

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

May 8, 1980

EVENING SESSION

Priority of Debate (Continued)

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the motion which was, as far as we're concerned as official opposition, adequately put before the Assembly by the member for Nipawin.

I think there have been a number of very good arguments furthered, Mr. Speaker, on this motion. I think there are a number of issues which the government finds itself in a very difficult position to defend. Certainly the Minister of Labour will have a very difficult time defending this position regardless of when the strike is settled — even if the strike is settled tonight. For some reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel the strike will be settled fairly soon. I don't know why, but I do feel it's going to be settled very soon.

The Attorney General is concerned about my comments with regard to labour unions. Yes, I have a sixth sense. That gives me four more than you.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to have any difficulty whatsoever discussing and then running by the government once more my personal feelings with regard to labour unions, and what they're doing or not doing for this country and for this province.

More importantly, I want to talk very briefly about the Minister of Labour and his responsibilities on behalf of the Department of Labour. One of our members asks, where is he? He's out negotiating. I think that's good. I think that's where he should have been a long time ago. It was unfortunate that a motion had to be put before the Assembly, and that the time of this Assembly had to be taken up forcing the Minister of Labour to take action. He's a minister of inaction, as can be seen by his record.

When we look at what we have, we have a recognized and reputable organization, the Dairy Producers' Co-operative, which I don't mind saying I very much defend, notwithstanding the fact that possibly it would be a good idea to have another outlet for dairy products. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if we did not have just a Dairy Producers' Co-operative but also had another source for the dairymen of this province to ship their milk to, then we would not be faced with the emergency it is today.

I feel that having Dairy Producers' employees represented by, I believe, four different unions, makes the job of the Minister of Labour much more difficult. I just don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how negotiations can take place when the organization is represented by four different unions. In particular two of them, the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union and the United Food and Commercial Workers' Union, are actually competing with each other for a greater share of the membership of Dairy Producers' employees, each one offering a better package than the other.

I think that when the situation exists as it does in this particular case, it makes it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for negotiations to take place. Certainly a labour dispute of this nature with the ramifications it's having on the dairy industry in the province of Saskatchewan, further eroding the total agricultural problem that we have in this province, is, to say the least, a volatile situation.

May 8, 1980

This isn't the first time this has happened. If that in itself is enough reason for me to stand in this Assembly and say, yes, I'll put the agricultural industry and the farmers of Saskatchewan before labour unions, then so be it because I do. The farmers of this province are not unionized. Farmers, I say again, are not unionized, and if the hon. member for Moose Jaw is suggesting that the farmers' union is a union as such, well, then he's out to lunch because the farmers' union is not a union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the farmers, the dairy producers in particular in the province of Saskatchewan, are an efficient lot of people, hard-working individuals, and I know what it's like to work seven days a week . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, now the hon. member suggests that I have never worked seven days in my life. Obviously either he has had too much for supper or doesn't know what he is talking about, and I would suggest that it's likely the first one.

Mr. Speaker, I do know what it's like, having been in the dairy industry myself. I know what it's like to get up early in the morning, seven days a week, 52 weeks of the year, 365 days, year after year. For seven years I was in the dairy industry in a concentrated and specialized way. I never had to dump my milk because of a labour dispute. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House, that had I been faced with the situation of having to dump my milk because of a labour dispute, I would have been in the Minister of Labour's office or the Minister of Agriculture's office or both for that matter.

I think that we have had in past years and we have again this year, a very responsible position taken by our dairymen. Their marketing and costs are governed by the milk marketing board, and the prices they receive for their product are in direct relationship to the cost of production. But when you look at the total costs, Mr. Speaker, the consumer must bear for a litre or a two-litre carton of milk today, it's becoming every day more evident that cost increases are coming, not because of the farmers' profits increasing, because we all know they are not. Their net profits are decreasing, we are finding, because of increasing demands made by unions.

When I say a few words and speak out against unions in this particular instance, we are not talking, Mr. Speaker, about the rank and file of unions. We are talking about those individuals who are at the head of unions who seem to promote what many times seems to be unreasonable demands. I just noticed in the paper today that Dennis McDermott had a \$5,000 increase proposed at the CLC convention in Winnipeg, putting his salary now at \$55,000. That's in the neighborhood of two and one-half or three times what we get paid, Mr. Speaker. You know, we hear all kinds of quips being tossed across — well, he does five times as much as you do — and irresponsible and senseless statements, but they're all coming from the back rows because what brains are on that side of the House are pretty much in the front rows.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I want to urge the member for Moosomin to stay on the topic. The matter is put forward and in order to be in order it must be a definite matter and it must be of urgent importance. If it's a definite matter it must be stated in the resolution and it's a definite matter. There's nothing in the resolution about the president of the CLC or his salary or the brain-power of the government front benchers or backbenchers. I wonder if the member can stick to the subject.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I can stick to the subject. To do it might be difficult, given the narrow scope, but I suppose one could say there's a strike; it should be resolved right away. Then I might have to say it again and again. But I don't think, Mr. Speaker,

that is my position in this House. What we're dealing with is a broader problem than just a strike of Dairy Producers' employees. We're looking at why the Dairy Producers' employees are striking. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the strike is because of a conflict between two labour unions. You take that one step further, Mr. Speaker, and then you have to ask yourself why are two labour unions in conflict with each other for the employees' membership? Then, Mr. Speaker, you have to take it one step further to say is it because of the vested interests of those who are at the top of the labour unions? Mr. Speaker, I suppose that's why one has to move away from the very narrow concept of the motion put before us.

Certainly we're looking at something a lot bigger than just a strike, Mr. Speaker, in Dairy Producers' Co-operative — as if we don't have enough problems in this country right now and in this province in our agricultural industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at something even further than that. Where does it go? Where does it end here? We have Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which handles 80 per cent of our grain,. What if the employees of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool were to go on strike? What would the Minister of Labour do then? What would the Minister of Agriculture do then? Nothing, like they've done in this strike? Nothing, because this government's policy is straight grain and no diversification?

Mr. Speaker, is that the issue? That's the issue as I see it. I'm not just looking at this motion in this strike. I'm looking at the other strikes which could come and could well come in the next year or two. The Attorney General knows right well that I'm not far off base. I'll tell you I'm not so far off that you can tag me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been at all times, since I became a member of this party, a well-balanced respect for labour union, not just in Saskatchewan, but throughout the breadth and width of this country. We see that respect in a balance, a balance between management and labour. That's what is not in place here tonight as we discuss this motion. We have an imbalance, obviously. If we didn't have an imbalance we would not have a strike. We have an imbalance between management and we have an imbalance between labour, so that's the problem, Mr. Speaker. If we could get that balance back in perspective, Mr. Speaker, we would not have this strike which we're looking at right now. Those are the concerns, Mr. Speaker, which I have.

Now, I'll sum it up by saying this. When it comes to a third party, being affected by a labour problem, I will stand in support of that third party. In this case that puts me in support of this particular motion. That third party is defenceless, absolutely defenceless. Mr. Speaker, I'll say it again. If it comes down to putting agriculture before labour unions, then that is where I'll be — agriculture in this province before labour unions.

AN HON. MEMBER: — A man of integrity, that is what Birkbeck is.

MR. BIRKBECK: — At the same time, I can still have a good respect and an understanding of labour's function and of a union's function. I think that is fair. But when it goes so far, Mr. Speaker, as to affect innocent and defenceless third parties, then it has gone too far for me to tolerate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that concerns me as well is that it is morally wrong, Mr. Speaker, if this government believes (as I have to think it believes) that it is for the people and for the little guy. It doesn't make much sense to lose such a wholesome product as milk when food is in such demand throughout the world because of a labour

May 8, 1980

dispute, because of two unions fighting with each other. That doesn't make much sense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the reasons why I would support a motion of this nature. And I, Mr. Speaker, accepted your ruling (I do now) that it should be discussion on the motion, not get into other subjects. At the same time, as I have described, it is a concern that I have that goes beyond just this situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think those are a number of issues people need to be concerned with, certainly the members of this Assembly need to be concerned with. It is not a matter of whether or not we're for or against unions. That's the issue the government will make. That's the old line argument. Tories are for the multinationals. They are for the labour unions. Well, if that is the situation, then it doesn't make much sense, Mr. Speaker, for this government. It is in partnership with multinationals. I don't know of any labour union that we're in partnership with. Certainly, I'm not. So I don't want to see that kind of an argument made. Whether or not you or this opposition support labour unions is not the issue. The issue here is simply that there seems to be a rivalry between two unions. When that becomes the case, then all members of this Assembly have to concern themselves, regardless of where they fall regarding labour unions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by saying it is incumbent upon all members to exercise what I think is their responsibility and take a serious look at the situation regarding labour, not just in Saskatchewan but in this country, to see that there is a fine balance between management and labour. I'm not saying one is all bad and the other one is all good. I'm not saying that. I'm saying they both have their place. They are both to be respected. It is for us to try to maintain that balance which I think will maintain harmony throughout all industries affected by management and labour. That's the issue. That's the concern I have. If members address themselves in those regards then, Mr. Speaker, we will not be confronted, nor will our dairy industry or any other industry in the province, be confronted with situations as they are now.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset of my remarks this evening, I, for whatever reason, have a funny feeling it's going to be settled fairly soon. Therefore I would say I will be supporting the motion. Thank you for the time of the House.

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)): — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had not intended to enter the debate today because I really think it's a needless debate. I don't think we should have been here at all because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I know more about dairying than you do.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I wonder if the members can keep the level of the undertone down because I am having trouble hearing the minister.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, members of the opposition in today's debate, I'm sure were looking for a way to beat their breasts to try to make themselves the champions of both sides once again. It seems to me that in debate that's what they have been trying to do. I can see the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current raising the issue because they need, very desperately, to try to find some friends out there. I suggest neither one of them will find the kinds of friends they want on this issue because I don't think their case is well put.

The member for Rosthern prattled away for about half an hour and said very little except that he berated everything to do with labour. I can understand him for doing it because that seems to be what he always does.

The member for Moosomin spent a long time discussing just about everything except the subject, and managed in the process to find himself constantly and continuously being on one side of the subject. He was constantly saying that somehow or other the debate was because there were two unions fighting on an issue and we were caught in between.

I can remember very well being in this same situation two years ago. We didn't have two union at that time. We were dealing with only one union and we had this same kind of problem. So I don't think he should suggest it is because there are two unions trying to resolve their problems in this process.

I think the members will be well aware that the government is totally aware of the seriousness of the situation which is before us. I don't think we needed the members opposite to tell us that. I think we have been aware of it for many days. We and the Minister of Agriculture have been working diligently to try to resolve the problem. We regret as much as anyone that no agreement has been reached up tot his time. We are, nevertheless, committed to let the bargaining process take place in its normal manner as long as it is possible a solution can be reached.

The Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Labour and I believe, the Minister of Consumer Affairs are, at the present time, in fairly serious discussion with the respective parties and they would have been, regardless of whether those fellows over there raised the issue. I know we have long been waiting to try to resolve this problem. I think that the ministers, in their present activity, will, before a great deal of time passes, be able to give us some better information.

As I indicated, two years ago I was in the same position. We sat for hours in negotiation and the people in this House, the members opposite, were screaming and banging the table and saying that somehow or other because they were the people who had brought the situation before us, we were in negotiations. We were there long before you guys even thought about it. It was not a very pleasant task, Mr. Speaker, to be down there and speaking to the two respective parties when they were very, very intense in their negotiations — with the bells ringing up here, with people banging on the door saying, what's going to happen, when are you guys going to get it settled? That's not the right kind of situation, Mr. Speaker, for proper negotiations to take place, and I suggest to you that all we are doing here is complicating the situation, and irritating the situation. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we did not need from the members opposite any coaching as to what needed to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I've spent more time in a dairy barn and around livestock than any other member in this legislature, and I think that even covers the dean of the House. I guess I've milked more cows and cleaned more barns and sat out in the cold more than any one of you guys, so I know what it is. I know what it is when somebody's production is cut off, and when you have problems with production and losses in agriculture. No one needs to tell me that story. So my sympathies, Mr. Speaker, are very much on the side of the producers in this situation. I know how many dollars they have invested in the industry, and I know what the financial implications are in this situation.

