

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**13th Day**

**Wednesday, January 15, 1975.**

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

**QUESTIONS**

**IBEW BACK TO WORK**

**Mr. D.G. Stuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. I noticed two things, one, the strikers are back to work and so are the teachers, the NDP teachers.

I talked to the president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and he informed me that the strikers have gone back to work, they are ready to go back to the bargaining table, roughly in his own words, if they can be assured if people who come to the bargaining table can in fact bargain and make a deal. In the light of this, I wonder if the Premier has the same information that they are back to work and they are ready to go back to the bargaining table? In lieu of this we are quite prepared to move this Bill along as rapidly as possible. I wonder if the Premier has this same information and if he does have it, is he prepared to say, pass the Bill but maybe not proclaim it and give both the management and the union an opportunity, one more opportunity to settle this at the bargaining table?

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, to reply to the question first, I do not have direct information along the lines that apparently the Leader of the Opposition has. I have checked with my colleagues, well I don't know whether I have checked with all of them, but I and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) and my colleague, the Deputy Premier, and the Minister of Industry and Commerce and Minister in Charge of the Power Corporation (Mr. Thorson) have not been directly contacted, but my information is that in fact someone from the IBEW was in touch with the officials of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I have not spoken with those officials of the Power Corporation but I believe, my colleague, the chairman of the Power Corporation has and if we may, Mr. Speaker, I will ask Mr. Thorson to respond to that aspect of the question and then I will attempt to deal with the other parts of the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

**Hon. K. Thorson** (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, may I inform the Assembly in response to the Leader of the Opposition's question, that over the noon hour I was in telephone communication with the president of local 2067 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and I have not had the opportunity to convey that to the Premier until now. As a result of that communication I have asked the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to communicate with the appropriate union officials and to indicate that, of course, the Corporation negotiating team is

prepared to meet with the union team for discussion and, if it is mutually agreeable, proceed to make the necessary arrangements about time and place and so on. I expect that some communication will take place between them this afternoon.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the other question of whether when the Bill is passed and its proclamation could be delayed. We are clearly in a dilemma there because while we like to see the matter settled by collective bargaining and the Bill contemplates that, the bargaining will continue and the parties reach a settlement the arbitrator will not perform any function. We are still under the dilemma that not to proclaim the Bill is really to operate with arbitration hanging over the negotiations if we, the Government, don't like them and we, on so many occasions including yesterday, have expressed the view, we on this side of the House have expressed the view that that type of negotiations where the Cabinet keeps something hanging over the negotiating table is undesirable. We, therefore, are faced with a dilemma and quite frankly we think that we would be better advised to pass the Bill and to proclaim it so that this becomes the voice of the Legislature, and that the Cabinet is not in the position of hanging something over the negotiating table so that, as it will be alleged, if negotiations don't go the way we want to we are going to wield the stick.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It's a stick, anyway.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, I realize that. The Member opposite says it's a stick anyway. It is, but it is a legislative stick rather than a Cabinet stick.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Share the guilt.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, it's share the guilt if you like, but we have tried to make the point that there is a distinction between the Legislature speaking after having full opportunity to voice their views, and the Cabinet, exercising executive functions, hanging over negotiations. Accordingly, we would prefer not to proceed by the route suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

### SHUT DOWN AT BURNS

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, well, I still think my proposal would be the best way to proceed, however, that is in the hands of the Government.

May I direct a question to the Minister of Industry? I have been in contact with Prince Albert again and the information I now have is that the shut down at Burns, the partial shut down, will now affect not 250 people as was expected but maybe as close as 300, it may be 300. When the session was on, the last time I was urging the Government at the Cabinet level, at the Premier's level, to take some immediate action because this is a tragedy for the families involved as we all appreciate, and it is a tragedy and a serious blow to the city of Prince Albert and to the farmers in that area because if that major shut down takes place at Burns and Company it will work a great hardship on a great many people in that city and in that area. My question, has the Government, has the Premier or the

Minister taken any positive action up to this point or do they contemplate quickly to try and stave off this situation?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I have been in touch with the Minister and I know that he has been active and I, therefore, would ask the Minister to respond.

**Mr. Thorson:** — Mr. Speaker, all of us were I think, if not shocked, certainly surprised to hear early in December that the packing plant operated by Burns Foods Limited at Prince Albert would be reducing the number of employees and its activities on the ground that its continued operation would mean a loss of revenue, a loss of money for Burns Foods Limited. As a matter of fact I find that almost impossible to believe but so the company had announced.

On December 18th I wrote to Mr. Childs in Calgary, who is president of the company, to confirm and set out my understanding of the reasons for this cut down and to ask him to bear in mind some of our concerns about the impact on the Prince Albert community, generally, and the employees, particularly. I also asked him if he intended to modify the decision in any way from layoff of approximately 200 unionized employees and 40 out-of-scope employees, to let the Government know. We would appreciate having as much advanced notice as possible. Mr. Childs was kind enough to acknowledge my letter in one he wrote to me dated January 6th, 1975 and he did not, I may say, suggest any modification to the decision in that letter. He did indicate a willingness to meet with me and I talked to him on the telephone on Monday, January 13th of this week and he and I agreed that before the end of this week we would meet. I indicated to him clearly that I would like to satisfy myself as to the reasons why Burns Foods Limited and its management feel that this plant simply cannot be operated except at a loss now and for the future. We were not able to set up the time and place for the meeting on the telephone but he called my office back yesterday and arrangements have been made for me to meet him when he comes to Regina tomorrow.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I want to say right here that I think it is a disgrace that you have waited this long. For a Government that ran all over the country trying to get a tractor plant, all the way over to Europe and everywhere else, to sit there for three or four weeks and let this time go by when 250 or 300 employees' jobs are at stake, a major industry is at stake. This isn't good enough. Now my question is, are you prepared to make them some definite concrete offer? Have you got people working? Are you prepared to do almost anything to keep that plant open? I think it is that vital that you should be prepared to do almost anything to keep that plant in operation. It may be that they need some help over the next year or two. I don't know what their problem is, maybe it is not a large enough plant. I don't know what the problem is myself and I quite appreciate that you don't, but I think that you dragged your feet and I hope that from now on and my question is from now on, do you intend to take more positive action and not just take this sort of questioning attitude you have taken up to this point? You haven't even met with them yet and it is unbelievable.

**Mr. Thorson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, they say it is unbelievable that the management of Burns Foods Limited has come to the conclusion that this plant cannot be operated except at a financial loss. Considering the size of the company, the number of plants they operate, why pick on the plant at Prince Albert if the company is in difficulty? But that is the decision that the company has made. Now I assume that they have been forced to that conclusion because that is the factual situation and that there is simply no way in which that plant can be operated except at a financial loss. Otherwise I can't imagine why Mr. Childs, who once lived in Saskatchewan, and who I know is concerned about the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan and the people in Prince Albert. I am sure that he has come to the conclusion that of all the plants in his system that is the one that he will have to reduce in activity and in employment. He says there is no other economic choice available to him.

Now, I assume to say that that decision was reached because there was no other. Who can help but have respect for Mr. Childs and the management of Burns Foods Limited. I don't think they came to that conclusion without the relevant facts before them. I wrote, as I say, on December 18th to say this is the situation as I understand it. You have made your announcement about reducing the number of employees, if you intend to modify that decision in any way we would appreciate having additional notice. He wrote back to say he didn't feel that my letter needed a reply, but he was replying. He didn't feel a meeting was necessary but he was willing to meet with me. I phoned him and said that I was quite prepared to meet with him and I would like to understand why it is that this plant cannot be operated except at a loss. I want to satisfy myself on that, Mr. Speaker, and if there is any way in which he can suggest that this plant can be operated without a loss, because I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is not suggesting, indirectly or by inference, that the Government of Saskatchewan should pay a subsidy to Burns Foods Limited, in order to keep this plant running. Perhaps that is the only choice available. We would have to consider that, if that is the conclusion we meet after the meeting with Mr. Childs.

### **REPORT ON FISHING INDUSTRY IN SASKATCHEWAN**

**Mr. J.G. Richards** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Tchorzewski) in the absence of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). My question, Mr. Speaker, concerns the Resources Planning and Development Consultants' report on the Fisheries Industry, which I finally can make a copy available to the public. I certainly shan't table it given your ruling and given the volume of xeroxing it would require to get another copy. The question, Mr. Speaker, is that the report states, according to the samples taken, two-thirds of the fish coming from Saskatchewan were of unsatisfactory or of inferior quality and is the Minister of Consumer Affairs aware of this report, which was transmitted to the Government in May of 1974, and has he done anything about what are obviously rather startling conclusions concerning the quality of the fish from the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation?

**Hon. E.L. Tchorzewski** (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I have not read the report personally in reply to the question from the Member. It is my understanding that the National Fish Marketing Board determines on these kinds of matters and the quality of fish that is being used for commercial purposes and so on. So at this point this is all I can reply to the Member, although I can undertake to check further to see what the status of that situation is.

**Mr. Richards:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, just to correct the Minister, it is the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation and not the National Film Board or Fish Board, as the case may be in the Minister's impression. The supplementary question is, the report continues to document very low net income for fishermen in order of, one of their examples, \$280 net income per fisherman at Ile-a-la-Crosse, surely a shocking situation. Is the Minister prepared to encourage the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) to finally enter into some public discussion over the state of the fishing industry in this province and to stop and not to continue issuing regulations as appears in the Gazette of December 27th, based on this report, before the public or the relevant organizations of fishermen have had a chance to discuss this very weighty and voluminous report?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I will certainly convey the views of the Member to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan in order that he can have the benefit of the opinions that you expressed.

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley). It is well documented by the World Conference on Food that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) attended, the world now, of course, is short of food and potash being one of those important ingredients as far as production is concerned in many countries. A recent news report indicated that in Saskatchewan - it was carried on national television - we have now had the cancellation of mines for improvement or new mines involving approximately \$195 million worth of expansion or improvements. The question I should like to ask the Government, is the Government willing to either change its taxation of the industry or its secondary policy involving potash requiring a 50 per cent ownership in new mines and expansion which are obvious policies that are curtailing the expansion of the industry in the Province of Saskatchewan at this time? Is the Government contemplating any change as far as the potash industry is concerned in the Province of Saskatchewan in the next short period of time?

**Hon. E. Cowley** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to reply to the Member for Cannington that the Government, the Department of Mineral Resources at least, at this time, is reviewing the reserve tax, the structure of that particular tax as it applies to the industry in various companies in terms of calculating the changed impact this has had as a result of Mr. Turner's Budget which affects different companies in different ways, because the level of taxation is different depending on the reserves and their values and so on. So to that extent we are examining and

re-examining continually all of our taxation policies in the minerals and resource sector.

With respect to the basic policy, the insistence upon 50 per cent plus of ownership of any new ventures and our offer but not requirement in terms of participation in the expansion of the existing ventures, the Government is not contemplating any change in policy. We are continuing to hold discussions with parties that are interested in joint ventures and we will continue to proceed with the policy as announced.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then I take it that the Department is looking into some possible changes. How quick could the potash mining industry in Saskatchewan expect some announcement from the Government about the proposed changes, because many of the mining companies in Saskatchewan are currently undertaking expansions in other countries of the world which is much to the detriment of Saskatchewan in employment and in revenue, how quick can they expect an announcement from the Government about a proposed change?

**Mr. Cowley:** — Well, I couldn't be interested in the list of expansions that Saskatchewan companies are taking in other parts of the world, however, with response to your question I think that very shortly, I think within the next two or three weeks, we shall have examined the impact on particular parts of the reserve tax and will probably be in a position to make some announcement. We are also holding discussions from time to time through officials in the department with various people in the potash industry. As I said, I don't want to suggest that we are planning a substantial change in our approach to the taxation of the potash industry but I want once again to say that we are looking at particular areas of the impact of the Federal Budget upon the reserve taxes.

#### HEARING AID EQUIPMENT LOST

**Mr. A.R. Guy** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to, in the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), direct a question to the Premier.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think we have had four questions already, instead of the traditional three. Are we prepared to permit another question?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Go ahead.

**Mr. Guy:** — I should like to ask the Premier, last year as he knows, we had the spectacle of thousands of dollars of money being kicked around in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, in offices. Now today we find out from Dr. John Bury, Director of Regional Health Services, that the new Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan couldn't account for \$11,667 worth of hearing aid equipment at the end of September. I would like to ask the Premier: When is he, now that he has increased the public service staff by some 3,000 since he took office, when is he

going to start hiring employees with the administrative experience that these sorts of unforgivable events - no excuse for them in a government that proclaims to be efficient - when is he going to hire staff that can make sure that these things do not happen in the future?

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, may I say that, in direct answer to the Hon. Member's question, I think the answer is today, yesterday and tomorrow, in the sense that I believe that the employees of the Government of Saskatchewan are quite capable of doing an excellent job in administration. Let me say also that mistakes have been made and will be made. If our Government adopted the posture of some other governments, and I won't instance any, of not introducing any new programs, or undertaking any new social advances, then administrative errors could be minimized. When, however, a new social program is being introduced, one in which there is (so far as I am aware) no experience in North America to draw upon, such as the Hearing Aid Plan, it is possible that there will be administrative problems. This is a penalty we pay for progress. A penalty we did not pay when Members opposite were on the Treasury Benches because there was no progress.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — But a penalty which we are now paying and I think in some sense of the word must be prepared to pay.

