

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**June 15, 1983**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PETITIONS**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the provisions of rule 11. As all members will know, my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, is away from this Assembly as part of the official provincial government delegation to the funeral of Archbishop O'Neill. He's asked that in his absence I sign and present to the Assembly a petition from certain Saskatchewan residents who are gravely concerned about The Trade Union Act. I am therefore pleased now to present this petition containing some 34 pages of signatures.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I am also very pleased, under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures* of the legislature, to present a petition on behalf of a number of individuals of Saskatchewan, the working people who are very concerned about Bill 104. I do so present the petition.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am also pleased to present a petition to the legislature from a number of Saskatchewan working people, under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*. The signatories to the petition are concerned by and firmly opposed to Bill 104. I do so present the petition.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to make use of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*, I present a petition to the legislature from a number of individual Saskatchewan working people who are gravely concerned by the provision of Bill 104 and are firmly opposed to it.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* provides for the presentation of petitions to the legislature. Under that rule, I rise to present a petition on behalf of a number of individual workers who are gravely concerned by the provisions of Bill 104 and firmly opposed to it.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Mr. Speaker, rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* provides for the presentation of petitions to the legislature. Under that rule, I rise to present a petition on behalf of a number of individual who are gravely concerned by the provision of Bill 104 and firmly opposed to it.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition to the legislature from a number of individual Saskatchewan working people who are gravely concerned by the provisions of Bill 104 and who are firmly opposed to it. This petition is presented under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the provisions of rule 11 to present a petition signed by a number of United Church minister and others who are associated in a professional way with the United Church of Canada.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I am pleased to present another petition on behalf of concerned working people of Saskatchewan.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition to the legislature from a number of Saskatchewan working people under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*. And I want to say the signatories to the petitions are indeed concerned by and firmly opposed to Bill 104. I so present the petition.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to use rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures* to present to the Legislative Assembly yet another petition from a number of Saskatchewan citizens who are very concerned by provisions of Bill 104 and who are firmly opposed to it.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11 of the Rules and Procedures of the legislature, I would like to present a petition signed – there's about 17 pages of them here – by individuals Saskatchewan residents who are concerned about the provisions of Bill 104 and firmly oppose it.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, once again, rise under rule 11 to present a petition with 142 names on of greatly concerned individuals in the province of Saskatchewan over 104 and firmly oppose it.

**MR. YEW:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition to the legislature from a number of Saskatchewan working people who are greatly concerned about the provisions of Bill 104 and who are firmly opposed to it. This petition is presented to you under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present, under rule 11, a petition signed by some 118 people, all in Saskatoon, of various occupations, who are concerned that bill 104 is not in the best interests of Saskatchewan people and petitions this Assembly to withdraw Bill 104.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I am pleased to present yet another petition on behalf of concerned working people of Saskatchewan who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Mr. Speaker, I am pleased on behalf of the working people of Saskatchewan who have signed this petition, under rule 11, submit the petitions. The signatories of this petition are concerned, and indeed, firmly opposed to Bill 104. I so submit.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to make use of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* to submit to the Assembly a number of names of people who are opposed to the provisions of Bill 104 and wish to express their opposition to it.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, under provision of rule 11 I would like to present petitions. Most of these people are from North Battleford; they are 42 in number, who are opposed to the provisions of Bill 104 and are concerned that this bill be withdrawn at this time. I'd like to present this petition.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Mr. Speaker, I rise under rule 11. Under that rule I rise to present a

petition on behalf of a number of individual workers who are greatly concerned by the provisions of Bill 104 and firmly opposed to it, the petition of 139 names on it.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition to the legislature from a number of Saskatchewan working people who are greatly concerned about the provisions of Bill 104 and who are firmly opposed to it. This petition is presented under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the provisions of rule 11 to present a petition signed by some 78 people in Saskatoon of a wide variety of occupations – I see on one page what must be the entire staff of the Saskatoon library – who fear that their rights would be jeopardized and their freedom of association will be endangered by Bill 104.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, once again under the provisions of rule 11, I am pleased to present to this legislature a petition on behalf of concerned working people of Saskatchewan who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Mr. Speaker, I present a petition to the legislature from some 52 in number of Saskatchewan working people, under the provisions of rule 11. I want to indicate that the signatories of this petition are concerned and firmly oppose Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to make use of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* to present to the Assembly a petition which lists out a number of people, many of them nurses from the hospital in Saskatoon, who wish to express to their Assembly through the one means they have to express such a presentation as they are not allowed to appear in person, and wish to express their oppositions to amendments to Bill 104.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition under the provisions of rule 11 for some 117 people, most of them from Carrot River and Arborfield. They are housekeeping aides, cook 3, cook 1, nurse's aide, laundry aide, and so on – most of the occupations – dietary aide, maintenance 2 persons, that are opposed to Bill 104, and wish this Assembly to withdraw that bill. I present this petition of these 117 at this time.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I rise under rule 11. Under that rule, I rise to present a petition on behalf of a number of individual workers who are gravely concerned by the provisions of Bill 104 and totally opposed to it. I now present 122 names, and they're all from Saskatoon.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of some registered nurses from Weyburn and Regina who are gravely concerned by the provisions of bill 104 and who are firmly opposed to it. The petition is presented under rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present under the provisions of rule 11, signators 81 in number, the vast majority of whom appear to have come from one of the Saskatoon hospitals, who in the short time available to them have got this petition up to protest the erosion of their rights as free men and women in a free society.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11 I wish to present to this legislature yet another petition on behalf of concerned working people of

Saskatchewan who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Mr. Speaker, I'd like to present yet another petition to the legislature from some 54 working people in the province of Saskatchewan under the provisions of rule 11. The signatories of this petitions are concerned and firmly opposed to Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to make rule of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* to present to the legislature yet another petition from a group of workers in Saskatchewan who wish to use this forum to express their opposition to the amendments proposed to Bill 104 by the Conservative government.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, I have before me a petition I wish to present here that includes approximately 48 names of petitioners who request your honourable Assembly be pleased to withdraw Bill 104.

The petitioners come from Nipawin, White Fox, Ridgedale, Codette, and Choiceland, Snowden, Nipawin areas, and are people that are very concerned with what is happening with Bill 104 and what it's going to do to them.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again I rise under rule 11 to present a petition of 69 names, all from Saskatoon, who are strongly opposed to Bill 104.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislator from 31 registered nurses of Regina who are gravely concerned by the provisions of Bill 104, and who are firmly opposed to it. This petition is presented under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present, under the provisions of rule 11, the signors of 106 workers, largely hospital workers in the Moose Jaw and Swift Current area, who wish to protest the stripping of their rights.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I have yet another petition to present to the legislature on behalf of the concerned working people of Saskatchewan who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of honour, on behalf of a group of working people, to submit a petition under rule 11. The signatories to this petition are firmly opposed to the implementation of Bill 104. I so submit.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to make use of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Assembly* to present to you and the Assembly a list of names of a number of individuals who are opposed to amendment to The Trade Union Act, and the petition is presented to the Assembly with the hope that it would lead to the withdrawal of these amendments to Bill 104.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, on behalf of four pages of carpenters from Saskatoon area, and the balance is from, it looks like a hospital up there, I wish to present the petitions to this Assembly, who are concerned that this provisions of Bill 104 amendments be dropped at this time.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now want to present another petition under rule 11 with 119 names on mostly from Saskatoon and the Estevan area, who are strongly opposed to Bill 104.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of yet another 25 nurses from Regina, who are gravely concerned about the provisions of Bill 104, and who are firmly opposed to it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The afternoon mail has just arrived, and I therefore present through this petition 140 signatories, apparently by the occupation from Intercontinental Packers in Saskatoon, who rightly understand, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 104 will erode their rights as free men and women.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I have yet another petition to present to this legislature on behalf of individual working people who opposed bill 104 and ask for its withdrawal.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Mr. Speaker, on behalf of some 47 working men and women across this province, I'd like to submit a petition on their behalf under the provisions of rule 11 of the Legislative Assembly, and indicate that the signatories to this petition are indeed opposed to Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to present to the Assembly under the rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures* of the Assembly, a list of names of individuals who are oppose to the amendments to Bill 104. They include registered nurses, orderlies, ward clerks, and a number of other individuals from hospital in Saskatoon.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 52 concerned workers in both Regina and Saskatoon, I wish to present a petition under the provision of rule 11 of the Legislature Assembly. These people, who are teachers, counsellors, and stenos, and so on, are concerned that the provisions of Bill 104 will take a way some of their freedoms and rights.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to present another 124 names under rule 11 from Estevan, Bienfait, and Torquay area, who are also opposed to Bill 104.

