

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature**

**May 8, 1980**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. D. LINGENFELTER (Shaunavon):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, a group of 29 students from the separate school in Shaunavon. Christ the King School, who are here today with their teacher, Mrs. Eldene Glass, and Sister Leona, and a helper, Jan Glass, as well as their bus driver, Harold Trumper.

I must say that it is a pleasure each year to introduce this group of students. They come from the school which I attended from Grade 1 to Grade 8 in Shaunavon, and many fond memories exist from that school.

I'm sure all members would wish to join me in wishing them an enjoyable stay here in this Assembly, and a safe journey back to Shaunavon tonight. Thank you.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. F.J. THOMPSON (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, a group of 21 Grade 4 students from the Ducharme School in La Loche, seated in the Speaker's gallery.

They are accompanied by their teachers, Joan Bue and Ann Saleski, by their bus driver, Jack MacPherson, and by their chaperones, Pauline Laprise, Susan Herman, and Christine Janvier.

This group left La Loche on Monday, and have travelled to Saskatoon and on to Regina. Later on today they will be travelling back to Saskatoon and attending the Shrine Circus tomorrow. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that this group of students has travelled from La Loche to Regina, approximately 600 miles.

I would like to welcome them here, and in closing I sincerely hope that the trip will be both educational and enjoyable. We all wish you a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Buena Vista):** — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to this House, two groups of students — one group is Grade 8 students from Churchill School, 28 in number, and another group from Lorne Haselton School, 35 in number.

The students from Churchill School are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Ernie Balzer, and the Lorne Haselton children are accompanied by student teacher, Barbara Farmer and Mr. Don Bates.

I would ask the Assembly to join with me in welcoming the students here. I hope they have an informative and educational trip to Regina. I will be meeting with those groups

May 8, 1980

a little bit later.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Action of Government re Dairy Strike

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The last time there was a dairy strike the government took the action of calling in the parties to negotiate in the Legislative Building, the participation of the Minister of Labor (I believe at that time it was the Minister of Labor), and perhaps, the Minister of Agriculture. Will you give the undertaking that you will embark on the same activity and do so immediately?

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I report to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that calls have gone out to both the negotiations for management and labor to come, in fact, to the legislature this afternoon or early this evening (whichever can be accommodated) to meet with the Minister of Labor, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and myself. I report also to the hon. member that the representatives of the dairy association met with me this morning. That was their recommendation. We are following up on their recommendation and also the pattern that was set two years ago.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary. The statements in the press today by one of the dairy producers indicates that the milk producers' association has been attempting to get the government to introduce legislation to protect perishable food producers from strike action. Has your government ruled out such legislation? If you have not ruled out such legislation why, with the strike being a distinct possibility for some months, did you fail to bring such legislation before the Assembly during this session?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, the proposal for essential services legislation, to which I think the hon. member is making reference, is a proposal that comes forward to this government on many occasions. I think our position on it is very fair. It is clear in the sense that we just don't see it working. Therefore, why implement a policy which doesn't seem to work? I indicate to the hon. member the experience in Quebec, and of course the most recent experience in the province of Alberta, with respect to the nursing strike where the essential services legislation did not work. So we have indicated to the dairy producers' association that in our minds that kind of an idea doesn't work. I think it's a position well-known across this province, and a position well-known to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary. The minister is then indicating that the dairy industry in Saskatchewan is doomed, for some considerable time, to be faced with a strike every second year. That threat will hang over the dairy industry for some time. I very specifically ask whether such legislation would be considered for perishable food producers, and is the minister stating that he has no intention, assuming this strike is settled, of protecting the dairy producers in the future?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I outlined the position of the government in answering the previous question. It is not our plan to introduce what I suspect could be described as essential service legislation. Our policy on that is very clear. I've indicated to the hon. member (and I gather that he supports the position) that we're calling the

parties together this afternoon or early this evening, to encourage them to go back to the table to settle it in a way that is probably the best way to settle disputes between two parties. I should perhaps, Mr. Speaker, report to the Assembly that not all of the processors are out on strike and there are plants operating yet in Preeceville, Humboldt, Regina and Moose Jaw. So while the broad situation in the province is not quite as serious as it might be, there is a significant area where the situation is serious and producers are under a great deal of pressure.

### **Telecable Broadcasts in Saskatchewan**

**MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie):** — My question is to the Attorney General in the absence of the minister in charge of Sask Tel. Mr. Attorney General, I have a communique here received by the minister responsible for Sask Tel, expressing his deep concern about the scrambling of the telecable Saskatoon signal by Sask Tel. Now today I notice Sask Tel is threatening to scramble Cable Regina, and it looks like Sask Tel is not going to allow them to put an earth station to receive that satellite. What is this government going to do about starting to let the people of Saskatchewan receive the broadcast proceedings from the House of Commons debates in Ottawa?

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be the very last person to deny the people of Saskatchewan the benefit of scintillating and highly intelligent debate, which goes on in the House of Commons, from television. As I have indicated to the hon. members in the past, Sask Tel has taken the position that the satellite receiving service through the revolving satellite around the globe is available through Sask Tel equipment. It is available to Saskatoon Telecable and was for several days or period of time before Telecable decided to use its own equipment; it is available to Cable Regina. That position has been clear, and therefore nobody should be denied the provision of this very important feature of debate in the House of Commons.

**MR. GARNER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Cable Regina, as well as Saskatoon Telecable, has all of the licences from the federal authority, from the Canadian Transport Commission to the CTRC. They have the authority; they have the rights. Do you not agree that maybe Sask Tel and your government is overstepping its bounds, and just going too far in trying to penalize and prevent corporations from functioning in Saskatchewan and people receiving this information from Ottawa?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have here a fundamental difference between the Progressive Conservative caucus and the government caucus. The fundamental difference is respecting the role of Sask Tel. Our position is absolutely crystal clear. The only way we can provide telephone services or television services or cable television services or sophisticated pay TV services (hopefully in the future to all of rural Saskatchewan) is if Sask Tel has control of the hardware. We cannot do that if we allow private operators, be they co-op, in the case of Regina Cable Co-op, or Telecable, to own a portion of that hardware and thereby by-pass the important and costly equipment which Sask Tel has put into place. Furthermore, I do not agree with the hon. member's statement at all the rights and licences are in place.