**Mr. Guy:** — A supplementary question to the Premier.

Is the Premier saying that because he has introduced a new program - a Hearing Aid Plan - that the people who are administering this program don't have to have the ability to count from one to two, to three, to four, to five, to six, when they are counting the dollars, the public taxpayers' money that is being used in this program. You mean that because it's a new program they have no responsibility to the taxpayer how that money is going to be spent? They can let it be thrown around the province, put in shoe boxes, \$11,000 and you say we don't have to be responsible for that. When are you going to enquire into this to see where the \$11,000 has disappeared to?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I know that if everybody in the province spoke as loudly as the Member for Athabasca, there wouldn't be a need for a Hearing Aid program.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — But we do need a Hearing Aid program . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — He wanted George to hear it.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well I am sure the Member for Rosetown (Mr. Loken) has got that message now.

We do need a Hearing Aid program. It is, I think, totally wrong and irresponsible for the Member opposite to suggest that

the people who are administering that program are somehow doling out the money without keeping any track of it.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Eh!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I'll try to speak a little more loudly myself, I'll try to emulate the Member for Athabasca.

The point is, as I think will come out in the appropriate time, when this program was started up there was a great wave of people who requested that they be tested, that they get hearing aids, that a large number of hearing aids were brought into stock, that numbers of them were not - the hearing aids which the person should get (I say a number of persons were examined), loaners (as the saying goes) were loaned out to people who were to get hearing aids later. A large number of impromptu measures were improvised to deal with the very large backlog of people who were awaiting the introduction of this program. It is my information that in the course of dealing with this very large number of people and dealing with lending them one hearing aid and getting another back, and so on, that all of the appropriate records were not kept. It is, I think, generally thought that no hearing aids have really been mislaid, or stolen or otherwise but that the statistics are that the records are not clear, that they cannot be fully identified, that is what the news story says, and I think those are the facts.

## **MOTIONS**

### **HOUSE SITTING HOURS**

**Hon. R. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer):

That on Wednesday, January 15, 1975, Rule 3 (3) be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 7:00 o'clock p.m. until 9:30 o'clock p.m.

Just let me say a word or two on this Mr. Speaker, before I actually make the motion and forward it to you. I should hope that in the hours or so that are available to us this afternoon that we will be able to do this. It is my fond hope as House Leader (House Leaders always want to get things moving along) it is my fond hope that we will get the business that is before us, for which we have been convened, dealt with and out of the way and that we wouldn't have to follow up on the hours, but knowing legislatures just a little bit and knowing that sometimes on occasion the best intentions or the best hoped for plans can go awry I move this Motion now out of an abundance of caution. I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion



of the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 28 - **An Act respecting a certain Dispute between Saskatchewan Power Corporation and certain of its employees be now read a second time.**

**Mr. A.R. Guy** (Athabasca): — I'm not going to say that I had no intention to participate in this debate, because that wouldn't be the truth. I came down here prepared to speak because I think that every Member in this Legislature has a responsibility to make known his views on this very important subject and this very important dispute which we have been brought in to settle and for which we have been presented with legislation, compulsory arbitration legislation which I am sure all Members have some very strong feelings about.

I might say at this time, like my other colleagues in the Opposition, I am going to support this Bill because we believe in the principle that the Government must have the right to prevent work stoppages when the public interest is at stake. This doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with the method in which we reached this particular stage where compulsory arbitration legislation is required. I think that the Government has, as I will point out later on, failed miserably in their attempts to bring this dispute to a satisfactory settlement for all parties concerned.

I think it is unfortunate that so few NDP Members have had the courage to speak out in this important debate. I suggest that perhaps it is a sad day for many of our Members opposite particularly for our new Members, and certainly for some of the older Members, where this may be the last session that they will be in this Legislature. I am sure that the Members who are here for the first term must be in a sense of shock to see the Premier and the Cabinet act in such a callous manner to promises which they, in their own constituencies during the last election campaign, made in the belief that that was the policy of the NDP party. I know that the school teacher from Saskatoon, who has gone back to his classroom today, I know that he made the promise to the union workers in his constituency that compulsory arbitration would not be used by the NDP Government when they, and if they, became the government. I am sure that the Provincial Treasurer made that same promise to trade unionists in his constituency. I am amazed that he has not had the courage to stand up and explain why he is supporting compulsory arbitration today when he promised that he would not support that type of legislation only a few years ago.

Then, of course, we have Members - the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk), who I understand have already announced they will not be contesting the election. I am sure that it is a very great disappointment to them to be here today and supposedly supporting this type of legislation, although they have not spoken. We don't know whether they are going to support it or not. But, I am sure that they would like to have retired from this Legislature without this blot. I am sure that they would have liked to retire with dignity and without this blot of voting for compulsory arbitration, something which I know those two Members have been opposed to for as long as they have been Members of the NDP party, because they believe the NDP party opposed compulsory arbitration, and now today they are going to be forced to stand up and support that legislation which they have been opposed to all their lives. This has to be a very disturbing time I am

sure for Members who are going to leave the Legislature.

But it is interesting how they are going to vote because what we have to ask ourselves - are they going to vote according to their consciences and the beliefs they have had over the years, or are they going to be dictated to by the Attorney General and the Premier and Members of Cabinet who are looking at their own political futures far more than they are worried about the concerns of other Members who have to live with their consciences after this nefarious legislation as our friends always refer to it as being brought in, being voted and supported by an NDP Government.

This has been a unique session in many ways, the last couple of days. This is the first time that I can recall that a Government crawled into the Legislature with its tail between its legs to pass legislation which only a few years ago they had called a special session with great pride to strike off the books. Rather strange that this event has happened, in the manner which it has.

This is a case, also, in this session where we have seen an outstanding, I think, performance by the Opposition in their willingness to co-operate with the NDP Government . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — . . . to end what the Government considered was an emergency. We waived the seven-day period; we started at 11:00 o'clock in the morning; we went through until 9:30 at night; we waived the right to private Members' day, even though we have a great number of questions and returns on the Paper that we are anxious to get the answers to; and as we showed a few minutes ago, we are prepared to sit tonight in order to get the legislation through. We didn't agree to sit this morning for one very important reason. The emergency is over, they are back to work. The Union has gone back to work. We wanted this morning to be able to check out for ourselves, not take the word of the Attorney General or others (not suggesting that his word is not always very adequate, very trustworthy), but we wanted to check out for ourselves whether the Union had gone back to work. And we were convinced that this was true and that there was no longer an emergency. Therefore, I have to admit that I am very concerned with the Press in our province who today have been stating on numerous newscasts that the Opposition is trying to stall this legislation. I don't know how they can see this as stalling, since all of the Members on this side have not yet spoken. I have heard of the Government attempting to muzzle the Press, but I have never heard of the Press trying to muzzle the Opposition. I think that it is very unfair and very unreasonable of the Press to expect a piece of important legislation such as we are debating here, which in the ordinary process would take four or five or six and maybe even seven days to pass, and we have been here from 11:00 until 9:30 last night. We didn't agree to stop the clock, we were all tired, Members opposite were tired, and certainly this is a more important piece of legislation that we would take an hour at the end of a long day to get it through and this is what the Government wanted. The fact that we didn't agree to it, surely cannot be reasonably said to be obstruction or delaying tactics. I think that we have done a tremendous job in affording the Government the opportunity of bringing this legislation before the public,

before the Legislature and in passing it (probably not in record time) but something very close to it. We have never attempted to delay, we have no intention of delaying. As I said earlier, when I started, because we believe in the principle that the Government must have some protection of the public interest we are today going to see that this Legislature does proceed in the normal and very rapid manner.

This is a very unique session, this is the first time, I think, that an Opposition has tried to end the session on a positive note. And this was attempted yesterday by our Leader, who said: "Let's get this legislation out of the way; it's negative, we have to have it; nobody wants to be here discussing it; let's get it out of the way and then let's turn to something positive - let's turn to a resolution to discuss some other approaches for settling disputes between management and labour". We were very disappointed that the Government, and particularly the Premier, refused to do that, so we are going to go away from here on a negative note. We are going away with the idea that we have passed legislation which was distasteful to a lot of people and that we have not done anything to set into motion any machinery to try and prevent ever having to come back into this Legislature again to pass similar types of legislation. This wasn't very much to ask of the Premier of this province and I must say that when the Premier refused this he certainly showed his contempt for the working man, contempt for this Legislature and the people of this province, when he wouldn't even take a few extra hours to discuss what could be or out of which could come perhaps some of the most important ideas and most important legislation that this province has ever seen. We were turned down on that at a time that the Opposition was trying to end this session on a very positive note.

I should also say that this is another unique situation where for the first time, as far as I can remember, the Government has had the opportunity to withdraw legislation which they claim they didn't wish to enact in the first place. The Union is back to work, they are ready to negotiate. So the Government could, if they felt so strongly, withdraw this particular legislation. But again, the Premier says 'no' and the Attorney General says 'no'. So it leads us to believe that they want to pass this particular legislation, that in fact this is revenge on the particular union that we are putting back to work for placing the Government in an embarrassing position in the first place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest that this legislation is more significant than merely putting one Union back to work. The main significance is that Mr. Blakeney and the NDP Government broke faith with another segment of society, the trade union movement. Our citizens have been surprised and concerned over the last three and a half years when they saw the NDP Government, the Attorney General, Minister of Industry, and others break commitments that had been made to the forest and the oil and the potash industry. But then people said, well this isn't out of character for the NDP because they've always been opposed to private industry. And there was surprise and concern over the last three and a half years when we saw compulsion used on the hog producers, the businessmen, to close up their businesses for five days, the school boards, the university, the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, relative to the ward system and any other group that you care to mention. But again the people said, it's not out of character of the NDP because their

record is one of abuse of power. But never did anybody in this province believe they would see the day that the NDP would break faith and break their word to the labour unions of this province.

The NDP, until today, have stood unequivocally on the side of free collective bargaining and to eliminate and remove any political interference in that bargaining. But no more do they stand for that. They destroyed that concept with this legislation.

The New Deal for People promised and confirmed this stand. In case Members opposite have forgotten the New Deal for People so soon, I have a copy of it here, in fact, this is the original. It's one of those big yellow ones that they were so proud of. It said, we are going to enact a new trade union act, we are going to guarantee free collective bargaining and we're going to repeal Bill 2 and we're going to remove political interference. They didn't say we are going to guarantee free collective bargaining in the summertime, but not in the wintertime. They didn't say we are going to guarantee free collective bargaining for this union, but not for that union. What is said and what the NDP told the people of the province as they went from one end to the other in the election campaign, we are going to guarantee free collective bargaining for all unions at all times in the Province of Saskatchewan. That's what they promised and that's what they said in their New Deal for People. It doesn't put any ifs or ands, such as, if it's raining, if it's lightening, if it snows, if sand blows in your face, it didn't say that. It said for all time and on all occasions for all unions we believe in free collective bargaining and not for compulsory arbitration.

Then, of course, we can go back to every convention that the NDP have had since 1938 or 1933 or whenever it was they were formed and they passed a resolution supporting the free collective bargaining principle. Again, that has now been broken. Free collective bargaining is not a policy of the NDP Government any more. These promises and these commitments have been broken.

Why were they broken? That's what the people in the province are asking. Why was it broken at this particular time? Well the true facts are that when Blakeney, Premier Blakeney was faced by the promise to the Union and the public reaction to a strike in winter affecting the heat and power supply in this province, Mr. Blakeney said simply, sorry brothers and sisters there are more votes in the public than there are in the Union. It was as simple as that.

That is what is bothering the unions and the backbenchers today and that is why they are not speaking. Now that the precedent has been set by that Government, it will be easy to do it a second time. And to do it again, and to do it again, and to do it again whenever they think for their own political expediency that it's expedient to do so.

What we have to remember and what the unions have to remember, that the NDP Government represented by our frontbenchers over there, who are getting scarcer by the moment, is that the NDP will turn on friend or foe alike to save their own political hides.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — That's what this legislation

is pointing out to the people of Saskatchewan regardless of whether they are in union or management or working for the Government or not working for the Government. They must remember that when the time comes to save their own political skins they will turn on friend or foe alike, it doesn't matter to them. That's been a pattern that's been followed ever since the CCF or NDP were invented back in the gusty days of the 1930s.

The fact is that the NDP Government has not broken one promise to the unions, they broke two promises. They promised not to interfere in the collective bargaining process and not to impose compulsory arbitration. They've done both. If the first promise had been kept, of course, the second would never have been broken.

If negotiations between the union and management had broken down, it was bad enough then to resort to compulsory arbitration, but it must have been a shock to NDP supporters and the union to pick up the Leader-Post on Monday and see that it was the Cabinet that had rejected the union package, not the management. There was no negotiation between management and union at that particular time or maybe had never been. The Attorney General never really showed yesterday that there had ever been any true negotiation between management and between the union because the Cabinet were sitting there, were giving the guidelines, were saying what they would accept and what they wouldn't. They sent a boy to do a man's job. The unions trusted him, thought that he had the right and he had the power to agree, to verbally agree to an agreement and then he goes back and the Attorney General says, no that's not good enough we won't accept it.

If that isn't interference in the collective bargaining procedure, I don't know what is. This had to come as a shock to the people who have supported your party over the years.

No, we can't forget that the negotiations between labour and management didn't break down because of any failure by the labour union or any failure by the management team or by the federal negotiator or arbitrator, it broke down because of the interference of the Blakeney Cabinet. That's why it broke down.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — They created that strike and the situation that we are now in. Why? The Attorney General says because the blizzard was forecast. Did this legislation help last Saturday's blizzard? Of course not. Would it have helped if there had been a blizzard on Sunday night or a blizzard last night or a blizzard on Monday night? No, it wouldn't have helped then either.

