

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**66th Day**

**Friday, April 27, 1973.**

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

**Welcome to Students**

**Mr. D.L. Faris: (Arm River)** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Owens, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the House some 40 young people from the United Church Youth Group at Lucky Lake. They are accompanied by Mr. Williams and some of the parents. It's a great pleasure to have them here and I hope they will find this an interesting and worthwhile experience and that they will have a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Plywood Mill at Hudson Bay**

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney: (Premier)** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an announcement. I am pleased to report on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan that the various consultants who have been retained to advise the Government have now finalized their preliminary reports on the improved utilization of our forest resources. Mr. Norman Springate and Associates of Vancouver, B.C. have concluded their recommendations with respect to alternative opportunities for developing new forest industries in the Hudson Bay area. These conclusions have been reviewed by other forest officials. These examinations lead our Government to conclude that new forest industries can be developed in the Hudson Bay area which will improve employment opportunities and result in a greater financial return through better conversion of our forests into higher value products. I am therefore pleased to announce my Government's decision to proceed with a major forest industry at Hudson Bay, a plywood plant.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The proposed white spruce veneer and layup plywood mill will be the first of its kind in Saskatchewan. On the basis of our consultants' recommendation the project will cost approximately \$6 million. It's estimated to employ 150 persons when operational and provide a payroll of \$1,200,000 annually.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Because much of the success of this proposal relates to the benefits which can accrue from an integrated forest industry we will need to continue our discussions with Simpson Timber Company at Hudson Bay relative to future operations and the development of other necessary details. We wish to ensure at the same time the continued successful viability of the Simpson Timber Company operations. Proposals that have been

made to us by officials of Simpson Timber Company and the preliminary impact studies by our consultants provide confirmation that this new industry can be developed without jeopardizing the viability of Simpson Timber operations. We are also advised that these proposals are in keeping with good forest management practices and will provide for proper conversion of large logs into higher value products.

A prime objective of the Government in developing the new operation is to provide for a better utilization of Saskatchewan forest resources. The new plant at Hudson Bay will allow for a more effective use of larger logs in alternative wood products and provide for a greater return both in jobs and income to the people of Saskatchewan. The estimated net mill value of the plywood to be produced at the new plant is \$6.5 million annually. It will use an estimated 61,000 cords of wood each year. Residue chips from the operation will be directed to the Prince Albert Pulp Company and residue cores to Simpson Timber Company.

MacMillan-Bloedel Limited which operates a poplar wafer-board mill at Hudson Bay have expressed their interest in becoming the marketing agent for plywood produced by the new plant.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — This is the beginning of a provincial forest management and forest industry development program by our Government. It is based on sound forest practices with proper conversion of timber resources to high value wood products. This, we believe, will provide greater financial return to the people and improved employment opportunities for all the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.G. Stuart: (Leader of the Opposition)** — I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, the hysterical applause on the other side is their desperate reaction to what might be, and I emphasize might be, the first positive announcement of a job producing industry that this NDP Government has been able to announce in almost two years.

Now, to begin with, I see we've tabled the first version of the Springate Report which we want to study with interest and I suggest we'll study with some scepticism. I noticed in the Press release that . . .

**Mr. Whelan:** — Do you doubt it?

**Mr. Stuart:** — Do I doubt it? Well I haven't looked at it yet but I understand there were a couple of versions of it. I think you had to send them back to do another study to come back and say, yes, there is enough wood. And I'd be very interested if the Premier would tell us the names of the other forest experts who backed up the Springate Report. I understood the Premier to say in his announcement that the conclusions by Springate that this forest management licence area could, in fact, sustain an annual harvest sufficient to keep the present operations of Simpson Timber going and ensure the