I want to remind the hon. member that with respect to channel 10, there is no CRTC authorization of channel 10 in Saskatoon, I am advised, to use the House of Commons broadcast. In fact, that hearing is coming up before the CRTC right now. The Government of Saskatchewan is intervening, requesting that the CRTC make that channel 10 application a public hearing, so the decision is in fact not open. If I'm wrong, I want to ask the hon. member why it is we have not yet seen a lawsuit from

May 8, 1980

Telecable on this matter, as the members have promised?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. cable Regina has been in contact with Sask Tel regarding costs of receiving this signal . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I want to hear the question.

**MR. GARNER:** — My question to you, Mr. Attorney General, is why does Sask Tel charge more for that same signal than another company can provide?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I have indicated, or at least this government has indicated that the policy of Sask Tel with respect to the cost for provision of signals is based on rate averaging between rural and urban areas, densely populated and not densely populated areas. That is purposely designed so that we can provide thereby, hopefully, some measure of hardware services to all of Saskatchewan. If we charged on a strictly customer will bear basis, then many parts of rural Saskatchewan would not even have telephone services like they have today. The only way we can do that is by rate averaging. The only way we can have rate averaging is if we can have the good with the bad. Now the hon. members opposite want to privatize a portion of Sask Tel. The hon. members opposite want to privatize the earth station satellites and I object to that policy.

### **TV Signal**

**MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — A question to the Attorney General. Some time ago in the House, when I asked a question to the minister in charge of Sask Tel as to why the government did not proceed first of all by way of the injunction rather than by the scrambling process and he said they considered that but rejected it. Would the Attorney General tell the House as a chief law enforcer and a person committed to the court system, why did the government not use the court system by way of injunction in this particular case?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate the answer that the hon. minister in charge of Sask Tel gave. The minister for Sask Tel took the position that the contract had been breached by members of Saskatoon Telecable. And if that is a wrong interpretation I simply as the hon. member opposite . . . Perhaps he can't answer, he shouldn't be expected to answer. If that was an erroneous action, there's a remedy open to Saskatoon Telecable.

Secondly, I repeat again — I stand to be corrected because I do not have a day-to-day grasp on this particular issue — I repeat again that channel 10 has not been authorized by the CRTC to be used as a House of Commons channel and it is being used. And I think that is clearly very indicative as to why there has been no lawsuit to this time by Saskatoon Telecable. That hearing is coming up.

Now somehow under those sets of circumstances and facts, we are the ones who are at fault. We are the ones who should have gone to court, even when it appears the company has not the authorization from CRTC for the use of that channel and when it appears clearly on the basis of the contract that Sask Tel was ready, willing and able to provide the equipment. I repeat again, on behalf of Sask Tel and to the citizens of Saskatoon and Regina, we are ready, willing and able to provide the dish, and you can

get the House of Commons service on satellite assuming the CRTC approval of that channel.

Nothing changes those facts. But if anybody tries to dismantle or privatize Sask Tel — yes, at a higher price — so the rest of the residents of Saskatchewan and Wilkie have a chance of receiving the House of Commons debate . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — If you want to privatize the good and profitable portions of Sask Tel and leave the unprofitable portions to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, we can't go that way.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Marketing of Computer Office Equipment**

**MR. ANDREW:** — New question to the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General elaborate on how Sask Tel can provide everything more cheaply? Could the Attorney General advise the Assembly if it is the intention of Sask Tel to start at this point in time or this year the marketing of computer office equipment, in particular word processors? Is that a new business function of Sask Tel?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that to be a new business function of Sask Tel. I want to be absolutely fair to this House and to the members. I have not been in contact with the general manager of Sask Tel in the last little while, particularly on this one specific example, but I simply do not believe it to be a new function of Sask Tel.

I do want to say before I take my seat, in response to this question, Mr. Speaker, that today we are seeing in the world of communications a fantastic expansion of the principle of telephones. We are seeing all sorts of variations. And if the principle that telephones should be provided by a public utility holds true, then equally it should extend to other technological advances.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I'll take the member for Nipawin.

### **Dairy Workers' Strike**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's certainly a pleasure speaking from this chair rather than that one. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your consideration. Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Minister of Labor with reference to the dairy strike. The minister will recall, in 1978 there were similar circumstances to those extant today with reference to the dairy industry, and he will recall the circus-like atmosphere in which the negotiations were conducted in this building including the ringing of bells for many hours, almost jeopardizing those negotiations.

Would the minister not agree that, rather than the circus-like atmosphere and proposing to end the strike by bringing these parties together here in these buildings, a cooling-off period, sending the employees back to work and trying to settle at the bargaining table would be a more reasonable and rational approach?

May 8, 1980

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labor):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I am not prepared to accept the viewpoint of the hon. member for Nipawin that this some how or other represents a circus-like atmosphere. Certainly if that was the case two years ago, it wasn't created by members on this side of the House. Those who were responsible for the introduction of the motion, the departure from the Chamber and the ringing of the bells are not longer with us, and I trust that will serve as a lesson and an example for all members in this House.

With respect to the suggestion of the hon. member of sending them back to work at this point in time without any conclusion to the disagreement, I think that represents probably not a good situation at this point in time. Certainly I am hopeful that reason will prevail and the parties will be drawn together very shortly within a matter of hours, and there will be a real possibility of reaching an agreement between the two parties which is the ultimate conclusion and the one we would like to see accomplished yet today if at all possible.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister will be aware that last year's or 1978's precedent of bringing the members into this Chamber or the various parties to the agreement into this building in order to try to settle it is being repeated now. There has to be in the minister's mind a slight thought that perhaps that's where it's going to end up at any rate, every time a strike between the dairy workers and the others has to be settled. Would the minister not agree that because of the very urgent nature of the perishable commodity, milk, and because it is now Thursday and leading into a weekend, we could see very serious damage done to the dairy producers in the industry between now and Monday which is the next possible chance to pass legislation in this Assembly that could send them back to work for a cooling-off period?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, a prolonged discussion at this point may be somewhat counter-productive in light of the fact that we are in the process of bringing the parties to a collective agreement together. And it's my understanding that the hon. member will be able to pursue his suggestion very shortly after question period. Accordingly I think I would reserve judgment on what decision should be reached until such time as the hon. member has an opportunity to present his point of view. I think the suggestion he seems to be making is that essential services legislation (if that's what he is presuming) should come about, because of the fact that this has somehow become a recurring feature every two years. I am hopeful that certainly will not be the case.