This type of legislation will not prevent the emergency that occurred last Saturday. That's why we wanted to look at some other approach to settling these disputes, but the Attorney General and the Premier said no. This legislation cannot prevent the emergencies which the Attorney General suggested could be prevented by this type of legislation. On that basis there is no justification for this Bill.

I suggest the NDP Government double-crossed the unions, not because of the blizzard last Friday, but because he feared the

public reaction if there would be a storm next Friday and the strikers were not back on the job. That's what scared the Cabinet.

**An Hon. Member:** — Scared me too.

**Mr. Guy:** — Yes, it scared you too. It scared you so that you're afraid to get up and speak in this debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Members opposite argue that the Government had done everything that could have been done in the face of the emergency. They had to act.

Let's look at the facts as they relate to previous statements of the NDP and as they relate to the use of compulsory arbitration. The Leader of the Opposition, back in 1966, the late Hon. Woodrow S. Lloyd, when the first Essential Services Bill was brought in said:

I suggest that the question before us, in main, is this, it is a question of the Government's failure to cope with a situation which led up to the strike, which is now in effect in the Province of Saskatchewan. The question is the Government's failure to remove any danger or possibility of Saskatchewan people being refused essential services because of their inability to deal adequately with their working force.

I think we have to look at that statement because certainly if it was a true statement in 1966, it has to be a true statement today when 300,000 man days were lost in the first nine months of this fiscal year.

Then he went on to say:

Why didn't they (and they are talking about the Liberal Government at that time). Why didn't they attempt some of the obvious moves of conciliation, voluntary arbitration, mediation, rather than that kind of medicine it is now trying to shove down the throats of the union.

He summed it up by saying - (I'm paraphrasing parts for brevity), that the Government had failed to give the kind of leadership which would have produced the kind of bargaining which could have resulted in a settlement. The Government failed (he said) to insist that all possibilities for a voluntary settlement had been exhausted before proposing interference by legislation.

He went on to conclude and again I paraphrase: We would never use compulsory arbitration until every last solitary possibility of voluntary settlement had been exhausted.

You know, yesterday the Premier of this province almost reiterated word for word what the Leader of the Opposition said in 1966. He said that he believed compulsory arbitration should only be used after every other means had failed.

I want to look for just a moment at the record of whether all other means had failed. Was there conciliation attempted in this particular dispute? It was not. There was no conciliation officer or conciliation board appointed. They didn't try conciliation. Mediation? There was limited mediation. But I suggest to the Attorney General that the mediation could not be expected to work. They brought a mediator in from eastern Canada, a capable man, but he was told that this dispute had to be arbitrated in four or five days. They put a time limit on him. He started to try and arbitrate around the clock. You can't do that when you first enter the arena for voluntary arbitration. There was no way that mediation could work under the circumstances and the conditions that had been created by the Blakeney Government. That's why it failed.

Now, was there any voluntary arbitration, was there any voluntary arbitration as Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Blakeney said was one of the ways in which disputes could be settled? There was no voluntary arbitration.

So when we look at it honestly there was no conciliation, the limited mediation that was tried could not be expected to work under the conditions in which it was tried under and there was no voluntary arbitration. So the NDP Government did not follow up what they had been preaching for the last 20 years that they should try every conceivable method to end the dispute without using compulsory arbitration through the Legislature. They never tried it, they never did it, and that's why we are here today. That's why we say there is no justification for being here in this Legislature to pass this type of legislation. You didn't do what you had promised the people of this province.

So according to the words of your NDP leaders over the years you have failed to provide the leadership which prevents these situations from occurring. You did not use the means at disposal to avert a strike and in fact, I suggest, you moved with rather indecent haste to bring in legislation which shows obviously that they wanted to legislate compulsory arbitration for a reason known not to the backbenchers, not to the NDP party structure, but known only to those few who sit in Cabinet. They are the ones that know why this compulsory arbitration is in front of us today.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) and I notice he's not in his seat today, made the strangest speech of all. Either his speech was that of a coward or of a man who has no thoughts of his own. I haven't been able to determine which.

But what a difference a day makes, or in this case it was three and a half years. He was so proud on a hot July day in 1971 to introduce legislation to end political interference in the free collective bargaining process and to guarantee that compulsory arbitration would never be used. Yet on a cold January day in 1975 he supported government interference in the bargaining process and the use of compulsory arbitration.

I would like to suggest to all unions and anyone else who has any dealings with the Minister of Labour, that when you listen to him, before you agree or before you take his word as being something you can depend on, you had better go out and check the thermometer, because if it's in July maybe you can believe it, but if it's in January you had better test him again.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — In July he said, no emergency could exist because the unions are responsible people. Yesterday he said the emergency did exist, the unions are irresponsible people so compulsory arbitration is needed. It's no wonder that our labour situation in the Province of Saskatchewan is confused under the leadership of the Minister of Labour.

So, Mr. Speaker, Government has failed completely in this regard to justify the need for proceeding with this legislation, because they haven't proven that the strike could not have been averted, particularly true in the light of today's events where the workers are back on the job and they have agreed that they are willing to go back to the bargaining table.

As I said when I started, we are going to support this Bill on second reading so that it will be available immediately if an emergency situation does arise, and we do believe the Government has some responsibility to protect the public interest and this legislation will do that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. L. Larson (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this occasion. I've listened quite intently and quite interestedly to what the Opposition has been saying. I find some of the comments rather ridiculous and rather hard to understand. I want to say that I speak as one who represents a rural riding where the advent of power shortages and power outages can have a pretty profound effect. I suppose I probably speak as one who has had some experience and some first hand dealings with unions, both inside and out. I have worked as a labourer, I've been a union member and I fully understand and I'm fully cognizant of the problems of those who are struggling very hard to better their way in life. I have worked a long time as a farmer. I have considerable experience trying to organize and better the lot of farmers. So my sympathies to a very large extent must go to the underdog.

I believe in the principle of organized people doing for themselves what they can't do individually. I believe very firmly in the principle of collective bargaining. I think it is one of the few tools that the organized underdog has to better his way of life.

I have listened to the Opposition and the position they are taking, it is very difficult to find any rational sense in what they are saying. As I said, I represent a rural area. Life itself depends on power. This has come to mean more to the average person living in a rural area than most people realize. When I get phone calls in my constituency worrying about what would happen when at best they are several miles away from service. When you get phone calls with a raging blizzard outside, with cattle and livestock out in pens, depending on several forms of electricity both to keep their water warm, for lights, and other purposes, houses with water-works that would freeze up and other appliances that are absolutely essential to survival. Furnaces hooked to electrical systems, means of cooking, all dependent on electricity, it has a pretty sobering effect on your responsibility as a person in



government.

I get rather distressed and disturbed when I hear Members of the Opposition talking about the insignificance of backbenchers. I just want to say that as far as we are concerned we are absolutely and totally responsible in our constituencies and the problems that we face and how we act in response to them. This is one of the incidents and one of the cases where it is absolutely necessary to recognize that responsibility and act accordingly. To suggest that we are puppets of a Cabinet or a Premier or any Member of Cabinet is of course nothing more than pure political manoeuvring and grandstand playing. It makes me feel very depressed that our political system in Canada has degenerated to this particular level.

For some of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, with my sympathies for organized labour, I felt I had to say a few words. It would be very easy and probably very popular in many respects to go out on a tangent as some of the Members opposite have done to promote your own personal position. This is a situation where there is more at stake and more important things are involved than trying to promote or build yourself up. I don't think that in conscience any of us could sit idly by and not take the necessary steps that had to be taken in order to alleviate the crisis that certainly was paramount in the minds of all the people of Saskatchewan who depend on power.

I want to say to my friends in the labour movement that for the most part the people in Saskatchewan - and I am talking about the rank and file - have a lot of sympathy for you. They are very sympathetic to your cause but in cases like this they don't see any alternative but to have to keep a public utility that is built by the people for their own use and for the very dependence of their life operating even though it means unpalatable steps as this case has meant. For the Opposition to sit and speculate and to use all kinds of contradictory positions, first of all we are going to support it, then they go into all kinds of confusing statements totally irrelevant, totally ridiculous and totally unrelated to the very important and very serious debate that is before us, seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be making a mockery of the situation that we are faced with. It is irresponsible, it is confusing and it certainly doesn't add anything to solving the situation we were in. This speculation, this hope for some personal gain by this kind of speculation is certainly not worthy of having the Legislature called to deal with this problem. The legislation is no more palatable to me than it is to anyone in the House, yet there comes a time when you have to face your responsibilities, this is one of them. I am not particularly concerned about whether or not the Opposition degrades me or belittles me insofar as my stand is concerned, my conscience is clear in what I have to do and I intend to do it. I wanted to take this opportunity in this debate in this House to make my position clear. I have very great sympathy for the organized workers in the province because I have been one of them, I have come up the hard way and I have seen the need. But at the same time when you are put into a responsible position by people who trust you, people who place confidence in you, you have got to do what responsibility dictates and certainly not apologize or weasel or wiggle around about it.

For these few reasons, Mr. Speaker - there is much more I could say, but I don't think it is relevant or necessary -

I am going to support the Bill and support the steps taken by the Government.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, as I say again, in wrapping up the debate, this is a very serious matter and a very serious debate that we have had. My colleague says I should give the Leader of the Opposition my scenario. But I think the Leader of the Opposition gave the people of Saskatchewan his scenario, his approach, the Liberal Party's approach to trade unions, to the principles of free collective bargaining during the course of the last day and a half or what will likely now be two days at the end of this.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this debate has done one thing, among a number of things it has done this: it has clearly confirmed in the minds of Saskatchewan citizens that the Liberal Party will do almost anything, say almost anything for a try at political success even if it is short-run political success. The Member for Athabasca said that the Opposition was ending on a positive note and I must say to him that his speech certainly was more positive I think than the speeches that took place yesterday. I wouldn't accept the judgment that it ended on a positive note.

There is another thing the debate has confirmed or shown. It is that basically the Liberals of Saskatchewan are anti-trade union, are anti-strike. If, after these speeches by the Liberals opposite, if after all of the subtle anti-union comments about the need to find alternatives to free collective bargaining, the need to somehow do away with the right to strike, the need to somehow limit the business of free collective bargaining, if after all of the playing to the galleries yesterday, if there is a doubt in any person's mind about the Liberal Party's approach to trade unions, I would be surprised. If there is any doubt about the difference between the attitudes that we on this side have and the Liberals have with respect to the approach of some of the labour-management difficulties that arise from time to time I would be very flabbergasted if anyone didn't have those doubts clearly resolved in his or her mind.

I say that the Liberals in this debate have shown again as they have very often in almost every debate in the three and a half years that I have been in government and that is taking the short-run political course.

Just harken back to the speeches in this debate. You will recall yesterday how the Liberals tried to illuminate the story to the people of Saskatchewan that somehow this dispute, that somehow this strike, that somehow this Bill, that somehow the serious act of calling this Legislature into session was a great and clever plot by the NDP to get votes. How incredible can the Liberals get? Hardly anyone in Saskatchewan today believes that they present a credible alternative to government generally. I think that that line that they tried to advance in the second reading debate really takes the cake. Why, to listen to the Leader of the Opposition this whole thing you would almost conclude was somehow cooked up by the IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) and the NDP just to make the NDP Government look good. How silly! How incredible! How irresponsible! How political a position could be taken that any Members of the Legislature could advance! Yet yesterday the Liberals, when the galleries were full, were telling their friends in the trade union movement - trying to portray - I say

that sarcastically of the Liberals, that they were the champions of the working man.

For nearly two days, Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the contradictory utterances from the mouths of my friends opposite, contradictory, Mr. Speaker, confusing. In their haste to find the ground which is politically popular to them in their minds they changed their speeches, they changed their positions, faster than some people like Davy Steuart. Now the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) smiles - I have to admit that in some quarters it is very difficult to say Davy Steuart, so maybe the change isn't that fast. But very, very quickly they change their positions, they change their postures, they change their speeches.

The Liberals, they contradict each other. The Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) said yesterday, the situation was serious and a power utility cannot be allowed to be closed. That was what he said. Basically the Member for Lakeview gets up and tries to say that the emergency, the case for the seriousness has not been made out.

The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) when he was on the topic of the Bill says that he supports the Bill. The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) (I am glad that he is here), excited and breathless yesterday charges into the Assembly in the evening and says that he may not support the Bill. He wants to adjourn the House and adjourn the Bill. Then the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) gets up today and chastises the Press because they report that the Liberals tried to adjourn the debate yesterday and to block the Bill. If that isn't blocking and if the Press didn't report it, I don't know what is. And I am not here to defend the Press, as Members of this Legislature and some members of the Press will know. That is the point that I want to make about their contradictions. They not only contradict one another, they contradict themselves in their very own speeches. The Member for Morse who is in his seat, I am glad that he was there, criticizes us heavily because we called the Session too quickly, after six hours only. Why? For the grand political purposes of getting votes. Then a half a minute later, Mr. Speaker, he turns around, he criticizes us for having waited for six hours and keeping the people in danger. They contradict each other and they contradict themselves. I think the Member for Cannington, who is not in his chair, said the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, political statements, confusion, contradiction. I ask the people of the province, I ask the trade unionists, I ask the IBEW to carefully consider the statements made by the Members opposite in this dispute.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the party opposite - they laughed when I said this - revealed in their basic debate what I think is a fundamental anti-trade union approach. I think there is a fundamental difference between the NDP and the settlement of trade union disputes in this province and the Leader of the Opposition and friends opposite. I think that is clear. I say that the line about trade unions yesterday by the Liberals was basically the same line that they took on Bill 2. In 1966 during the course of Bill 2 the Member for Milestone said that strikes are a disease. That was the phrase that was used. During 1966 the Member for Cannington had a comment to make about strikes, about collective bargaining, and here is what he said about the

principles of free collective bargaining. He said:

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the concept of collective bargaining between management and labour is not one which is undertaken a very great deal of the time in our society, in good faith.