**MR. YEW:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of yet another group of registered nurses from Regina, who are greatly concerned about the provisions under Bill 104, and who are firmly opposed to it. I present this under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present a petition under the provisions of rule 11 – 22 signators, although few in number they come from a wide variety of Saskatchewan communities, who wish to inform this Assembly that they believe that Bill 104 is not in the best interests of Saskatchewan people. They ask the government members to withdraw it.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I have yet another petition to present to this Assembly on behalf of working people of Saskatchewan, who also ask for the withdrawal of Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition to the legislature from some 51 working men and women across the province under the

provisions of rule 11, and on their behalf to indicate that the signatories to this petition are indeed opposed and concerned by the legislation being introduced under Bill 104. I so submit.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to present to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of the number of individuals a petition under rule 11 in which petition they ask for the withdrawal of Bill 104 which would amend the labour act which they believe will take away some of their rights. This list would include a number of individuals from either a bank or a credit union. There are tellers, file clerks, and others who wish us to present this petition to the Assembly.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a good cross-section of workers in Regina and east up into the Qu'Appelle area, I would like to present a petition under rule 11. Some of these people are teachers, researchers, receptionists, social workers, rehab workers, accounting clerks, and so on, and these people are concerned with the provisions of Bill 104 and pray as petitioners that that bill would be withdrawn at this time.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Mr. Speaker, I also want to under rule 11 present to this legislature another petition with 60 names of working men and women across the province who request that the government consider withdrawing Bill 104.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of yet another group of working people who are greatly concerned about the provisions of Bill 104 and who are firmly opposed to it. I present this under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This one, I now, would be of considerable interest to members opposite. There are 11 names from Regina. But the description of their occupation, I would guess that most of these are public servants. I know this one will be copied endlessly. These people understand, as do all the others, that Bill 104 will erode their rights.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I have yet another petition to present to this Assembly on behalf of the working people of Saskatchewan who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to present a petition on behalf of some 120 working men and women from across the province, a petition under rule 11, and indicate the signatories of this petition are concerned and firmly oppose Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to use this opportunity to present to this Assembly under rule 11, a petition which includes a number of names of individuals who are concerned about amendments to The Trade Union Act, Bill 104, because they feel that it'll take away some of their rights that they have worked hard for over the last number of years.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Mr. Speaker, on behalf of some 51 people from across Saskatchewan who indicate that Bill 104 amendments are not in the best interests of Saskatchewan working people, I wish to present this petition under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Mr. Speaker, I want to present yet another petition on behalf of 30 working men and women across the province who request the government to withdraw

Bill 104.

**MR. YEW:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of yet another fairly large group of working people, some of them in the civil service, others with the bricklayers' union and various other working groups, and I would like to state on their behalf that they are gravely concerned about the provisions under Bill 104 and are firmly opposed to it, and they so wish to have this bill withdrawn. I submit it under rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present to this Assembly, under the provisions of rule 11, petitions containing 150 names, addresses, and occupations – people of some courage – most of whom it appears work at Intercontinental Packers in Saskatoon, who in the short period of time available to them have got this petition together and ask that Bill 104 be withdrawn.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I have another petition to present to this legislature on behalf of working Saskatchewan people who wish the withdrawal of Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Mr. Speaker, I want to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of some 55 working people of Saskatchewan, under the provision of rule 11, and indicate their opposition to the proceeding with Bill 104. I so submit.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to submit to the Assembly, under rule 11 of *Rules and Procedures* of this Assembly, a list of names of individuals who are opposed to amendments to The Trade Union Act included in Bill 104, I would like to now submit this petition.

**MR. ENGEL:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure that I have to stand up on behalf of some 48 workers in Saskatchewan who understand what the provisions of Bill 104, are, and would urge this Assembly to withdraw bill 104. Under the provisions of rule 11 of the Legislative Assembly, I present this petition.

**MR. THOMPSON:** – Mr. Speaker, under rule 11, I now present another 83 names, containing names of dairy workers, pipe fitters, garage workers, who are strongly opposed to Bill 104 and request that the government withdraw the legislation.

**MR. YEW:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of a various number of working people from Regina, from various trades, who are gravely concerned by the provision so Bill 104, and who are clearly opposed to it and wish to have this bill withdrawn. I present this petition to the legislature, presented under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Under the provisions of rule 11, I wish to present the petition of 148 people, most of whom describe themselves as labourers, who have been moved to use this ancient mechanism to attempt to elicit from the government some compassion, some understanding, and some respect for their fundamental freedoms.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I wish to present this petition to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of concerned working people who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of some 53 working people of Saskatchewan. I submit this petition under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*. I want to indicate that the signatories to this petition are opposed to Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to submit on behalf of a group of individuals, most of them being from the city of Moose Jaw, a petition which expressed their opposition to the amendments proposed in Bill 104, and I would like to now submit this petition under the rules of this Legislative Assembly, rule 11.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislature, a list of 51 working people who are direly concerned about the provisions of Bill 104 and who are firmly opposed to it. I present this petition under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the provisions of rule 11 to present a petition behalf of a number of people – 102, to be exact. Given their occupations, which are in recreation – lifeguards and so on – I would assume these to be fairly young people. Notwithstanding their lack of experience and lack of age, they appreciate what this government is doing to them and they ask that it come to a halt.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I have a good number of petitioners here, working people of Saskatchewan, who oppose Bill 104 and ask this government to withdraw the bill.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present yet another petition to the legislature from a number of working people in Saskatchewan, primarily registered nurses, from the city of Saskatchewan. I submit this petition under the provision of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* and indicate on behalf of the petitioners that they oppose strongly implementation of Bill 104. I so submit.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to present to the Assembly a petition which includes a number of people from the city of Moose Jaw who are wishing me to express through this petition their opposition to Bill 104, the amendments to The Trade Union Act, and ask that the Conservative government look at withdrawing regressive amendments.

**MR. YEW:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of a number of working people, namely welders, pipe fitters, carpenters – all from various areas such as Prince Albert, Duck Lake, Key Lake, Buffalo Narrows, and northern Saskatchewan. I hereby submit this petition on behalf of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* under rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the provision of rule 11 to present a petition on behalf of 119 Saskatchewan citizens, almost all of them women, comprising two heterogeneous occupations, hospital workers and day care worker; homogeneous, through, in the sense that they both care for people. And all they ask is that this government who some compassion for them and withdraw Bill 104.



**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I have yet another petition to present to this legislature on behalf of concerned individual working people of Saskatchewan who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present yet another petition to this legislature from another group of working people in Saskatchewan. I submit the petition under the provisions of rule 11, and I want to indicate that those who signed the petition are firmly opposed to the implementation of Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present to the Assembly a list of names included in this petition who are diametrically opposed to the amendments to The Trade Union Act included in Bill 104. This list includes a number of people, working people, from Saskatchewan. I think the majority would be from the city of Moose Jaw, who wants to use this forum under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures* of this Assembly to express their opposition to these amendments.

**MR. YEW:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition again to the legislature on behalf of 47 working people who are gravely concerned about the provisions of Bill 104, and who are firmly opposed to it, and would like to see this bill withdrawn. This petition is presented under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish to rise under the provisions of rule 11 to present the petition of 144 people. It is not clear how this petition was taken up. It includes people from Saskatoon, Gull Lake, and wide variety of different parts of the province. It seems to include the staff of the fire hall in Saskatoon and a number of farmers at Gull Lake, whose rights are not directly affected, but who understand that if you take away the rights of one individual in society you imperil them all.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11, I wish to present another petition to this Assembly on behalf of concerned working people of Saskatchewan who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present yet another petition to the legislature from a large number of working people in Saskatchewan, primarily registered nurses. I submit the petition under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*, and I want to say that those who have signed the petition are indeed concerned and opposed Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to present to the Legislative Assembly, under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*, a list of names who are included on this petition who are opposed to the proposed amendments which we are dealing with in the Assembly here today and would wish that the Conservative government would withdraw these amendments included in Bill 104.

**MR. YEW:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to present a petition to the legislature, a petition of 47 names from the University of Saskatchewan which lists a number of professors, teachers, and staff. I present this under the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* under rule 7. These petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are firmly opposed to the provisions of Bill 104, and would like to have it withdrawn.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish to rise under the

provisions of rule 11 to present a petition of 123 people, apparently from Saskatoon, all of whom stating that in their view the amendments to The Trade Union Act are not in the best interests of Saskatchewan people and they ask that the bill be withdrawn.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11 I wish to present yet another petition on behalf of concerned working people of Saskatchewan who oppose Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present yet another petition to the legislature from yet another large number of working people in Saskatchewan. In this case they are primarily registered nurses from across the province. I submit this petition under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* and I want to indicate that those who have signed are opposed and certainly concerned in respect to Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to submit to the Assembly under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures* of this Assembly a list of 60 signatures who are working men and women from across Saskatchewan. They do not indicate which town they are from, but do indicate they work and earn their living in Saskatchewan and are concerned with provisions included in amendments to The Trade Union Act, Bill 104, and wish that the Conservative government would withdraw the amendment and the bill.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislature from a wide sector of working people from Moose Jaw, Regina, a various group of working people: truck drivers, librarians, child care workers, and also people from the university I submit this under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* and I wish to state that they are gravely concerned about Bill 104 and are firmly opposed to it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under provisions of rule 11 have a fairly large petition here to present to this legislature on behalf of concerned working people who wish the withdrawal of Bill 104.

**MR. LUSNEY:** – Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of rule 11 I have a fairly large petition here to present to this legislature on behalf of concerned working people who wish the withdrawal of Bill 104.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present yet another petition to the legislature from a number of working people from across the province, in Regina and other cities – again, primarily a group of nurses, who are in fact opposed to the legislature that is being introduced. And I submit this under rule . . . provisions 11.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to submit to this Assembly under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures*, a list of 60 names of people who work in Saskatchewan and are opposed to the proposed amendments to Bill 104, which we are dealing with in the Assembly at this time, and would like the Conservative government to have this bill withdrawn.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislature – a list of 50 names from various working people from Saskatoon. There are various pipe fitters, waitresses, labourers, carpenters, etc. These people are direly concerned about Bill

104 and the amendments for The Trade Union Act that are not in the best interest of Saskatchewan working people, and thereby petition to have Bill 104 withdrawn. I submit such under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the provisions of rule 11 to present the petitions of 32 signatories. Unlike all of the others I have given this does not give their address their occupations – so we know only that these people are concerned about what's happening and they earnestly hope this government will rethink its actions.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition to the legislature from a number of Saskatchewan working people under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* act. Those who have signed this petition are indeed concerned and opposed to Bill 104. I so submit.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, It is an honour to present on behalf of 50 individuals who would like us to submit their names as being opposed to Bill 104 under the rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*, who would like this Assembly to consider the withdrawal of the amendments to The Trade Union Act in Bill 104. I now submit the petition of 50 names.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of 51 working people who are gravely concerned about the provisions of Bill 104 and who would like to have the . . . who are firmly opposed to it and would like to have the bill withdrawn, and I submit such under the . . . this petition presented under the provisions of rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present the petition of a number of signators who urge that Bill 104, which will strip them of their rights to associate as employees, be withdrawn.