I know it is most essential in this industry that production be maintained at a very high

May 8, 1980

level, because I do know we are facing real problems with regard to production and maintaining our quota. I know farmers out there know this and are very concerned about it.

I think, however, Mr. Speaker, knowing all of these things, it is important for us to recognize there is a bargaining process going on here which has to be allowed to work. I'm confident, given the time and given the effort which is now being made, an agreement will be reached, and we will not have to take any precipitous action at the present time.

I think we have to consider that both sides in this issue have a responsibility. It is not just the labour people who have a responsibility, or just the processors who have a responsibility. Unfortunately, the producers get caught in the middle. However, the processors, I think, have in this issue a major responsibility. They are the people by and large, who represent the producers because almost all the producers in Saskatchewan are members of the Producers' Co-op, and they are one of the sides in this issue. So I think it is important to recognize that while they are being hurt in the process, they have some remedies through their own producers' organization. I think they should not be let off the hook lightly on this particular issue because I think it is important they recognize that through their own organization they have to apply the kinds of discipline which they want us, in this House, to apply. I don't think this is the place to apply it. I think they, as processors, are as aware as we are of the importance of what loss of production means. They know it means reduction of the viability of their own industry and they know it means the viability of their own plants, and thereby it means the viability of the whole industry in the province. So I think they are well aware of the seriousness of the situation.

I think labour unions as well are aware of some of the serious implications. I'm sure the members of the unions who are sitting in negotiations right now are thinking very seriously about what would happen to their jobs if the industry were to go down the drain, as some of the members opposite seem to suggest it might. I'm sure the members of the unions don't want to lose their jobs. There are 800 people in that industry and I'm sure they don't want to lose their jobs, so I'm sure when they are sitting there in discussion tonight they have these concerns in mind.

I know it is very easy, Mr. Speaker, for farmers to have a hate for unions because farmers are, I suppose, the most unprotected group in society. Maybe that's partly their fault, but nevertheless, it's very easy for farmers to become upset because unions are at various times, in various places, creating problems for them which they seem unable to do anything about. So I have a great deal of sympathy with the farm population out there when they are upset over what's happening here. Nevertheless, I think it would be improper and unwise for this House to precipitate any kind of a premature activity when the negotiations are in the stages that they are right now. I was there two years ago and we were in the process of doing exactly what's happening right now. Had we listened to this House, we would simply have interjected ourselves into a debate where we really shouldn't be at all. We would have been called upon on many, many occasions to do the same thing. Once the government interjects itself into those kinds of negotiations it's pretty damn difficult to back out.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, while all of us are frustrated about the slowness of the negotiations and all of us know the problem which is hanging over our heads, we should let the process work, give it a little bit of time. I'm sure the proper solution will be found. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I too as the last hon. member who just spoke, wasn't going to enter this debate, but now I can see it's necessary.

Mr. Speaker, when the former minister of agriculture stands up in this legislative Chamber and states this is a needless debate, then I say to you, Mr. Minister, shame on you. shame on you. Then in the next breath, you turn around and say, you have sympathy for the farmers of Saskatchewan. What are you doing? Once again, you're flipping the coin — two sides of the coin. It's just exactly what you're doing.

Mr. Speaker, during the supper hour, I had numerous phone calls from dairy producers in my constituency, just one constituency in the province. I'd just like to express to you and to the members of this House just how it is affecting these young farmers who have gone into the dairy business with FarmStart loans . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the Attorney General, if you want to get into the debate, get into it later. Until then, just put a lid on it.

Mr. Speaker, the first young family is Eddy Dewold. They have 23 cows. Thirteen hundred pounds of milk are going to be dumped Sunday. The Ollenberger family milks 30 cows. Three thousand pounds of milk are going down the tube Saturday. Lorne Kohlman, 3,700 pounds of milk, Saturday; David Brosinsky, 2,300 pounds; John Heck, 3,000 pounds, Friday; Ben Gartner, 2,400 pounds (He's lucky he's got a big tank, he can hold until Monday); Alex Kohlman, Friday morning, 8 o'clock, 3,300 pounds; Schachtel, Saturday morning 3,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, this is only eight producers for a total of 22,000 pounds, turning out approximately 8,800 quarts of milk at about 65 cents to a quart. Six thousand dollars of milk is going to go down the drain. but, Mr. Speaker, I want to add this. This came from the dairy producers in my constituency. The said, where does the NDP government want the milk, on the legislative steps or in the Minister of Labour's office or the Minister of Agriculture's office? They'll deliver it, starting tomorrow morning. We're going into a strike here. We're into a strike here, Mr. Speaker, that, if everyone would have sat down at the table a month ago, we wouldn't have. Twenty-two thousand pounds of milk going down the drain starting tomorrow morning.

Now, they also said, who is going to pay for this milk? Is the government going to pay for it? I doubt that very much. The innocent victims, the producers of Saskatchewan are only a small group, a small voting group, but the big political machine of the NDP isn't concerned about that small group of producers, about whom my colleague from Moosomin quite clearly said, they're up at 5 o'clock in the morning, seven days a week, in a year-round job, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell us how bad the unions are.

MR. GARNER: — Look, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General wants to get into this, I imagine there will be time later tonight and hopefully he will stand up and tell the dairy producers of Saskatchewan that his NDP government is going to pay for this milk that goes down the tube.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell us how bad the unions are.

May 8, 1980

MR. GARNER: — Oh, tell us how bad the unions are. If you and your colleagues had sat down a month ago . . . You laugh; it's a big joke.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Seventy-five days.

MR. GARNER: — I don't care about 75 days; you won't sit down and negotiate. You wait until something has happened and it has happened. Now who is suffering? The dairy producers in Saskatchewan; does this government care about them?

AN HON. MEMBER: — It is your fault.

MR. GARNER: — My fault. Now it's my fault the Attorney General says. It's not my fault at all. If we were government, I can tell you right now, we would have sat down a month ago, we would have been negotiating with them, we would have been talking.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Seventy-five days.

MR. GARNER: — Seventy-five days. You sound like a broken record, just like your government. It's a big joke, Mr. Speaker, we have young farmers in Saskatchewan. If this strike continues they will fold. We have lost 8,000 farms in Saskatchewan already. We're going to lose some more, thank to the NDP government. Thanks to the NDP government, Mr. Speaker, we're going to lose some more farmers in Saskatchewan.

Maybe this is what the Minister of Agriculture would like. After all, he stated there should be no diversification, everyone should go into grain farming. Maybe this is just one more step; they have to sell the cows off and seed the rocks to wheat.

Mr. Speaker, it is very evident who this government is thinking about. They are not thinking of the people of Saskatchewan. And one very important point, Mr. Speaker, that has to be brought into this debate, is the waste that is going to start taking place tomorrow morning.

Now, everyone of those members opposite should be hanging their heads in shame because every time a quart of milk goes down the drain, there are starving people in the world who could use it. But that doesn't matter. What's 22,000 pounds of milk, or 800 dairy producers being hurt? This is the attitude the NDP government has when it concerns rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the young farmers are going to suffer and suffer very badly. I think it was a very good suggestion my colleague for Qu'Appelle brought in today, that we should stop the clock and be ready because just maybe we can save some of this milk from being poured outside on the Legislative Building steps. The shocking part of this is that it goes right back to the new minister of municipal or urban affairs or rural affairs (he keeps changing portfolios so often, I never know where he is at). The former minister of agriculture stands up and says it's a needless debate and then on the other hand, he turns around and says, I have great sympathy for them.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour who sits there and shakes his finger; the Attorney General who sits there clacking all the time; the Minister of Agriculture who wants everyone to go into wheat farming. Mr. Speaker, this is an old tired government. The only new idea they had was Bill 13. They picked that up from Peking and Moscow last summer. I will be supporting the motion.

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I think it's somewhat unfortunate that some of those opposite would use this opportunity to bring true collective bargaining, which is recognized in our North American continent, into disrepute in this House as it has this afternoon. I might suggest that when those people opposite try to suggest to the people of Saskatchewan and to the members of this House that they are truly interested in the dairy farmers of Saskatchewan, it's a my thing and they're being political opportunists. They have no issues whatsoever to stand on so they have to try to manufacture one when there's an unfortunate situation at this time.

It's rather remarkable when I can see the hon. member for Moosomin talking in one breath about how he believes in true collective bargaining, the trade union movement, the individuals who belong to the trade union movement. And in the second breath, if I understood him correctly (and that's rather difficult most of the time), this afternoon he was saying the trade unions are not people. I might suggest to the hon. member opposite that he reread what he said this afternoon. Trade unionists are people of Saskatchewan and people of North American and people of the world.

As I listen to those opposite, there isn't a question in the world that they would be really disappointed if a settlement were reached within minutes. When I listened to the question period yesterday, exactly two hours and five minutes after a work stoppage occurred, not across Saskatchewan, but in particular locations, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle was on his feet, urging the government to pass back-to-work legislation — two hours and five minutes, immediately after the clock hit 2 o'clock.

I listened to another member this afternoon, the hon. member for Rosthern, who tried to suggest that he's the labour representative of the Conservative Party. I'm not certain, Mr. Speaker, whether he has a union card or not. I understand he was a janitor with CUPE, which is a wonderful job. I agree that all jobs with all unions in all occupations are respectable. But, it's amazing when I hear him say he has sat down at a negotiating table and he has personally made exceptions to the rule of law, as he said the other day. He has personally made exceptions in order to facilitate certain individuals including himself. I hope he's not a member of CUPE now.

When I listened to him this afternoon, it amazed me to think that the member for Rosthern ever sat at the bargaining table — heaven forbid and God bless those people to come out with anything if he did. It amazed me when I listened to him and realized what he was saying. He was really saying on one breath: I love the unions; I love the people in the unions; I'm a unionist and all the rest of it. I said unionist, not Unionest. I suggest that if we really look at what he was saying this afternoon, he is saying he believes in true collective bargaining. But then he flip-flops and says look, we have to limit the responsibility of the unionists involved in CUPE or whatever it may be; we have to limit their responsibility and even two hours and five minutes after a work stoppage has occurred, put them back to work.

Now I don't know where the hon. member for Rosthern learned his type of true collective bargaining, but I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that he has never taken a course through the Canadian Labour Congress; he has never taken a course through the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. I would doubt if he's ever been to a trade union meeting where they talk about true collective bargaining.

I can understand the hon. member for Moosomin. You know, he's here and he's there; he was trying to say the Conservatives believe in true collective bargaining.

May 8, 1980

MR. KATZMAN: — Point of order. The member has suggested I have never been involved with the trade union unionists. I wish to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The member for Rosthern shows little regard for the decorum of this Chamber and I want to take this opportunity to say that to him. In future he should pay more attention to the decorum of this Chamber. That is not a point of order.

MR. SKOBERG: — I don't think there is any question at all that the hon. member for Rosthern probably, deep down, believes there is collective bargaining. And I think it's unfortunate, really unfortunate, that the Devine policy had overcome the deep-down philosophy of true collective bargaining.