present employment in Simpson Timber at the present level as well as a \$6 million plywood plant, that this conclusion is backed by other forest experts, I don't know whether he named them, I hope he would give us the names and also table whatever correspondence, whatever reports he's got from them to back them up. Maybe, are they included in the Springate Report?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, I hope you will table them. When he says there has been consultation with the Timpson Timber Company, I don't know what he means by consultation. I don't know what that Government means by consultation and nobody else does because the word I get from people like Simpson Timber and MacMillan-Bloedel and the Prince Albert Pulp Mill is that there has been no consultation, absolutely none. I talked to MacMillan-Bloedel today on the phone to talk about this Forest Bill and they had never heard of it. They were aware that there are some changes coming in but they had never heard of that Bill. They had no idea what was in the Bill, in fact they had some tiny hint that it was just some tidying up or sort of a mild Bill. I think they have found out now just exactly what kind of a tidying up, it's a ripping up of the contracts.

But this plywood plant which is going to employ about 150 people, I hope the Premier's assurance that this won't endanger the operation that is already there is backed up, in fact, and only a study of the Springate Report and some back-up conclusions by other forest experts to give us some idea how authentic that is would prove this point. But let me make it very clear, if there has, in fact, been consultation then the people that the Premier says were consulted with haven't been aware of it. I suppose it's the same kind of consultation you had with the university and with other people, the same kind of consultation you had with the city of Saskatoon and the city of Regina. What kind of consultation this is I don't know. NDP consultation, I guess, because the other parties really have never been aware of it. These people, I'm informed, haven't been aware of any real consultation, in fact, in the talks, there has been some talk with them, they indicated that if the studies that they were carrying on and studies backed up by someone like Springate could indicate an annual harvest or an annual availability of enough larger diameter white spruce to maintain a pulp mill that they were prepared to look at it and to consider it.

Anyway, if what the Premier says turns out to be a fact, well then we'll have another industry and we'll have another 150 people employed. But we on this side welcome this news with a great deal of caution and with a great deal of scepticism and I hope when I sit down the Premier will tell us who backs up the Springate Report and also what management he is going to have, who is going to be in charge of this plywood plant because there is no question the Government can get the money to build a plywood plant but it's another question to get the management. I see you suggest MacMillan-Bloedel who might be the marketing agent. I find that refreshing. You're going to have a socialist enterprise at one end but you need a good private enterprise at the other end to do the selling. I should like to know if he's decided who's going to be the management, who's going to be the manager, who's going to be the executive direction of this plant.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I will reply to a couple of the items referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. I should like to read the portion of the announcement:

I'm pleased to announce further that forest inventories, forest management practices and forest utilization data used by Springate have been reviewed by other qualified authorities.

Now this is what we say. We do not say that the Springate Report in detail has been confirmed by other authorities but basically what we do say is that the forest inventory, the availability of the wood, which seems to us to be the critical factor, has been look at by two other people, by Professor Gray of the University of Manitoba and by Harry Smith of British Columbia. Now these people are not known to me personally other than being represented to me as experts in the field of forest utilization. And these are the two people who have been consulted, I am advised by the Department of Natural Resources, to confirm the forest inventories and the forest utilization data which was supplied as the basis of the Springate Report.

With respect to the other aspects, we are not in a position, at this point, to announce who will be the general manager or who will be the operations manager or who will be the sales manager. Those decisions will come later. But we are reasonably sure that this operation can be operated successfully and that competent people either are currently on staff or can be obtained.

**Mr. Steuart:** — If I may, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier or the Minister of Natural Resources would give us more details about these two "experts", the professor from Manitoba and the individual from British Columbia. Did they go into the forest area, did they do an on-the-spot study and have they put in writing their back-up views, back-up material to the Springate Report? Could we have that tabled today or Monday?

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Do they know what a tree looks like?

**Mr. Speaker:** — We can't entertain a debate on it at this time. On a Ministerial announcement we do allow an answer. I think the Leader of the Opposition can ask the Minister for further information and if he doesn't get it he can raise it at a later time. I think the Minister can take note of the request and they can discuss it privately with the Leader of the Opposition.