**MR. KOSKIE:** – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of some 30 working people throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I submit this petition under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*, and I want to indicate the grave concern that these people who have signed this petition have in respect to the implementation of Bill 104. I so submit.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** – Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit on behalf of 46 individuals included in this petition, who would include dietary aides, RNs, nurses' aides, from the hospital in North Battleford, who are wishing to express their opposition to the amendments to Bill 104, or included in 104, and would ask that the Legislative Assembly would consider the withdrawal of this bill at this time. I submit this petition under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*.

**MR. YEW:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of people from various working groups and classes: truck drivers, meat cutters, housewives, and various other trades. These people are direly concerned about Bill 104 and are firmly opposed to it, and they would like to have the bill withdrawn. I submit such under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present the petition under rule 11, of a number of signators, people who did not expect the election of a

Conservative administration to result in . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — When you're presenting petitions, that's all you're allowed to do, is to make your presentation and not make a speech.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I rise, Mr. Speaker, to present the petition of a number of Saskatchewan people who are concerned with Bill 104 and ask this administration to reverse itself.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am indeed pleased to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of some 48 working people from across Saskatchewan. I submit this petition under the provisions of rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*, and I want to indicate that those who have signed the petition indicate their concern and firmly oppose Bill 104. I so submit.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to submit a list of 55 names under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*. Mr. Speaker, these individuals are from the constituency of the Minister of Labour, and these brave souls have asked us to submit on this petition to this Assembly, and are asking that the amendments to The Trade Union Act included in Bill 104 be withdrawn. I might say as well that these individuals also work for the government so I consider them deserving of some sort of an award.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the legislature on behalf of about 30 working people of various trades who are greatly concerned by the provisions of Bill 104, and are firmly opposed to it, and would like us to have this bill withdrawn. I submit such under rule 11.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the provisions of rule 11 to present the petition of a number of people, most of whom work in the constituency of Estevan. They wish to protest not just to their member, but to all members of this Assembly, the grave erosion of their rights under Bill 104.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate to have an opportunity to submit to this Assembly a list of 51 names of individuals who are wanting us to relay to this Assembly their dismay with the amendments to The Trade Union Act which are proposed here in this Assembly at the present time. I would like to now submit this petition under rule 21 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I rise under the provisions of rule 11 to present the petition of 30 people who wish to protest to this Assembly and hope that somebody will listen to their plea that Bill 104 be withdrawn.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to submit to the Assembly a list of 54 names of individuals who are wishing to use this forum of petition to express their opposition to the amendments proposed to The Trade Union Act which are included in Bill 104, and not only their opposition to it, but they are asking that the government and this Assembly withdraw the bill at this time. I here submit.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the provisions of rule 11 to present the petition of a number of people from Saskatoon who would appear to be associated with the university, who wish to protest what Bill 104 is doing

to them and their rights.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to submit to the Assembly under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures* of the Assembly a list of 51 names on a petition. These individuals, too, are wishing to express their opposition to Bill 104 and asking that it be withdrawn at this time.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish to rise to present the petition of a number of signators from the community of Prince Albert, who wish to protest to this Assembly the erosion of their rights to associate as employees.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to submit to the Assembly a list of 49 names of individuals who work here in the province. They would include people who work as miners, maintenance workers, shift workers, and looking at their place of residence, I would take them to be potash workers from Saskatoon. They wish to express through a petition from their opposition to Bill 104 and ask that it be withdrawn at this time under rule 11 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present the petition of 55 tradesmen from the Regina area who understand what we hope to impress upon the government, and that is that Bill 104 erodes their rights to form a union and work in a union.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit my final petition which I have here today, on behalf of a number of workers in the province of Saskatchewan, 60 to be precise, who are wanting to express their opposition to the government's proposals to amend The Trade Union Act the amendments which they would see as taking away rights, and would ask that Bill 104, being considered by this Assembly, be withdrawn at this time.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present the last petition of Saskatchewan people who pray that this unprecedented display of protest will move the government to withdraw Bill 104.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** —Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Bill 104

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — A question to the Minister of Labour. Mr. Minister, you have witnessed an unprecedented — at least in my time and I wish the Attorney General were here to confirm that because he has been here as long — an unprecedented display of protest. Members of this Assembly have just learned of some 7,000 workers who have voiced their opposition. My office is daily flooded with petitions. There will be more. My question is: will you now table your countervailing evidence that there are thousands of workers who support Bill 140.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Assembly and the member opposite that I have no intention of withdrawing Bill 104. I've been listening and we are with a few House amendments.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – The question, Mr. Minister . . . I'm surprised to learn that you think a few House amendments will pacify this level of concern. I didn't ask you, Mr. Minister, if you're going to withdraw it. I asked you if you would table some evidence of your assertion that there are thousands of Saskatchewan workers who support this outrage.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** – Mr. Speaker, I've told the Assembly many times that I have had a lot of correspondence and a lot of phone calls and a lot of meetings with a number of people around the province – workers in this province – and I have no intention of tabling that information because it wasn't sent to me on that basis.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Well, without, Mr. Minister, disclosing the names which it would no doubt fear retribution by an eight-man opposition, without disclosing their names, could you just tell us how many people have had the courage to put their name to paper to support you?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** – Mr. Speaker, those people that gave me their names gave it to me in confidence, and I have told a number of people on radio shows that I have thousands of names in my office, but I have no intention of tabling them. They were given to me in confidence.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, to give us some evidence of that, some evidence beyond your own bald assertion, Mr. Minister, if you won't give us the names of these phantom people, will you at least tell us how many there were? Were there 7,000?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** – Mr. Speaker, I told the member opposite that we had thousands, and I'm going to stick by my words. There are thousands of the up in my office, but I have no intention of putting their names on the Table.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Are you telling us, Mr. Minister, that there are thousands of people who have described themselves as working men and women who have written to you supporting this? Is that what you're telling this Assembly?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** – Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear the question.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – I don't doubt it; the Attorney-General is so vocal in misinterpreting.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Does the member have a question? If you have, get directly to it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Mr. Minister, do you have 7,000 names of working men and women who support this outrage?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** – Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to embarrass the member opposite if I tabled the thousands of names that I have.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Will you admit, Mr. Minister . . . Mr. Minister, will you admit what is painfully evident to everyone, and that is that you're not tabling them because you don't have them?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** – Mr. Speaker, I do have them, and I'll live and die by that statement: I do have them. But I have no intention of tabling them.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, do you have any which you are free to table? Do you have shred of evidence of any working men and women who will support you in this outrage?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Minister, I've said it many times already in this Assembly in the last 10 minutes. I have not intention of tabling that information because it was given to me in confidence. That's the way it's going to stay.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. I would just like to ask him: prior to brining in his amendments here, did he authorize or did he have any consultation or review of the Georgia model, that is, the labour legislation which is in place in the state of Georgia? And is that in fact what is being imposed on the people of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I have never been in Georgia, U.S.A., in my life before. I wouldn't have a clue what their labour legislation says because I haven't seen it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister whether or not, in designing and introducing the amendments, whether the minister in fact availed himself of the very regressive legislation that is in place in other conservative provinces, such as Alberta. Did you in fact review that as a model?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, we looked at a lot of trade union acts all across Canada, in no specific province — all acts, even the federal act. But the bulk of our amendments came out of the wishes of the people that submitted briefs and that to us from the province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — One further supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister whether he has, as his party has indicated in the past, to introduce in the future the right-to-work legislation here in Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not even going to talk about right-to-work legislation. The amendments proved that we weren't going right-to-work legislation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, you stated last year in this Assembly that you were considering right-to-work legislation — that that option was being considered. Are there, Mr. Minister, further amendments being considered to The Trade Union Act or The Labour Standards Act which will further erode the rights of working men and women?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, we chose a moderate approach to the amendments of The Trade Union Act and that's what we're sticky by. I'm sure that, given a chance to be implemented, it's going to work and you'll see that it's going to work.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you've just witnessed