There's no question in my mind whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that when we look at the resolution or the motion introduced by the Unionest member for Nipawin, that it must have been the Devine policy and the Devine instructions which told those Conservatives opposite how to react to his type of resolution. I'm sure we'll all be most interested in reading Hansard tomorrow. We'll be rather interested to see what those people really think of the citizens of Saskatchewan that do belong to a trade union.

It is also interesting to listen to the expression of opinion from the hon. member for Rosthern who must be the official spokesman for labour on that side. He talked about two unions being involved in conflict.

When I look at the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, I wonder, when he was a member of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (he's probably out of scope now), whether he thought his agreement that he submitted for conciliation or arbitration or for true collective bargaining, should read exactly the same as a caretaker's. He knows and I know that doesn't happen. When we have individual contracts up for resettlement or negotiation, nobody says what shall be in the contract except the membership.

And across the way, I look at the hon. member for Regina South. I can appreciate the mirth on his face because I know some of the things that happened with the CBRT (Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport & General Workers) in negotiating with that hon. member. I don't use names as the Conservatives have done consistently. But when I look opposite, there's no question in my mind that those people believe the union members of Saskatchewan are second-class citizens. They believe they do not have the right to use the democratic process of free collective bargaining. And this afternoon was a typical example when the Conservatives, in particular, were standing up and condemning collective bargaining, free collective bargaining. I hear the hon. member for Moosomin talking about Marxists and all the rest of it. Perhaps he would do a little reading and studying on the socio-economic policies of the trade union movement and the whole policy affecting Canada at this particular time. He never went any further than that. There's no question in the world about it.

Mr. Speaker, there's not a question in the world that in any democratic work stoppage which occurs in this province or any other province, someone suffers. There's not a question in the world that the most unfortunate ones who suffer are the consumers and those people who are producing the goods. But I might say this, those very same people that the hon. member for Wilkie, and of course he's a past master of bringing names in . . . He tried that yesterday. He's doing it again today. I wonder how many of those people he named today probably have to go to the labour market for a job and probably

belong to a trade union movement somewhere in this province or elsewhere.

The deliberate effort of the Conservatives, in particular, to divide the farmer from the union member, is apparent. Any farmer who knows anything at all about what goes on within true collective bargaining recognizes that. They don't like it. We don't like it. Nobody likes it when a work stoppage occurs. But the fact remains — that is democracy at work. It may be slow. it may be difficult, but the fact remains you've got to let it work itself out.

For those opposite to approve the motion as it is presented now, and when we look at the clock, we see a deliberate effort to prevent a settlement tonight. Those opposite do not want a settlement because they would have no issue left. Nobody doubt that whatsoever. I'm surprised at the member for Nipawin introducing the resolution. I expected it from the Conservatives opposite, particularly the official voice of labour over there. But the fact remains that it was introduced. The position taken by the member for Nipawin isn't the position now being taken by the Conservatives.

I'm suggesting that the hon. member for Nipawin has been taken in by the rhetoric which has been going on this afternoon by the Conservatives. I would also suggest that he did not condemn the labour movement, if I listened to his statements correctly this afternoon, when he introduced his motion. In fact I didn't hear the member for Swift Current condemn the labour movement as each and every one of you have done when you stood up on the Conservative side.

Mr. Speaker, the right of self-determination is vested in the membership of any trade union. When I listen to the hon. member for Regina South say from his seat, nonsense. That's how little he knows about the trade union movement. He'd rather deal individually with an employee than collectively with a trade union movement which has been certified in this province. He knows it. He'd rather have an individual who he could subject to the worst type of working conditions than collectively have a bargaining unit which could talk about conditions, terms of employment, and all the rest of it.

All I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that there is room for true collective bargaining. Those opposite have indicated, in the most extremist manner this afternoon, that they do not believe in collective bargaining. I don't think, there's any question about that whatsoever.

All of us realize, Mr. Speaker, that the motion we have before us really spells out one thing — whether or not we believe in democracy or compulsion.

When I listened again to the member for Rosthern, when he was talking about the Minister of Labour, saying, why didn't you do something, what have you been doing, and all the rest of it, I thought that he knew better. I thought that really that member for Rosthern might know a little bit. You do not involve government in the democratic process of collective bargaining. But it's quite true, when I listened to him this afternoon, that he doesn't realize that.

Again, I expected from the hon. member for Moosomin because he wouldn't know labour from farming or whatever it may be. There is no question about that.

If we want big government to move in on every facet of our life, then that's what they are recommending over there. The Conservatives are recommending that big government move in. They are saying the co-ops and those trade unions involved in this particular

May 8, 1980

dispute shouldn't have the right to negotiate, that the Minister of Labour should immediately move in and say to those people, look, you are not going to democratically negotiate a collective agreement. You are going to do as I tell you as the Minister of Labour.

You know, it's unfortunate this debate has occurred when negotiations are going on. It's remarkable, Mr. Speaker, that those opposite don't realize the conflict between two trade unions, in this particular case, has nothing to do at all with the issues at hand. If one union serves notice on the management, that management will respond to that certified union. If another union which has also requested bargaining within the collective bargaining process serves notice, they will respond to that. Responsible management and responsible unions can, collectively, come to an agreement if the politicians keep their noses out of it.

It's amazing, and I mentioned this yesterday or the day before sometime, in the Ottawa scene, if any member of the House got up about a contract under dispute, the then Minister of Labour Bryce Mackasey, he, forever and a day, would say, let the collective bargaining process take its course. That's as far as it went. Then when Lincoln Alexander became the Minister of Labour under the Conservatives, exactly the same thing. Lincoln Alexander said we have true collective bargaining, let that bargaining take its course.

But somewhere, this band across the way called Conservatives, all of a sudden decide they are going to negotiate a collective agreement within this Legislative Assembly. And when the hon. member for Rosthern stood up and started reading proposals that were put before management, it was hard to believe the man could possibly have said, I once sat at a bargaining table.

Proposals aren't the final ultimate in so far as management or labour is concerned. Anyone there should know it, particularly the member who is the superintendent of schools now, or on leave, I presume, from Indian Head-Wolseley. He knows when there are proposals put forth, that's the starting portion. He suggested maybe that some of the proposals are a little foreign to the language that I just heard, and didn't agree with them. Maybe now he is acting as the superintendent and that's understandable. I presume at one time he loaned . . . Oh, he's the principal, maybe he was in scope. I'm not all that sure. Maybe he does have a card. I wasn't all that certain about that.

But what I'm really saying, Mr. Speaker, is the motion we have before us at this particular time really means those people are not prepared to let the normal and democratic process proceed. I think most of them opposite truly believe there is a democracy in this country, truly believe there are responsible people on both sides; things aren't dictated to that person or that person. The management side, the board of directors and the executive, whoever it may be give directions to those people negotiating. The labour side, meetings are held, executives sit down and discuss what shall be submitted. I know that the hon. member for Regina South believes me when I tell him that the individual leader of a trade union, no matter which trade union, does not at any time lay down the direction he shall follow without the sanction of the membership.

It amazes me when I look across the way and see the laughing faces of some of them, particularly Regina South. I understand and appreciate why he would laugh, because he doesn't understand true collective bargaining. But the fact remains that the real problem here today is that we are not giving the method of consultation and

determination a chance to work, I have a feeling there are a good number opposite who are a little disappointed this ever came to the floor today, without at least giving those people a chance to sit down in some serenity, to try to do their best to work things out. But rather than that, they ran out the clock this afternoon — ran out the clock — and then if the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Consumer Affairs had run out of the building, what would they have said? They would ask hey didn't you stay here and listen? Listen to what? Listen to a condemnation of our democracy at work. That's all I heard all afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support any resolution I have heard around here today, or any point I have heard around here today, because all I have heard is a condemnation of our democratic process. And I am sure when I look at the hon. member for Moosomin, and the one for Rosthern, and the one for Wilkie, who is not here right now . . . He is probably out trying to drag a few names out of the gutter somewhere. But when I listen to those people, there's no question at all that they are not interested in a settlement of this strike. I am interested in a settlement. I am interested because people are being affected. People throughout this province are being affected, and on this side of the aisle there's no question in my mind that this party, and our ministers who are responsible are prepared to go the extra mile to bring about a settlement without having it dragged through the rungs of parliamentary procedure on the floor of this House. And it's not deserving, particularly for the House Leader of the Conservatives to be a party to this, because he doesn't believe in it. And there are many of them across there who do not believe in it; we all know that.

Mr. Speaker, let's conclude this debate now. Let's conclude it and get on with business, and let those people who are vested with the responsibility of bringing about a settlement, sit down and try to bring about a settlement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, it's a good thing we have debates like this in this House because the backbenchers, like the man from Moose Jaw, have something to say, although he didn't say anything. We are not too happy to be backbenchers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General wants his turn, would you give him his turn, or can I have my turn?

Mr. Speaker, something is very odd here tonight. The last three speakers have really been upset about the member for Rosthern. They have never said a word about milk. They have been going after the member for Rosthern. I just want to, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, put it on record that he did have a little bit to do with collective bargaining unions and what not. The member for Rosthern used to be the manager of an indoor artificial ice rink, a chief shop steward for CUPE 59, several years on union negotiation teams and head of the occupational health union side, as well as the representative of Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, as well as representative of Canadian Federation of Labour at several different times. I say the member for Moose Jaw South doesn't know what he is talking about when he is condemning the man for Rosthern. But I say right now is the time to quit talking about one another in here and let's get back to the issue and that's the dairy farmer.

Did you people over there not read this? It sure is evident the last three speakers never even read the motion. Now, since the member for Nipawin has not been our leader, I do not condone what he does. But this motion he put in today, everybody in Saskatchewan should be behind.

May 8, 1980

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — They are not interested in 800 dairy farmers having the milk being thrown out in a very few days. No. I wish, Mr. Speaker, very much at the bargaining table tonight, (which I understand has come to an end now, they will be meeting again at 11 o'clock), for goodness sake, for the dairy farmer and for all concerned in this province, that it is settled. But if it isn't settled tonight, Mr. Speaker, I put the blame right on the Minister of Labour for not doing it before today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — I put it right there and right there, Rosthern and Moosomin. That's where I put it.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, when we speak out of order and do too much talking in here, we are called out of order. The Attorney General seems to be in the conversation at all times. When he wants his turn, he can have his turn but it is my turn right now, Mr. Attorney General. And I have very little to say except you people over there (and I can pick you all out) . . . I saw the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon was very concerned about this situation. I could tell by looking at the man he was down and out. He is the only one. The Minister of Labour and the rest of you people have never even milked a cow in your life. You don't know what it is like. Yes, also the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural) looked pretty sad this afternoon too.

I have raised, Mr. Speaker, looked after and milked more cattle than the Attorney General has ever seen so I am not interested in his remarks. I know what it is like, Mr. Speaker, to be a dairyman tonight. Now they have been laughing over there when they said 200 and some dairy people are going to go out of the dairy business if this isn't settled in three or four days. Well, people don't believe that. But there have been too many strikes, too many unsettled strikes. They cannot afford to keep on with strikes because they don't know where they are at.

Two years ago there was a serious one. Now, I hope, like I said before, this is settled tonight or over this weekend. And if it goes over the weekend, it is too late.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They are talking right now. They are talking right now.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — They are not talking to them, Mr. Speaker, right now. They are not meeting again until 11 o'clock tonight. Mr. Speaker, I hope for the sake of the dairyman that they are talking right now. I hope they talk all night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — And talk and talk and talk and don't quite and don't go to bed until it is settled. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, if I were the Minister of Labour or Minister of Agriculture, this never would have come to this. It would have been settled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I know why the Attorney General is so concerned about the unions. There are only about 1,500 votes when it comes to the dairyman but there are quite a

few more when it comes to all the union votes. That is all he is interested in is votes.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's all he is interested in.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — One more thing on this subject, Mr. Speaker, and that is if this is not settled tonight, I'll put the blame directly on the Minister of Labour — not the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture stood up and said eh didn't mind taking what the member for Indian Head-Wolseley had to say. He didn't mind. He's agreeable. I talked to him about it out in the hall, heads down, like this. But do you see the Minister of Labour like that? No, he has that look on his face: I could care less about the dairymen. He's only interested in the labour people in this province. He's the Minister of Labour and that's all he cares about — votes and his own position.