### **Motion for Further Estimates**

**Mr. E.L. Cowley: (Minister of Finance)** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 127:

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending the Thirty-first of March 1974,

be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

At 10:24 a.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor then entered the Chamber and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

### **Welcome to Students**

**Hon. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords)** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we don't have Mr. Speaker in the Chair today and I think the visitors may have a somewhat different view of House proceedings than they would have had under ordinary circumstances. I trust that someone will explain that to them in the course of their visit here.

I take great pleasure in introducing 66 students from Battleford High School which are not only from the urban area but also from the rural area as well. They will also represent other constituencies, I believe, than The Battlefords. I think the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) probably has some constituents in that group, also the Member from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) and the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). All of these constituencies centre on The Battlefords and many students that attend Battleford schools are from the outlying areas. But regardless of where they are from we welcome them. We welcome them and also those people who accompanied them, parents and teachers, Mrs. Farrow, Mrs. Tkatchuk, Miss Chubb, Mr. Beier, and I believe the principal, Mr. Mitzel.

I hope that your day is going to be enriched with your visit here. I certainly hope that you will enjoy the museum and other areas that you will visit this afternoon and I speak on behalf of the House when I wish you a safe return home.

I hope that we will have other visits from The Battlefords which because of its distance prevents us being treated often with visitors from the better part of Saskatchewan. I was speaking in the Comprehensive School last night at the opening of one of our consumer affairs education seminars. I got down here a little ahead of you today — at three o'clock this morning. I hope you have as good trip home as I had down this morning.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. B.M. Dyck: (Saskatoon City Park)** — I welcome the students from Battleford Collegiate. I taught in that community for a few years. I hope that they have an informative and worthwhile afternoon here in the Assembly and I hope that they come back and see us again.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. Boldt: (Rosthern)** — Mr. Chairman, first of all I would welcome the Minister of Highways for making the longest speech he has made in the last six or seven weeks. I should also like to welcome 55 students from Aberdeen of the Aberdeen School, 55 Grade Eight students. They're here under the direction of Mr. Nick Peters and Ralph Riendeau. I'm sure that all Members of the House will want to wish them well here and a safe return home. I will meet them around 3:15 later on this afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.W. Cody: (Watrous)** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) who is away from the House today, I think he's in Ottawa, I should like to welcome the students from Aberdeen as well, as well as their teachers, Mr. Peters and Mr. Riendeau. I know that Mr. Mostoway, if he were here, would like to meet you as well as the Member from Rosthern. I certainly hope that you have an enjoyable day at the Legislature and also a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current)** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the House some 49 students from Grade Six of Central School at Swift Current, who are in the Speaker's Gallery in the front benches. A pretty bright looking group that does brighten up the look of this House a bit today. They are being conducted by Mr. Ralph Pelletier, their teacher and Miss Gobrowski, and Mr. Harold Evjen, the bus driver. I certainly trust that they have had a good trip so far. I hope that they have a good visit to the city of Regina and to the Legislature and that it may be informative and pleasant and that they have a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **Adjourned Debates**

#### **Second Readings**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North) that **Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend The Trade Union Act, 1972** be now read a second time.

**Hon. G.T. Snyder: (Minister of Labour)** — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words of my own to the debate concerning Bill No. 73, amendments to The Trade Union Act which have been provided by Members opposite. Let me begin by saying, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that it has been my earnest hope that we would never again be in the position where we would have to witness the introduction of anti-labor legislation into this Assembly following the events of 1966 and 1969 when that pattern emerged when Members opposite sat to your right hand in this House, Mr. Speaker. However, we are entirely committed on this side of the House to doing things in a democratic way even if it means that Opposition Members are allowed to bring forward anti-democratic statutory amendments like the one which is under discussion at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment which is before us is an attempt to inflame labor-management relations. It's a sick and it's a thinly disguised effort to weaken and to frustrate the trade union movement in this province. This Liberal amendment, Mr. Speaker, represents what must be regarded as a serious and a dangerous manoeuvre but I have sufficient confidence in the integrity and the intelligence of this Legislature to believe that this Bill will be relegated to the shredding machine where it properly belongs. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed amendment by Liberals opposite exposes them and eliminates what little remaining credibility they may ever have had in the field of labor-management relations.