an unprecedented display of concern by over 7,000 people who don't think it's going to work in their interests. Mr. Minister, does this unprecedented protest not give you any cause for concern at all? Will you not rethink this matter?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, about all that I've got out of it so far is the fact that you've taken up two hours and ten minutes of time to be able to use up that time and not be able to debate the amendments, because you haven't got the support to do it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, it just seemed like two hours; it really wasn't hours. Your mathematics is as bad as our drafting. Mr. Minister, you have 7,000 people who are concerned and have the courage, in the vast majority of cases, to put their address beside their names. I ask you, Mr. Minister, will you not, in light of this, at least let the bill stand over the summer, so that people who are affected may contact and contact members of this Assembly?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to stay here all summer and hear the debate and get the bill passed, because it's needed out there.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, will you not admit that you are ramming this bill through the House to protect yourself yet further displays of concern by Saskatchewan people?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, we gave you an extra 10 days to have a look at the amendments, with no legislature. You had 24 hours a day for 10 days to look at the amendments.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, you misunderstood my question, as you seem to misunderstand so much these days. My question was not whether or not we have sufficient time to deal with it, although that's also in doubt, but whether or not the citizens of Saskatchewan have sufficient time to organize themselves and to bring their point of view to bear on this bill. And that's why, Mr. Minister, I ask you again: will you not let this bill stand over the summer?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, the House Leader will decide that, but it's not our intentions to do so. I would suggest that the people have had nine months to present their petitions, because they've known for nine months that we're coming with amendments to The Trade Union Act.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to address a question to the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour has indicated that he has given . . . that his government is an open government. Here is a piece of legislation which will affect the rights of a lot of working people in Saskatchewan. If indeed you are, in fairness, going to allow the various groups to have an opportunity to examine a bill, why don't you introduce the bill, allow it to sit on the order paper, allow their representative parties to examine it, and then proceed with your bill? Why are you ramming it through the House in a most secretive manner that has ever been witnessed in this province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Give the hon. member an opportunity to reply.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of ramming. You can take all the time you want; we're here to debate, and let's get into the debate and the clause-by-



clause. That's where we need to discuss it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated on a number of occasions that he has had thousands of people writing in to him in support of his position and amendments, I would like to ask him if he would, in fact, detail at least, the time, the place, and the number of meetings that he's had with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour — that major group that represents the working people in this province. Forget about your chamber of commerce individuals. Let us have the list of the meetings you've had with the Saskatchewan labour federation. And you present that to the House.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I can remember one meeting with the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce. I can remember one meeting with the SFL. I can remember one meeting with the building trade. I can remember one meeting with the personnel association. I can remember one meeting with the federated co-ops, and it can go on and on and on. We had one meeting with them all. Anyone that submitted a brief, we sat down with them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd like to ask a further question to the Minister of Labour. He has now detailed that he has in fact met with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour one occasion I would like to ask the minister whether he feels that one meeting with a major labour group in Saskatchewan constitutes good faith consultation by his government, and as a Minister of Labour?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, in my judgement, it was.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, the chamber of commerce had ample opportunity to present their point of view — they drafted the amendments. Trade unionists have not. And, Mr. Speaker, they have had only 10 days to react to this because nobody, nobody anticipated what we got. Notwithstanding that fact, a very significant fraction of trade unionists have responded with a protest, by my calculations a third of a quarter. Mr. Minister, will you not let this matter stand over the summer so that you can surely come to understand what an outrage this is?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that we are here to debate the amendments to The Trade Union Act. We are here to debate it. We have no intention of tabling or not tabling it or carrying on with it during the summer. And that's our stand right at the moment.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, perhaps, Mr. Minister, you'd enlighten the Assembly as to why. What pressing urgency lies behind these amendments that they cannot wait until fall?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to sit here. Have your time to look into the . . . whatever it is that you want to investigate. You've had eight or nine months to do it because you've know that it's been coming for that length of time. It seems strange that you've left it until now.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, we were in error. We quite overestimated your compassion. We did not anticipate this. Mr. Minister, I want to ask you if you really

believe that, when you tell us that this bill take precedent and must be passed before the House deals with anything else, that that really gives an eight-man opposition the option of standing it over the summer. Do you really believe that we have any option but to have this thing passed in a few days . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Give the hon. minister the opportunity to answer.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, so ashamed! I'm not ashamed at all! The whole intent of the amendments is employee rights, and we are going to expand and protect employee rights, give them the opportunity of secret ballot votes, and I don't care if there's another . . . There's no other system in the world where a secret ballot vote isn't the most democratic thing.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Labour. Mr. Minister, you are introducing what is indeed a controversial piece of legislation, and you know it. What I'm asking you is that this session has been sitting for 57 days, and we had a fall session in the old session, and I indicate to you that you delayed the introduction of this bill until the very last so you could ram it through this House. What are you afraid of? Are you afraid of the workers of Saskatchewan? What are you afraid of? Allowing the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to voice their opinion?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not afraid of anything. We took our time to go through this, months and months and months and months. We've been receiving briefs up until a couple of months ago. We wanted to wait and give everybody an opportunity to have their input, and as I said, my cabinet days in Saskatoon have been filled with the union workers and unions themselves coming and talking to us. We gave them the time. We've given them eight months to do it, and that's the reason we never had it ready until now. We wanted to give them that opportunity.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — A further supplement. Mr. Minister, in the bill that you have introduced, will you in fact not deny to this House, will you in fact agree with the proposition that the major changes in this legislation are in fact the changes requested by the chamber of commerce of this province?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I could bring you 12 briefs or 15 briefs that are exactly the same as what's in the chamber of commerce. They're all asking for the same thing. There are co-ops in there too, and could be matched with the chamber of commerce brief.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — One further supplemental. Mr. Minister, you said that your government has been working for months in respect to the preparation of this legislation. What I want to ask you is: in view of the magnitude of the effect it will have on the working people of Saskatchewan, why are you so adverse and completely opposed to give the workers of this province . . . If you agree that it's a benefit to the working people of Saskatchewan, then why are you ramming it through this House? Why don't you leave it over the summer and give the people the opportunity to totally support the bill?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, you've had, and everyone has had, weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks to give consideration to this. You've had two weeks since

it's been tabled . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I'm talking about working people.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Okay . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We are not going to be setting it aside for the summer. We are going to follow through on it and get it passed.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, out of the briefs that he has received — he says he's received hundreds of briefs and thousands of letters — can you tell this Assembly how many recommendations from labour are included from the briefs which are included in the amendments to Bill 104? Will you tell me how many, whether there's one, or two, or zero, recommendations that are in favour of the workers from the brief that you have included in the amendments?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the members opposite there are a lot of items in that amendment bill that have been asked for by the workers of this province. And I get the feeling that you people across the way do not agree with secret ballot votes, you do not agree with employee rights, because that is what is built into the amendments of that act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — A question to the Minister of Labour. He has indicated in answering some question how this bill is going to be so much better for the working people. I ask you: have you received any representation from Saskatchewan Federation of Labour or any other labour unions to delay the implementation?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, certainly we've had representations to delay the bill or do away with it totally. But that doesn't mean that we are going to do that. We feel that the amendments are fair. We want to get some responsibilities built back into the system. We want a good work stability, and the employees out in this province are wanting . . . Jobs are becoming their number one priority and you know it and I know it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd like to ask a supplemental to the minister, If indeed, Mr. Minister, you are convinced that the bill that you're introducing is a benefit to the working people of this province, if you are in fact telling the truth to his legislature, then I ask you, I ask you: why are you afraid to delay it and allow the working people an opportunity to thoroughly join with you in the endorsement? Because indeed they haven't. Why are you rushing it through this house at such a late date in the session? Why are you jamming it through without allowing the people of this province to voice their opinion?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I've said previously many times that there are thousands of employees that have come to us to ask for the amendments and that's what we're coming with . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thousands of them.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, by common admission this is the worse drafted legislation to come before this Assembly in a long time, certainly the worst thing we've ever got from your administration. WE can only assume that it wasn't intentional and that it was done hastily.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Does the member have a question? The member is making a speech and I would ask you to get into the question.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My question is: since it obviously took you many months to make up your mind, why do you deny Saskatchewan workers the same length of time to consider this and respond?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, the workers have been coming to us and asking for the amendments. The unions were here with their briefs and we didn't have hundreds, as the member opposite said. We have 58 to be exact. A lot of them, almost a third of them, are union briefs. The balance, we've been sifting out all of them, trying to arrive at a moderate approach to give everyone the opportunity to have their employee rights, their secret ballot votes, and that's the thing that they're asking for, and we're giving it to them.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, new question. Mr. Minister, only someone of your political persuasion could describe these amendments as moderate. Mr. Minister, by way of background, let me tell you I went through this; I found only four amendments that exist in other legislation across Canada. This is new legislation, Mr. Minister, and surely working people and their associations should have the right for something more than 10 days to consider the ramifications of a bill which is without precedent.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I've said that we are giving you the opportunity to debate the bill, and we'll be here as long as you wish to debate. You'll have your input, and we'll pass the bill.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That's right, Mr. Minister. You will pass the bill and you will do it in a very . . .

## **TABLING OF REPORTS**

### **Report of Chief Electoral Officer**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before orders of the day, I'd like to lay on the table a report from the chief electoral office, who says that he has the honour to submit herewith, pursuant to section 222(1) of The Election Act, a report respecting returns of the election expenses incurred by candidates in the constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake, for the by-election held on February 21, 1983.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. McLaren that bill No. 104 — **An Act to amend The Trade Union Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Order! There's so much noise in the House it's impossible to carry on business. I'd ask the House to return to some semblance of order.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I want to begin by talking about freedom. Freedom is something that the members opposite . . . about which they've had a good deal to say. We heard the member from Saskatoon Westmount tell us how poor people needed freedom — freedom to live in poverty without being assisted by government. No doubt we're going to hear it again and again and again, as the Minister of Labour, with his peculiar views on trade unions, believes that the workers need protection against each other, but none is against their employers — because that's what your documents say, Mr. Minister, is that the union members need protection against their associations, not against their employers.

I want to begin by referring Conservative members to the charter of rights and freedoms. This may sound trite, but members opposite obviously need to be reminded because they have forgotten fundamental freedoms upon which this country was built. Mr. Speaker, section 2 says:

Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of the law . . . everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: (a) freedom of conscience and religion; (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion, expression, and freedom of the press and other media of communications; freedom of peaceable assembly; and freedom of association.