His constituency, Mr. Speaker, happens to be in the city of Moose Jaw. If he were out on the farms like we are, where you get the talk from the grassroots people, he wouldn't be sitting over there laughing. I didn't see the farmers over there smirking and laughing this afternoon. They were said. I could pick them all out. Mr. Speaker, no one on this side of the House will be taking the blame for anything.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'm not having any trouble hearing the member for Arm River. If he'd just keep talking, I'd keep listening.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, when I do speak, I speak quite loudly and I don't want to have to talk over again. I thought people couldn't hear me. That's why I had to quit talking. I didn't want to have to repeat it.

But, Mr. Speaker, at least I've been talking about the dairy farmer. It's better than the last three speeches I've heard over there. All they mentioned was the member for Rosthern, it seems to be that everything that happened in this House since I've been here (over a year, two session) anything we bring up, any issue that happens in this province, I don't care if it goes to DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) or where it goes, all of a sudden it is the PC's fault. I say, Mr. Speaker, when they start putting the blame on us in 1982 and/or '83 we'll be government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, who are laughing about this, want to go to their own constituencies tonight, get on the telephone and start phoning people because it's not just the dairy farmers who are going to be suffering. If the Attorney General didn't watch television last night, he should have because the consumers who want the milk for their babies also want this settled. There are people in the Attorney General's constituency who would like to have this strike settled. They like milk too. The dairyman wants to sell the milk and the consumer wants to buy it.

You know as well as I do what's going to happen here. If it isn't settled over the weekend, in comes the milk from the outside provinces. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite now this as well as I do. They're not interested in the dairy farmers of this province. They could care less about 1,000 to 2,000 capitalist votes. They say let them go. We don't need them. They don't have them to start with. They're not worried about it. They're worried about their own votes, the union votes. But they're not all theirs either. They're just taking that for granted. They had better check on all the laborers in this province to see what they think about strikes not being settled.

May 8, 1980

I just say in closing, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the dairyman and for the sake of the consumers in this province that this is settled tonight. And if it is not settled, Mr. Speaker, I put the blame entirely on the Minister of Labour . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I will not stand for it to be put on the Progressive Conservative Party because it is not there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. Might I ask the indulgence of the House to make an introduction.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — I would like to take this opportunity to introduce through you, Mr. Speaker, to the members, and to welcome a group of Boy Scouts, some 14 (I believe) in number, from Weyburn, the best little city in southern Saskatchewan.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — They are accompanied, Mr. Speaker, by their leaders, Mr. Greg Bobbitt, Mr. Larry Ortman and I'm not certain but I think Mr. Cal Albright was to be here, but I do not see him. The third Weyburn Boy Scouts group received their charter only last year. They were invested by myself, both last year and this year. They have contributed to the United Appeal; have visited the patients at the Souris-Valley Extended Care Hospital, they have canoed in northern Saskatchewan last summer; also taken courses in canoe safety. To add to their experience, Mr. Speaker, they will be engaging in alpine camping this summer. Most of them have had first-aid training, also instruction in mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. These Boy Scouts have camped in all seasons of the year, in rain and in snow. I am sure it is our wish, Mr. Speaker, that their first visit here to their provincial capital and the Legislative Building proves knowledgeable and pleasant. I say it is just another way to celebrate Saskatchewan's 75th birthday.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I look forward to meeting with this group of scouts and their leaders shortly after they leave the Chamber. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking on behalf of all members when I say we wish them all a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Priority of Debate (Continued)

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It hadn't been my intention to enter the debate on this motion today, however having heard some of the comments made, I feel I should.

I am not a farmer; I have never milked a cow in my life. I was going to say I am not a unionist or a union member, but I have been a union member. I have belonged to a union so I can't really say I haven't belonged to a union. When I was 15 years old I belonged to a union. It was at that time I decided I would never belong to another union party as long as I lived and as long as I worked. And I never have.

The members opposite tonight have (and I missed most of the debate this afternoon); however I heard as much as I could tonight through the screaming and the hollering) once again demonstrated the support they show for union parties. Well, I don't blame them. If I were on that side, certainly I would be doing exactly the same thing, especially when you consider the NDP last year alone received just short of \$500,000 from the unions. When you consider that they have little choice but to speak the way they do . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They have very little choice, Mr. Speaker, but to support unions as they do and, of course, so they should. However, I've also listened to the arguments and the debates about the farmers and the producers. Again, I think we have every right and should have concern for those farmers, especially in this case. Because it takes only two days or three days for them to be in a sound position of ownership of a farm and so on and then be in the disastrous position of losing it all. That's an important consideration; it's an important concern.

But in the time I spent in the legislature today, in listening to the arguments I heard very little, in fact I hear nothing, said about the consumer. The consumer, Mr. Speaker, is the ultimate victim of a strike. But the NDP has never, ever shown that concern for the consumer. They pay in the end. The producer will get his increase or he'll pass it on.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He may go broke.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — For those who don't go broke. The union members will receive their increase, but always, always, at the expense of the consumer. And in this case a very basic necessity of life — milk and dairy products.

I believe I heard today or yesterday that there were 258 points on the bargaining table. When you look at some of them (and I think somebody mentioned one of the things was birth control pills), where is the responsibility on behalf of the union membership? I don't know what the other 258 items (or whatever the number was) that they can't seem to settle on. And they're sitting there negotiating over these silly things. Then the government says, well, we can't interfere. You can't interfere? That's right. You can't afford to lose almost \$500,000 from unions by interfering.

You want to give them the right to strike and that's right; they should have it. But have you ever thought about the right not to strike? We're not your government; we're not there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

If the Attorney General will give me the opportunity I might — I just might. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is concerned. He shouted the words across the Chamber tonight. He's concerned about cutting the unions at the knees, but he doesn't seem to be concerned about cutting the consumers at the knees. Let them pay; let them pay the costs.

The member for Moose Jaw North spoke for a considerable length of time on the democratic process, how we must allow unions to negotiate in good faith like, I suppose, they did for the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association). That was a democratic process. I suppose that's what you would call a democratic process where only a handful, but far less than the 50 per cent requirement, said we'll strike. It didn't matter about the 80 per cent of whatever figure it was who said we don't want to strike; it didn't matter about them. It didn't matter that the majority of people didn't have an opportunity to voice their opinions. It isn't the membership of a union which dictates and negotiates; it's the executive.

May 8, 1980

And today we have come to the point where union executives have become irresponsible and have little concern — well all right. I'll say some unions have little concern for the membership. When a strike occurs, it isn't the executive who suffers, it's the membership. But who cares? Not the government — you don't care. You let your 10,000 employees out in the cold without wages, picketing without incomes at a time of the year when it's very important, and you would do the same thing again. So don't try to tell me or the people of this province that your concern is for the democratic process of collective bargaining, because that has become a farce with you people.

That is no longer the important issue. The important issue is the consumer who must ultimately pay, and the union member who loses every time there is a strike and he has nothing to say about it, with the intimidation that goes on. He says I've never been involved in collective bargaining. He's wrong; I have and very successfully so — settled without difficulties.

I don't want to see the labourer suffer, the member says. Did your government think of bringing in a bill to allow deductions for the tools of tradesmen in this province? The Minister of Labour was quite concerned because the bill accidentally passed through second reading. Oh yes, I expect them to do a flip-flop on this. So I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is time that this government took a look at the so-called democratic process, the so-called collective bargaining of unions, because it isn't unions, it's the union executives who are determining today. The union membership has nothing to say but ultimately they suffer, ultimately they lose, and ultimately the consumer pays and he loses. But because you, as a government, Mr. Speaker, get the money you need to operate your party, you don't have the nerve or the guts to go against the wishes of the union executives. And that is where your problem lies — not with the membership, not with the producers, with the executive.

They will dictate to you. They are the ones who intimidate you and tell you how you're going to operate the labour laws of this country. They tell you. You don't make those decisions. Those decisions are made by those labour bosses, again at the expense of the membership and at the expense of the consumer. And now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a concern; they're not going to worry. They're going to defeat the motion from the member for Nipawin.

Mr. Speaker, there have been so many cases in our recent history of unions creating havoc and chaos in the country — the postal strikes, our SGEA strike of last year (an illegal strike as was determined by the courts). That doesn't make you happy.

You are prepared to disregard the law with respect to strikes and disregard what the Supreme Court of Canada determines, as you have done before. That's the kind of respect the government opposite has for the law, the laws you make. Mr. Attorney General; the law you print. Because once it has been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada you thumb your noses at them, and then you pass retroactive law to take care of the problem you didn't know how to take care of in the first place. That may happen again.

You talk about respect. I heard the member for Lakeview the other day talk about the traditions of this House. I heard him spout off for ours about the traditions. Do you know how much respect the people of the province have for the tradition of the legislature, and of parliament? Ask them and they might tell you. Why do they have very little respect for it? Because of your disregard and disrespect for the law. That's what happens and that's why they have little respect for the traditions of this legislature. I

respect this legislature; I wouldn't be here if I didn't. But you have the nerve to turn around and say to the supreme court judges that they don't know what they're doing and they're wrong.

You would support those who support you — the unions. Last night in Winnipeg the unions said they would not abide by legislation to send them back to work. How many times have union leaders ended up in jail for that?

MR. SPEAKER: — I am going to attempt to encourage the member for Regina South to stay very close to the subject before us. I think the member has every right to make reference to certain matters, but I think he is getting too far away from the topic. We have to stick to the subject. As I said earlier, this is a definite matter and it is of urgent importance. Some of the things I hear the member for Regina South talk about are really not on the subject. I would encourage him to stay close to the subject.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was only trying (and I respect your judgment on that) to reply to some of the comments which had been made from the opposite side this evening. I suppose I have strayed and I will try to contain my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about a strike of this nature and we talk about the diary producer being on strike at the expense of the consumer and the producers. Mr. Speaker, strikes in general are probably, I would hope, within the area of discussion and debate of this particular strike, because again the government has demonstrated its unconcern for everyone except those who pay them. You have to pay the piper.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have any relationship with Union Carbide. I don't know what the member is talking about. If the member for Saskatoon Centre would like to discuss donations by corporations, Mr. Speaker, and talk about another \$4 million of donations to the NDP, I'd certainly be very happy to get into that.

Mr. Speaker, as I've said, I want to emphasize the remarks made tonight by the member for Moose Jaw North referring to the little concern we have for the democratic process and collective bargaining. He is only concerned that particular system isn't disturbed because it's been in place for 50 years, or whatever the case might be, and should be left alone. Well, there isn't a member in this Assembly, I'm sure, who would disagree that the parliamentary system or the legislative system has evolved over many centuries.

Why is it that the collective bargaining system and the union approach must remain the same as it did 50 years ago? Isn't it time we had a good look at the methods used? Isn't it time to say maybe they are not always right? Until the government opposite receives its funds other than from union, I'm afraid that is a hopeless case; when we change the government and we set them on this side of the House, perhaps those ideas will change. The member was just showing me some of the donations of dues, Mr. Speaker, from unions to the NDP. We see amounts of \$22,000 and \$23,000.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member for Regina South will realize that if I allow him to continue in this vein it opens up a whole area which I'm going to have to let other members respond to. I think that's not within the terms of the debate. He has to stick to the motion that's before us. I invite him to read the motion.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm sorry. I apologize, Mr. Speaker. The member for Maple Creek

May 8, 1980

the other day asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs about his concern over the anticipated 10 cent per litre increase in the milk. The Minister of Consumer Affairs sluffed off that question, was not too concerned. He said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. That's exactly what he said. He wouldn't answer it because it was a hypothetical question, but it's no longer hypothetical. That 10 cent increase today is going to be very real.