One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that Members opposite might have used their time more responsibly by directing their attention and joining their friends in the employers' associations in supporting the principle of free collective bargaining as the best method of determining working conditions and seeking methods of improving the collective bargaining system. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that would be expecting too much from people opposite. It seems that they are only comfortable when they are attempting to tear down our institutions apparently because they lack the initiative to do anything constructive in terms of labor-management relations. In the present context then they completely pass over the realities of labor relations. They manage to overlook the glaring inconsistencies in their so-called labor policy or non-policy as it really is. They are too blind to spot the contradictions between their philosophy on labor and the business and professional practices that they seem to endorse and carry out.

This amendment which is before us, Mr. Speaker, is so embarrassingly naïve and it embodies such profound ignorance of the underlying principles of The Trade Union Act that one might almost be moved to pity the originators if it weren't for the fact that the subject in question is one of such vital importance to every working man and woman in the Province of Saskatchewan.

For just a moment, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the provisions of this Bill. They are deceptively brief. In the first place it is proposed that an employee be permitted to apply to the Labour Relations Board for a certification order whether or not one presently exists or for an order decertifying an existing union. Well, apparently, Mr. Speaker, some backroom boy has obviously been suffering delusions of grandeur and somehow he visualizes himself as some 20th Century Machiavelli designing some kind of master strategy which will achieve the desired objective without anybody noticing it. At least Prince Machiavelli, Mr. Speaker, evil though he was had a few brains in his head. The present amendment suffers from a remarkable deficiency in that particular commodity. Far from being a Machiavellian character, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is more worthy of the typically bungling efforts of the three stooges. Let there be no mistake, Mr. Speaker, removing the weak camouflage surrounding Bill 73 it has only one purpose, to weaken or to frustrate and get rid of trade unions. The amendment which is before us, Mr. Speaker, would encourage union raiding, it would encourage internal friction and labor unrest at any time of the year whether a collective bargaining agreement was in effect or not. It's nothing but a shallow manoeuvre, Mr. Speaker, to pit union against union, brother against brother, to create internal friction and frustration and inflame management-labor relations.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why Members opposite don't have the courage to admit to the people of Saskatchewan what they are really attempting to do in this document. Why don't they, Mr. Speaker, include in Bill 73 the repeal of Section 3 of The Trade Union Act which, in essence, establishes the right of employees to organize and to bargain collectively because this is basically what they are proposing by their amendment. They are aware, of course, Mr. Speaker, what a widely unpopular policy this would be so they attempt to mask their intentions in this manner. There is no doubt if Members opposite have their way, Mr. Speaker, unions in the Province of Saskatchewan would be nothing more than social clubs with no genuine status

and no bargaining power. It seems logical to wonder, Mr. Speaker, just who would benefit from the amendment which has been placed before us and the answer is clear. The answer is a substantially few employers, a handful of unscrupulous employers, Mr. Speaker, because the vast majority of employers in the Province of Saskatchewan today actively promote the effective operation of collective bargaining in their establishments as a means of orderly and effective operation of their business enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I think quite sincerely that union members almost to a man strive to do an honest day's work in return for fair gains obtained by the collective bargaining process. They and their families have a right to share equitably in the fruits of a modern industrial society as have large numbers of unorganized workers who have come to depend upon unions to establish labor trends for their ultimate benefit. Mr. Speaker, the public as a whole I suggest looks to the bargaining mechanism to facilitate the systematic development of our economy.

Just let me ask the few remaining Members opposite, and out of 15 three is a pretty sorry spectacle, Mr. Speaker, just let me . . .