Mr. Speaker, since it seems to be so badly needed by members opposite, I'm going to table this copy of the charter of rights and freedoms.

Members opposite are comparing Saskatchewan to Poland and East Germany. I may say that so, Mr. Speaker, are a lot of Saskatchewan workers. A lot of workers are saying the same thing. I remind the Conservative members of this because they seem to have forgotten that freedom of association is one of the four fundamental freedoms contained in this country's constitution, and in the constitution of virtually every other democracy. Nowhere does our constitution say what the Minister of Labour seems to imply into it. Nowhere does the constitution say freedom of association except in certain circumstances, freedom of association except for working people. Nowhere does Canada's constitution say you're completely free to associate except when you're trying to form a union of working people.

Freedom of association is a fundamental freedom guaranteed by the constitution of Canada. I just read it. There are no qualifiers such as members opposite attempt to put on. There are no conditions. Freedom of association is guaranteed in the constitution without qualification and without condition. I suggest that members opposite remind themselves . . . Oh, we've got the goon squad back again with one new addition. Welcome to the member from Saskatoon Nutana to the goon squad. Every time members opposite get a little sensitive we see coming to this side the goon squad to try to disrupt the Assembly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I say, welcome to one new member. I haven't seen you as part of the goon squad to date. So welcome to it.

I remind the Conservative members, because there are sections . . . I remind Conservative members of this because there are sections in Bill 104, which I will come to later, that

actually attempt to qualify, or put conditions, on freedom of association in the case of Saskatchewan's working people.

Freedom of association, Mr. Speaker, is not something that originated with the charter of rights and freedom. Freedom of association was something that a former prime minister, who must be rolling over in his grave when he sees what people under the same name as him are doing . . . A former prime minister passed in the House of Commons a bill of rights, the Canadian Bill of Rights. And I want to remind members opposite what the late John George Diefenbaker had to say about fundamental freedom.

Part 1 of that act, passed in 1960, states:

It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely, the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law; the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law; the right of the individual to equality before the law . . . freedom of religion; freedom of speech; freedom of association and freedom of assembly . . .

Something that is being denied the Saskatchewan workers.

Freedom of association is guaranteed in numerous international treaties in which Canada is signatory. I remind members opposite, in 1948 Canada signed an international treaty, Convention No. 89, "Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize." I have a copy of a the document here. I'm not going to go through it in detail, but I would invite members opposite to do so, because your bill violates many of the fundamental principles that Canada agreed to observe and respect in this international labour convention . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if members opposite want me to read it, it certainly would be germane, and I could only think it would do them some good.

Canada also signed Convention No. 98, "Right to Organize and to Collective Bargaining," 1949 – another year. I have that document; I have a number of others, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to read from one other. It is the International Bill of Human Rights, the United Nation, again something Canada signed – if I'm not mistaken, when John Diefenbaker was prime minister. Article 20 says:

Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceable assembly and freedom of association.

But apparently not in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, apparently not here.

Freedom of association, Mr. Speaker, has been recognized and supported by a number of clergy, one of who was not the Catholic bishops, not the United Church ministers who signed that today, not Father Bob Ogle – someone who's been dead for almost 20 years, Pope John Paul; this is Pope John Paul II, not Pope John Paul I. But I want to relate to members opposite from his 1981 encyclical called *On Human Work*. The leader of the Roman Catholic Church had much to say about unions of working people and freedom of association, and I want members opposite to see what he had to say about states like Poland, and I suspect he might have said that about

Saskatchewan, had this been introduced in time. And he said, directly for the member from Kindersley who seems to need it:

While work in all its many sense is an obligation, that is to say a duty, it is also a source of rights on the part of the worker. (It is also a source of rights on the part of the worker.) These rights must be examined in the broader context of human rights as a whole, which are connatural with man and many of which are proclaimed by various international organizations and increasingly guaranteed by individual states.

That is true, Mr. Speaker, this bill goes contrary to the flow of our history, of our history. The Conservative government in Ontario, Queen's Park, the Conservative government in Ontario, introduce the bill, which I'm told went some distance toward outlawing strike-breakers.

That is not what this government has done. What this government has done is to make the work of strike-breakers infinitely easier, and to make it infinitely easier for employers to utilize it. What this province is doing runs contrary to the flow of modern history which has been to expand upon, and strengthen our laws which guarantee respect for individual and workers' rights.

Respect for this broad range human rights constitutes the fundamental condition for peace in the most world, peace both within individual countries and societies and international relations. I want to emphasize that last sentence. I want to remind the Minister of Labour that during the period of the former administration during the decade of the '70s, the average time lost for strikes in Saskatchewan was half the national average. That's right, Mr. Minister. Under the, legislation which you are about to destroy, Saskatchewan had half the national average in terms of lost time due to strikes.

Mr. Minister, the 7,000 or so people who wrote in fervently hope that we might equal the national average, much less be below it, because we will not. One of the many things your bill does is to foster and encourage strikes, disunity, and disharmony in labour-management relations.

I shall, Mr. Minister, get on in a moment to the way that your bill does that. If you lose the page . . . The document, I may say, I got from the library is not the easiest to use. I want to remind members opposite who treat this as such a joke, I want to remind them of what the same Pope, Pope John Paul II, who has . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He is not. I indicated I was in error when I said it was Pope John Paul I. I want to remind members opposite what he had to say about unions and their place in society. They are not, as the member opposite seems to suppose, an instrument of oppression for working people. That is the whole context from which your bill is drawn up, that unions are an instrument of oppression to working people, and along comes a white knight on a big white charger to save union people from themselves, because unions have nothing more than an association of themselves, because unions have nothing more than an association of themselves. I want to remind you, Mr. Minister – since you need it so badly – of what Pope John Paul II had to say. In section 20, the "Importance of Unions:"

All these rights, together with the need for the workers themselves to secure them, give rise to yet another right: *the right of association*, that is to form association for the purpose of defending the vital interest of those

employed the various professions. These associations called *labour or trade unions*. The vital interests of the workers are to a certain extent common for all of them . . .

I will pick out another couple of sentences, which I think are particularly germane to the minister who has proceeded on talking about worker rights, obviously implying that's worker protection from the union. That's obviously what you're saying. The member might well profit from reading the whole thing, but I don't intend to do that.

The experience of history (talking again about trade unions) teaches that organizations of this type are an indispensable *element of social life*, especially in modern industrialized societies.

It may be the assumption of the minister opposite that the Tory wrecking crew is going to so thoroughly de-industrialize Saskatchewan that we will have no use for trade union. That may be your assumption. It's not mine, because I don't think this administration is going to last long enough in office to accomplish it, although you're making brilliant progress to date in the de-industrialization of Saskatchewan. Well, I want to go on.

Catholic social teaching does not hold that unions are no more than a reflection of (a class interest) . . . and that they are mouthpiece for a class struggle . . . They are indeed a *mouthpiece for the struggle for social justice*, a mouthpiece for the struggle for the just rights of working people in accordance with their individual professions.

Skipping the next sentence and going on:

Even if in controversial questions the struggle takes on a character of opposition towards others, that is because it (being the trade union) aims at the good of social justice, not just struggle for the sake of "struggle" . . . (which is what the Minister of Labour seems to ascribe to trade unions). It is characteristic of work that it first and foremost unites peoples. In this consists its social power . . .

You saw some of it today. And if you insist on passing this legislation in its present form, you will see it again. I spoke last night of my memories, many of them fond, of the former premier, Ross Thatcher, as an individual; I say "as an individual." I grew up four miles from the man's ranch. Long before I was in politics many of my memories of Ross Thatcher as an individual are warm. But I remember him passing Bill 2. I remember that self-satisfied smile on his face – the type of smirk which I see upon members opposite – and I tell you he was not long in regretting it, because bill 2 was a factor in the defeat of that government.

So I say to members opposite: if you don't feel it now, you will come to feel the power of working men and women bonding together to struggle for social justice. It goes on:

. . . it is clear that, even if it is because of their work needs that people unite to secure their rights, their union remains a constructive factor of *social order* and *solidarity*, and it is impossible to ignore it.

I want to repeat that.



... their union remains a constructive factor of *social order* and *solidarity*, and it is impossible to ignore it.

One more paragraph, Mr. Minister, and I'm going to leave this.

Speaking of protection of the just rights of workers according to their individual professions, we must ... always keep in mind that which ... conditions the specific dignity of the subject of work. The activity of union organizations opens up many possibilities in this respect, including their *efforts to instruct and educate* the workers and to *foster their self-education*. Praise is due to the work of the schools, what are known as workers' or people's universities and the training programmes and courses which have developed and are still developing this field of activity. It is always hoped that thanks to the work of their union workers will have more, but above all will be more.

Mr. Minister, if you're done nothing else, this despicable bill, I suspect, will breathe a great deal of life, as there has always been, but it will breathe a great deal of activity into workers' labour schools. Mr. Minister, my point is that working people in Saskatchewan, as elsewhere in Canada, are guaranteed the fundamental freedom to band together as they wish, and no government, no matter what is majority, has the right to place conditions, qualifiers on that fundamental freedom, and no government, no matter how large its majority, will succeed in doing so in the long run.