I disagree with that statement, but I think it is a fair statement to make. I don't agree with it, but it's legitimate. But then he says this:

It has now resolved itself into demands by unions of 'how much can I get'.

This is the Member who criticized us because somehow we have betrayed our principles of free collective bargaining.

Yesterday, and I am glad to see that my colleague (and I say this in a political sense) my friend the Leader of the Opposition is in the house, I think he gave one of the wittiest, and one of the best speeches that he has given and very humorous speeches that he has given. It was entertaining, Mr. Leader of the Opposition. I think that it entertained all of us and perhaps entertained the people in the galleries. I am the one who is accused of being the scenario type. I think I've got a few lessons to learn from the Leader of the Opposition, watching how he played the galleries yesterday. Certainly in that area I have a few lessons to learn.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — It was entertaining. But you know, when the galleries are full, the Liberals are for the trade unions. The Leader had great fun reading back our speeches to us on Bill 2. And I am going to say a word about that. For those who think that he and the Liberal Party (as one might think if you were in the gallery yesterday) was trade union, even a little bit trade union and sympathetic, I want to read to the House just for the record what was said in 1971 about trade unions by the Leader of the Opposition. I'm not going to go into any great length about this, but this I can say - I will just give one quote and there are many, but this doesn't solve much in the debate, but he's talking about unions. This is on page 238:

What small contractor can truly negotiate with construction unions (and the IBEW is in the construction field) who hand him a mimeographed contract and tell him to sign, or go broke. Frequently union demands have no relation to the profit or loss picture of the employer. The employer can't give what he hasn't got. If he does, he goes broke. Yet the union organizers time and time again are absolutely not interested in the economic facts of life.

Then, about free collective bargaining:

For some time it has been apparent to those who are not prejudiced that free collective bargaining in Canada is a very sick institution. A great many intelligent people think that it has become an outmoded practice and that it has broken down too often to the detriment of the general public in this nation.

Well, all right, as I say, I am not trying to argue with you about your views. I am just trying (and you are confirming it), to underline to the people of the province, the trade unionists of the province, what your views are. Exactly what you have stated them to be, but to listen yesterday, one wouldn't think that that's the case. The Leader of the Opposition yesterday talked about The Trade Union act. He said to the galleries, as I recall, pointing up very dramatically, something like - 'And do you know what this NDP Government has done', he says, 'Why they have made it such that if you don't become a union member you can be out in 30 days, you lose your job if you lose your union card'.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I said if you dare talk against your union.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Then that's what he said. If you dare talk against the union they can expel you in 30 days if they want.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — I wonder if my friends in the trade union movement agree with that, and those attitudes about trade unionism.

Now the height of contradiction of the Liberal Party, I think, came from the Leader of the Opposition himself when he told the unions (and this I really felt) and in a sense it is kind of funny and yet in a sense it makes the very point that I'm trying to make to the people of Saskatchewan, to the trade unionists, to the businessmen and the corporations in free collective bargaining, the very point about the Liberal posture, the totally contradictory Liberal posture on this very difficult problem of free collective bargaining. He said when the unionists were in the galleries, he said: "The NDP think that they have got you in their hip pocket". That's what he tells the unionists when they are in the galleries, that we own them lock, stock and barrel. But when they are not in the galleries, when the unionists aren't in the galleries, what does he say? He says: "The NDP is in the hip pocket of the unionists". That they own us lock, stock and barrel.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Two hip pockets.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes, two hip pockets.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — And I don't think the Leader of the Opposition knows his left from his right hip pocket, or his left from the right foot, and that's exactly the point that I am trying to make, that he doesn't know into which pocket to put the point of view that he has got. He doesn't know whether he is for it or against it. Not only does the Liberal Party not know where they stand on this issue of free collective bargaining, it's the same thing throughout the entire complaint. That's what he says when the unionists are here - oh he says: Boys they think they've got you right in their pocket. But you know, during the course of Bill 2 in 1971 debate, when the unionists weren't in the crowd, here's what he said. Page 240. I just want to read this one:

This is the Leader of the Opposition speaking now after the Minister of Labour moved repeal of Bill 2 (odious Bill 2). He said:

I suggest that the NDP changed their mind (about Bill 2) after they listened to the labour union bosses when they were summoned to the meeting with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour.

We knew that meeting took place and I would have bet \$10 to a plugged nickel that when they snapped their finger, little Allan wouldn't have said, "How, and when do I jump?" He'd just have said, "How high?"

Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest to this Assembly that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour told the NDP to get rid of Bill 2 or else.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Or else, what?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Or else they would have withdrawn their support, stirred up the Wafflers and you wouldn't have been there ten minutes.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Lock, stock and barrel. It's nothing very important to the entire issue, that little exchange, by itself, it's not important whether it's humorous or done humorously, or otherwise, but what is important I tell the Members of this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan is that it indicates the total contradiction, the total confusion and total commitment of the Liberal Party to try to get votes out of any situation, even this situation, no matter what the opportunities and the consequences are.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word about other aspects of the debate on the Bill itself.

The Liberals opposite said that I said in my second reading speech that the Union had negotiated in bad faith. That is totally wrong and false. I did not say that and Hansard will prove it. The issue is not the negotiations particularly. I am sure that both sides bargained in good faith. The point is that they broke down, the offers were removed from the table, a strike was started and an emergency created in the Government's judgment and I assume that if you vote for the Bill on second reading, you assumed an emergency arose and we had to act. That's the issue.

Now the Liberals say somehow that this is the same as Bill 2. That we have broken faith with the trade unions. This is what the Member for Athabasca said and I totally disagreed with his speech, but I could acknowledge that I think it was a point well articulated from your point of view. That we broke the faith with the trade unions. I want to tell you that we have not (and the Member for Milestone) says so does the SFL.

I don't know what the SFL has been saying the last few days, but I say to you that I don't believe the NDP has, neither with the trade union movement nor with the people of Saskatchewan. We have not broken faith because of the introduction of this Bill. I believe the SFL will see that. I believe that the parties, all the people in Saskatchewan will see that. This is not Bill 2, Mr. Speaker, this is totally false. There are many basic fundamental differences in philosophy and in the actual legislation, this time, rather than the infamous Bill 2. I want to tell you that in Bill 2 that whole process started right from the very bargaining and the political history of the time, leading right up to Bill 2. The determination of the Liberal Government to make no offer on wages to the Union, except 4 per cent at the very last moment. I am not even sure about the offer of 4 per cent.

The Member for Athabasca, today in his speech, quoted the late Hon. Woodrow Lloyd and what he had to say on that Essential Services debate. Mr. Lloyd also said that he conceded there was a time where the public interest was paramount and you had to bring in one-shot legislation. But I just want to tell you one little aspect about the debate which I found interesting as I read it through the other night. This is on Orders of the Day before the Bill started:

**J.H. Brockelbank** (Kelsey): — What is the present stage of negotiations with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation?

The answer:

Negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily.

Question: What increase in wages has that union asked for?

Answer: It has asked initially for 16 per cent.

Question: What has been offered by the Corporation?

Answer: No offer has been made by the Corporation, after months of negotiation.

In the case of the IBEW no offer was made for I think about five months, according to the history, no offer until they were right up against the gun and they made the offer of 4 per cent; 4 per cent and they brought in the Bill as Bill 2. That was the attitude that the Liberals took both with the IBEW and with the OCEW, around which Bill 2 finally ended. There was no bargaining. There was no mediation. One area where the Member for Athabasca was totally off base today and anybody who knows anything about trade demands can understand that, he talks about mediation. He says - why you had a mediator, but you're not a conciliator. As if there is a difference in the functions - a basic difference in the functions. There was a mediator brought in. He did the best that he could to bring in the packages in this area. All right, so it broke down. None of that was done in Bill 2. Bill 2 was not a sincere attempt to put public interests or to justify public interest over union

interest. Bill 2 was a political move because there were no offers, there was no mediation, there were no negotiations, there was just simply political comment for months and weeks on end prior to September, 1966, and the Leader of the Opposition will admit this himself because it's true. Public statements, political statements, against unions and against collective bargaining, that's what Bill 2 was about. There was nothing like that when negotiations broke off here, between the IBEW and the SPC, nothing whatsoever. I want to say that the whole tenor of Bill 2 is in opposition to the principles of free collective bargaining. It casts an all-embracing net, it allows the Cabinet to declare any trade union dispute an emergency, an essential industry if it deems fit. It has such a wide purpose in mind that it defeats the entire philosophy of collective bargaining. That is not the case with respect to this Bill. While the regret always is that the collective bargaining process has broken down on our part, it must be acknowledged by all that on occasion the public interest overrules. That is, in the judgment of the Government, the case that is before us here.

The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) yesterday said, in quoting me, that I believed in the right to strike. Yes, I do believe in the right to strike. I believe the right to strike is a part of the rights of free collective bargaining - right to associate, right to negotiate, right to strike. Those three make up free collective bargaining, but I also believe that on special, very special occasions that third right may have to be temporarily abridged in the interests of the public, and I believe that's the case we are in here with the Corporation and the IBEW.

Members opposite know that that's the case. Members opposite know that that's the issue. I don't believe that the trade unionists are fooled, or the people of Saskatchewan are fooled one iota on the argument that this is Bill 2. Everybody knows that it isn't; everyone knows your approach hasn't changed to free collective bargaining; everyone knows that your alternative is something like a compulsory labour court or a Bill 2 (call it what you will); that's your alternative. Everybody knows that you would, if you got back into power, you said so on Bill 2 on some of the quotes, and you voted against it - if you got re-elected you would re-institute Bill 2. That's not our approach. That's not our approach. You don't have to vote for the Bill, but at least we have the guts to come into the Legislature to face the House, to face the public, to make out our case in this area, and I believe we have done so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am moving second reading of Bill 28.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Richards** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, if there is one other Member willing, I think this is a sufficiently important motion that I would like to see the vote recorded.

**Hon. A. E. Blakeney** (Premier): — I concur with the Member for Saskatoon University.

Motion agreed to on the following Recorded Division:



**Yeas - 46**  
Messieurs

Blakeney	Thorson	Oliver
Dyck	Kaeding	Flasch
Meakes	Whelan	Steuart
Wood	Carlson	Coupland
Romanow	Engel	Loken
Messer	Cody	Guy
Snyder	Robbins	MacDonald (Milestone)
Bowerman	Tchorzewski	Gardner
Thibault	Cowley	Weatherald
Larson	Taylor	Lane
Kowalchuk	Faris	Coupland
Brockelbank	Owens	MacLeod
MacMurchy	Gross	Wiebe
Pepper	Feduniak	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)
Michayluk	Comer	Malone
Byers	Hanson	

**Nays - 1**  
Messieurs

Richards

**MOTION**

**HOUSE ADJOURNMENT**

**Hon. R. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by my colleague the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor):

That when this Assembly do adjourn at the end of the sitting day on which this motion is adopted it shall stand adjourned to a date set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the Government and that Mr. Speaker shall give each Member seven clear days notice, if possible, by wire and registered mail of such date.

Motion agreed to.

**ROYAL ASSENT**

At 5:49 o'clock p.m. the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:53 o'clock p.m.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE on Bill No. 28 - An Act respecting a certain Dispute between Saskatchewan Power Corporation and certain of its employees**

The question being put on Clause 1 it was agreed.

**Mr. E. C. Malone** (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Chairman, I have a few general questions to ask the Attorney General in connection with the Bill.

**Hon. R. Romanow:** (Attorney General): — Before the Member does, Mr. Chairman, I can't hear the Member very well. I think it's the mike and I think also because there is a little bit of talking. So I am going to ask for 'school quiet'.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Attorney General, just a few questions.

As I understand it your philosophy for bringing this Bill to the Legislature, was that the Union had gone on strike or it had been locked out, or whatever, but they weren't working and it was because they weren't working that the so-called emergency situation was required and you felt to cure the situation you required this legislation and this Bill. Now that the Union is back to work and now that the Union has indicated that they are prepared to sit down to the bargaining table with management again, and bearing in mind your philosophy of being against bargaining of this nature, why do you feel the Bill is necessary at this stage?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, as the Hon. Member will know, the Bill does a number of things, one of which is a return to work, one of which is a maintenance of service, one of which is to allow the free collective bargaining operation to run its course and one of which is to make sure that a mechanism exists for settlement. There obviously is a need for a mechanism of settlement and we think that those . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What for?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well in case the free collective bargaining process breaks down there has to be a mechanism for settlement.

**Mr. Malone:** — You are now saying that the free collective bargaining has broken down, notwithstanding the fact that the Union has said that they are willing to go back to the table and negotiate again with management.

**Mr. Romanow:** — The information that I have is that no collective bargaining has started or resumed and is not likely to resume for a while anyway no matter how expeditiously the parties want to get to, so the situation is today as it was basically at the time of the calling of the Session, five o'clock on Saturday, with the change that some, if not all of the employees, are back.