**Mr. Weatherald:** — On a Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker. I also just counted the Government benches and I notice there are just about 28 missing. That's not too good out of 45.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I would agree that reference to how many Members are present may be noted. But in reference to how many Members are on the other side of the Chamber either back and forth is not called for. As long as we have a quorum that's all I'm interested in.

**Mr. Snyder:** — Mr. Speaker, after what was represented to be a conversion to a more sane labor policy Members opposite should be able to muster more than three Members in the Legislature to take into consideration a matter which they considered important enough to bring to this Assembly and not to waste the time of the Legislature with the kind of frivolous material that they are placing before the Legislature today.

I should like to ask Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, how this amendment can be reconciled with the so-called endorsement of the free collective bargaining principle which they endorsed at the last Liberal convention. I think it says just the precise opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite attempt to deceive in their usual fashion and claim in the words of Members opposite, that they are only trying to protect the individual rights of employees by providing that an employee may make an application to the Labour Relations Board for a decertification order.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you today that that's utterly nonsensical. If Members opposite would go to the trouble of establishing at least a passing acquaintance with The Trade Union Act they would discover that the rights of the individual employee are already safeguarded in legislation. Section 5 of The Trade Union Act assigns the broad power to make orders and specifically provides that any trade union or



any employee affected may apply for a rescinding or an amending order. Members opposite have argued in this House that decertification cannot be provided under the existing Act and they conveniently and deliberately overlook the present mechanism that has been set up to specifically deal with the process of decertification through Section 5(k) which governs the rescinding and amending of certification orders.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in their eagerness to criticize they create untenable and unworkable circumstances which would see the waiving of the present requirement that applications be made to the Board only during an open period between the 30 to 60 day hunting period before the anniversary of the effective date of an agreement. As a result, Mr. Speaker, applications for decertification and intervention could come before the Labour Relations Board not only between the 30 to 60 day hunting period but during the whole of the year, during 365 days out of the year. Moreover, under the amendment a rival union would not have to wait six months before resubmitting a certification application as at present which would indeed create a good deal of chaos. On top of everything else, Mr. Speaker, the Bill has been drawn up in such a sloppy manner that Section 5A of the amendment which we are considering would be in direct conflict with 5(k) of The Trade Union Act dealing with rescissions and amendments with no indication of how this conflict between 5A of the proposed amendment and 5(k) of the existing Act could possibly be resolved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this sorry mess is compounded further by the addition of Section 6A to the Bill which would require the Labour Relations Board to order a decertification vote where the Labour Relations Board is satisfied that an application under Section 5A has 25 per cent membership support. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the Labour Relations Board would then be obliged to call for a vote even though it had been demonstrated that 75 per cent of the employees supported the existing union. Now the absurdity is completely contrary to democratic principles wherever they may be found. Even at the operational level, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is contradictory because the party across the way has voiced their widespread criticism of the card support system. Then they turn around and build into the amendment which they have before us today the requirement which can only be met on the basis of card support. At least, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the amendment may have accomplished one positive result, namely the universal acceptance of the demonstration of employee support of a union through the use of signed membership cards.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the amendment would have the effect of taking away any meaningful way in which a labor organization could control and discipline its membership by stipulating that an employee cannot lose his membership in a union for activity against the union unless this activity has been instigated by the employer. This, Mr. Speaker, is utterly senseless. In its most extreme terms, and this is using an extreme example, Mr. Speaker, in extreme terms it means that a dissident union member could not be expelled from the union even if he were convicted of blowing up union headquarters unless it could be proven that management handed him the bomb. It is an extreme example but is just how simple minded the amendment which has been presented really is. This proposal, Mr. Speaker, flies in the face of every principle in our organized democratic society.

No organization, Mr. Speaker, could possibly function without some means of controlling its membership. The present Act preserves a very careful balance between the protection of the rights of the individual employee and the assignment of genuine powers to the union to ensure that members live by the rules of that union. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, which is before us would destroy that balance.