We are very much in favour of a process of free collective bargaining, and we believe that it works in the larger percentage of cases with only perhaps 4 per cent or 5 per cent of the total collective agreements not reached in a civilized and gentlemanly manner. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I think the scenario that is laid on is the most appropriate one considering the circumstances.

**MR. LANE:** — Final supplementary. Would the minister be prepared to commit the government opposite, if negotiations are going on tomorrow, that this Assembly stop the clock at one o'clock Friday so members of the Assembly can be prepared to be brought back at any time over the weekend to pass legislation if negotiations break down?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I don't know if the -hon. member is directing the question to me or the House Leader but I would be inclined to believe that his question should be directed to the House Leader. I wouldn't like to prejudice talks that are about to take place by attaching any preconditions to them. Accordingly for my perspective, I think it would be

a mistake to be laying on any preconditions. Obviously discussions of all natures will be talking place in that time and concerns will be taken into account but I think it would be premature at this time to be announcing what our intentions are. Obviously a great many matters will enter into the picture between now and later this evening.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I'm going to take the member for Arm River. The member asks a hypothetical question, which is not permitted during question period.

### **Randy Wangler Case**

**MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. The minister stated yesterday, as reported in Hansard on page 2747, that he relies on the rules of the Canadian Conference of Motor Transport Administrators for making decisions concerning the eligibility of a person for class 3 driver's licences. In view of the fact that I spoke to that organization this morning in Toronto (to Joanne Knight whose name was given to us by your office as a contact), can the minister explain why there has been no communication at all between this office and your own on the matter of Randy Wangler, which was brought to your attention several months ago?

**HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** — I will try to give a very simple answer to a member who — well, I won't go into that. The fact is that we don't get in touch with the CCMTA board every time a situation raises. The fact is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I did not say that yesterday, Mr. Speaker. I said that the Canadian Council of Motor Vehicle Administrators meets annually, and it recommends certain rules. We abide by those rules; we don't just jump in midstream every time a case comes up. Neither do we go to the Canadian Medical Association every week. They met, (I was incorrect on this — I thought it was Winnipeg, but they met in Ottawa) less than a month ago and discussed, as I said, two items, one-armed drivers with less than two joints, and diabetics. They decided it at that meeting, and it was confirmed again by Dr. Bartlett from B.C. I might say I have a telegram from Dr. Thom here that I would be prepared to table. We had confirmation again from the members of the board, not doctors chosen at random who are about as irresponsible as the one RCMP officer who was quoted in the House.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — It was your secretary this morning who gave us that name and said you had contacted him. In view of the fact that you also rely for advice on Mr. Dygala, the assistant deputy minister of highways for Manitoba (as also reported in Hansard, page 2747 — and this is like this one I raised yesterday) can the minister explain why Mr. Dygala's office was not given the information that Mr. Wangler had an artificial arm to assist in arriving at a fair decision on whether he was eligible for a driver's test or not?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Mr. Speaker, the member again stated an untruth when he said my secretary said that we were in touch with CCMTA; that's completely untrue, because we don't. We don't get in touch with the CCMTA. The highway traffic board advises me; my office does not get in touch with them. I simply report on behalf of the chairman. The other statement is that it doesn't matter whether there is an artificial device or not. The fact of the matter is that the rules say a stub arm is no arm.

May I, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, read this statement that was asked for yesterday? It comes from Dr. Thom who was in British Columbia at the time.

In response to your inquiry, I must state most emphatically, from a

May 8, 1980

professional point of view, there is absolutely no way that I can support the issue of a class 3 licence to Mr. Wangler. Such a procedure would be in direct contravention of current CMA standards. Furthermore, this case involves amputation of two joints, which in an emergency would create the most serious safety hazard both to Wangler and to others. He clearly cannot be said to have two arms. He has one arm and a prosthesis, a totally different matter. I have personally discussed this case with an eminent orthopedic surgeon and also specialists in rehabilitation medicine, and they completely agree with the standard and my interpretation of it. It is my understanding that this standard has recently been reviewed by the CMA and is considered certainly and currently appropriate.

This is signed Dr. I.M. Thom, M.B., Ch.B., C.C.F.P., the medical adviser to the highway traffic board, and I'll table it.

## **PRIORITY OF DEBATE**

### **Dairy Workers' Strike**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Prior to the orders of the day, I would like to move, seconded by the member for Swift Current, (Mr. Ham), by leave of the Assembly . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He's not there.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, I'm on my feet right now and that's O.K. The Speaker can give the rulings, not the Minister of Labor . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor or are these other gentlemen going to keep on talking?

Mr. Speaker, prior to orders of the day, I would like to move, seconded by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham):

That priority of debate be given to the urgent and compelling need for this Assembly to discuss: (a) the 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, producers, and the economy of Saskatchewan, (b) the imminent loss by Saskatchewan milk producers of their present quota to other provinces, (c) the need for this Assembly to pass legislation calling for a cooling-off period to end the anxiety being experienced by every man, woman and child in the province, to end the current atmosphere of confrontation and to allow the contract dispute to be settled in an atmosphere of reconciliation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It has been moved by the member for Nipawin, however, I do not see a seconder in place. Who seconds this motion? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's unnecessary for the mover of the motion to have a seconder when he's asking leave and the member is asking leave under the rules, section 17(5). Has the member leave of the Assembly to proceed?

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Point of order. I don't want to speak to the substantive issue about this matter. But I am unclear about the procedure that we follow three or four times during the session in this regard. My understanding is (and I would ask clarification from you), that first of all a member asks leave for the right to move priority of debate. he then hands you a written statement. Mr. Speaker, then,



according to sub (6) which I quote:

. . . if he thinks it is in order, and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the Member has the leave of the Assembly.

My understanding of that is that it requires, before you ask leave of us, a judgment called by you that it is: (a) in order; and (b) of urgent public importance. If that's the case, then it's read out and leave is asked of all of us. Am I to assume that that is in fact the case, that you do think it is in order and of urgent public importance, or not? Because I think if you rule on either one of those, that it is out of order or that it is not of urgent public importance, then leave is not necessary of us.

I will now speak to this matter which I understand is very important, but I'm unclear about the procedure. Am I right or wrong?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — If you would give me a moment or two, please. Perhaps we should have more of these priority of debates so that we'd get into a routine manner of handling them.