Mr. Speaker, there's a request for a 2 cent increase to cover an increase in power and gas. Drought conditions have added on an immediate 2 cents because of having to buy feed. Another 2 cents for feed will be added on in October. The present offer by management to the dairy workers will add on 4 cents. Add it up, Mr. Speaker. It comes to 10 cents. The Minister of Consumer Affairs yesterday (I believe it was yesterday; it might have been the day before) said it's a hypothetical question and didn't bother with it. It is no longer a hypothetical question. The facts are there, and the concern is still not there from the minister, as it is still not there from the members opposite. They are concerned with only one very small point of this whole mess. The member for Moose Jaw North continues to talk, and he spoke for half an hour, about how we must protect collective bargaining and protect the democratic process. When you start giving concern to the consumer, when you start giving concern to others and to the members of the unions as much as you do to that process, then perhaps we'll see more justice done in the collective bargaining system.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad this debate is taking place. I'm glad because once and for all we have seen the attitude of the Conservative Party toward organized labour and to trade unionists. I'm glad that this whole debate is being recorded, because I'm sure the people in the working class of this province who have organized themselves into unions will be glad to read the position and the policies of the Conservative party, and the hate campaign they are mouthing.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has been going on for at least four hours. And we've heard four hours of trade union bashing by the Conservative spokesmen. This is good, because I think working people are entitled to know where the Conservatives stand on trade union and labour issues. We know how much Conservatives hate trade union.

Mr. Speaker, the record is clear. I've listened to at least four of them in the last while. I've listened to the member for Moosomin, partly to the member for Rosthern, and I've listened to the member for Regina South and the member for Arm River. Each one of them shows his contempt and hatred for the trade union movement and for the working people of this province. So it is important that the record be transmitted clearly and loudly to trade union people. And I will make it a point to see that trade unionist in this province receive a copy of that record, because they are entitled to know.

Mr. Speaker, I have had some experience within the trade union movement. And I have had some experience of directly bargaining with employers in the dairy industry. I had the good fortune of working full time for the trade union movement from 1949 until 1971. I know something about the trade union movement. I know something of how workers make decisions, and of the objectives and wishes of the working people.

Working people organize into trade unions in order to improve their working conditions and in order to deal with the employer on some equitable basis. We, in the province, and as a political party, believe that workers have the right to organize into unions of their own choice. We believe that workers have the right to organize into

unions and that they have the right to bargain. Workers have the right to the protection of the law to get trade union organizations started. And we, as a political party and as a government, support that principle.

As a government we passed (back in 1944) a trade union act which guaranteed the workers, the right to organize into unions. Mr. Speaker, The Trade Union Act in Saskatchewan is a piece of legislation which is recognized throughout North America, as being unique in trying to create a balance, in trying to create the right of both the employer and the union to somehow have an equal balance and equal say in the collective bargaining process (more so than any other place in North America). During that collective bargaining process our law guarantees that there shall be negotiations. Employers and union have the right to talk and to determine their conditions in the collective agreement.

They have the right to call on the government. We, as a government have established a voluntary conciliation process. That is used widely. They have a right to call for conciliation boards. They have a right to establish a mediation process. They have a right to use an arbitration process to help them. Workers are given the right to strike. Employers are given the right to lock workers out. Those are rights that are guaranteed by our trade union act. I believe the processes and the procedures we have set out are fair and superior to those set out anywhere else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — We have seen in some parts of this country some provinces pass legislation denying the right for workers to strike. They set up a procedure, in particular, the so-called essential industries, that must refer their dispute to compulsory arbitration. We've seen that process fail. We've seen it fail in Quebec, in Ontario, in the Atlantic provinces and just a few days ago in the province of Alberta (where they have a compulsory arbitration process which they tried to use in the case of the nurses). It didn't work.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's the Tory solution. That's the Tories.

MR. SMISHEK: — This is the solution these people opposite are proposing. That system cannot work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Maybe it was a system that worked at one time. But this is the system the members opposite would try to impose on the people of Saskatchewan. They would try to impose this system on the dairy workers and the employers at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I have seen in the last while — the strike took place at 12 o'clock yesterday noon and these people, within a matter of 26 hours, are trying to prejudge who is guilty.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And negotiations are going on.

MR. SMISHEK: — They are saying that the collective bargaining process cannot work, that we must force these people back to work, that these people should not have the opportunity to work out their differences. Now I appreciate that there are people who are seriously affected. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe by passing compulsory

May 8, 1980

arbitration legislation, as the members opposite have advocated . . . Now, I have listened to them. They have said the Minister of Labour should have done this some time ago, Mr. Speaker. What they have said in effect, Mr. Speaker, is really we should take away the right to strike from workers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — It's not only in this case. They say, you should have done this ahead of time. In other words, the position of the Conservatives is that there should be legislation prohibiting the right of workers to strike. That should be denied. Workers should not have the right to strike.

During the course of this discussion, Mr. Speaker, they went into all kinds of tangents. You know, I was interested in hearing the hon. member for Regina South talk about the New Democratic Party getting \$500,000 in political contributions. Mr. Speaker, we in this party, value our association with the trade union movement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — In case the members opposite are not aware, there are approximately 3 million organized workers in this country. Those 3 million workers contributed \$500,000 towards the political parties, Mr. Speaker. That's less than 20 cents per member.

I would like to remind this legislature that in 1978 the Conservative Party of Canada received something like \$23 million; of which over \$20 million was received from corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — That was fair and proper, and it's fair and proper for multinational corporations to contribute over \$20 million to the political coffers of the Conservative Party but it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, for the workers of this country to contribute 20 cents per capita to a political party.

Mr. Speaker, it is the workers who made those decisions of whether or not they will contribute that half a million dollars or that 20 cents. I doubt whether the shareholders themselves were determining whether they would be contributing the 20-odd million dollars to the Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in hearing the remarks of the hon. member for Moosomin and his allegations about international trade unions; his allegations that trade union dues flow out of this country and somehow nothing comes back in return. Mr. Speaker, international trade unions were organized by workers in order to respond to the multinational corporations. How could auto workers possibly bargain collectively, effectively, with Ford and General Motors in Canada?

AN HON. MEMBER: — In Windsor only.

MR. SMISHEK: — In Windsor only, when the decisions are being made in Detroit. It was in response to that situation that the auto workers organized international unions. The same thing goes in respect to the steel industry. I can tell you the same thing applies to the food industry. How do you deal with Canada Safeway? You don't negotiate with

Canada Safeway for a pension plan and I know it. That decision is made in Oakland, Mr. Speaker. In Oakland, California that kind of a pension plan is decided. The workers organized an international union so as to have some effective say, Mr. Speaker. That is why international unionism came into being.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this: for many, many years (I don't know the exact figure) but for every dollar which was paid by the Canadian workers in dues, \$2 came to Canada to help workers organize, in strike assistance, in legislative assistance and research assistance. That has been the situation. I can't tell you what it is right now but for a long, long time, Mr. Speaker, there was money coming from south of the border to Canada to help workers organize in this country. Not only that, not only was it in respect to organizing international unions but also to help organize Canadian unions. Yes, Mr. Speaker, union like CUPE today exist because there were others that helped to establish the principle in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, the right to organize unions, the right to bargain collectively, the right to strike and the right to lock out, are things that we on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, value, protect and defend.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about the right not to strike?

MR. SMISHEK: — The right not to strike is there as well. People make the decisions. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the hon. member for Regina South and I would like him to sit down and to listen, because his knowledge of the trade union movements is almost zilch, Mr. Speaker. When he tells us and alleges that decisions are not made by rank and file people, that it is a handful of picked people, the executive, who make decisions about strikes, I say to the hon. member, he doesn't understand the trade union movement, he doesn't know how it functions and the only thing he does understand is his hate and contempt for the trade union movement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — I have never heard more venom, more vicious remarks on the rights of workers and on the trade union movement than I have heard today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe and I know the trade union movement is an organization that is more democratic than most organizations that people organize in this country. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that officers are elected by a rank and file. I can tell you that decisions and our law require that at least 51 per cent of the people must vote in favour of the strike. That law is there. That law was passed by the legislature and that law is abided by. Now, it's true, there might be some differences of interpretation. The courts have clarified that. That's why we have the courts, Mr. Speaker. Now it's clear that what the future world will hold, time will tell.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was saying that yesterday at the Canadian Labour congress, the delegates said they would defy the law. That's not how I heard the news, Mr. Speaker. I heard the 2,500 delegates at the Canadian Labour Congress convention say they pledge their support to CUPW (Canadian Union of Postal Workers) as a legitimate trade union having the right to bargain and having the right to strike. They pledge their support and in the event of another dispute, they said that they would support them in their collective bargaining efforts to secure a better collective

May 8, 1980

bargaining agreement. I think that is fair. That is what the trade union movement is all about — people sticking together. It doesn't mean the trade union movement hasn't made mistakes. It doesn't mean they will not make mistakes in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House believe that the collective bargaining process does work. We believe the bargaining process is effective. We know from experience and from the record over many years that 95 per cent to 97 per cent of collective bargaining agreements are entered into between employers and unions that nobody hears about. Between 5 per cent and 3 per cent from time to time result in conciliation, arbitration lock-outs and strikes. Those are the ones that make the news. Those are the ones we read about in the headlines. But all those that are settled peacefully, nobody hears about them.

The hon. member responds negatively to the thing. It proves that he doesn't know anything about collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker. It proves he knows nothing about unions. But that is the record. That is the record.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that over a period of time, the collective bargaining process is going to be strengthened. In the meantime, it's going to be as it is — at times very fragile. But I think, rather than we as members in the legislature attacking the trade union movement, prejudging negotiations as we have tried to do here, what we should be doing, as responsible political leaders and as elected members, is helping and assisting the process rather than condemning the process, Mr. Speaker. That should be our role and responsibility.

These people opposite, Mr. Speaker, the only thing they can do, is tear down the institutions. They're the people who do not believe in law and order, Mr. Speaker. They're the people who demonstrated in this House, time and time again, that they don't respect law and order to the point that they had to be expelled, Mr. Speaker, from the place which believes in and passes law and order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — I have faith in the people who are running the dairies and I have faith in the workers who work in the dairies; they're going to straighten this matter out and they should be given an opportunity. We as a government have made available conciliation services to them. The Minister of Labour and the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Consumer Affairs are working with the parties. They have been meeting. They will continue to meet.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you this. I have had some experience in the dairy industry and I've had some experience in negotiating with some of the employers. Some facts have changed as time has gone by, but for almost 40 years since there has been trade union organization in the dairy industry in this province, we have had two disputes. In 40 years we have had two disputes, one two years ago and one now. But yet these people condemn the process. For 40 years the process has worked and there have been two little disputes, Mr. Speaker. After all, not all the dairy workers are out on strike, only some of them.

The members are concerned about consumers. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the news. The news tonight was saying there is plenty of milk on the shelves. The consumers' association didn't come and say there is a shortage of milk. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I dare to say that even if this dispute carried on for a week or two weeks, there

will be milk on the shelves. It might be powdered milk. We might have to use some canned milk, but there will be milk and people will be looked after. No one will go hungry in this country. There will be no shortage of milk, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you predicting two weeks?