I would be the first to admit that unions are given authentic disciplinary authority under this Act but it is used very seldom. I would point out that not once, not once since I have been the Minister of Labour has a case of abuse been brought to my attention. Mr. Speaker, this is yet another example of the nonchalance with which the party opposite proclaims doctrines which are mutually incompatible. On the one hand they try to emasculate the power of a union to control its membership, and yet at the same time they support the activities of their friends in the legal and medical professions and others in rigidly controlling their membership. Mr. Speaker, the Law Society elects a group of potentates called the benchers, and the benchers are required by the legal profession to appoint a discipline committee. On the grounds of what is nebulously termed "conduct unbecoming a barrister or solicitor" a lawyer may be struck from the register forthwith taking away his ability to earn a living in that profession. Similarly, a doctor who has been found guilty of a breach of one of the disciplinary rules of the College of Physicians and Surgeons may be barred from the practice of medicine. These and other professional organizations, Mr. Speaker, have absolute dictatorial powers to decide a member's livelihood. What colossal gall it is then, Mr. Speaker, for the political party opposite to accept this situation and at the same time attempt to prevent unions from maintaining some semblance of order and some control of their membership?

Those people responsible for Bill 73, Mr. Speaker, have also conveniently overlooked the commendation of the Murchison Committee in the construction industry which they themselves established in 1968. The Committee of that day, Mr. Speaker, expressed some concern about the extent to which The Trade Union Act of that day took away the rights of the union to discipline its membership. The Committee indicated that it was aware that this had contributed significantly to the number of wildcat stoppages on construction sites. Its report put forth the view that the disciplinary authority in the union should be strengthened under The Trade Union Act, not destroyed.

In response to the acknowledged desire of persons affected by legislation to receive notice of changes, the Government of Saskatchewan has attempted to follow a policy wherever possible of consultation with members of the public with regard to legislative amendments. It has been our practice in the Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker, to consult widely with people with respect to legislative changes. I would draw to the attention of Members opposite that with respect to The Fire Department Platoon Act which has been before this Assembly this Session, that the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association was consulted. With respect to The Radiation Health and Safety Act, The Department of Labour Act, The Fire Prevention Act, The Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act, The Fire Department Platoon Act, Petroleum Association, the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, the Retail Merchants Association, the Regina Personnel Association,

the Federated Co-op, Saskatoon Personnel Association, the Saskatchewan Mining Association, the Manitoba-Saskatchewan Division of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Saskatchewan Construction Association, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, the Retail and Wholesale and Department Store Union and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, special consultation was held with respect to the Fire Department Platoon Act with the Association of Rural Municipalities, the cities of Regina and Saskatoon and the Fire Fighters Association.

I make this point only, Mr. Speaker, because I would be interested in knowing whether this practice has been followed by Members opposite and if so where this practice has been followed by Members opposite and if so where the pressures were that brought about the conditions which caused them to introduce Bill 73. I should like to know from Members opposite if one of them chooses to speak in this debate, what views were expressed from what major groups and what consultations were held in order to initiate this piece of legislation. I venture to suggest that until yesterday the unions in effect were not consulted nor had they any input with respect of this amendment prior to its introduction to this House. The only real backing for this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, emanates from a handful of the most right-wing of individuals who continue to regard employees as faceless instruments of production. I invite Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to indicate where the motivation for this Bill really originated and with whom they consulted prior to the delivering of this Bill to this Legislature. At best, Mr. Speaker, this Bill represents a frivolous amendment, mischievous and a vehicle for wasting the time of this Legislative Assembly because it doesn't provide employee rights that don't presently exist. At its very worst, Mr. Speaker, this represents an irresponsible and an unwarranted attack on labor unions and on many employees who have devoted their energies to make the collective bargaining system work to the advantage of all parties concerned. It is a device for the disruption of the existing labor-management relations which we should be working to improve rather than to destroy.