I tell Conservative members this: even though your large majority may ram Bill 104 through this legislature, at some point, Mr. Minister, your government is going to be called upon to defend this legislation before another tribunal – a tribunal where the number of sheep in back-benchers' clothing won't be the deciding factor. That, of course, will be the tribunal of public opinion. You are not going to enjoy defending it in the long run before that tribunal any more than the late Ross Thatcher did. He had the same arrogant smile I see on members opposite – that smile which said what I've heard from so many rednecks and I just believe them. There are other people out there ... I say to the minister opposite: there are other people out in society besides those who would tear away at workers' rights.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, let me come to the question of why so many workers have used their freedom of association over the years to band together in unions of working people, and there have been many reasons. To understand those reasons, you have to understand the history of Saskatchewan. Others have spoken eloquently about life in our province in the early days, about how harsh the climate was and how that harsh climate made individuals feel so vulnerable, so exposed, but they learned to protect themselves by banding together, co-operating, as we often say in Saskatchewan; about how those pioneers often turned to collective action to fight against common enemies such as the powerful railway and grain trade monopolies which gouged individuals at every turn.

So, Saskatchewan because in many a unique place – a place where collective action, whether you call it social solidarity, whether you call it co-operation, whatever you call it, became the norm rather than the exception. And with that came willingness on the part of the Saskatchewan people to then submerge their own self-interest to the common good. That was why the principle which led to the creation of the wheat pool, of the producer and consumer co-operatives, and unions of working people, had such a strong growth within Saskatchewan.

Unions, like wheat pools, like consumer co-operatives, like credit unions, were organizations formed to work for the common good of their members, where each member had an equal voice, where the minority was listened to and respected, but here the majority ruled. It is against that special backdrop that early unions of working people were formed.

Why did working people feel the need for collective action? For the same reason people all over the world feel the need for collective action to try to improve their working conditions, their share of the wealth for their toil; for the reason so eloquently started by Pope John Paul II.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the member from Saskatoon University would like to introduce a group of students. I'd be quite happy to stand aside, provided I wouldn't lose my priority in this debate.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. FOLK:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and thank you to members of the opposition for the leave. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of 62 students from Greystone Heights Elementary School in Saskatoon. They're in grade 5 and 6. They're accompanied today by Jackie Semchuk, their teacher, and other chaperones. I've already had the pleasure of having my picture taken with them, and enjoyed some refreshments with them, and fielded a few question. I'd ask all members of the Assembly to join with me in wishing this group a very enjoyable stay here in Regina. We hope you've enjoyed it here on your tour of the Legislative Building, and a very good trip back to a great city of Saskatoon. Thank you very much.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **SECOND READINGS**

##### **Bill 104 (continued)**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In Saskatchewan as elsewhere, these associations of workers often met strong resistance from employers. On rare occasions the employers have had the active backing of a right-wing government, and that, Mr. Speaker, has violated the fundamental sense of fair play the Saskatchewan people have, and those right-wing governments which have trampled over workers in Saskatchewan have historically met a quick end. I ask members opposite to consider that, to consider the history of governments which have tried to trample on workers' rights.

Against the powers and prerogatives of a powerful employer, what chance does an individual worker have to improve working conditions unless that individual worker is able to band together in common cause? To listen to some members opposite talk, one would think that workers in the smallest plants and the in the smallest shops organize themselves, and that it was small employers and small-businessmen who were beset by this conspiracy. Of course it's just the opposite. The earliest associations and the

earliest unions were by workers who worked in the largest plants and the largest shops and they had the most difficult time in contending with an employer. Individually they were that much weaker and of course the employer was that much stronger.

By any standards, Saskatchewan's record of labour-management peace and progress is one of the best in Canada. But it is far from perfect. Our province has had its black marks. During the 1960s some of the provision, which are being re-enacted in this bill, were in our labour legislation then; they caused nothing but havoc. I refer members opposite to the provisions requiring . . . which gives an employer the right to ask for a strike vote after 30 days. I say to members opposite that was in the trade union legislation in the '60s put in by the late Ross Thatcher. It had a horrifying effect on strikes. For reason that are not entirely clear why that happens, but that seems to be the pattern. It may be that after a couple of weeks employers realize that their employees are capable of forming a union, are capable of staying out, and are capable of hurting them if it carries on. It may be as well, in fairness, that the employees have missed a pay cheque and they're beginning to understand that a strike hurts. But it's well known among conciliators that the third week is crucial – the third week is the key week in settling a strike. If you miss that you have missed a golden opportunity.

What the minister is enacting with this strike after a 30-day period is that it will be virtually impossible to settle the strike until after the 30 days have elapsed, because there will be no room for negotiation, no room for moving, no room for conciliation as long as that mandatory vote hangs over the heads of those involved in the negotiations.

So this province has had its black marks. The 1960s were a black mark. And then, as I predict, will be the case in the '80s, at least the first portion of it during which time you're in office. In the '60s this province had a strike record which was far worse than the national average. It was the worst in Canada. It was because of legislation the likes of which we now see being re-enacted.

You can go back further than that – in the time of yet another Conservative administration. You don't have to ask a working person, "Why unions?" If you read the history of the Estevan coal-miner's strike you wouldn't have to ask. If you had read the documents and the accounts – they are in the Attorney-General's department – of Black Tuesday, September 29, 1931, the day when three striking miners were murdered by the police as they attempted to hold a rally in that city . . . I urge members opposite to read those accounts, then visit the graves of those three miners in Bienfait, and then come back to the Assembly and speak on Bill 104. I ask members opposite to broaden their horizons to that extent.

You wouldn't have to ask a working person, "Why unions?" if you listened to the story of an employer, who in a rage during a labour dispute in 1973, threatened to bulldoze his plant with the workers locked inside unless they agreed to his demands. I urge the Premier in all sincerity to investigate that incident, and then explain why that employer – the general manager of which was the current Minister of Labour – how that employer who did that could be fit today to the Minister of Labour and to be introducing this particular bill.

So this point, I hope that I have established two things for the benefit of Conservative members opposite. The first is that working people, like everyone else in this country, enjoy the fundamental freedom to associate as they wish, and that freedom is guaranteed by the constitution of this country. And I suggest to members opposite that

it would be wise, wise indeed, to refer these amendments to the court of appeal for a decision on their constitutionality before they're enacted, because I say Mr. Minister, that these amendments may well be contrary to the charter of rights, denying, as they do, working people their fundamental freedoms.

I can guarantee the minister of one thing. One of the ways the workers of this province will test your mettle is to challenge these courts, because I've no doubt but what the court of appeal will have an opportunity after they're enacted, if you don't do it before, to challenge this legislation. It will be done as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow morning.

Secondly, the second thing I hope I've established in the minds of members opposite is that, in spite of the fact that Saskatchewan has a relatively good record of labour-management relations, there are valid and compelling reasons which have encouraged working people over the years to band together. They have done so.

I want to ... (inaudible interjection) ... The member from Prince Albert says more petitions – there will be more. There will be more as the people of Saskatchewan come to understand what the arrogance of 55 seats ... how the arrogance of 55 seats can warp the judgement of a government. People of Saskatchewan are coming to understand what 55, 56 seats means. What I means is that your judgement is warped and you don't listen. We sat today and introduced an unprecedented number of petitions, something that ... I have been elected since '75. I've been associated with this Assembly in one fashion or ... or since '71, as has the member from Quill Lake. The member from Qu'Appelle, previously the member from Lumsden, goes back into the '60s, and there is no precedent for what we say today. The arrogance – you could have cut the arrogance in this room with a knife – notwithstanding an unprecedented protest.

Let's contrast that, Mr. Chairman, with the record of the CCF and NDP with respect to working people. From its creation, the CCF in Saskatchewan was a movement of working people, both urban and rural. One of its earlier manifestations was in fact a party called a farmer-labour party. The CCF grew out of the farmer-labour party. That party had a commitment to working people, to ordinary people. It had a commitment to people and not just to the railways and the banks and the Montreal corporate lawyers; it had a commitment to ordinary people.

This commitment was manifest in many ways. Support for co-operatives of all kinds – this province was in 1945, remains in 1983, the only province with a department of co-operatives. What that evidences is a solid commitment by Saskatchewan people to working together. Farmers may call it co-operatives; working people may call it unions, but it is the same phenomenon. There are policies and programs which strengthen family farms. By the time the CCF left office, farmers in Saskatchewan enjoyed a prosperity which was without equal in Canada, and that government enacted a sound statutory framework for working people in the struggle to better themselves.

Throughout the years, the successive CCF and NDP governments, this statutory framework had developed into four distinctive acts. The Labour Standards Act, about which I predict that we will see, in this government's arrogance, I predict we will see a further erosion of workers' rights by amendments to The Labour Standards Act. I would be delighted to think that we might get through another session without amendments to The Labour Standards Act, but I just do not believe that. I wonder how the minister is

going to justify that, because The Labour Standards Act basically deals with unorganized workers. You can hardly defend unorganised workers against the unions. I wonder how you're going to justify that particular bit of pandering to the business community.

The Labour Standards Act sets out minimum standards for wages, hours, and working conditions, to which every employee is entitled. It makes no difference if that employee is unionized or not; it makes no difference whether that employee is working for a small business or a multinational corporation; it makes no difference whether that employee is working in urban setting or a rural. Regardless, that employee is guaranteed certain minimum standards by law.

When we left office, Mr. Speaker, many of these minimum standards, including the minimum wage, were the best in Canada. I question, Mr. Speaker, how much longer that will be the case. I question whether or not that pinnacle of legislation will survive what years this government has left in office.