MR. SMISHEK: — I'm not predicting anything. All I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there will be sufficient milk. Yes, there will be sufficient milk, even in two weeks, because there is plenty of skim milk. I'm talking from the standpoint . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . You were saying there isn't any milk. I say there is milk on the shelves. I believe there will be a sufficient supply of milk. Mr. Speaker, the consumers have a right; as well as the producers have a right; as well as the worker have the right; as well as the industry has rights. We are tying at this time, through the efforts of the Department of Labour and through the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture to help resolve this dispute.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What rights do the consumers have? What about the rights of the consumers?

MR. SMISHEK: — Yes, I believe the consumer does have rights. The consumer has the right to organize into a consumers' union. In some places they have organized and they have the right to deal with prices and services. We all have rights. The problem is the Conservatives would deny those rights if they had the chance. They would deny the consumers the right to organize unions, as they are trying to deny workers the right to form unions. At least, if not deny them the right, they would pass legislation that would make them totally ineffective. They would paralyze the trade union movement. They have said so today for four solid hours.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a responsibility as members, not just to place blame on a particular party because we, at the particular moment, don't like what they have done and we see an opportunity to somehow make cheap politics out of a situation that is, at the moment, fragile.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this issue will be resolved. We, as members of the legislature, have a responsibility to act responsibly, not to inflame the situation, go give both parties an opportunity to work out their differences. I would hope in the next while, they will see to it that there is a settlement, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I have mixed feelings about the debate this evening. I very much regret it from one point of view. I regret very much that the two parties opposite have seen fit to join together to intervene at a very sensitive and very critical stage during the collective bargaining process aimed at reaching a settlement in this most important dispute. I think it is most regrettable that the hon. members should have used this kind of opportunity within the legislature to intervene in such a way. But I also, think, Mr. Speaker, that the debate this afternoon and this evening has been a useful one at this kind of point in our province, because it has given us an opportunity to get a better picture of the viewpoint and the perspective which each of the parties in the legislature takes with respect to collective bargaining.

May 8, 1980

I think there is no dispute, Mr. Speaker, that collective bargaining, the process of negotiating wage settlements between workers and employers, is an extremely important and critical activity within our society today. I believe it is important to have the opportunity to debate openly and freely how that process should work and to come to better understand each other's point of view with respect to that process.

But, Mr. Speaker, there has been an awful lot of rhetoric from the other side this evening; a tremendous amount of rhetoric about unions, union bosses and union executives and the damage that workers and unions do when they organize and bargain collectively, the damage which the other side alleges is done to society as a result of that process. Given that this debate has been taking place and this legislature has seen fit to discuss this subject this afternoon and this evening, I think it is important that we focus on what the real issue is here.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what I heard the members from the opposite side of the House say, I think the real issue all of us should be engaged in looking at is how do we get a settlement in this dispute. There is no question that the dispute and the point it has reached is unfortunate; no one denies that point. No one denies it is regrettable whenever a dispute reaches the point where we have at least some strike action taking place. That is not to be denied. But I think the critical point, Mr. Speaker, is the question of how can each and every one of us as responsible citizens and as responsible elected members of this legislature, make a contribution towards seeing that there is an effective, early and satisfactory settlement to this most important dispute.

What I think is regrettable, as I listen to this debate and observe the members opposite in what they are doing, is that their activities, Mr. Speaker, are clearly designed (or perhaps unwittingly, I don't know which), to have the effect of interfering with a quick and early settlement to this dispute. They are the interventionists in this process, the hon. members opposite have chosen to intervene at a critical time, and in such a way as to complicate the whole process of reaching an agreement . . . (inaudible interjection).

I believe the hon. member for Regina Rosemont is correct to a degree. I believe it is somewhat unwitting. I don't think the hon. members on this occasion, or on many occasions, have taken the time and effort to carefully think through the implications and impact of what they are doing. I think once again that is displayed here tonight by their lack of leadership, their lack of planning, their lack of forethought and their inability to sit down and consider what is the important question here in this dispute.

Mr. Speaker, they think the important question is to take advantage of this opportunity to attack labour unions. They think the important question is to attack contributions to political parties by labour unions. They think the important question is to drag out the old stereotype of the union boss and to build up an attack against that old stereotyped figure. Those are what they think the important questions are. Well, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that is not what is important. What is important at this time, Mr. Speaker, are the dairy farmers who wish to see a settlement, an amicable settlement, the consumers who wish to see an early settlement, and the workers who wish to see an early settlement. All wish to see this settled by time-honoured and respected collective bargaining processes taking their normal courses.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no absolute guarantee that at this critical stage in the bargaining those activities are now under way — the processes of conciliation,

the processes of assistance being offered by the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labour — will bring a settlement at any given moment or any given time. But what is critically important is that everyone understand the sensitivity of the process.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I wonder if we can have a little more quiet. I'm trying to hear the member who is speaking and I'm having some difficulty.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I think what is critically important is that there be a sensitive and fundamental understanding of the processes which lead to reaching a collective bargaining agreement. There must be a clear understanding of what is possible in terms of conciliation; there must be a clear understanding of what is possible in terms of assistance from the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labour; there must be a clear understanding of the appropriate timing of this kind of assistance and help.

The hon. members opposite reflect either an ignorance on this question or a contempt of the whole process because they have chosen to intercede at the most sensitive time in the whole process. At the very time, Mr. Speaker, when the parties are coming together again at a sensitive point in conciliation with the help of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Agriculture, what happens? These people move in with their attacks upon labour, with their attacks upon unions, and their stereotypes of the union bosses, with their claims that we must have legislation here and now tonight. They say we must break this thing down, this thing that just may be working. They're afraid of success or they don't want to see success or they're ignorant of the whole possibility of success as a result of this process.

The intervention which just took place is, I think, interesting as well. Symbolically something happened today. The hon. members from the new party moved a little closer to the Conservatives in their seating arrangement. On the very same day, we have seen the leaderless larger group of opposition members unable to find their leadership or find their leader. They once again have found a leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McARTHUR: — We have floundered through issue after issue, many of them of great public importance, this session and the hon. members opposite could not find a direction. They could not find a leader. But today we hit an important issue (and no one denies it's important) and the larger group opposite, the Tory party with their large numbers but without a leader, without a direction, found a leader.

And what well did they go to to find their leader? The same old well — they had to go back to the same old well and fish out the same old leader to help them find a path, a direction, a way to go on this most critical and difficult subject.

The poor, worn-out, tired old leader is better than anything they could find among that whole group. He's more original. I don't agree with his ideas on this subject but at least he had an idea. At least he was able to focus something from the opposition side of this debate here today. That really tells you something about where the Conservative Party is today in our province.

But, Mr. Speaker, the regrettable thing in my view is that it's still the same old philosophy, whether it be the Unionist-Conservative coalition or whether it be the non-coalition which is pretended to exist on occasion. but today we see the coalition. When

May 8, 1980

the coalition comes together, the American ideas, the new American thoughts have introduced nothing new into the philosophy, nothing new at all. The philosophy of the Unionest-Tory coalition, when we get into a difficult subject, is the same old conservative Tory philosophy.

It's the same old anti-union, anti-free collective bargaining position. It's the same old lack of understanding of the processes through which differing groups, with differing points of view on a subject like a collective bargaining agreement, each agreement. The Tory party has never been able to understand that process. They have shown that time and time again in this province and outside this province. And the new party, the new Unionest Party, had to fish into the same old well of ideas in order to come up with an idea. At least they had one, but the same old Tory stock of ideas.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we have it. Here we have the kind of leadership question, the kind of philosophy question, the kind of policy question they are totally unable to cope with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what this debate does, and I hope it will be useful to this unholy coalition on the other side, is help to develop in the minds of members of this Assembly a better understanding of the collective bargaining process and its importance in our society today. I do think it is true, as the hon. member for Regina North-East indicated in his address, that free and relatively unfettered collective bargaining is an important part of a free and democratic society. Mr. Speaker, free and unfettered collective bargaining is nothing more than ordinary working people coming together through a process of co-operation, and turning their efforts toward negotiating with their employer in order to determine the terms and conditions under which they will work, including the remuneration for the work they will do.

Now by the very nature of that process, it is bound to be fraught with conflict and disagreement, because you have conflicting interests coming together to reach an agreement. There is no question at all that it is a process which must recognize disagreement because if there were not disagreement then you would not need the process at all. But the important thing about this process in our society is that it is one which recognizes the principle of freedom of contract, the right to freely engage in developing a contract between two parties without the intervention of big brother, the kind of big brother that it is fully apparent the Tories would like to have overseeing the development and the operation of contract of all kinds.

Mr. Speaker, I have in question period on at least two or three occasions had hon. members opposite stand up and demand that I, as minister, intervene in a contract relationship in which I have no right to intervene. But they demand that big brother intervene, and indeed step in and abuse whatever power I have. They want to see a minister of the Crown bring in the big stick. That's been a constant theme of what's been running through the things they have suggested this session. And here it arises again.

They are maintaining, when we arrive at this difficult, critical and sensitive stage, that we should not take the chance to let the process reach an agreement but rather, Mr. Speaker, that the government should step in with the big stick and tell them how it's going to be — say to them tonight, this is how it's going to be. Well, I say to you that's undemocratic, Mr. Speaker, that is inconsistent with the principles of a free society. I say it would be wrong.

Mr. Speaker, there are obvious reasons why we recognize this process of free and open collective bargaining. We recognize it first of all, as I said, because it is an important

part of a free society. You cannot separate the principle of collectively bargaining on a contract from freedom and democracy. That cannot be separated. I'm surprised at the new leader of the new party who looks toward a society to the south of us, which, if nothing else, has recognized on many occasions the important implications of freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is nevertheless the one who wants to bring old Tory ideas into that framework and who says in that kind of society he wouldn't accept the basic principles and implications of freedom and democracy. No, he would use the interventionist approach every time there is a difficulty that arises, prior to the need for any kind of suggestion of such intervention.

Mr. Speaker, there is another reason that we, by general consensus in our society, respect the whole process of free collective bargaining. And that is simply because it works. It works better than the alternative. There is nothing that is absolutely perfect and works to the perfection one might demand of an ideal state. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, in this whole question, whether it be in collective bargaining agreements or anything else, that guarantees there will not be some degree of problem. But, Mr. Speaker, this process of collective bargaining we are engaged in, or the parties are engaged in right now on this important dispute, is important to respect and is important to pay attention to, to give it the full opportunity to work, Mr. Speaker, because in general it works. It is clearly the most acceptable and the most effective way of reaching agreements.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I say to you it's important for the hon. members opposite not to panic too quickly, not to jump in too quickly, when we are looking at something that does work, that is important to have working on a continuous basis in our society. Mr. Speaker, I think the debate this morning reflects some very interesting things about the Conservative Party.

I mention first of all the obvious point. They are leaderless and thoughtless and without ideas. They have no ideas and no principles to guide them so they have to look to the old leader and the old well of ideas. I mentioned that to you already. But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the guidance being sought from above should be brought down into the Assembly. It might be more and more helpful, down here on the floor than by seeking Divine guidance from above. But I'll leave that to the hon. members to judge and determine.

But, Mr. Speaker, in addition to indicating that, there have been a number of other interesting things I have observed in this debate and it confirms some basic characteristics of the members opposite — first of all that willingness to stereotype ordinary people that for some reason they believe are not people they would sympathize with or support. We have the hon. member for Regina South into his stereotypes about the big union bosses and so on. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that kind of stereotyping is appropriate. I don't think that kind of bigotry is appropriate on any occasion, and I think it is not appropriate when we are at such an important and sensitive time in the process of collective bargaining. This is the type of stereotyping, Mr. Speaker, which I think does nothing but harm to the whole process.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I wonder if the member would state his point of order again.