**Mr. Malone:** — I suggest to you, Mr. Attorney General, that my information is that all of the employees are back. That the president of the Union, Mr. Hill, has indicated that any time he is ready to sit down with management and the only conclusion that I can come to is that the people who are stopping the free collective bargaining is the Government through its agency, the management of SPC.

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, I am advised that the General Manager and the bargaining team for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation are also willing to bargain collectively and if that comes about as a result of developments all for the better. No one is trying to stop them.

**Mr. Malone:** — I should like to ask another question then on when the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) became involved in the negotiating proceedings. Now presumably the proceedings were initially handled by the management of the SPC, if I am wrong correct me, and I suspect somewhere along the way it became evident that the assistance of the Minister was required. Could you just tell me when that was in the process of negotiations?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Friday, early morning to the afternoon, somewhere like that to early or middle late evening Friday.

**Mr. Malone:** — You are saying that the Minister didn't become actively involved in the negotiations until Friday of last week?

**Mr. Romanow:** — That's right.

**Mr. Malone:** — And all negotiations up until then on the part of management had been handled by Mr. Keith, or somebody under his guidance?

**Mr. Romanow:** — That's right.

**Mr. Malone:** — All right. Now what authority was given to Mr. Thorson, or the Minister of Industry by the Cabinet when he became involved? What could he do and what could he not do?

**Mr. Romanow:** — The situation is that at that time we've got to understand that it was not negotiating in the sense that the parties were on opposite sides of the table and exchanging the proposals and counter proposals and the like and making modifications, in the normal sense. At that stage in the game, the mediator, Mr. Bill Kelly, was there and at that stage in the game as has been indicated on a number of occasions, all sorts of packages, all sorts of proposals, as I understand the situation were being pieced together. Accordingly, it was felt because of a number of matters that were being discussed that the Minister should be present to see what he could do to assist. Under these circumstances, the Minister has like any Minister, who has, like I have, certain duties and responsibilities and he just tries the best that he can do to see if a

package acceptable to the Government and acceptable to the other side can be worked out. As it so happened it wasn't.

**Mr. Malone:** — Just to set the scenario, using your favourite term, am I correct when I say then that some time during Friday of last week when the Minister became involved with the mediator, with the management team, with the union team, that there was some agreement of some kind worked out and that the minister at that time felt that management had agreed to whatever this was, the union had agreed to it and then he apparently agreed to it, according to the press release of Mr. Hill and then took it back to Cabinet, is that correct?

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, I do not believe that to be correct. The situation is as the Minister has said in second reading, that a package or versions of packages were, was on the table, no agreement was made. The Minister undertook to canvass what the possibilities were for dealing further with that package. No agreement was on the table.

**Mr. Malone:** — Well, let me put it this way to you then. Had the negotiations reached the stage where management, through Mr. Keith and his officials, had agreed with the union using the auspices of Mr. Kelly and so on? Had there been an agreement to that stage where management and union had agreed?

**Mr. Romanow:** — No.

**Mr. Malone:** — At no time?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Not to the best information knowledge that I have. There was no agreement.

**Mr. Malone:** — The Minister is sitting right beside you and the manager is right behind you.

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'm answering the question. I say no.

**Mr. Malone:** — You qualified your answer by saying to the best of your information.

**Mr. Romanow:** — To the best of my information the answer is no.

**Mr. Malone:** — Is it conceivable that your information is not accurate?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I have full confidence in the information.

**Mr. Malone:** — What is the source of your information?

**Mr. Romanow:** — The Minister.

**Mr. Malone:** — The Minister of Industry sitting beside you? Who apparently is not being allowed to answer questions in these proceedings.

**Mr. Romanow:** — It's not a matter of being allowed, I'm the man who introduced the Bill and piloting the Bill, so ask the questions.

**Mr. Malone:** — Are you saying then that Mr. Hill is misleading the people and the Legislature when he says there was an agreement?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'm not saying Mr. Hill was misleading.

**Mr. Malone:** — One of you is obviously wrong then. Mr. Hill said there was a verbal agreement. He has challenged the Premier to I believe, table a memorandum that was agreed upon. He has challenged the Premier to disagree with him. Now, which is right, you or Mr. Hill?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, I don't want to get into that argument as to who was right or who was wrong. I don't believe that there was a request to table a memorandum, but that's irrelevant. All that I tell the House is what the Minister said in second reading. I report again there was no agreement. The public and the Members will have to decide as to who they think or what they think is the correct version on that, but I report to the House that's the situation.

**Mr. Malone:** — Was Caucus, your Caucus sitting last Friday and last Saturday?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes.

**Mr. Malone:** — Did your Caucus consider the negotiations to the extent just prior to negotiations breaking off and the strike being called?

**Mr. Romanow:** — What our Caucus discusses is secret. I don't expect you to tell me what your Caucus discusses.

**Mr. Malone:** — Well, when we're considering a public company such as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, I suggest to you that your discussions in Caucus perhaps aren't so secret any more and I'm not asking what was discussed in Caucus, I'm asking whether this was brought up in Caucus?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I say again and I know the Hon. Member appreciates this. What was brought up in Caucus I can't reveal. I kind of like my Caucus, I want to go back there.

**Mr. Malone:** — Well, I like to think though, Mr. Attorney General, that the people of Saskatchewan should know whom they are dealing

with on labour negotiations. Now are they dealing with the management of SPC or of a Crown Corporation, are they dealing with the Minister in charge, are they dealing with the Cabinet or are they dealing with the New Democratic Party? And I think what they are doing is they are dealing with the New Democratic Party and that any employee group involved with a Crown Corporation had better realize this, because I suggest to you, Mr. Attorney General, from what you've told us, the implication is that the Caucus of the New Democratic Party considered these negotiations and decided they weren't going to accept them for reasons that are known to it only.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well you can draw any implication or statement you want out of that. As far as I am concerned the Crown Corporations negotiate by management and/or their representatives in teams. That's the way any negotiations in any Crown Corporation I've been involved with are handled, Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, I'm sure that's the case with SPC. As the Leader indicated in his speech yesterday, there may come a time at the end when the Minister has to be informed of the developments. In this case we had long protracted negotiations which didn't work. Very intensive mediations, didn't work. I think that's a point where the Minister is legitimately entitled to be consulted and to get the benefit of the best counsel that he can from the sources, Cabinet colleagues.

**Mr. Malone:** — Would you tell me then Mr. Minister just how far management can go in this, were allowed to go in these negotiations? That is, could the manager of SPC and his staff have settled them at a certain stage without going to Caucus or without going to the Minister for permission?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Management obviously like in any Crown Corporation could make certain recommendations with respect to settlement or not and to advise the Minister, I'm sure it was under your administration, former administration, as it is under our administration. When the thing is settled. Take the SGIO example, using that as an example. The thing is concluded. I have to be told and advised on the operation. That is the same ground rule that lies with SPC.

**Mr. Malone:** — I'm not saying, it's not a matter of being advised. You earlier said that the Minister or that recommendations are made to the Minister. Is this the case here? That is, did the management of SPC come to the Minister and say, all right we have agreed with the union thus and so and we recommend that this package be adopted?

**Mr. Romanow:** — The situation was, as I've tried to indicate to the Member one that was very difficult. As I say when the mediator was there for the several days he was there, the four days or whatever, a number of packages and number of proposals were involved. At that stage in the game it wasn't a matter of a recommendation to the Minister, otherwise it was the matter of the assistance, giving the assistance, whatever could be done. The good offices of the Minister, the abilities of the Minister to try to work out through mediation some form of a successful package. It was on that basis as opposed to a basis of recommending or non-recommending.

**Mr. Malone:** — So what you are saying then is it never got to the stage of management coming to the Minister or Cabinet or whatever and recommending that something be adopted? This never happened?

**Mr. Romanow:** — To the best of my knowledge that never happened.

**Mr. D.G. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — What exactly, when I talked to the President of the Union this morning, he said they would be prepared to go back to the bargaining table on one condition, that the people that showed up on the other side of the bargaining table could in fact bargain and make a deal. Now surely that's the basis, the essence of bargaining. You've got people on both sides of the table, on either side of a table and they can make a deal. Now what in God's name did Mr. Thorson take back to the Cabinet? You say the management didn't agree, you say he didn't agree. I'd like to know what he took back, what did he take back to the Cabinet?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well as the Premier and as the Minister have indicated and as I have indicated on Friday there were a variety of packages that were proposed by the mediator. Simple fact of the matter is that a package that was proposed was not accepted and the negotiations, the mediation broke down at that stage in the game. I don't think it helps the Member or helps the negotiations between the Union, the subsequent negotiations that are going to take place or the arbitrator to discuss that. I'm not asking to reveal what the Union position was, where the Union was at. I don't expect the Members would expect me to do that, to betray the confidences of what the Union's offers and proposals and where the Union was at, nor vice versa would the Members expect that similarly I should do the same thing as far as the Corporation is concerned.

**Mr. Malone:** — But surely, we're not asking you to divulge what happened. What the Leader of the Opposition and I have asked you about is whether at any time you reached the stage where there was some sort of tentative agreement, that is something had to be approved. Well, you've talked about various packages and alternate packages. Well, surely somewhere to get those packages together there had to be some agreement somewhere along the way or you wouldn't have the package?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, you know, it's the word agreement, the word agreement. When one deals in negotiations there is an agreement which comprises the package, there are many things in the package. There may be no objections or there may be qualifications on some of those particular items. It's meaningless until you can put the package together and you've got a deal. That's the situation we're at.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, this is amazing. It's no wonder the negotiations whatever they were broke down. As you try to explain this or have us believe, the public believe, there were some meetings and this fellow Kelly from Ottawa was there and he proposed or he put together some packages. Now the Union says they agreed

on one. Not a bit reticent. They said it publicly, he said it to me, he's challenged the Premier and the silent Minister, who should be putting this thing through, he should be talking to us first hand, he said they had an agreement. They were prepared. Now what I want to know is, was one package taken back to the Cabinet and if it was did the Cabinet, will you tell us on your word as a Minister, that the Cabinet decided this all by themselves, that Mr. Thorson said here is a package? He surely didn't just come back and say, here's a package, nobody has agreed to it, will you agree to it? Now nobody else has agreed to it, management hasn't agreed to it, the Union hasn't agreed to it, nobody here has agreed to it, just the fellow from Ottawa said here's a package and then you fellows all on your own said no we don't agree to it either. So nobody agreed to it. The Union said they had an agreement. Now did he take one package back? My question is did he take one package back and did the Cabinet all by themselves without consulting anyone else, did they reject that package?

**Mr. Romanow:** — On Friday, there were a number of packages that were being developed as I'm informed by the mediator and the parties. Certainly in any of the reports which I was present, the packages were considered in the light of the possible consequences of acceptance or rejection or attitudes on all sides, the Corporation side and the Union side. That was the situation. I can't answer to the Member that there was a package that the Union agreed upon that was presented back to the Cabinet, because a simple fact of the matter is that it just wasn't that type of mediation proposal. It wasn't as I've tried to tell the Members, a situation where you are sitting opposite each other at the table and here it is on the counter and take it. It's a mediation, a very difficult process, one of changes on an almost hourly basis before an operation can come about. Now during the course of that mediation it broke down and broke off and the Union said the deals were off, all the offers were off the table and the Corporation said, okay we acknowledge that.

**Mr. Steuart:** — What about the Cabinet? Did they make the decision by themselves?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Cabinet made the decision.

**Mr. Steuart:** — By themselves?

**Mr. Romanow:** — By themselves, like who else?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Who else? I don't know. I don't think that's good enough to say, we don't tell what goes into Caucus. I agree that what goes on in Caucus is secret, what goes on in Cabinet is also secret. I think that as the Member stated that in this case, in this case, we have a far different situation, and I think that the public is entitled to know who makes the decision. Where does the buck stop? Now, it was like Christmas I guess, there were a whole lot of packages. So he brought back a whole lot of packages or half deals which nobody agreed to. It's no wonder it broke down. There was nothing concrete. Nobody had agreed to them, the management hadn't said yes, we like that, we'll take that one or that one, we can live with it. The Union says they agreed to something, your people obviously deny it. You say that your Caucus was not then consulted, because you said the Cabinet made the decision all by themselves.



**Mr. Romanow:** — The Member will appreciate and again I say this with some concern because I think, I'm talking about just the process of Caucuses. In your Caucus I'm sure that the impact of when you were government of negotiations or a likely decision by government would be raised, I mean the Members have a responsibility to know. That's part of the reason why all the Members are here and that was the case under your operation, but the decision and the responsibility of the decision lies with the management and as I say at that point where there is a reference back to the Cabinet with the Cabinet.