The Occupational Health and Safety Act was yet another corner-stone. This act was the first of its kind in Canada, when it was introduced by the NDP in 1972. Many jurisdictions have attempted to copy it since, but it remains the best in the country by far. And this law quite simply recognized the rights of individual worker with respect to health and safety issues in their workplace. It recognizes and it is built on a worker's right to: (1) know about any hazardous conditions in the workplace; (2) participate in decisions about workplace health and safety; and (3) refuse hazardous work.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that last year there were 50 per cent more man-hours lost due to accidents, compensable accidents, by the workmen's compensation board – 50 per cent more time lost due to compensable accidents by the workmen's compensations board than due to strikes. The Minister of Labour thinks that the amount of time we have lost due to strikes is abominable. I wonder why he is not concerned about time lost due to accidents, why we saw occupational health and safety gutted, as we did. But perhaps the member is coming to that; perhaps the minister, in his unique way, once he finished The Trade Union Act, will turn his brilliance to The Occupational Health and Safety Act.

The third corner-stone of workers' rights is the workmen's compensation act. The act provides compensation for victims of industrial accidents and for the survivors of those who die from work-related injuries. Under the NDP, this law was much improved in 1974, after a comprehensive review of a joint employer-employee review committee. IN 1979 a new act was introduce by the NDP, which greatly increased the benefits available to injured workers and the spouses of fatally injured workers. Last year, after yet another review by a joint employer-employee committee, our government was prepared to increase those benefits once again. We have waited over a year. We know this government is sitting on those recommendations, that the Minister of Labour has repeatedly promise to make a decision on them, but no doubt is having difficulty getting back to his desk to do so.

The fourth pillar of workers rights in this province, enacted by the CCF, was The Trade Union Act. It was with a sense of pride and accomplishment that the first CCF government under Premier Tommy Douglas introduced Saskatchewan's first trade union act in 1944. It was the first industrial relations statute of its kind in Canada. It wasn't until three years later that the Parliament of Canada passed a similar law at the

federal level. Other provinces eventually followed the Saskatchewan lead.

In 1944 Tommy Douglas looked to a number of precedents, one of which was the US. Statutes. You know, Mr. Minister, you have been successful in spreading the myth that Saskatchewan's legislation is vastly different than other provinces, that it is a difference of a kind. I say, Mr. Minister, that is just not factual. It is just not factual. Indeed, if you read Canada's labour legislation, most are very similar to Saskatchewan's because they followed Saskatchewan's. What they lack is some of the refinements. Some of them lack them all. Some of them lack only some of them. But the difference in this province's trade union legislation and other provinces has not been nearly as marked as you suggest. The difference now will be very real, because the kind of things, which you are introducing, are, by and large, without precedent. It's by and large without precedent.

Saskatchewan's trade union legislation, as it exists today prior to the passage of Bill 104, is relatively simple and straightforward. It embodies four major principles:

First: individual employee rights. The law guarantees workers the right to organize as they see fit, and if they so choose, to bargain collectively with their employer. It acknowledges, respects and protects the basic right of workers to decide whether or not to establish a union at their work place without any interventions and without any interference from their employer.

The second is collective employee rights. While the law provides extensive protection for the rights of individual workers, it also defends them collectively. The law recognizes and protects workers as a group, once they have decided for themselves, of their own volition, to form an organization – not matter what the name, whether it be called an employee association, trade union, or whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to have a look at the House. What we see is symbolic of the interest members opposite have in the workers of Saskatchewan. In a debate in which they . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Right. In a debate in which their very rights are being taken away – and by far the most controversial piece of legislation this session – there are six members. Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues were to get up and leave, you would be forced to close this Assembly. That is the kind of interest members opposite have in the rights of workers.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the recognition that Saskatchewan laws gave to workers as a group once they decided for themselves to join a union. The law requires that the majority of workers must support the formation of such an organization; 50 per cent of those who are eligible to vote must vote in favour of forming the union; the majority must support it or sustain it as a simple practical matter; and that a majority of workers can have such an organization broken up or decertified, as it's called, as their exclusive bargaining agent. And that happens on occasion.

To listen to the members opposite you would think that workers have no control over their unions. As you are wont to describe them, the unions are instruments of oppression. I tell you that, unlike many of the employers, union representatives are elected, and union representatives are defeated when they're not doing their jobs. Unions can only be formed by a majority of workers. If they aren't serving a useful purpose, workers can and do vote to decertify.

The collective rights section of The Trade Union Act recognizes that, as in any democratic body, the majority rules, and it has throughout the history of this province.

The third major principle of the current law is the specific references to unfair labour practices. The law sets out many specific labour-management practices which are illegal. It forbids certain acts by an employer such as interference, intimidation or coercion I say, Mr. Minister, that the amendments which you introduced seem designed to do nothing other than encourage employers to interfere, to intimidate, and to coerce their employers.

At the same time, the existing legislation forbids certain acts by employees, as individuals or through their organizations. The rules are there. They are specific, and they have served this province well.

The fourth and major principle in The Trade Union Act, as it exists today, is that it is meant to help not hinder the collective bargaining process. I would remind the minister that during the period of time when this legislation was in existence — during the '70s — Saskatchewan had a lost-time record half the national average. If Canada's lost-time — lost time due to strikes — if Canada's average was Saskatchewan's average this would be a different country. This would be a different country, Mr. Minister. Unfortunately it isn't, because in the national level and other provinces, Conservative right-wing governments with close ties to narrow-minded business groups have held sway. And regrettably this legislation is now being torn apart.

The current law establishes an unfettered, unencumbered statutory framework within which collective bargaining can take place without unnecessary interference. It does not place petty, foolish and cumbersome restraints on the collective bargaining process, and I'm going to object in a moment to some of it — restraints which you place on collective bargaining which I think will serve us very, very poorly.

It does not, for example, require conciliation or mediation to take place prior to a work stoppage. It does provide the parties with a legislative framework to voluntarily accept conciliation. By definition the only way conciliation can work is if it's voluntary.

It's our belief, Mr. Speaker, that the fewer obstacles we put in the way of both sides sitting down and bargaining away their differences, the better. That's the major principle behind The Trade Union Act. We can put our money where our mouth was. We introduced that in 1973. We ushered in a period of labour-management peace which was unprecedented since the '50s. It brought to an end the dark years of strife which the former Liberal administration had introduced in the '60s. And that period, which I suggest for some time will be viewed as a golden period in Saskatchewan's history, has again been brought to an end with Bill 104.

Let us look for a moment at what the results of this legislation was. Members opposite would have us believe that the legislation — The Labour Standards Act, The Workers' Compensation Act, The Occupation Health and Safety Act, and The Trade Union Act — heralded a period of unprecedented disaster. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, it heralded a period of unprecedented peace and prosperity — a period which many people are looking back on nostalgically, wish they had not brought it to an end last April a period which many people can hardly wait to re-establish whenever you people have the courage to call another election.

The point must be made, Mr. Speaker, that during the '70s under this comprehensive, positive NDP policy towards working people the whole of our province benefited. The NDP policy towards ... (inaudible interjection) ... One member says I've knocked

them right out of their seats with this speech. I have indeed done that. There are only about eight left in the House.

The point must be made, Mr. Speaker, that during the '70s under this comprehensive, positive NDP policy towards working people, the whole province benefited. This NDP policy towards working people just didn't permit economic development in our province. It didn't just permit it – it made a positive contribution to it, just as surely as this legislation will make a negative contribution towards economic development. The record is clear on that point. During the 1970s, Saskatchewan created new jobs at an unprecedented rate, an average of 9,000 new jobs each year. That average was met during 1981, the last year we were in office. Members opposite may not want me to recall the record during 1982 when this wrecking crew took over. And you're going to need to create 9,000 new jobs for some time to come to undo the damage you people have done. The Trade Union Act will be part of that damage.

During the period of that administration, members opposite would have us believe that The Trade Union Act drove businesses out by the score. In a bizarre document that I'm going to get to called "Background Notes on the Proposed Trade Union Act," we see the comment repeatedly made that amendment to The Trade Union Act are necessary to restore investor confidence. I ask members opposite if they aren't admitting they are sacrificing the needs of working people to the get-rich-quick schemes of a very few. I ask members opposite to consider the very injustice and inequity of justifying these amendments, however bad they may be, by saying it's necessary to restore industrial confidence. But I also ask you to examine the truth of the statement and hold it up against the historical record.

In 1981 and in the '70s new investment in our province grew at an unprecedented rate. It's averaged increases of 19 per cent a year. Our relative position with respect to the economies of the other Canadian provinces was much improved. Saskatchewan went from being a have-not province to have a province during the 1970s under the NDP policy for working people. The Trade Union Act, which you people believe you need to tear apart to restore investor confidence, brought unprecedented investment into this province. Saskatchewan went from being a have-not province to a have province during the '70s when this legislation was brought in.

Let me just give you one specific example of what this kind of atmosphere did for Saskatchewan in the '70s. In 1971 the Saskatchewan per capita income was 20 per cent lower than the national average – a very considerable difference. In 1981 Saskatchewan's per capita income was higher than the national average – a remarkable change in status – and that came about in a period in which a government was in office that enacted a large number of acts which benefited working people but when they benefit working people, they benefit everyone. Surely members opposite must understand history if they do not understand the trade union movement.

In summary, the NDP policy for working people helped this province through a decade of prosperity and progress for the entire economy. What this government is trying to do is to rewrite economic history, to suggest that somehow or other The Trade Union Act, and The Labour Standards Act, and The Occupational Health and Safety Act, and The Worker's Compensation Act were obstacles to economic growth. Of course, the opposite is true. That legislation brought in an unprecedented prosperity to this province.

I want to turn, Mr. Speaker – as time is drawing on – I want to turn, for a moment, to the



principle behind the NDP's policy towards working people and the principles enunciated by this government in Bill 104. I want to remind members of the stark contrast between the former administration and this administration . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yeah, there's quite a contrast. "That's right, " the member from Prince Albert says: and we saw the result of that contrast today of petitions containing the names of over 7,000 people.