May 8, 1980

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I said I'm questioning that word, bigot.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The word, bigot, was just used by the member.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'm sorry. I didn't hear the word. I didn't hear the member say it. Order, order! I wonder if members could review the kind of language they are going to use in the Chamber. Earlier this evening I heard a member on this side saying some other member doesn't have the guts to do something. That is unparliamentary, and it is suggested now that a member over here said somebody's a bigot. I wonder if we could all clean up our act a little bit and make it more parliamentary.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, you are referring to me about guts, and I will apologize. I would ask the member opposite to do the same.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I concede the word, bigot, may be questionable within parliamentary procedure, and I withdraw that remark.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the stereotyping of labour union leaders, labour union executives and labour unions is regrettable and unfortunate and non-productive, and believe it indicates clearly why the members opposite will never get support from ordinary working people in this province. It is because they have no sympathy for working people; they have no understanding of working people. They will not support working people in what they do and in their struggle.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the comments this evening as has already been mentioned indicate a complete contempt for labour unions and there is no place for that kind of contempt for any important part of our society in the political process in which we operate. I believe that indicates something else about the Conservative Party and indicates the reason why the Conservative Party will never be acceptable as an important party in this province.

Mr. Speaker, what they are doing tonight also indicates their willingness to be wreckers, to get in and destroy and break down any important attempts to bring about resolution of difficult problems which we face. That indicates why they should never be given the opportunity to govern in this province. The kind of approach they would take — the heavy handed approach to disputes and problems and difficulties, if they were given a chance would be something all people in this province would regret.

The members opposite have attempted to set group against group, to set farmers against labourer, to set co-operative dairy producers against workers. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is appropriate at this time or any other time. The important point, as I mentioned, is that we should see an agreement reached and see it reached as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the way to achieve that as far as I'm concerned is to let the collective bargaining process at this critical and important time, find its way through to the possible point of completion. No one can guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a resolution at 10 o'clock, or 11 o'clock, or midnight or any particular time, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, anyone with any common sense or common understanding of the whole process would recognize we are at a point where a settlement may very well be close and near at hand. And when you are at a point where settlement is near and close at hand, there is absolutely no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for trying to destroy the

possibilities of such a settlement at that point.

It is clearly, as my colleague said, the work of an irresponsible opposition — an opposition, Mr. Speaker, that will never accept the bargaining process. For that reason, I hope all members will join with the members on this side in defeating that resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, there is hypocrisy oozing out of every pore of the members opposite. They are standing in this House putting up speaker after speaker with a bunch of rhetoric about union bashing, etc. etc. Not one of them has talked about the real issue or the motion, except perhaps the Minister of Education who just sat down. He did concede that perhaps a couple of dairy producers in Saskatchewan might hurt a little as a result of this strike going on. He did concede that. He has alluded to the fact (as every member has on that side of the House) that this is a terrible, dastardly deed we have committed today, intervening while delicate negotiations are going on. But you guys can't screw up your courage enough to bring this thing to a vote tonight. You put up speaker after speaker, six speakers, with the same junk every time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — I am only going to take a couple of minutes. Then I hope you people do have the courage to let it come to a vote. I would like to see the farmers of Saskatchewan read the record when this particular debate is over.

You talked about your union bashing, the member for Regina North-East said we have two weeks' supply of milk in Saskatchewan. Where? It is on the shelves. Who cares whether the strike is settled or not? In the interest of free collective bargaining, who cares whether the strike is settled or not? We have two weeks. In two weeks we will only have about 300 dairies hang locks on their doors. Even without this strike, we have had 50 in the last year hang locks on their doors.

The most significant contribution, aside from the hopper cars, this government has made to agriculture is getting the two members for Moose Jaw elected and off the railroad so that those hopper cars can in fact roll.

The motion very clearly (and this is what we should be debating, the importance of this motion, the motion of solution is the next procedural matter) states, Mr. Speaker, the urgent and compelling need for this Assembly to help end the senseless dumping of about 2 million pounds of milk per day and its implications for the consumers, the producers and economy of Saskatchewan.

What we heard this afternoon from members from that side of the House is that they stood up and said, well, this is beautiful, free collective bargaining. And, of course, we do believe in beautiful, free collective bargaining. But when it affects a very, very important sector of agriculture in Saskatchewan and then, in turn, affects the consumers of Saskatchewan, it is about time that somebody, someplace, sat down and said, let's get this thing resolved.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Right on, leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

May 8, 1980

MR. BERNTSON: — Where do you think, if we hang up the locks on another 200 or 300 dairies in Saskatchewan, the milk is going to come from then? We will have lost the quotas. We have dairies in Ontario and Quebec who would be very pleased to get them. Once they get them, they are not going to be too anxious to give them up. It is serious stuff. At the same time we have the Premier daring around Great Britain saying, we can set you up in the dairy business. We have money. We have land. We have cattle. Come on over. Right here in Saskatchewan — the land of opportunity — 650 dairies went broke in the last year. And if this strike continues for two weeks, as the member for Regina North-East suggest it will, we will have 300 fewer dairy operations in Saskatchewan. And don't talk about whose fault, where, why . . . You (I was going to say turkeys, but that's unparliamentary) people stood up six speakers. Your collective time, I suppose would more than double everything that came, except in content and substance of course, but in the time you gobbled up more thoughts while these very delicate negotiations are going on.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Don't you wish you had a leader? Yours is never in the House, Roy. He's running over to Yugoslavia, an economic communist.

MR. BERNTSON: — I don't know precisely how many dairies there are in Saskatchewan or dairy operators, but bout 800. I think they'll find the debate today very interesting. And we will be making it available to them. The member for Regina North-East indicated that in spite of everything you will come down on the side of unions. Let the dairies go broke. Let the consumers pay through the nose for their milk. Let us lose our quotas. But above all else, let the strike go for two or three weeks in the interest of free collective bargaining.

I'm going to challenge the members opposite. And I'm going to take my seat very quickly. But before I do, I'm going to challenge the members opposite to wind it up, get it to a vote, get it on record, and show the people of Saskatchewan that you're prepared to deal with this problem. Just to show you that I am more than a little serious about this, our caucus is prepared to stop the clock until it comes to a vote.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his, if I may describe it in these terms, generous offer to stop the clock in order to help solve this dispute. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I don't think this House, or the dairy farmers, or the dairy workers, or the dairy producers can stand much more generosity of the kind we have heard from the Progressive Conservative caucus during this afternoon and evening.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment this situation is very serious. The situation is serious for the dairy farmers. it is serious for the producers. It is serious for the workers. It has a tremendous spinoff effect for all the people of Saskatchewan.

I also want to tell the members of this House that as much as I disagree with many of the things indicated by the member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Unionist Party, I think everyone who looks at this debate objectively will agree that at least he brought forward the arguments for the emergency debate, and his recommended solution in a responsible fashion, the tone of the debate reflected that. The tone of the debate after the Leader of the Unionist Party for Nipawin and his follower for Swift Current, Mr. Ham, interjected reflected the seriousness of that particular proposal. I want to hasten to add that I don't agree with all of the matters indicated therein, but there was an acknowledgement that this is a very serious problem which affects all of the people, the

constituent elements in the province of Saskatchewan. Make no mistake about that.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition, thanks but no thanks, to the most generous offer that this debate should be continued beyond 10 o'clock, because after the member of the Unionest party completed their remarks, what did this Assembly see? First of all, this Assembly was treated to the remarks of the member for Rosthern, who got up and his very first issue was that the collective bargaining process in this case broke down.

He alleged that one of the unions, or for that matter maybe all of the unions, wanted the inclusion of contraceptives in their negotiating process. Then he wondered out loud how it could be that the dairy strike came about over such a frivolous issue as contraceptives. Mr. Speaker, I personally agree if that is how the strike broke down, it would be a frivolous reason for being at this stage of then negotiations, and for at 9:30 this evening debating all day on a so-called emergency debate this matter. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member for Rosthern, is it a credible position to take for the member of this House that this dispute has come to the point because of contraceptives?

I want to ask the hon. members of this Legislative Assembly, those in the press, those who have been following the issue, can it be credibly indicated that the strike has stated, that the dispute has ground to a halt because of the hon. member's analysis of contraceptives? Obviously the answer is no. Why did he say this? Why did he pick one thing out of the bargaining demands of the union, one thing only? He made no mention of wages. He made no mention of the side benefits. He made only fleeting reference to pensions. He made no mention of the dental plan. He made no mention of any of the issues on which apparently the two sides are deadlocked. He picked on one thing, contraceptives.

There is another thing you mentioned and I'll talk about that in a minute. There is one thing one might be tempted to do and that is to laugh, if it weren't so serious. Laugh over the fact he would have this Assembly, this press gallery, the public of Saskatchewan, believe this serious situation has come about because of that issue. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that. This member was motivated for malicious purposes. This member was motivated in order to try to catch a catch phrase or a catch work or to pick an insignificant matter, which was put on the bargaining table apparently some weeks ago as a small element of a negotiating process, as the political reason to show the dairy farmers and others in Saskatchewan why this strike was called. I say that was a despicable act by the Conservative Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the other reason given? I want to remind this House that this was the new party, under the new leader, one Mr. Grant Devine, the new Leader of the Conservative Party, who authorized and directed his caucus to take the destructive approach at this time in the important selective bargaining negotiations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the other reason? What was the other reason by these Devine interventionists of the Conservatives? The other reason given by these people was very clear. The other reason given by the member for Rosthern was that apparently there was an interunion dispute. I say, don't take my word for it, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, the member for Moosomin does not have to take my

May 8, 1980

word for it; neither does the member for Arm River. Nobody need take my word for it. But I challenge the members of the press, I challenge anybody outside this Assembly, if you don't take my word for it, take a look at any news report, look at any report, respecting this dispute and show to me one line which indicates that there is an interunion dispute at the source of this particular area. One line — I challenge any member. I challenge them even after tonight. I challenge, Mr. Speaker, any member. I challenge them even after tonight. I challenge them tomorrow, if the negotiations should break down, to show me one line on the so-called interunion dispute. Mr. Speaker, that is a pure, malicious figment of the imagination of the Devine Conservatives designed to be malicious at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe for one moment that this is a case which the Conservatives really entered into an informal way. I don't believe for a moment the member for Rosthern, who pretends to be a dairy farmer who knows problems there, and at the same time a union negotiator who also has experience in those problems. He's the all-round man. I don't happen to have all of those all-round experiences. This isn't something which reflects all of the collective wisdom of the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, this is a deliberate policy of dividing, a deliberate policy of pitting groups against groups.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I was in this Legislative Assembly in 1967 to 1971 when there was a premier called Ross Thatcher. I respected Ross Thatcher in many ways, although I fought with him bitterly. All of us did, the member for Kelsey-Tisdale among others.

I want to tell you what Ross Thatcher's policy was. Ross Thatcher's political policy was to put teachers against trustees. His political policy was to pit trade unionists against farmers. His political policy was to pit the young against the old. Mr. Speaker, you don't have to believe me. Nobody in this House has to believe me. Take a look at any of the policies and the speeches of Ross Thatcher. Close your eyes. Just keep your ears open and if you heard the member for Rosthern, you would swear it was the Liberal leader of the 1964-71 era.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks by saying that there is not . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! What's the point of order?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I'd just like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what Ross Thatcher has to do with this dairy strike?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! That's not a point of order. The member had his opportunity to debate. I'm sure he brought some things up that other members didn't think were relevant.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, there are other members in this House who want to say a few words on this debate. I'm going to try and wrap up very quickly. but I want to make one point before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker. I certainly won't say this to the

members of the Conservative caucus because obviously they won't buy it. But I want to tell the farmers of this province and the workers of this province and the people who are at the mercy of this dispute, exactly where we are at 9:40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, at 4:30 p.m. or thereabouts this afternoon, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Labour and the minister of Consumer Affairs were locked up in discussions — I don't know if I need to say negotiations because we aren't parties. We're trying to facilitate a settlement or the possibility of a settlement. They were locked up in discussion with the producers and the unions involved. That was at 4:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, every elected member of this House knew that. I accuse the member for Rosthern, the member for Moosomin, the Devine Conservatives, of deliberately judging that the unions are at fault in this dispute right in the middle of a sensitive and important time in the negotiations. I accused the Devine Conservatives of attempting to scuttle the negotiations.