The rules with regard to priority of debate states, Rule 17(5):

The Member desiring to make such a motion rises in his place and without debate asks leave to move the Assembly give 'Priority of Debate' to a definite matter of urgent public importance and states the matter.

That is what the member has done. Everything is in order up to there. Rule 17(6) states:

He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it is in order, and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the Member has the leave of the Assembly.

Now I intend to read it out as is stated in sub (6) and ask if there is leave of the Assembly to proceed; if objection is taken sub (7) deals with the manner in which that will be dealt with. So I find that everything is in order up to this point. The motion is as follows:

That priority of debate be given to the urgent and compelling need for this Assembly to discuss: (a) the 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 and producers, and the economy of Saskatchewan; (b) the imminent loss by Saskatchewan milk producers of the present quota to other provinces; and (c) the need for this Assembly to pass legislation calling for a cooling-off period to end the anxiety being experienced by every man, woman and child in the province, to end the current atmosphere of confrontation and to allow the contract dispute to be settled in an atmosphere of reconciliation.

Does the member have leave to proceed?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Agreed.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all the motion we have put before you is identically the same motion, precisely, as put forward by a Liberal member of this Assembly, Mr. Wiebe, in 1978, 36 hours after the dairy strike commenced. We now, in

May 8, 1980

Saskatchewan, are 26 hours after the dairy strike commenced yesterday. Fortunately some of the outlets are still working. So the situation is not quite as serious as it was in 1978. But the situation is nevertheless of urgent importance. The dairy producers in the province of Saskatchewan, because they are producing a perishable product, cannot possibly survive even the shortest strike.

The last dairy producers' strike was settled within 48 hours, if you recall. This motion came in at 36 hours and within 12 hours the workers and management in this building with the bells clanging, finally settled the strike. It was settled within 48 hours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even with that, the losses estimated by the milk producers in 1978 ran to the millions of dollars. The milk producers in Saskatchewan in 1978, after the strike was over, reported to the Minister of Agriculture, to the people of Saskatchewan and to the Minister of Labor, that their losses were exorbitant and that a great many dairy producers went out of business as a result of that 48 hour strike.

Here we are, just two years later, with identically the same kinds of problems facing the dairy producers. The strike is 26 hours old and the minister says, maybe the unions and management will arrive in these buildings for a meeting sometime today or tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the minister waits for that meeting until tomorrow the strike will already be 48 hours old. I would like to suggest to the minister that his chances of settling that strike today or tomorrow or even the next day, in the manner and fashion in which he has chosen to act, are marginal at the very best. Why? The minister says, in 1978 we settled them in just this fashion. We brought the parties together. They were here in the building. We were able to settle the strike without having to take any governmental action, other than to call them together here. And we ended it right then and there.

Mr. Speaker, the chances of the union and management getting together this time, under those circumstances, are almost nil because they recall what happened in 1978. The people who are represented by the union recall what happened to their earnings from the settlement in 1978 and the erosion of their earnings. In many instances in this province, in many of the working areas of the dairy workers, those individuals are saying to their union leaders, don't settle it the same as last time. That's what they're saying; that's what their union leaders are saying. We're not prepared to do it the same as last time; we need a better break. The Minister of Labor nods; he knows that's what they're saying. We need a better break than last time; we're not prepared to do the same as last time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the problem is this. Last time it was settled in this building. This time the odds are less that it will be settled in this building. By Friday noon, 48 hours after the start of the strike, producers are going to start dumping milk; they have to. They have 48 hours of storage; that's all. If that strike drags on until Saturday, producers will have to put a whole day's supply away. If it drags on through Sunday, another day's supply away, through Monday, another day's supply.

Now the head of the dairy producers, in today's newspaper, predicts that anything more than a 48 hour strike will cost Saskatchewan 200 milk producers. He's not a party to these agreements; the minister is. He's not a party to the agreement between the workers and managements. He's representing innocent third parties who have no control over what you do, over what happens at the bargaining table. And he estimates

that over 200 producers will be gone, through bankruptcies, if the strike is more than 48 hours old.

How is it going to be possible, Mr. Minister and Mr. Speaker, if all we're doing today is bringing them together, maybe this afternoon (they're not here yet) and maybe tomorrow? Given the atmosphere of confrontation that exists today, it's not going to be possible. What are the alternatives, Mr. Speaker? Well, you're talking about essential services, and that's one alternative. Let's make a law that requires all people who work in essential services not to strike.

Mr. Speaker, that's a non-workable law. I totally agree with the Minister of Agriculture's statements today that that's a non-workable law. It didn't work in Alberta, as the minister said; it didn't work in some areas in the United States, which passed that kind of legislation; it didn't work for Ross Thatcher when he passed it here in Saskatchewan and it won't work in Saskatchewan today either.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a law that does work, which should not be a continuing law but should be invoked by the members of the legislature in situations just like this, when it happens, at the time it happens. That is a law that requires workers to go back to work for 90 days and to spend that 90 days attempting to solve their differences. Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of law makes the workers and management understand that legislators are serious about protection of innocent third parties. It's not a blanket law; it's not something that applies all the time; it is only applied when innocent third parties are in imminent danger. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that dairy producers in Saskatchewan are in imminent danger tomorrow, not today or yesterday. They are in imminent danger. By Saturday, some of them are going to go broke and by Sunday, more of them and more waste.

Now this kind of law, Mr. Speaker, would in fact work when it's brought in by a legislature such as this one at the time that this kind of serious disadvantage to third parties may possibly be an imminent danger. Mr. Speaker, I think that's the kind of law we need — a temporary law, a law for this strike — but we need it now, not tomorrow or Saturday or Sunday. It should be on the books now. It should be brought into this legislature now.

What happens, Mr. Speaker, if, as has been the present government's practice from time to time in the past, they bring in laws for temporary needs that have permanent implications? The members of the opposition, in looking at this so-called temporary law, are required to examine it in detail and find that there are sections of the law brought in for a temporary basis, for a temporary need, which have permanent implications. The members of the opposition feel compelled, Mr. Speaker, to debate those permanent implications, and to bring those to the attention of the people. That means further delay. That means more producers out of business. And the government would stand over there and play some politics with it and say, oh you see the opposition didn't really want this kind of law. The opposition didn't really want to bring it in. And some members of the press and some others would believe that we were debating items in the law which had some permanent implications.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of an atmosphere in which laws are brought in at the very last minute, when producers are going out of business, is unfair to members of this Chamber. It's unfair to members on the other side, who may want a little more time to discuss the kind of temporary law that's being brought in, without the threat of producers being broken every hour on the hour when the strike goes on too long.