**Mr. Malone:** — Management?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, or as I said, the last statement.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Chairman, you know, let me just say this. I don't think I believe, I find I don't think I believe what the Attorney General is saying, I'm sorry to have to say this. I think I know now why he is putting this through, I know now why we're not getting at directly, at the Minister in charge because then he would have to answer directly. It's no wonder the Union said to me this morning, the President of the Union said, look we'll go back and bargain if we're given the word that the individual that comes to bargain can make a deal. And it's no wonder he said we don't close out our option to strike. I don't blame him, dealing with this kind of a mess and this kind of a situation. Surely when you go to deal you would say to the Minister in charge, as I've been involved with Crown Corporations, and as have many other people, look we will go along with 16 per cent or 18 per cent or 22 per cent and five weeks holidays or four weeks holidays or four and half weeks holidays. You know the substantive issues. There are five or six or eight or nine or ten. And your Minister comes back if he is doing his job to the Cabinet and says there are ten issues. The management tells me they can buy these six, there is no problem there, they don't add to the cost or they don't add substantially to the cost, and they don't cause us any problems, they are ironing out some problems we both had. These three are going to cost money, but there is only going to be so much and the management recommends to me that we can buy that as well. Now there are these three issues that are left open and here is what we want to do. Surely the Cabinet then says to a responsible Minister go back and sit down and if you can keep it under 18 per cent or 19 per cent, if you can keep the holidays at four weeks after 25 years or five weeks after 25 years or whatever, in other words they give him their decision, their outside limit on the outstanding issues and he goes back and he makes the best deal he can. Then he comes back as a final touch and says, just as the Union representative, here's the package I made and if they've got any confidence in him, they give him the stamp of approval. But surely you send somebody to that bargaining table that can bargain. If you don't, then it's no wonder you've had 300,000 man-days of strikes. It's no wonder that we've had the most terrible record of labour management relations, bad relations in this last two or three years, that we've had in the history of this province.

Don't sit there and say, you know we're union people, we know how to bargain. If you are, then I say you had better put the Minister of Labour in that seat and you had better talk to

Mr. Smishek, you had better talk to somebody in the union movement because anybody with the most elementary understanding of any kind of bargaining would understand that what you've described to us is either totally false, is either totally false or else it's the most inept way of bargaining that anyone has ever heard of and you are asking for exactly what happened and that is a breakdown in negotiations and a strike.

Now will you answer this question? If you go back to the bargaining table are you prepared, is your Government prepared - here is the Premier maybe he can tell you - is your Government prepared to send somebody to that bargaining table with some outside limits so they can make a deal, so he can say to the Union, which the Union already says publicly and challenges you to disprove, that they thought they had a deal, so that he can say, yes, this is a package, we can sign it? I don't know how you have ever come to any negotiation conclusions with the manner you describe and that is why I say I have to believe that it is false, I have to believe that you are throwing a smokescreen over this, I have to believe that that is why you are trying to pilot this Bill through and he isn't or he isn't, the Minister of Labour or the Minister in charge, and that's why you are, so that you can evade the issues, you can't be telling us the truth. It can't be that bad.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, I tell the Member that I answer all the questions in this House as truthfully and as completely as I can answer them. As far as I am concerned on the information that is before us, both parties tried the best deal that they could get and it didn't work out with the efforts of the mediator and that is where the situation lies.

**Mr. Malone:** — I want to go back to this business of the package, Mr. Attorney General. I am going to quote from the Leader-Post, this is from Monday's paper, in the lead story near the end of it it says:

Premier Blakeney would not say at his Saturday news conference which union proposals were rejected. He would only say that, 'a total package was rejected by the Cabinet.'

Now I presume those remarks in quotes were made by the Premier, is that correct?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, it is a newspaper report. I am not trying to be picky about it, I didn't see that report. I have been too busy the last three or four days, so don't ask me.

**Mr. Malone:** — The Premier hasn't denied it so I assume it is correct. Now, what package? How is the package put together? Was it agreed upon by management and the Union? Was it agreed upon by management, Mr. Thorson and the Union?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, as I have said to the House already, nothing was agreed to at the time of the mediation efforts. And I have also told the Members that there is no use asking me to tell you what the package is in the mediation proposals. When the

Union makes certain proposals and offers and counter offers during the course of these intensive mediations, I mean I wouldn't want to be in a position where I would go all over the world and tell what the Union was making or vice versa. You shouldn't be asking that of us. These parties are happening to negotiate in this current matter and will have to negotiate long after this matter is all over, that just doesn't work. So I try to tell you that the parties tried with the help of the mediator to do the best job they can, they couldn't, and I think, despite what the Liberals will say, that our record as a Government when we negotiated has been pretty fair and pretty good.

**Mr. Malone:** — The Attorney General well knows I am not asking what was contained in the package. What I am asking is how was this agreed upon? How did it come about that a package presumably delivered by the Minister of Industry to the Cabinet to be considered, how did that come about? Surely somebody put it together, was it strictly the Union, did management have anything to say about it?

**Mr. Romanow:** — The package as I have tried to say, the package as of Friday, or the possible arrangement of the packages, I suppose through the major efforts of the mediator trying to bring the two sides as closely as they can together on as many of the problems and the issues together. He couldn't do it, he couldn't bring them together on all issues and the deal fell through. So what more can be said.

**Mr. Malone:** — Maybe we are talking at cross purposes or something but surely something was put together or the Cabinet wouldn't be considering it. Surely that is the case. I am asking you, how was it put together, who agreed to it? Now, did management say, here is a package we agree with eight points and we disagree with three, or was it total agreement with the package to be finalized by Cabinet if they agreed to it? Did the Minister of Industry agree and not management? I don't know, I am just asking the question, how did it come about?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, I repeat again to the Member, that there was no agreement by the Minister in any of the discussions or deliberations with the Union or with the mediator at the time. That is said in second reading itself, and that is public record. Now that is the situation that we are in. How did it come about? When you mediate, the packages come up in the intensive negotiations and the intensive mediation discussions that continue. How does it come up? Some people give in here, some people give in there, some make adjustments here, some make adjustments there, to try to put together a package which is acceptable for both sides. As it so turned out, the packages so turned out on that Friday and it ended up that they were not acceptable to any side. Both sides, the Union said it was off the table and the Corporation said the same thing and that is how it works.

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Attorney General we are getting into a pretty heavy situation here. Somebody is lying and I think when this House is called on the basis of protecting the public interest, we had

better start getting some answers. Now, I don't know who it is but a pretty serious allegation has been made against your Government, that there was an agreement. You are not letting the person charged with that accusation speak on it. I think some very obvious conclusions can be drawn. And you say, let's look at the matter of the package for a minute, you say you don't want to discuss the package. Those are your words and yet you went through second reading in your own speech, and you went point after point what the Union had offered and day after day in their position.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — False.

**Mr. Lane:** — That is not false and we will get the transcript of that for the Attorney General in second reading who stated position after position and he is not denying it, Mr. Premier.

**Mr. Romanow:** — I haven't heard that.

**Mr. Lane:** — You have stated position after position, what the Union asked for, what they counter proposed and what the SPC offered and the counter proposal up to a certain point. At that point you become silent and at that point supposedly everything breaks down and the public interest comes to the fore and you step in. When you take it that far, I think that the public is entitled to know just what you did propose, what your final offer to the Union was and what the final position of the Union was prior to Cabinet making the decision to call the Legislature and reject the package. You can't stand up and say that you are concerned about the public interest and the public interest has to be protected and then try and smokescreen the whole issue and hide the Minister responsible who has been charged with some very serious accusations. You've got a duty and we are asking you to tell this House, this is supposed to be a decision of the Legislature as the Premier said. I want you to tell this House what you had offered and what your final position was immediately prior to breakdown of negotiations and the decision of the strike and finally what the Union's final position was. You have done it in your own speech point after point. Let's make no mistake, if you tell us what that position was, the final position if an agreement is reached and a mediator makes a final binding decision then your position and the mediator's final decision are one and the same, or it is one and the same as the Union's final position prior to the breakdown, we are here on a sham and a farce. I think that we are entitled to know exactly why we are here. What was the package, what were the details? You took it up to the end of December, you quit from then, I think you have got a duty to tell us exactly what you rejected, what the Union offered because that has got to come under public scrutiny when the mediator makes his final decision.

**Mr. Romanow:** — The mediator doesn't make final decisions.

**Mr. Lane:** — Well, the decision of the mediator.

**Mr. Romanow:** — I think, Mr. Chairman, that I am very sorely tempted to make as much of a political speech as the Member for Lumsden

(Mr. Lane) tried to do in this area, basically upon the, I won't say ignorance, but the total misinformation about the process of collective bargaining. It doesn't surprise me particularly coming from the Liberal Party because I don't believe, as I said in my second reading speech, that they believe in the principles of free collective bargaining. Mediators don't make decisions, mediators don't make rulings, that is not their job. It is an attempt, an accommodation, there is a give and take by parties, they don't make decisions as the Hon. Member would suggest. Now I am not going to go further into this type of a response to the Member because obviously if there is any smokescreen in this area, it is the statements of the Hon. Member. He says that serious accusations have been made and that the Minister is hiding. That is false. The Minister got up in second reading and he told this House that there was no agreement. That is the Minister's position, he has said it publicly and he has said it in the House. Now the Union president has a different version of the operation. So be it, but that is what he has told this House. All the answers have been advanced in this area and when the Hon. Member says that the mediator - what the mediator receives in confidence from both parties in an honest attempt to try to settle - what he gets out of the Union and what he gets out of the Company, forgetting about this issue but in any issue and forgetting about the complexity of those particular issues, that there should be full and total revelation of that, he doesn't know what he is talking about in collective bargaining.

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Attorney General, I apologize for the use of the word 'mediator', I should have used the word 'arbitrator'. The final decision made by the arbitrator.

You say he is not hiding. I am going to ask the Minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, what package . . .

**Mr. Romanow:** — That's out of order.

**Mr. Lane:** — Why is it out of order? What package did you get from the Union to take to the Cabinet? What package did the Cabinet reject, would you give us the terms of each of those?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Chairman, I have answered this on behalf of the Government as the Minister who is piloting the Bill. I have answered it over and over again to the Members. I repeat the answer again.

**Mr. Malone:** — I am sorry Mr. Attorney General, I don't like to prolong this, but in my opinion, you haven't answered the question. I am prepared to stay here until the end of the week until you do answer the question if necessary. But, as I say, the Premier has been quoted in the newspaper as saying a package was rejected. We are asking you what the package was? Who agreed to it? I am not asking you the contents of the package, I don't care at this stage, but where did it come from and how did it get there? And you are not answering. Will you answer it or will you let the Minister of Industry?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I am trying to tell the Member again when he says, where did the package come from. The packages of Friday came from the deliberations of the mediator, the Union, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the officials and there were no agreements as the Minister said. Now have I answered the question?

**Mr. Malone:** — No, you haven't. Was there an agreement, an agreement to that package by management and by the Union?

**Mr. Romanow:** — No.

**Mr. Malone:** — Who didn't agree to it, the Union or management?

**Mr. Romanow:** — All that I can say to the Member is that in the course of the mediation the proposals of the sides, nobody agreed to them, they were off the table.

**Mr. Guy:** — Okay, Mr. Attorney General, the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation wouldn't waste his time or the time of the Cabinet, or the mediator or anyone else by taking a package to Cabinet that no one had agreed to, or take a package to Cabinet and ask for Cabinet's either support or rejection, as it turned out, without at least one or both sides agreeing to it. I would suggest that he wouldn't waste the time of Cabinet taking a package that hadn't been agreed to by both sides. You tell us that the Minister took a package to Cabinet or it is stated that the Premier admitted a package was taken to Cabinet. You tell us that no one had agreed to that package. Why did he take it to Cabinet? When that package appeared before Cabinet, what did you reject? If there was no agreement by anybody how could you reject and yet the Premier admitted that he rejected that package. What was that package? Who had agreed to it? Why would he take it if it hadn't been agreed to by somebody? It doesn't make any sense, Mr. Attorney General.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, as the Hon. Member and again and the Liberal Party generally, just doesn't understand what mediation and how mediation operates. There is in the course of mediation nothing that says that before one side can propose a set of proposals to its side or to people that it seeks ratification or comments on, that there has to be agreement from the other side. Certainly not, in negotiations a mediator tries to give all changes to the parties. There may not be any agreements one way or the other with respect to the package or packages. Now a package was rejected. The Member asks me, what did I reject, what did we reject as a Government and I answer to him as I answered to the Member for Lumsden, in the mediation process it is not proper, it is not right, the parties are going to be meeting, we have to preserve the future relationships of the Corporation and the workers. If the mediation operation, if the mediator or any mediator is going to work in any consequent dispute, if the parties forget about the Corporation. Let's think of some other operation. Let's say SGIO and the employees as their employees go on strike if there is a breakdown. If there is a subsequent mediator, a revelation of that type of an operation, why should any side have any confidence in a mediator. Why would any mediator take on that type of a role, given that type of

circumstances and you say that we should. Well, I don't believe that that is the best interest of the public and I don't believe it is in the best interest of the parties involved.

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, what you are saying then, Mr. Attorney General is that the package that went to Cabinet was brought there by your running boy, your errand boy, was a package that had been put together by your mediator. It wasn't a package that had been agreed to by union nor it wasn't a package that was agreed to by management, it was a package that the mediator thought would satisfy both sides. It was given to the Minister in charge and the Minister in charge then came to Cabinet to see if it was acceptable to Cabinet before it was presented to both sides and then the Premier rejected so there was no point in him going back and presenting the package to both sides. This is what you are telling us, right?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I am saying as I have said before, that the packages of Friday are not, as the Member for Lumsden says, decided by the mediator for acceptance or rejection. The mediation process doesn't work that way. Through the good offices, the reputation, the skills of the mediator, packages arise as a result of the parties giving and taking in the whole operation. You are mediating on three days, or whatever it was, intensive mediations, I wasn't there personally, but I'll bet you there were all sorts of proposals that were flying around. That is the point I want to make absolutely clear, it wasn't a package that necessarily came from the mediator, it was a package which arose as a result of the efforts of mediation.