Let's take a moment to contrast the principles behind the NDP . . . We're being distracted by a note from the government House Leader actually that I'll come to in a moment. And I may say for the benefit of members opposite that I will co-operate with the request made. I want to take a moment to contrast the record of the NDP administration – the period of peace and prosperity for all – and the principles enunciated by this bill, and I want members opposite to ask themselves how on earth they believe this bill is going to maintain, never mind foster, the prosperity and peace which this province used to enjoy.

I, at many times, called this piece of legislation the chamber of commerce bill, and have done so with good reasons. It is an employers' bill. It incorporates only suggestions made by the employers. It speaks to the bad experience that some employers have had, and the Minister of Labour in particular in the past. I do not like bringing up personalities. When I see a Minister of Labour who allows his bitter personal experiences to be reflected in legislation, I think I would be derelict in my duty if I did not.

It ignores entirely suggestions which have been made by individual workers and their representatives. I do not believe, Mr. Minister, that the briefs which you took from working people were all intended to be confidential. I do not believe you will be breaking the confidence by introducing them in this House. I will tell you why you will not table those briefs, because they are uniformly opposed – they are uniformly opposed to the legislation which you have brought in. It would be amusing, Mr. Minister, if it were not so tragic. Your comment that you have thousands of letters supporting this legislation would be amusing if it weren't so tragic. It would be amusing because no one who is in any way familiar with the minister's office would believe that.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that you have no support on this thing from working people.

The minister kept telling us that working people have applauded the bill, and that he received thousands of letters. I say, Mr. Minister, that applause came to a sharp conclusion when they saw the bill. The number of workers who have applauded the bill in recent days have been noticeable by their absence. The member from Quill Lakes offered you the opportunity to give those legion of supporters out there a chance to rally to your side and delay this legislation. You didn't take it, with good reason, because there aren't any. I wished, Mr. Minister, you had the courage to admit that. You haven't the courage and of course there aren't any such thousands of letters.

I see five principles underlying Bill 104, this chamber of commerce bill. The first is a false assumption that there's a fundamental difference between workers and their unions. Mr. Minister, the workers are the unions. Only a majority of workers can establish a union, only a majority can sustain one, and only a majority can at any time switch to another union. A majority may even, and on occasions do, revert to non-union status. A union is not, as Conservative members opposite seem to believe, an

institution that can exist or function without the support of the majority of the workers involved; it can only function with the support of the majority of the workers.

The second principle of this bill is that it is designed to reduce the rights and protections of individual workers; not increase them as the Minister of Labour claims ... (inaudible interjection) ... If the member thinks I'm out of order, why doesn't he call a point of order?

For example, I say the provision of this bill which says that there cannot be a second certification application after one has been successful, for a minimum of six months, reduces and restricts the right of individual workers to associate or organize. Mr. Minister, we both know where the bizarre provision comes from it. It comes from an incident in 1973, Morris Rod-Weeder, where a certain employer couldn't resist dancing on what he thought was the graves of the union representatives – did so in such an obnoxious fashion as to irritate all the workers who promptly contacted the union, promptly held another vote and certified. That's the explanation for that.

As I say, Mr. Minister, when you allow bitter personal experiences to be reflected in this legislation, we would be derelict in our duty if we did not bring that to the attention of the public. As I've noted earlier, there's a fundamental freedom guaranteed by the constitution of Canada, and that's being violated.

Another example is that now an employer can threaten an employee with the loss of seniority rights for simply trying to exercise his or her rights under the law. Mr. Minister, in wrapping up, I really hope you explain how that protects workers' rights – how that protects workers' rights.

The third principle is that this bill reduces the rights and protections which workers have now collectively enjoyed. This is the minister's and the Conservative government's assault on the principle of collective action, of social solidarity. Someone said a moment ago that these proceedings reminded them of Poland. Oh, how that is true. The workers of Poland know the principle of social solidarity, and they know what it means, and aptly named their union movement "Solidarity" as they struggle against the oppressive measures of an anti-democratic regime in that nation.

I suggest that the Minister of Labour knows what the principle of social solidarity means as well. I suspect he found that out through bitter personal experience at the Morris Rod-Weeder Company. In solidarity there is strength in workers, and you seek to reduce that strength, Mr. Minister. This bill is your attempt to weaken the social solidarity of Saskatchewan workers.

The fourth principle is that this bill is designed to strengthen the hand of employers, and it will almost certainly do so. Every single provision of Bill 104 will substantially strengthen the enormous power that employers now hold over employees in Saskatchewan.

The fifth and final principle I find in this Conservative bill is the most interesting and the most bizarre. It is that Bill 104 introduces heavy-handed, cumbersome state intervention in the collective bargaining process. But, of course, there are two rules, are there not, Mr. Minister? There are two rules, are there not? There is, as we have said before on other occasions, socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. It's getting the government off the backs of the business community, but getting the government on the backs of the workers. There are, are there not, Mr. Minister, two

standards, depending upon whether or not this government perceives these people to be friends or enemies? This from a government that preaches that it's the best government which governs the least. Yet here they are imposing bureaucratic red tape and interference on the collective bargaining process.

Provisions such as the 48 hours notice of a work stoppage, possible required strike vote after 30 days – provisions such as these are not productive. They do not facilitate collective bargaining and quite simply amount to state intervention in the entire collective bargaining process.

Mr. Minister, it was a fundamental principle of the legislation introduced by the former administration that workers and management would be free to work out their problems themselves without a good deal of interference. You, Mr. Minister, have driven a tank over top of that principle.

I want to continue, Mr. Minister, in a somewhat different vein. I want to take time now to respond to the points which the Minister of Labour puts forward, as the reasons why Saskatchewan must have Bill 104, and the changes which Bill 104 introduces to labour-management relations the documents I referred to, "Background Notes on The Trade Union Act," speaks repeatedly of labour-management relations, and that seems to be a simple argument that this stripping away of worker's rights is necessary to enhance investor confidence to encourage investors to come to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, when Bill 104 was first introduced, I called it a way station on the road to right-to-work legislation; a way station on the road to labour laws such as now exist in southern Dixie states; Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas. And the kind of talk we have heard from the minister about the need to boost investor confidence is the kind of talk we hear in those seven jurisdictions. It's the same old open for business pitch and, Mr. Minister, I did some checking into that pitch that has been formulated by the American state of Georgia, because we've heard a lot in recent months about the Georgia model, and about this government's plan to make Saskatchewan Georgia North. I've discovered that the pitch we heard from the Minister of Labour is very similar to the pitch which was used to sell the state of Georgia to prospective investors. And I am fortunate enough, Mr. Minister, to have with me a document which is in fact that brochure and it rings with the very same phrases, Mr. Minister, as what I have heard you use in your background notes.

Let me just quote a couple of those for you. Here's the boast – the state of Georgia's – and it's so reminiscent of what we saw in your publication:

The pro-business attitude of state government (this is Georgia speaking) . . . The pro-business attitude of state government has given us the most streamlined environmental permitting procedure in the Southwest as well as right-to-work legislation free port tax incentives, a fair and taxable equitable tax structure which allows industry to pay only its fair share. Georgia leads the nation in the percentage of labour-management elections won by management. Georgia prohibits public employee collective bargaining (Is that next, Mr. Minister?), strikes by public employees.

Mr. Minister, will it be your proud boast someday if Saskatchewan will lead the nation in the number of labour-management disputes won by management? Will that be your proud boast? It may well be, Mr. Minister. It may well be.

This right-wing government has coupled its open for business talk with anti-worker laws. That of course was the case with the Thatcher government. It was the case with Bill 2, The Essential Services Continuation Act. It's remarkable, Mr. Speaker, how the language then and the language today is so similar.

I want to refer Conservative members to the 1965 throne speech debate. When Premier Ross Thatcher told this Assembly ... It's a direct quote; it might have been lifted out of your documents: "And the welcome mat to private enterprise is out." Time and time again, our ministers have invited business men from Canada, from France, Germany, and the United States to locate here. It didn't work in the '60s; it won't work today. I warned Conservative ... (inaudible interjection) ... Who built the potash mines? By and large, the CCF did. By and large, the potash mines were all in place before 1964. If the member had any understanding of Saskatchewan history, you'd know the accuracy of that statement.

I warn Conservative members that your lack of understanding of Saskatchewan history – not just the potash mines, but the labour history of this province – is going to be your undoing. I just ask you to reread the history of the '60s. Ross Thatcher came to power promising to create 80,000 new jobs in four years. How reminiscent that is ... (inaudible interjection) ... The member from Prince Albert asked me if I've ever belonged to a trade union. I'll never find out the truth of your status, because if you did, no trade union would ever admit to having left such an unblemished right-winger behind.

The only way, Mr. Thatcher said, the only way to encourage private enterprise to come into our province was to use regressive labour laws. But you know, the welcome mat wasn't worn out. It wasn't then and it isn't now. Between 1965 and 1971, unemployment in Saskatchewan increased by 63 per cent. My, how reminiscent that is. Real investment in agriculture declined by 36 per cent. Real investment in primary industry declined by 49 per cent. Total real investment ...

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I'd like to interrupt the hon. member to advise him that we would like to take time now for Royal Assent, and he will be recognized again when the House begins tomorrow. At this time the House will prepare for Royal Assent.

## **ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS**

At 4:47 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave Royal Assent to the following bill:

Bill No. 105 – An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal year ending on March 31, 1984.

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 4:49 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:50 p.m.