May 8, 1980

I say to the Attorney General today, that if he waits until Monday to bring in this law, if it's necessary, and of course we hope it isn't necessary . . . As the Minister of Labor has already said, the collective bargaining process is the best possible way to solve things in an atmosphere in which those problems can be solved. But the real question, Mr. Speaker, the real problem is that when a product that spoils has to be dumped as of noon tomorrow and producers are going to go broke, that gives legislators no time at all to think about any permanent implications if you wait until Monday. You will already have put some dairy producers out of business. If we brought in a law today, temporarily, for this situation, that forced a cooling-off period for 90 days, we wouldn't run into that problem tomorrow or Saturday or Sunday or Monday or Tuesday. Now if the Minister of Labor is suggesting that somehow, in some way, the free collective bargaining process can be allowed to continue through Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday of next week, in the meantime decimating the ranks of Saskatchewan dairy producers, then I think the minister is misreading not only the mood of the Saskatchewan people, but also the precedents that he and this government have established in terms of when we sent the Saskatchewan Power workers back to work. You will remember those circumstances.

If I remember correctly (and I believe I do) there were implications in the press and from others that deaths occurred as a result of that strike. I think you will all remember that. Finally it was necessary to bring forward the necessary legislation to put the Saskatchewan Power people back, and you didn't like it. How could an NDP government ever like sending workers in unions back to work by law? Of course you don't like it. A government which has been supported by the trade union movement since its inception would not like that kind of legislation. And you wouldn't like this 90 day cooling-off period; I'm sure of that. I'm sure the union leaders in the province of Saskatchewan would say that's a dangerous precedent to set a 90-day cooling off period in this strike. Except, Mr. Speaker, had a 90-day cooling-off period been introduced in time, at the time of the Saskatchewan Power workers being sent back to work, perhaps those deaths wouldn't have occurred.

If 90-day cooling-off legislation is brought in now, in the light of this current situation, perhaps more producers are not going to be put out of business — perhaps. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is worth a gamble; surely it is worth a shot; surely it is worth a try. To suggest that within 48 hours (and let's say he's wrong, let's say it's 96 hours — 4 days ) we should lose 200 of our dairy producers means that one of the strongest industries, one of the most basic industries to Saskatchewan, would be lost.

How many workers are there in the potash industry? Not as many as there are in the dairy industry. Not as many jobs were lost in Saskatchewan with the nationalization of the potash mines, which you say created new jobs (even if I accept that point). If you lose 200 dairy producers you will probably lose a 5-1 ratio, probably 1,000 jobs. Those 1,000 jobs are going to come out of the unions and the very management which is doing the fighting, because if the producers aren't producing the milk then the workers can't process the milk.

That's how serious this problem is. That's how urgent this matter is. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we in this Chamber can have a little more common sense than we've had in the past. Surely we can take a stand now by creating this 90-day cooling-off period before any producers go broke, and before large quantities of milk have to be discarded. Surely we can do that now rather than wait until the damage is done, because this time, since the circumstances are so similar to 1978, we in this legislative Chamber will not

be forgiven if we don't act.

Can we, therefore, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister of Labor, gamble that your negotiations in this building are going to be successful this time? They were last time. Frankly, I think we were darned lucky last time. But I think all sides learned from last time.

Now there is another alternative of course, Mr. Speaker. Both sides would accept a settlement imposed by the government if the government allowed a dramatic and huge increase in the price of milk. The Minister of Labor could walk in, the Minister of Agriculture could walk in and say to both sides, settle boys, because we are going to lay the money on your right now. We are going to raise the price of milk skyrocketing high. We are not going to do it tomorrow or the next day. You go ahead and settle any way you like. We don't want to have to introduce a 90-day cooling-off period to let you settle your own problems. What we are going to do is walk in with cash out of our pockets (it's not our pockets, it's the people's pockets) and say to you, here's what we are going to do. You let the workers have the increase that they want; you let them have the plans they want and we'll foot the bill through a raise in the price of milk in a month or two after the people have forgotten what has happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a government calling itself NDP, it has in many ways (in my judgment in the past and probably will continue in the future), used the Department of Consumer Affairs to the detriment of many businesses. It created the Department of Consumer Affairs and yet it feels that consumers are important (at least it said so in every campaign that I have been involved in in Saskatchewan).

Can a government which puts forward that kind of stand legitimately walk up to a bargaining table this afternoon or tomorrow and tell the guys to go ahead and settle it any way you like? Give any increase you like because we are going to raise the price of milk to cope with it. We are not going to do it today or tomorrow, but in a couple of months when things cool off a little bit. We'll wait until people understand then up it goes. We won't do it all at once; we'll do it one-half cent a month, or a cent a month like we did the last time. Remember the last time? Every month or two there was a rise in the price of milk for about six or eight months. It wasn't all at once. So it made the consumers wonder how in the world did that get settled? Did that get settled on the backs of the consumers or was there true and free collective bargaining which took place?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, to protect the consumers of this country and of Saskatchewan, as well as the producers, these people must be allowed to settle those differences over the collective bargaining table themselves. They haven't been able to up to now and that's why they are on strike. But in 90 days they probably would solve them. Surely a 90-day cooling-off period would give them a chance to bargain more reasonably and realistically knowing that the legislators in this building are serious about our dairy producers, knowing that we want to maintain a dairy industry in Saskatchewan and are prepared to do whatever has to be done to solve the problem.

First of all is the important need for this legislation now, not tomorrow or the next day. We are not talking about something you can drag on for two days or three days or five days. This is something which has to be decided soon so that we don't lose those producers who are already in jeopardy.

First of all, it is necessary to protect the producers; secondly, it is necessary to protect

May 8, 1980

the consumer. The government went about its business raising milk prices every month or two for six or eight months, which is what was done after 1978 in order to provide for the settlement that happened (the minister doesn't agree with me) in such a circus like atmosphere it was beyond comprehension. The minister was running back and forth if you remember between this Chamber and the bargaining session. The Liberals had moved a priority of debate. After the debate was finished in a chintzy fashion, which I am sure the minister will recall, he left the Chamber and the bells rang for an hour or two. The minister was quite right in coming back to the Chamber and saying it was totally wrong and it could have jeopardized the talks.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Ever day, for an hour or two.