**Mr. Malone:** — I just want to read something to you, Mr. Attorney General. This is a quotation from Mr. Hill. It is a verbatim transcript of an interview he had with CKCK radio. He says this:

Our reaction is that we don't feel it is necessary to even have this strike, that we had a verbal agreement basically settled Friday night at 7 o'clock and this was what top management officials of the SPC and Kim Thorson, and the Cabinet turned this down.

Now, you have just told us that there was no agreement. That there was no package. Are you then saying that Mr. Hill was lying? That's what you are doing, isn't it?

**Mr. Guy:** — The Premier is lying too, then.

**Mr. Malone:** — As the Member for Lumsden said, this is a very serious matter, somebody is lying somewhere along the way and I would like to find out who.

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, I am not saying that Mr. Hill is lying, I am not saying that he is misleading, I am saying that is his interpretation of the events or of the facts. They do not coincide with the interpretation of the Power Corporation and the facts that we have. Now, if people put on the basis of somebody is lying, it is an either/or proposition, that's a smokescreen.

**Mr. C.P. Macdonald** (Milestone): — Mr. Attorney General, I find this very, very strange. There was no agreement of any package between management and the Union. There were many packages considered by Cabinet and I suppose they came back to the Union and taken back to the management. I would like to know who was doing the negotiations. Was it the Cabinet negotiating because the only way the Cabinet should have been involved in this issue at all, was to substantively agree with the proposal that came forward after union and management agreed. Otherwise, why would Cabinet ever be involved and if they were involved before a substantial agreement was made between management and labour, it means only one thing, that the Cabinet was doing the negotiations. The purpose of Cabinet in any Crown Corporation negotiations between labour and management is to agree in principle with the agreement that has first taken place between management and labour and I know that the Attorney General will not deny that and I know the Premier won't. When the agreement comes, the Cabinet takes out the 'bug' lines, but to suggest that many packages and some packages rejected are coming back and forth to Cabinet, to me that means the Cabinet is doing the negotiating. But there is even a much more important thing, the Attorney General has stood up in the House and said, because caucus is secret we can't tell you whether caucus discussed this issue. But Cabinet is secret, but you say Cabinet discussed it. I think there is a very important fundamental issue here at stake, if every time a labour negotiation between somebody that works for the public purse of Saskatchewan is discussed by the NDP caucus and approved by them, that the negotiations are political negotiations. And I suggest to the Attorney General that isn't good enough. I am asking him again, did caucus discuss these proposals or these packages that were rejected by Cabinet and if so, under what justification does the NDP take negotiations between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and employees and its management to the political party? He won't tell us about it, he won't tell the Members of the Legislature, he won't answer the questions, he won't discuss it with the public and yet he discusses it with his caucus. Now, I am asking again of the Attorney General, was this proposal or these packages for this issue and these problems of the negotiation discussed in caucus on Friday?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I tell the Member again that in my judgement what the caucus discusses or doesn't discuss is within the purview of the caucus. I don't expect you to tell me what your caucus discussed about this very situation. I don't expect that and I don't expect you to ask it of me. I also said, when you were out earlier, in the Committee of the Whole when you people were the administration and you had a situation where quite obviously it is of extreme importance to the province, the caucus is advised of the overall general developments or possible consequences of any action. It happened during your administration, it happened during our administration, it's not political negotiating. The decisions are made, rightly or wrongly, with the management where possible. I am talking now generally, where it is required by the Minister and/or the Cabinet. Now that's the best that I can answer to you. I am not trying to cover up anything in that regard.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I would just like to make one comment. I would hope that union people in Saskatchewan and all employees that work for the public purse listen very carefully to what has been said



by the Attorney General. The fact that discussions, negotiations, certainly when they are finalized, the caucus is advised, certainly the same as the public and the Opposition. But you are asking us to come back here to discuss something that isn't caucus matter. They are negotiations that actually took place. I hope that all union people realize that the caucus of the NDP before that final rejection on Friday night at 7 o'clock were given the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons and that they participated in the decision that led to the rejection at 7 o'clock, because I think that is pretty serious. I think that union people are going to consider it pretty serious.

**Mr. Romanow:** — That is your interpretation or judgment of the facts, but I want to tell you that on Friday at 1:30 p.m. and I don't think this is disputed, the unit chairmen were being advised as to the state of the mediations and the discussions and walkouts in certain parts were taking place. No one would dispute that. You know the conditions of the weather. Now, you tell me that that fact can't be reported and considered by caucus, that it doesn't have any implication, you're telling me that - you can say that - but I don't think we have to explain to the Union people that what you say is just simply not true about political negotiations. You can tell us anything you want about the rights and the wrongs of the Bill, but that is one that just isn't going to wash. You can say all you want but that is the facts.

**Mr. J.G. Richards** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back a little bit further into negotiations and to begin with quoting from the *Hansard* for yesterday when the Attorney General introduced this Bill and I quote:

In its opening statement, Mr. Speaker, the Corporation proposed to revise the article on vacancies and new positions to permit the Corporation to advertise positions prior to agreements being reached on the titles and the rates of pay and also proposed to revise the hours of work articles to allow the Corporation more flexibility in establishing the hours of work to best suit the needs in the work location concerned. In addition the Corporation said that it would make a wage proposal as the negotiations progressed.

That, according to the transcript, in early October when the first meetings occurred, the Power Corporation had no wage offer to make. To continue the quote:

At various times during negotiation sessions both sides made concessions on some of the minor and less contentious issues. On October 24th, as promised, the Power Corporation tabled a general wage offer to the Union of six per cent.

Now, taken from the transcript, I made reference to that yesterday afternoon and the Minister referred to a cost of living allowance agreement. There is no reference in the transcript that in October there was any mention of a cost of living allowance. Thus, in October, the Power Corporation was offering in its initial offer a meagre six per cent given 11 per cent inflation in 1974, that means the Power Corporation was asking the Union to accept a five per cent decline in real wages. To go on:

**An Hon. Member:** — Six per cent.

**Mr. Richards:** — Six per cent. On November 21st the Power Corporation increased its offer to ten per cent across the board. But still no mention of the cost of living allowance. So as of November 21st the Power Corporation was offering less than the rate of inflation in the year 1974. Only in its offer of mid-December, I believe on the 15th of December, 1974, did the Power Corporation introduce a cost of living allowance. Based on the transcript yesterday there was no cost of living allowance introduced by the Power Corporation prior to December 15th. Is that correct?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I am advised that the situation was that when the initial six per cent was made on October 24th it was without a COLA, and that on or about the 21st of November at the time of the ten per cent it was with a COLA, on or about that time. I didn't mention it in the speech I see here.

**Mr. Richards:** — So that the COLA was originally introduced in late November. All right we have established I think the point I wanted to make and this is, namely, that the Power Corporation, in my opinion, and obviously of the opinion of the union members involved, was guilty of dragging its feet in engaging in very conservative negotiating practices.

Now again in your introduction of this Bill, you felt at liberty to cite the initial offer made by the Union which amounted to, according to your calculations, a 59 per cent increase in take home pay and an increase in hourly rates of 67 per cent. Now, as you and I are both aware, these kinds of figures going out over the wire can paint the impression of greedy unions going for 70 per cent. As the Premier said yesterday, and I agree with him, the initial offers made by the Union are bargaining positions and are not what the Union may very well expect to be the final negotiated settlement. Why, if the Minister is so concerned, about the maintenance of good relations with the Unions for future bargaining that he see fit yesterday to cite publicly what was the initial bargaining position of the Union?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I felt that, as the Minister who was going to be introducing the Bill, or in fact introduced the Bill, that I owed it to the Legislature and to the public in general terms on the information that I was able to obtain to set out the relative positions by the parties, in general terms the movement of the parties before the negotiations broke down and before the mediation took place, in an attempt to show the magnitude of the job of the mediator and the difficulties that were before him. I can assure the Member that it was not intended and I don't believe it has the consequence of trying to sensationalize one position or another position, because if that is the case, according to your views at least, the six per cent offer would be viewed as very miserly on the part of the Corporation. So I wasn't doing it either to make the Union look bad or the Corporation look bad. That was what I thought was a general statement of the facts of the case.

**Mr. Romanow:** — But you did consider it important that we as Members of the Legislature have access to what were the details of the negotiations and counter offers? And you did consider it relevant to our deliberations as Members of the Legislature in considering Bill 28 that we have access to those offers and counter offers?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes.

**Mr. Richards:** — All right, now when we move into January, why is it not relevant that we continue to have information as best as you can provide as to what transpired in the process of negotiations?

**Mr. Romanow:** — In the process of mediation.

**Mr. Richards:** — In the process of mediation.

**Mr. Romanow:** — For the reasons I have outlined to my hon. friend and colleague from Lumsden.

**Mr. Richards:** — All right. I take it that the Minister is adamant in refusing to divulge what were verbal offers made during the process of mediation. Agreed? The Minister is not denying that verbal offers were made to the mediator, to the other parties during the process of mediation.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Right.

**Mr. Richards:** — There were in other words, verbal offers made at the time of mediation. We have had offers made prior to mediation about which the Government has felt it urgent that we have knowledge. Now, all of a sudden, I think there is a distinction without a difference that the Minister is wont to use at other times, because mediation comes into this, we aren't to know the facts that were involved. Accordingly, I shall just have to read into the record, the reconstruction that I have been able to do by investigative digging and telephoning, that I would like to make absolutely sure that the Government has this, and if you choose you can elaborate, deny, you can amplify. Now I understand that the Government via the process of mediation in the afternoon and evening of Friday the 11th of January, with caucus in session, the caucus considering these offers. That the caucus, and the Cabinet and the Minister responsible for the Power Corporation, were making a verbal offer that amounted to an immediate 18 per cent cash increase; an immediate reduction in hours of work from 40 to 37 and a third hours per week; a cost of living allowance which amounted to \$35 in May and \$35 in September which constituted approximately a seven per cent increase. The sticking point, and this is public, was that the Union also wanted a tail end list of a further reduction in hours from 37 and a third to 36, as of December, 1975. So the Government in its effort to avoid a strike had transformed what was undoubtedly difficult negotiations between the Union and the management into political negotiations in which the Cabinet and the caucus infused a lot of money with the hope of avoiding a strike. I repeat 18 per cent immediate cash increase; 40 to 37 and a third reduction in hours of work; a cost of living allowance amounting to \$35 a month in May, \$35 per month in September; and the sticking

point was the final reduction in hours of work.

I think that any normal person in the public has two questions which he asks himself: one, why the Government was willing to go that far in making it a political negotiation, if it is, as it says it is, so interested in avoiding back-to-work legislation and the odious principle involved, that it not go the one small step further? And conversely the question to the Union why, if that was all that was dividing you at the end of the day, why did the Union choose to break off negotiations so abruptly and call a strike on what turned out to be the coldest day of the year? I would very much have liked to be having this discussion in the Crown Corporations Committee in which we could have had testimony from both the Power Corporation officials, the Government and the Union involved, but that has not happened. I can at least ask the one half of the question, why did the Government not go, if it felt that it was political negotiation, that final step of the road?

**Mr. Romanow:** — First of all, let me just make one thing clear and that is that is your version of the facts as you admit that you have been able to piece together the whole story. Accordingly any statement or any question which is predicated on that version of the facts and asks me, as Minister piloting the Bill, why we didn't go the extra step one way or the other, has no meaning because as I say it's your facts. Let me make one general comment, which I've said again and again to the Members here, that as I understand and I admit that I'm not all that knowledgeable or experienced in actual labour relations matters around the table, perhaps not in many things, but certainly not in that area, you can't make too much out of one item or two items or three items out of twelve, when you are looking at an acceptance or a rejection of a package. The simple fact of the matter is that when the packages, as I understand there were packages on Friday during the course, were sought to be worked together by mediation, it was unacceptable in the end result. This is as I've said to the Members before.

**Mr. Richards:** — The Minister does not confirm my statements obviously. Does he chose to deny?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I don't.

**Mr. Richards:** — A simple answer, you could say you don't want to confirm or deny.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Agreed.

**Mr. Richards:** — I'd like to turn to another area briefly and I would like to begin it with a general statement and I'm trying to explore the area as to whether there really existed an emergency which justified the introduction of the Bill. I would like to take as my initial reading the statement by the Minister of Labour upon the repeal of Bill 2, which I would like to refresh Members' memories with. No, just one very quick passage.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, no honest person could entertain the belief that any responsible Saskatchewan citizen,

union member or otherwise, could in any way knowingly contribute to the death or injury of his fellow man. Union leaders have consistently made it clear that genuinely essential services would be maintained in the event of strike action and in every case, Mr. Speaker, in this province in which life or property has been endangered, this has been done. Often at considerable inconvenience to the union members involved.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think that is an excellent statement that sums up the confidence of the Minister in the responsibility of trade unionists in this province. Would not the Attorney General agree that the actions of the union members this past weekend, during the blizzard, which according to the release of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour they had 200 workers, voluntarily and without pay, engaged in the process of providing essential services and repair of breakdowns, not dramatically support the statement made by the Minister in 1971?

**Mr. Romanow:** — As I have indicated or tried to indicate in second reading I certainly believe that many of the union members, as I am advised in any event, co-operated. I have also tried to be as fair as I can to the House, some union members didn't co-operate. The simple fact of the matter is that on the best information and advice that we were able to get the risks that were inherent to the whole system, to the safety of homes, to the safety of people and businesses, given a usually normal January winter, compounded with what happened to be at the time a very exceptional circumstance was such that we couldn't take the risk. We felt the public interest at that stage of the game was paramount. I simply want to tell you that you can quote the Minister of Labour all you want, but he also included in his speech that as well as recognition of the fact, I can't put my hand on it right now, well he did in that very same speech that everybody quotes him, he included the fact of a recognition of what is called an emergency situation.

