people who are not protected by profits, they are not protected by union wages, but who have to work on low wages; and God knows we have lots of them here in this province, people who live on pensions. So I

say to this House, that I support the legislation because I believe that in the long run, it is going to be a bastion and protection against the power of either of these two big operators in our economy.

I regret, as I said before, I regret that such power should be put into the hands of 13 men of the Cabinet, I thought once and still believe that it would be better to call the Legislature if this service were to be declared essential.

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

**MR. LEITH:** — I have worked very hard to get to the core of the principle of this thing and I declare now that I intend to vote for the legislation when it comes.

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

**MR. D.G. MacLENNAN (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, in the remarks that I should like to make in closing this debate, I can only say that most of the speeches that I have heard from Members opposite in this particular debate were the same ones they gave in this past summer when we were in session. Some of the Members gave the same speech that they gave in 1966. There was the odd new comment. The Leader of the Opposition was critical of the Bill in the fact that the amendments do not spell out any, or there is not a clause in the new Bill that will spell out that a judge must be the chairman of the arbitration. Well, we can't have it both ways nor can they. The NDP in organized labor have over the years paddled the same canoe, they spoke with one voice on many issues. This harmony seems to be disintegrating. But there were differences of opinion in 1967. In 1967 in references to the UCAW dispute of 1966, Mr. Kimmerly, who I am sure you all know very well, James D. Kimmerly, OCAW International Representative, said in a press release Wednesday. The story is in the Leader-Post of May 4th of 1967. What were his comments about having a judge on an arbitration board? His comments went like this.

Judge Kindred may be a very competent judge, but as a member of the judiciary his report shows his almost complete incompetence in dealing with labor management matters. He has dealt with the situation on the plaintiff-defendant basis as though the union was on trial for rape or murder. He almost totally ignored the Canadian collective bargaining scene, etc., etc.

He goes on.

Without any experience whatsoever on past labor matters he has groped in the dark to establish his own criteria for a mythical or just wage in his increase. In some instances his report is self-contradictory.

That was an NDP supporter, I am sure, but certainly a well known member of organized labor attacking a Federal appointed judge. So we have had attacks on both fronts.

This afternoon, we were criticized for throwing it open so that we as a government may go and pick a man to sit on an arbitration board if one is every needed, and that man can be

**April 5, 1971**

picked from the wide spectrum of society. The man can be very knowledgeable and proven to be knowledgeable on matters of labor relations. But this was criticized by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. Yet in 1967 another one of their fellow travellers criticized us for having a Federal judge. So the remarks have been very political in nature, and that's to be expected.

Mr. Speaker, these people opposite are going to go to the electorate of Saskatchewan. They say here now that they would like this to be an issue. Every Liberal Member on this side who has spoken has challenged them to make labor courts or compulsory arbitration as an issue. But their credibility cannot be accepted from their words, Mr. Speaker. In their own platform that they announced a few weeks ago, they came out 100 per cent against compulsory arbitration and yet last week, we watched them waffle and waffle and come out, "Oh, in this case compulsory arbitration is necessary." So they want to adjust their philosophy and their principles on a day-to-day basis. Well, the people of Saskatchewan are aware of the politically expedient changes of principles the NDP have. Because of their about-face in recent days, because of this, the people of Saskatchewan will be in a position to know that they cannot keep their commitment to their own party members. Their commitment to their party members is, I believe, outlined in their platform.

The Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) was talking about this Government trying to be a government that will divide and rule. Yet I ask him to go back and read again what their Mr. Mitchell, who is well known to all of you over there, said in tonight's paper. What is most incredible is that the NDP Caucus should be on this bandwagon accusing us of dividing the community. Who's dividing to rule?

Mr. Speaker, the former Leader of the Opposition and the former Member for Biggar said this - or he will be the former Member for Biggar - said that this Bill was associated with hatred and despair. If there is hatred associated with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, it is the hatred that this Government has for the tragic consequences of ill-conceived strikes.

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

**MR. MacLENNAN:** — Many people on each side of every strike issue suffers and all Members of this House are aware of that. Many innocent people are laid off who are not directly involved in a strike and they suffer. This Government hates that type of situation, people suffering because of strikes? If there is despair, the despair is opposite. The despair is amongst NDP Members, especially those from the rural areas who must go back and explain their party's stand to the people of Saskatchewan. They are the ones who are despairing.

The former Leader of the Opposition said that the Saskatchewan farmer believes in fair play. That's true. I wish the labor leaders of the Locomotive Engineers believed in fair play when they struck or walked off days ago, last week. Were they fair to the farmers with the tremendous back-log of grain? No, they couldn't care less. They just walked off and tied up hundreds and thousands of boxcars. What about the Winnipeg fellows? There were further remarks by virtually all speakers opposite, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill would stifle

and destroy collective bargaining. Yet, what are the true facts. Collective bargaining, because of it, hundreds of agreements have been settled since 1966 in this province and we have had a Bill on the books since 1966. The Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) gave the number of collective agreements. Well these same agreements will come into existence by collective bargaining, just as they have in the past five or six years. Only four times in six years has this Bill been invoked and they all know that on one occasion the Bill was invoked by or at the request of the employees.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have heard other comments. We heard the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) dwell on this Bill and say that we are taking political advantage. Well, if this Bill is to our political advantage, therefore we must know and I want to assure the Member that we know that the people of Saskatchewan want this piece of legislation and they want it now.

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

**MR. MacLENNAN:** — We're bringing in this Bill because we are concerned about the situation that can result as a result of a major strike. We saw what could happen with the threatened strike of the Locomotive Engineers. I talked to dozens upon dozens of mine workers in the town of Lanigan who are very concerned about the possibility of being laid off and they did receive notice if the strike was to continue or to start. But, Mr. Speaker, this Government is concerned about all people. We are concerned about the employees that are on strike because collective bargaining has failed. We are concerned about their loss of income. We are concerned about the innocent who are laid off because some industry has been struck. We are also concerned about the production of our province and of our country. That's why we bring in a Bill like this. It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) say, "Well why bring it in, there is no panic, why bring it in now." Well he would be the type of an individual who would instruct his fire department to buy a fire truck after the town burnt down.

Mr. Speaker, this is preventative and this legislation is brought down solely for the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan. I commend all Members of this House and especially the Members opposite to re-consider and to support this Bill in this second reading.

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

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS - 26**  
**Messieurs**

|            |           |            |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Howes      | McFarlane | Boldt      |
| Cameron    | Barrie    | Loken      |
| MacDougall | Grant     | Coderre    |
| Larochelle | MacDonald | MacLennan  |
| Gallagher  | Hooker    | Heggie     |
| Breker     | Leith     | Radloff    |
| Weatherald | Mitchell  | Gardner    |
| Coupland   | McPherson | Charlebois |
| McIvor     | Schmeiser |            |

**April 5, 1971**

**NAYS - 23  
Messieurs**

Blakeney  
Wood  
Davies  
Berezowsky  
Whelan  
Brockelbank  
Matsalla  
Kowalchuk

Bowerman  
Romanow  
Dewhurst  
Smishek  
Snyder  
Baker  
Wooff  
Byers

Kramer  
Lloyd  
Meakes  
Thibault  
Michayluk  
Pepper  
Kwasnica

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