**MR. COLLVER:** — That's what I thought too. I thought it was and I don't think it matters. But the circus like atmosphere which occurred at the time of the last settlement . . . Anyone who was here. . . If the Attorney General, who was here in 1978 doesn't . . . As a matter of fact, I know, because he himself commented in the House on the circus like atmosphere that was being presented.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — No, I didn't.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I'll find it. I have too. Right at the conclusion, Mr. Attorney General when the minister came back and said the strike was settled. You check it out.

Mr. Speaker, the point is, that is not the way to go about the business of this legislature and it's not the way to solve problems in Saskatchewan. The Minister of Labor suggested today, and suggested yesterday, as I suspect is absolutely correct, that better than 97 per cent of collective agreements are reached without any fanfare. I agree with the Minister of Labor. The minister will know that when I was in business, at no time in 15 years of making arrangements and collective bargaining agreements, was I ever involved with a strike — ever ! That's a fact. The point is that most collective bargaining agreements are reached over the collective bargaining table, generally in an atmosphere of co-operation. But when they do not, surely, Mr. Speaker, they must not be allowed to seriously jeopardize the livelihood, and in fact, the lives of others. Surely we have to get a better mechanism than that for dealing with this kind of situation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from some of the comments made by the Liberal member for Morse during the debate in 1978, on this very issue. He said in 1978:

Farmers throughout the province of Saskatchewan (dairy producers) as a whole have approximately two days of storage facilities on their particular farming enterprises.

The situation is no different today. I go back to the fact that the strike was called at midnight Sunday night. That's not quite the same as today; it was called at noon on Wednesday. Starting today, that's 36 hours later, up to 2 million pounds of milk per day will be dumped down the sewers in the province of Saskatchewan. That's 48 hours the strike. That's tomorrow, Mr. Minister. It is important, Mr. Speaker/ No, it's urgent.

I would like to go back just for a moment to the motion. First of all, the reason for the urgency of this matter is the need for the Assembly to help end the senseless dumping of up to 2 million pounds of milk. That's a fact. No one doubt that. The Minister of Agriculture in yesterday's Hansard (I won't bore the Assembly by reading his remarks; I

will only paraphrase them and I'm sure he'll stop me.) said, this is a serious matter. That's what the Minister of Agriculture said. He knows because he's supposed to represent the farmers. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in his representation of the farmers, he has to stop and prevent the dumping of milk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I haven't touched yet on the fact that if these dairy producers go broke and if we lose any dairy producers, or if we lose the market for any length of time, Saskatchewan dairy producers, because of the arrangements in Canada, could lose their quotas. So that even if they could put together the necessary capital, even if they could put together the necessary moneys, even if they could go to the bank to borrow up to their eyeballs even farther than they are already, even if they could get their help back, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't get the quotas and the quotas will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent matter that requires immediate attention. If the minister waits and we lose dairy producers (as I predict the minister will say in his remarks today) I predict that this motion — I hope it passes but I predict it will not. I predict that there will not be legislation brought in today to bring a 90-day cooling-off period so that people can sit down and negotiate without the confrontation atmosphere. I predict that it won't. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that every member of the Legislative Assembly will then be held to account for the lost producers, for the lost revenues and for the destruction of the Saskatchewan dairy industry.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. The member for Nipawin has undertaken an obligation. The obligation is, at the conclusion of his remarks, he move the motion.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, you have my motion. It's difficult for me to move the motion since you have a copy of it. Mr. Speaker, I so move.

**MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current):** — It's indeed an honour to participate in the debate on this motion today. I have extreme difficulty in understanding the attitude of the Minister of Labor and the government in this province. The member for Nipawin has presented a reasonable and fair solution to a very difficult situation. We are not asking the NDP government to jeopardize their relationships with the people of the labor unions in Saskatchewan. We are asking the NDP to sympathize with all parties concerned in this dispute. The government simply has more responsibility. We have a responsibility as members of this legislature for a variety of subjects but in a situation that is as urgent as this one, we have a bigger responsibility. The minister is not interfering in collective bargaining by asking the parties to cool their antagonism for 90 days, if it has reached a point of antagonism.

I was a part of this legislature in 1978 and I have to agree with the member for Nipawin and I concur with the Minister of Labor. It was a disgusting affair to sit in this legislature while the bells rang as a result of our then cohorts to our right (the Liberal Party, since demised). If I recall correctly, the minister inferred that it just about jeopardized the negotiations in the basement. As I recall, the members of the negotiating teams had been up for some 24 or 47 hours (I don't know, but it was an extremely long period of time) and they had bells ringing in a tense situation with people under great duress. It was a completely idiotic move in my opinion. I can assure the minister, it goes without saying, that the two members in this caucus will not in any way at all become involved in a tactic like the Liberal Party of that time took on.

Mr. Minister, I am sure that you are aware, as are all members of this legislature, of the great number of difficulties the dairy producers and the people involved in the dairy

May 8, 1980

industry are facing as a result of inflationary problems in our society. Inflation, for the most part, in the eyes of many economists and experts is a direct result of government expenditure and government overspending. Granted the Government of Saskatchewan, in this past budget, presented a balanced budget (and I congratulate your government for that). But until recently, as you are aware, the Government of Canada, at this point still, and your government, saw fit to simply spend more than they were bringing in.

The spinoff of this kind of attitude and this kind of policy results in the workers (all of us but primarily the workers, the average people in our society), facing price increases day to day which they are unable to cope with. Therefore we become involved in situations such as we are facing today. I am sure the minister is aware that the dairy producers in this province are a group which invests just tremendous amounts of money in their endeavours and their enterprises — a minimum of \$150,000 for a small dairy operation and up to a maximum of \$500,000 for a large dairy operation. As has been so clearly stated by the member for Nipawin, a matter of two days can put some 200 of these people out of business. I am sure the Minister of Labor and the Government of Saskatchewan don't want the responsibility hanging over their heads, or the weight on their shoulders, of being responsible for putting 200 people in this province out of business.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan over the last several years has become a net importer of hogs. Saskatchewan is a net importer, at this particular time in history of hamburger. Saskatchewan has been known to this country as the agricultural centre of the nation. How much more interference or lack of concern, if you like, does it take before we become not the agricultural centre of this nation, but maybe even second-rate in respect to the level of agricultural industry in the country? There is little question that not only our dairy producers' futures are at stake here, but that the children and those in our society who consume milk on a regular daily basis have to be considered. Granted, for sure they won't die of thirst because there are other things to drink, but health experts and those in the field of food have for years encouraged the consumption of milk by our youth.