Now, it's for the Members of the House to decide whether or not it was or was not an emergency. The responsibility rightly or wrongly falls on the Government to make the judgement and we did call it an emergency. We felt and do feel the situation was very serious in the public interest and the public interest is paramount.

**Mr. Richards:** — Well, the relevant quotation from the Minister of Labour is on the previous page in which he says that:

In my mind an emergency suggests a life or death sort of situation.

And the Minister can find it on page 230.

One of the factors contributing to this being an emergency according to the Attorney General and the Minister of Industry was the very high peak demands resulting at this time of year. Correct?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes.

**Mr. Richards:** — Accordingly there was danger according again to the

Government and the members and the representatives of the Power Corporation of outages because of the peak demand. Now, in 1973 fully one-quarter, give or take a couple of percentage points, of electricity consumed in the Province of Saskatchewan was to power the donkeys of the oil wells and the pipe lines exporting Alberta oil through the province. Is the Minister willing to verify that this is approximately the order of magnitude?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes, generally speaking we'll accept that figure.

**Mr. Richards:** — So, I think this is an important figure because I want, I'm about to conclude but I think the public should be aware that fully one-quarter of electricity being used in general and I'm not talking about what was necessarily the percentage of the peak load of those days, but obviously still a considerable percentage was to be attributed to the pumping of oil through the province and oil wells, a function which surely does not rate as an essential service. Accordingly, did the Government cut off, during the course of the strike, any power to the pumping of oil from oil wells or to pipe lines?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, the situation I am advised is that the Corporation looked at this in an overall situation, the load, there were as I indicated in my opening second reading speech, reductions, it had to make the judgment calls as to whether reductions were or weren't made. To answer your question specifically, there were no reductions made in that particular field of activity. There were reductions made, as I understand it, at IPSCO and there was some reduction on pipe line pumping as well, I guess.

**Mr. Richards:** — How much reduction in pipeline pumping did occur in the power utilized, approximately in a percentage?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I don't have that figure, but we'll just see if we can give you some reasonably accurate general percentage.

**Mr. Richards:** — I am just about finished and I don't want to drag this out, but the point which I think deserves to be made is that surely here is an area of inessential services, the export of oil through the province, primarily to the United States, which very well could have been cut off at a time of emergency for the provincial system and the question arises as to why this was not an obvious area to cut down on the utilization of electricity.

**Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden):** — Question of the, I guess he's gone, the Minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

We're assuming that the way that the Corporation acted during the alleged emergency that they were able to maintain basic service, obviously the Corporation in doing its duty was taking some advance procedures. When did the Corporation commence taking these precautionary procedures on personnel and getting them spotted around the province?

**Mr. Romanow:** — The actual dispatch of out-of-scope personnel to man the positions was about 5:00 p.m. Friday afternoon.

**Mr. Lane:** — How many moves in light of negotiations and advance warnings given by, I think, the Union and the Power Corporation of the possibility of a strike, were any advance procedures taken with regard to personnel, were any personnel slotted to various areas of the province prior to Friday?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I think I could answer that best by saying that the Corporation had a plan, in a sense, of where men would be dispatched or wouldn't be dispatched. That type of thing, but the actual decision in terms of dispatching, nothing was done before that. Roughly 5:00 p.m. decision.

**Mr. Lane:** — Well, when there were a series of advertisements over the weekend requesting the people of Saskatchewan to cut back on use in certain peak hours, when were those advertisements placed and when were those advertisements drawn up or written up or recorded or whatever?

**Mr. Romanow:** — The advertisements were placed right after the 5:00 p.m. or after the strikes thing, 1:30 or 5:00 p.m., the 1:30 p.m. business, but somewhere in that period, they were placed after that. Now actually when they were drawn up . . . I'm wrong, sorry. The advertisements were drawn Saturday morning and they were placed Saturday morning and apparently they were run on Saturday by the Corporation.

**Mr. Lane:** — I think that very interesting that, Cabinet being involved in negotiations or the decision making process, and caucus being involved and with the warning of the strike that no formal warning, serious warning, in spite of a plan, was given by the Corporation to the general public to take safety precautions and to prepare for the worst or severe conditions. All we had was a request that they cut back. I don't think that that's adequate enough. And if there was a failure in Corporation procedures in this case, I would hope for the sake of the people of Saskatchewan that it doesn't happen again, because an ad asking people to cut back on power is not good enough, if we have the emergency as postulated by the Attorney General. I think it's a failure that not sufficient notice or not adequate notice and severe warnings were given to the people of Saskatchewan, either by the Government or the Corporation.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well I must here rise as a citizen in defence of the Power Corporation. I certainly believe that the management people, out-of-scope people did a terrific job under very, very difficult conditions and we were all fortunate, management, union, we were all fortunate that nothing really bad came about and I think they acted, they had the plan in place, mediation was still going on, as well. I think the Corporation did just an absolutely superb job and I don't agree with the Member for Lumsden, when he casts, I don't want to be argumentative, but casts doubts on the judgment of the Corporation in this area. I think we can all be proud of the people in the Corporation for that job.

**Mr. Lane:** — The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) in his speech and other Members of this House made it clear that they didn't have notice of that strike and that they were not made aware of the strike, and I would think that procedures should be reviewed, so that in the future the advertisements not just say cut back on power, but express to the people of Saskatchewan, hopefully in advance, you know, take safety precautions because it could be a very difficult situation.

**Mr. Richards:** — Mr. Deputy Chairman, did the Minister get any ball park figure from the SPC officials upon whether, what degree of reduction there was on pipe line utilization of electricity?

**Mr. Romanow:** — It's a guess. He doesn't have the figures here. He says also at what stage. I gather it sort of varies depending upon the loads. Sometimes it was up, sometimes it was down. There was a reduction. I can't give you that answer right now.

**Mr. Richards:** — Just one final comment. I can't resist, Mr. Deputy Chairman. As a Canadian nationalist, may I suggest that the next time this situation arises, let us cut off the electricity to the pipe lines exporting oil to the States, before we introduce compulsory arbitration legislation.

**Mr. Romanow:** — As a person who believes in free collective bargaining, let's hope there is not a next time.

Clause 1 agreed.

Clause 2 agreed.

**Mr. C.P. Macdonald** (Milestone): — Mr. Deputy Chairman, just one very brief question. I notice that this clause 3, what kind of time frame do you anticipate that the arbitrator will be able to bring in his final recommendation and this legislation has been drafted, I presume, somewhat along the same lines as the federal bill and I noticed that the federal bill is always given an interim settlement to look after the cost of living, during the interim before the arbitrator brings in his recommendation. Did the Government or did the Minister consider including in the Bill, a 10 or 15, 20 per cent or whatever stage that would provide a cost of living increase for the working people in the interim, before the settlement was brought in?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Yes, no, well it was considered at one point but I must say not particularly strongly because it was felt that under the Act, roughly you are looking at a month and a half, maybe with extensions, perhaps longer, but two months, where either one of two things would happen, either the parties would agree to an agreement and it's put to bed or in the alternative the arbitrator sort of gets the parties to agree to an agreement and it's put to bed. Accordingly we didn't think that applied here. In the federal matter there were more time periods involved. It's a larger operation. So we rejected it and that was the situation anyway.

Clause 3 agreed.



Clause 4 agreed.

Clause 5 agreed.

Clause 6 agreed.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Sorry, my Deputy gives me a good point that it should be a, this is just a small point. There is an ‘e’, Clause 7(b). No person who is an officer shall declare, and it says ‘authorized’, it should be “authorize”. I move seconded by the Leader of the Opposition that Section 7 be amended by:

Striking out authorized” in the second line of clause (b) of Section 7 of the printed Bill and substituting “authorize”.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8 agreed.

Clause 9 —

**Mr. Chairman:** — There is a House amendment applicable to clause 9 of the printed Bill moved by the Hon. Mr. Romanow to amend Section 9 of the printed Bill by renumbering subsection (11) and subsection (12) and adding a new subsection (11) as follows:

(11) The decision of the arbitrator may be made retroactive in whole or in part to the 1st day of January, 1975.

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Attorney General, on Clause 9 I think it’s the crux of the whole debate. I’m referring to sub-clause (5). From the evidence you have given, that the Premier has given, that the Cabinet Ministers have given, there is some pretty active involvement by the Cabinet in negotiations, and that Cabinet rejected the package or packages and yet under this whole procedure the only ones allowed to present evidence were the Corporation and the Union. So you go from one procedure beforehand where you are taking an active involvement and now you bring this one before the House supposedly to protect the public interest, and you don’t participate in it whatsoever. Now that’s the effect of the Bill that you have given here. If this Bill is your position, why were you bothered being involved in these negotiations in the first place and let Mr. Thorson and the members of the Corporation and Union settle it? That is precisely what you are saying here. The Bill is completely at variance with the whole posture you have taken prior to negotiations. What is your position on this - either you are in it or you are out of it? Make up your minds.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, it’s true that the Bill is at variance with negotiations because negotiations and mediations all broke down when the strike started and the Bill and this Session was precipitated. So it is at variance. All that this does is offer us a mechanism for settlement. Not one that we, or you people, or anyone of us particularly like, but that’s how it is, it’s all (9) does.

**Mr. Lane:** — I think it does a little more than that, in that

I think there is a pretty strong implication given on the stonewalling and the smoke screening you gave this afternoon and failure of the Minister of Industry and Commerce to be allowed to speak. If you had kept your hands off this thing in the first place there probably would have been a settlement, there wouldn't have been a strike and that's precisely what you are saying by clause (9) when you turn this over to an arbitrator. The only ones who can present evidence are the Union and the Corporation and your Bill you are not involved in any way in the arbitration process. You are out of it. I think that your whole position in this so-called emergency is refuted by Clause (9).

**Mr. Romanow:** — Please, I ask the Member to consider the situation we are in. Let's assume that the Power Corporation was not a public corporation, let's assume it was a private company and it controlled the entire utilities of the entire Province of Saskatchewan and its employees went on strike. This is a Government action. Now, I agree, there is that dual role that the Minister who acts as Minister in charge of the Corporation is a Government action for that public interest. I ask you to consider the principle in the light of that and if you consider it in the light of that Section (9) makes it perfectly logical. Would you say in my example that I have given you that the Government should be there as a party to that type of a position? Of course not, the Government acts as a matter of ending the dispute and getting the mediation going. So you cannot say that the Government should be there as a party, it's just not a credible position.

Clause 9 agreed to.

Clause 10 agreed to.

Clause 11 agreed to.

Clause 9 —

**Mr. D.F. Macdonald** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Attorney General about offences and penalties. I wonder whether this section is really needed in the Bill and I ask this for my information. First of all it goes on to say that there will not be any jail sentences imposed if they do not comply with paying a fine. The other thing that confused me a bit is that if the Union or Union member contravenes any portion of the Act then he pays a fine to the Crown. If it is a Corporation which is already a Crown corporation that has to pay a fine it then pays the Crown. How does the Crown pay the Crown? You take it out of one pocket and put it into another, so that really the fines and penalties are absolutely meaningless to the Crown corporation. They are not enforced by jail sentences for the members of the Union. Why are they, indeed, necessary at all?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, again, I ask the Member to assume, we are talking about a principle here, we are talking Saskatchewan Power Corporation that is owned by Mr. X, a private company with striking employees, and this type of penalty is introduced in that type of circumstance. Now to whom in a democracy is a fine paid? To whom do you want us to pay the fine? To whom? It is paid to the Crown. In my circumstance it would be perfectly logical. That's the principle and that is accepted. Now we substitute Mr. X, private owner SPC and make SPC a public

owned operation. Does that make the principle of payment to the Crown wrong? Of course it doesn't. There has to be in our judgement some form of a penalty section, a reasonably modest penalty section to make the Bill at least meaningful.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I don't know all the legal aspects. I don't know that it has to be in here to make this Bill meaningful. You said that whom do you pay the fine to, you pay it to whom you decide. Now the Crown has to pay it to the Crown by this, could not the Union member pay this fine to the Union by the same token and we could write that into this Bill. Now I really don't appreciate the difference and I don't appreciate that if Mr. S or Mr. X owned the company, it is owned by the Crown. I don't see any possibility of a penalty section being needed for either the Crown or for the Union. I don't see any possibility of fines or penalties being necessary and if they were necessary, could they not be done some other way by the courts deciding that somebody is breaking the law? Does it have to be written into this Bill?

**Mr. Romanow:** — It has to be because you must prescribe for the judge the limitations of the fine. He has to know what he is to impose as the penalty and I am sure that every Member in this House agrees that there is just no other alternative of paying a fine other than to the Crown. I wish that I could pay my speeding fines to the Liberal Party, for example, to help their campaign along. I think they could use the money and the help but I can't. I have to pay it to the Crown, the Crown represents the people and as I say again the principle here is to substitute public ownership of that corporation and put in private, put the CPR in there, anybody in another dispute and the payment of fine goes to the Crown. As a lawyer, I am talking just purely as a lawyer, an Attorney General who has the responsibility of piloting this Bill through, you have to have something to make the Bill have meaning.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clause 14 agreed to.

## **BILL NO. 28**

**Mr. Chairman:** — Therefore Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan enacts as follows: An Act respecting a certain Dispute between Saskatchewan Power Corporation and certain of its employees.

The question being put on Bill No. 28 as amended, it was agreed to.