From the political point of view I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition have created a grave tactical error in putting this philosophy of theirs on paper for all to see and it will be distributed widely, not only now but prior to the next general election. It is rather unfortunate that the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) is not in his seat because he has inherited quite a block of hard-working trade unionists in what is now his constituency of Moose Jaw North.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Members opposite have given a pretty good demonstration of those misguided little creatures called lemmings which periodically trample one another in their eagerness to commit mass suicide. I just say to the few Members opposite that are remaining in their seats that before you get irrevocably associated with this piece of dirty work, I sincerely urge all fair-minded Members opposite, if there happen to be any, who are genuinely interested in the peaceful and positive labor regulations climate in Saskatchewan to join me in killing this Bill. Needless to say I intend to do my part to see that it is shot down in flames. I would invite Members opposite to withdraw this Bill if, in fact, they have made some sober afterthoughts and have perhaps misunderstood the implications of the Bill. I am rather under the impression that the

April 27, 1973

Member who introduced it really didn't understand the text of what it was he was placing before this Assembly. I see the fine hand of people not seated in this Assembly written upon the face of this Bill.

I invite Members opposite to join with me in attempting to see that this kind of legislation doesn't come before this Assembly in the future.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.R. Guy: (Athabasca)** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Member who introduced the Bill would like the opportunity to close the debate so I will just say a few words and then adjourn it so that he will have that opportunity. I am sure that he would want the opportunity after listening to the wild-eyed engineer from Moose Jaw this afternoon.

He talks about wasting the time of the Assembly. I have sat here many days and listened to him go on and on talking some of the nonsense that he does on his Estimates and he does that when he is on anything that is related to labor. We have heard the same speech since 1964 when the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour passed their notorious resolution before we had been the Government more than two or three months, saying that they were going to do everything to defeat the Liberal Government. They wrote a speech at that convention and they gave it to the Member from Moose Jaw South and he has been using the same speech ever since. He hasn't corrected it, he hasn't kept up to the times, he doesn't know whether there are any changes in the attitudes toward trade unions today than he did back in the 1770s, long before the trade union movement ever started.

He talks about wasting the time of the House, you had better talk to your colleague, the Minister of Education. We spent hours and hours debating a Bill which he later withdrew. Then, I think back to last year when your seatmate the Minister of Agriculture, who spent days and days and days debating a Bill on Foreign Ownership and then you didn't have the courage to go through with it and you withdrew it. Talk about wasting the time of the Legislature, there has never been a political party in the history of this House who has wasted more time in the Legislature than Members opposite. Never has there ever been!

You know, I have to laugh, but you can be sure that when the Minister of Labour gets up and in the hysterical mood that he was in this afternoon, you can tell that we have touched a nerve because we have touched the area where he has been told by his union bosses, don't you ever let them give any suggestion or freedom of thought. That is something that is unheard of as far as the Minister of Labour is concerned. I think he hit the right key when he said, "I do recognize that union leaders must have control over the membership." This is the only reason that this amendment was brought in was to provide the individual union member with a few rights which the Minister of Labour doesn't agree. Of course, as a Member of the Government opposite, he doesn't agree in individual rights for anybody. The whole pattern of this Legislature during the last three months has been to take away the rights of every individual in this province. So why would the Minister of Labour be any different today. He

doesn't want the individual union member, he doesn't want the university community, he doesn't want those involved in business, he doesn't want the farmer to have any rights. All he wants is to become the big labor Czar where he cracks the whip and holds a big mallet over the heads of every union worker and every little employee in the Province of Saskatchewan. He has no concern for anybody except those who call the tune for him to dance to and he has sure been dancing.

So, I think, Mr. Speaker, in view as I say of this vitriolic hysterical outburst by the Minister of Labour that we had to listen to again this afternoon is typical. I don't know whether I speak for my other colleagues but he mentioned there were only three of us here and I tell him it was awfully hard for us to stay here and listen to him too, we really made a sacrifice to sit here and listen to the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder). So I am sure that my colleague, the Member from Moose Jaw North will have some comments that he would like to make in closing the debate, therefore, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:55 o'clock p.m.