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to read a portion of some of the remarks the member for Morse read into the record during the debate of April, 1978:

Any dairy farmer who has been in business for 10, 15 or 20 years may not be in that position for long. Much of the huge capital cost was acquired when prices were lower.

The situation hasn't changed today. He has now had an opportunity over the past few years to retire a lot of the capital but only two years have passed since the last problem arose with the producers and the dairies. But he's not in the same position as the younger producer today. Many of the young men throughout the province were encouraged by the government (not only this government but also previous governments) he said, to take up agriculture and encouraged to enter the dairy business.

It's your government's policy, FarmStart, which you're now jeopardizing through your lack of sensitivity to our request for a 90-day cooling-off period; you're counteracting your own measures by putting in jeopardy the future of these dairy producers. I think probably a question worthwhile asking, to which the minister in his remarks should respond (if he's able to find out from the Minister of Agriculture) is how many FarmStart



loans will be affected by 200 dairy producers biting the dust.

Obviously none of us, including I am sure, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Labor or the Government of Saskatchewan, wish to see dairy producers placed in a position in which they may face bankruptcy. These comments aren't coming from individuals such as the member for Nipawin and me who are not qualified to speak with authority on the dairy industry; they're coming from people in the dairy industry who are experts and know the industry.

The Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labor are fully aware that they have a responsibility. We're not asking for labor legislation to force these people back to work. We're simply requesting a reasonable approach of requesting the parties to return to work, cool off and face these things on a reasonable, eye-to-eye basis so that those people who have invested, in some case, their life savings or moneys borrowed at extremely high interest rates, will be able to maintain themselves and put food on their tables and be able to meet their commitments as well as supply the substance which the youth of our province require day to day.

Saskatchewan in 1978 had approximately 1,040 dairy producers within its boundaries. I don't believe that's changed too much with the dairy quota system today. About 540 are involved with fluid milk and about 500 in industrial milk. when you look at Saskatchewan as a total agricultural picture, and the number of farmers involved, 1040 is not a great figure. I think all governments in the past have been striving to increase that figure. Mr. Minister of Agriculture, we should be most interested in increasing our dairy production in Saskatchewan. We are on the brink of pushing 200 dairy farmers into bankruptcy, so it's obvious to anyone with any common sense that when you start from a negative position, you surely can't increase the numbers.

If we are to reach our potential in dairy production in this province, it's not only incumbent upon the government to encourage people into the business, it's your responsibility when they face these serious problems to act reasonably and fairly, to act in a fashion which will not antagonize the laborers or the dairy producers in our province. And obviously when conclusions are reached, not under a confrontation as we are now facing, but through co-operation and a cooling-off period, all involved will benefit. If the strike is prolonged, we could lose not only the gains which we have made to 1978 but any potential gains we've had since 1978.

Perhaps one month from now or next week or three years from now we may have 500 dairy producers in Saskatchewan. We could become net importers of dairy products from Alberta. Or will it be incumbent upon the Government of Saskatchewan to advertise and promote through FarmStart, inviting young aggressive individuals in our province to get into the dairy business, to face the same sort of problem 5 or 10 years down the road or sooner, since it's only been two years since the last problem.

Dollar figures in 1978, I am sure, are not unlike today with respect to loss per farmer; in fact I heard yesterday on the radio, I am sure, the dollars are very, very close. It is in excess of \$2,000 a day per dairy farmer under this present situation, that will be lost down the sewers in Saskatchewan.

I don't think anyone can overemphasize our approach, our suggestion, our motion to the government. Again, we are not asking for you to antagonize anyone in our society. I am certain, and I think I speak with a certain degree of authority in having something to do with people on a day-to-day basis in the business I was in at one time, that if the

May 8, 1980

minister had the opportunity to approach members of the labor unions that are striking, (and I'm not asking you to do this), if you happened on a casual basis to ask them if they would be upset or concerned if there was a 90-day cooling-off period, and under reasonable and fair conditions that both side would bargain without the pressure that obviously is coming from here today, without the potential pressure that came in 1978 with the result of the bells ringing in this place (which I said earlier was a foolish move), I'm certain the response the minister would receive from these people would be reasonable and fair.

In this very building, not an hour and a half ago, in conversation with one of the staff in this building who is a friend of a dairy worker in Moose Jaw, her report to me was her friend in Moose Jaw didn't want to go on strike. I'm not suggesting they don't have grievances; I'm not suggesting that people in the dairy industry don't deserve more money.

I'm not suggesting that dairy producers don't deserve any more money, but it's only fair, Mr. Minister and Mr. Speaker, that this situation be handled in such a fashion that we don't lose those 100 dairymen, that they don't lose the \$2,200 a day. My heart goes out to these young people who have borrowed money through FarmStart and lending institutions who are paying, I would imagine, between 10 per cent and 20 per cent interest rates today, to have to dump in the product of their labor down the drain.

From the few dairy people I know, I learn they have to work seven days a week, to provide not only for the investment of the physical equipment — the buildings, the electronic milking equipment — but the feed, the taxes, the licence, the regulations. In your system today it's just, I would suspect, like any other business; it's so necessary for those people to make that (and I understand it's not much) minimum of income to maintain their overhead. In a regulated society as the dairy industry is today, I can understand the reactions of the dairy experts with respect to the future of dairy producers in this situation.

To expand on the costs, with reference to the remarks by the member for Morse, Mr. Wiebe, in April of 1978, what does it mean in terms of dollars to the producer and to the province of Saskatchewan? Since there are 1,040 producers producing approximately two million pounds of milk a day in Saskatchewan, and about half of that — one million pounds — is industrial milk which sells for about (at that time) \$8 per hundredweight on approximately \$80,000, while the other half is consumed in fluid milk at \$12 per hundredweight (which I presume is increased today), which amount to approximately \$120,000, that makes a total cost to the actual producer in the province of Saskatchewan of over \$200,000 for every day that the strike is allowed go on past today. And I think it is safe to presume that figure would be higher in 1980.