I want to make it absolutely clear, Mr. Speaker, that however we hold our political reasons in our political debates; how much we may disagree on philosophical or political grounds, surely we must honour some facts. Surely we must honour some basis of political operation; surely we must know the fact that the minister, be they of NDP or of PC or of Liberal background, whoever occupies these treasury benches, are meeting with those participants of the dispute; we must surely honour those facts that in an effort to settle this matter in a collective bargaining way without legislation, they should be given at least the decency of a fair chance to do their job without political intervention.

Mr. Speaker, I was not members of this House — the Leader of the Opposition said six members spoke; I'm the seventh. Well there were five from a 15-man PC caucus who spoke and two from the Unionest Party, which is seven from that side who spoke. I'm saying to this House that this debate could continue from now until 10 o'clock, but I challenge the Devine poison-pen researchers who were doing this job for this caucus — at any time tomorrow morning to produce to me the records that any member of this side of the House cast blame on either the employers or on the unionists in this case. I challenge them, Mr. Speaker. No member from this side did. It ell you who did, though. The member for Rosthern did. The member said it was the unionists because of the contraceptives in the union dispute. The member for Moosomin did; the member for Moosomin called hassle, the member for Moosomin talked about the strength of union.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the point of order?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, we cannot hear the Attorney General. He's over on the other man's desk; we can't hare him; he's not talking into his mike.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I know all members want to hear the Attorney General. I know I want to hear him. I've been getting along fine and he's coming in loud and clear.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I was about to say, before I was interrupted by the hon. member for Arm River, and I repeat again to the hon. member for Arm River; I repeat to the hon. members in the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I am having trouble hearing the Attorney General now. I wonder if the members could just lower the undercurrent so that we can all hear the Attorney General.

May 8, 1980

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House a few minutes ago . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the point of order?

MR. KATZMAN: — I assumed that all members are supposed to speak through their own mike at their own chair. The Attorney General is not following the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think it's quite clear that each member must address the Assembly from their own desk and I think there's . . . Order, order. I think it's clear that members must address the Assembly from their desk, as the member for Arm River has found out recently. I haven't noticed the Attorney General move away from his desk. I quite often see members standing in the aisle and in the 16 years I have been in this House, I've seen members standing on both sides of their desks, in between them, and turned around facing the back. As long as the member stays at his desk, he's within order.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the members of the Conservative opposition accuse us of jamming the reception signals of other people's communications. They should be the last ones to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take my place. I want to conclude by repeating the challenge that I give to what unfortunately, I think, is a rather incompetent opposition. Mr. Speaker, I give this challenge to them and I give it to the Devine boys who are in the backrooms feeding this desperate and disjointed so-called opposition attack. The challenge I give to them is, you find me one quotation from one member on this side during the entire debate, which implied indirectly or directly or said so explicitly, that one party or the other was at fault in this dispute. I challenge them, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'll make a prediction right now. They cannot and will not find that. But I say to this House the actions of the Devine Conservatives are totally irresponsible. At the time when the producers and the unionist are here trying to hammer out a settlement their actions are absolutely irresponsible, and should be condemned roundly by the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And may I say, Mr. Speaker, one last comment about the suggestion by the labour critic, the future minister of labour, the member for Rosthern, I want to say to him, I look forward to watching him occupy the desk of minister of labour in about 1997. Mr. Speaker, I say to him the idea he advocates about the resolution of trade union disputes is also going to be very interesting to everybody including employers.

His idea of settling trade union disputes is to put down in rigid law, guidelines for negotiations. He says you're going to have to follow the negotiating period in such a time frame, and if you don't it's going to be the Minister of Labour who's after you. Because he was accusing the Minister of Labour right now of not doing his job. He says if the strike falls and takes place, somebody's going to be after you. The Minister of Labour is going to be after you. This, Mr. Speaker, comes from a government which professes free enterprise and private enterprise; this comes from a government which professes its belief in the principles that individuals and individual organizations should be free to resolve their own matters without government interference. This comes from a Conservative. How contradictory, Mr. Speaker, can that be? How inconsistent a position can they take, Mr. Speaker?

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to this House as I conclude, and this is my message tonight, that I've been here for 13 years. I'd say it's about time the Conservatives got the courage to get Mr. Devine down here on the floor of this House to get hold of this runaway caucus on his hands. Because if they do not, if they do not take hold of this, if they allow this kind of disparaging stuff . . . Look at what's happening in this House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle is acting as the leader. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle asks every question in a supplementary basis. Regardless of who sets it up, Qu'Appelle is up there. He's going to serve as the leader.

MR. SPEAKER: — I've studied the motion before us several times this evening, and I've found several people who appear to be off the topic. I think the Attorney General is off the topic.

MR. ROMANOW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My very last remarks are to say it's about time Mr. Devine asked one of his people to step down in order to give leadership to this caucus to avoid the kind of criticism and the irresponsible acts we've seen today. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of that kind of . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Mr. Speaker, point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is no doubt straying away from the topic.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I've brought the Attorney General to order. I find him to be in order now since I brought him to order.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I, Mr. Speaker, heard you intervene when the Attorney General had strayed from the motion before the Assembly, very carefully. And now, you're letting him continue. He just stepped right back in where he left off. Now you're saying that's in order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member is now contesting what I said. It's in the record. The member can check it tomorrow. Since I brought the Attorney General to order, he is in order.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to say it again for the hon. member for Moosomin. My argument, whether you accept it or reject it, is that today the Conservatives acted in probably the most irresponsible fashion in this House . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm not going to sit down. I'm going to make that point. They acted responsibly because they made a judgment call as to who was at fault in that dispute. The member for Moosomin says they made the right one. I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that is an act of irresponsibility that would not have taken place if Mr. Devine were in the House, guiding this particular caucus.

I am saying it is an act of irresponsibility because of the fact that Mr. Devine has failed, for whatever reason, either fear or inability to get elected, to get hold of this disparate caucus. The result is these kinds of statements being made on this particular issue. I say, Mr. Speaker, that at a sensitive time with the area of negotiations being carried on, the way they're being carried on, that is a very serious matter indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I close by saying the member for Nipawin who introduced the

May 8, 1980

motion (I disagree with many of his suggestions as I say) but he did, in a responsible way, try to get the debate rooted. We did not cast the judgment calls. We did not interject contraceptives into the debate or interunion jurisdiction or the union bashing of the member for Moosomin. I want to tell this House that in my judgment that fault is to be laid squarely, 100 per cent, at the feet of the new Leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. Grant Devine. That is a reprehensible act which should be rejected by all the members of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the point of order?

MR. COLLVER: — I have to wait for the Attorney General to take his seat in order to ask him if he would accept the question before it goes on. My question to the Attorney General is quite simply this. Would the Attorney General as the House Leader kindly bring this matter to a conclusion tonight in order that we could get some kind of a decision out of this Assembly. As you've said, we tried to start out in a serious vein. Perhaps we could conclude in a serious vein, so that the dairy producers in Saskatchewan know that at the start and the finish, at least, we're serious.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the question I make this answer, two pints. First, far be it from me or any person to try to deny any member the right to speak in this House. If there are members on this side who want to speak — 7, 8, 9 or 10 — they have the right to do so. Secondly, I repeat strongly and as sincerely as I can say it tonight, to continue the debate to stop the clock in order to allow an irresponsible determination of fault in this dispute that no responsible government or legislator would allow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. LINGENFELTER (Shaunavon): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with interest that I have listened this afternoon and evening to the debate by the members opposite in which they have attempted to cast a slur against the labour movement in Saskatchewan, and in doing that, against the workers of Saskatchewan. In particular, when I rose to speak the member for Moosomin was hollering across sit down, don't speak, this sort of thing. I think this is indicative, as well, of the type of people the members opposite are. I think their constituents would be interested in knowing that not only are they not interested in the workers of Saskatchewan, but also they are not interested in the freedom of speech of members of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I think we have to recognize other people's right to speak as unhindered as possible in the House. I was on guard for the member for Moosomin's rights this afternoon when he spoke and I will in the future, but at the same time I have to be for other members too. If members are getting interrupted and I can't hear them, I am going to have to call the House to order.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Thanks again, Mr. Speaker. My comments will only take a few minutes so I am sure the member for Moosomin and others on the other side will bear with me. The point I am going to make is that not only are the labour people of the province being attacked today but the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan is being attacked as well. What the members opposite are proposing is that after only 36 hours the government step in to bring about legislation that would end a conflict that not only involves labour but management as well. I think the co-operatives and credit

unions in my constituency would be interested to know that the members opposite do not have confidence in the management of our co-operative movement in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The Attorney General made the point that members opposite are slow learners and that they should follow the examples that were learned by the former premier of this province, Mr. Thatcher. And there's another leader also as well, the former leader of the Liberal party, Ted Malone, who learned a said lesson about what happens when you attack the rights of people in this province. An example, I want to cite is the longest co-op strike in the history of Saskatchewan, shortly before the provincial election in 1978 in the constituency of Shaunavon. At that time the member who represented the Shaunavon constituency (and Tory candidate of the day) insisted that the government become involved in that dispute. I would like to ask the members opposite what happened to those people when they insisted that the people in the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan didn't have the intelligence and integrity to solve their own labour problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think the members opposite should learn from history. I think that members opposite who do not follow the lessons learned through history are doomed to repeat them. I think the leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan should be cognizant of that fact, and I am sure that the next election here in Saskatchewan will prove that point and bear it out.

Just before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point that the motion before us calls for the Assembly to end the dumping of 2 million pounds of milk per day, and I was just wondering how it is possible to end something that hasn't yet started. I think that we are jumping to conclusions and showing our lack of respect for the labour movement and for management by saying that the impasse is not going to come to a logical conclusion through negotiation in the very near future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, it is another sad day in the legislature. Another sad day among many which have been perpetrated by the Progressive Conservatives opposite. It's a sad day for the farm organizations and farm people who are my constituents, and it's a sad day for the dairy workers in my constituency as well. It's a very sad day for them because of the interference of the members opposite in their rights, the interference in the rights of the farmers and the workers of my constituency and all the workers and farmers of this province. Their interference and obstruction in the free bargaining process of both sides at a critical stage, Mr. Speaker, I find appalling. I find that what is going on here is a simple repetition with a slight variation of the thing that developed two years ago. But I find too that this is a very, very interesting debate, in that it shows the true colours of the Conservatives opposite. It shows their true colours that they have displayed so often throughout this session, interfere with the governmental process, not criticize constructively, interfere with it. Obstruct the governmental process — don't criticize it constructively, obstruct. This is, just as many of us over here have called it, the new Devine order: obstruction and interference.

May 8, 1980

That's the order of their day. Yes, they deplored the bell ringing that went on last year, during this last strike. It was terrible, they said, that there should be such interference in the bargaining process. But they interfered and they obstructed just the same by their tactics today. This is the concern, Mr. Speaker, that they show for the farmers and the workers of this province.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:01 p.m.