When you take an average then of the 1,040 producers and divide that into \$220,000 per day, you are looking at an average loss of \$2,000 per producer per day. If you stretch that over a two week period you are looking at a revenue loss of \$28,000. Now heaven forbid if this carried on for two weeks. One couldn't imagine the state of the dairy producers if it carried on for two weeks. I don't expect it will carry on for two weeks. It doesn't have to carry on for two weeks; it doesn't have to carry on for another day.

As I understand, Mr. Minister, there are two days storage on most dairy operations in Saskatchewan — 48 hours. After four days the dairy processors will not accept milk. As

was stated earlier we are approaching a weekend. If the figures are even close to those of 1978 (and as I say I am sure they are higher) the loss will far exceed the amount suggested earlier — \$28,000 in two weeks.

The loss is one thing. No doubt there are many dairy farmers who will ride out the loss no matter how long it goes. It's those individuals who are up to their necks now whom I am concerned about. There are many people in society affected by strikes and by increased prices. There are very few industries that are affected so much by regulation and so much attention to the job as the dairy producers.

I don't know how the Minister of Labor sleeps at night, but if I were the Minister of Labor I wouldn't sleep very well. I know I shouldn't worry about that. Unfortunately I am going to worry about it. If I were the Minister of Labor I don't think I would sleep very well at night if there were 200 potential bankrupt dairy producers in Saskatchewan for which I may have been directly or indirectly responsible. None of us wish to pay the interest rates. None of us like to face a loan or a loan payment each month. But these people, under a great deal of day-to-day work, day-to-day responsibility, have an investment which very few of us in this legislature have to face. Very few of them, I am certain, were in a position to either inherit or with a lottery to purchase such an operation. The minister should very carefully consider his responsibility to his firm belief in the union movement (which I don't argue with for that's his conviction) and his commitment to many individuals who may not be here to contribute to not only our health and welfare, but the economy of Saskatchewan.

I would like to refer again for a moment or two to the remarks of Mr. Wiebe on April 11, 1978 and again stated by the member for Nipawin. It is a concern about losing our quotas in Saskatchewan. At what point in the last number of years did Saskatchewan become a net importer of hogs? From Quebec, no less! And at what point in the last number of years did Saskatchewan become a net importer of hamburger? From Alberta, no less! This in a province that has prided itself as being the agricultural haven in Canada, which it should be and rightfully so. Some of the most efficient farmers in the country live in Saskatchewan. But how can these efficient farmers exist in a situation over which they have no control, under a somewhat insensitive government with respect to their debts?

I tend to try to understand the laborers' concern, the employees of the dairy production outlets. I sometimes question how serious they are about striking, but that's a matter of opinion. I have more sympathy, quite frankly, for a man who has borrowed, probably more than most of our life saving will ever be, and paid high interest rates to take a chance as a young entrepreneur to supply a product totally regulated by both levels of government. In 48 hours or slightly longer he may be in a position where he may not be in business.

I fail to understand (and perhaps when the minister has a chance to speak he can make me understand) why he feels this is not important; why he feels he is somehow interfering in the collective bargaining process by asking for a cooling-off period.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I have been involved with these kinds of people — labor types. I've considered myself one for many years. I don't believe these people are that unreasonable. They would listen to a presentation, when explained to them properly. They're jeopardizing the livelihood of 200 people with a tremendous investment and their own jobs for that matter too. They can go back to work for 90 days and let reasonable and fair negotiators sit down on their behalf.

May 8, 1980

The minister knows that settlements, disputes and strikes eventually take place. Very few strikes last to the point where people go bankrupt. But in this instance it's too important.

I'm sure you are aware of the facts. These people cannot exist because of the nature of their business, the nature of their investment, the nature of the product — spoilage, regulations, quotas. It's not like asking bricklayers to go back tomorrow because the building might fall down (it doesn't happen), or the electricians in the potential strike which may take place in the construction industry. It doesn't affect the contractors the same way. It affects them, obviously, in the end as an expense. And there is the odd instance of a contractor even going bankrupt. But it's not quite to the same extent. Nor are these same people in the construction business regulated to the point of quotas or licences on a day-to-day operation they have to attend to. Nor do they dump their products down the drain within a 48 hour period if they're not accepted by the people who process them.

Perhaps many would-be politicians or MLAs reach the Chamber as a naive greenhorn as I did in '75, expecting what I thought might be pretty fair ideas and reasonable suggestions to be accepted by the government. You find out these things take a long time. Sometimes they go through the back door. I appreciate the process. And I understand the system better today. But in this case I don't understand.

I can understand any government of any political stripe concerning itself with not wanting to antagonize one group or another. That, probably, is a good balancing effect and an attitude any government should take. I understand the NDP for years has been the so-called spokesman in the labor movement. I don't criticize you. That's the nature of the system. If you choose to take that role, that's the role you take.

I cannot understand, when in a matter of time . . . There's no question, I don't think in the minister's mind, or in the mind of anyone else in this Chamber, that this strike will be settled within the next 72 hours or less. The minister knows how important it is. The Minister of Agriculture knows how important it is. The government knows how important it is.

Something as reasonable and non-political as this is being placed as an opinion. And after all, Mr. Minister, I don't think you're particularly worried about this caucus forming the government on that side of the House in the next two or three years.

We have the potential of 200 aggressive, and I'll use the word, gambling, young people, who have borrowed money, no doubt from your institutions. In a lot of cases they have been encouraged by your government and I congratulate you for the program that encouraged them into the business, and in the face of serious problems, of having to take a product that they work seven days a week for, with a tremendous investment, and have to dump that product down the drain because of, I assume, the minister's lack of wanting to get involved in any way that may resemble interference in the collective bargaining system. I understand why you don't want to get involved in the system, or have it appear that you want to get involved in collective bargaining. You do not have to in this instance, by asking for 90 days cooling off. This is reasonable and fair.

I am looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to hearing why the minister, in realistic terms — I'll repeat, realistic terms — cannot see his way clear to accept this type of motion, and why he feels, if he does, that he would be somehow interfering with

the collective bargaining processes of this province. And further, how do you deal with your conscience, if you like (and I'm sure you have one), with the potential of 200 young farmers either biting the dust . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I haven't heard anything from the Speaker yet. I'll wait for him.

### INTRODUCTION OF STUDENTS

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Yes, I would just, Mr. Speaker, ask leave of the Assembly at this time to introduce a group of students.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Does he have permission from the Chamber?

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would thank the hon. member for Swift Current as well. This will give him an opportunity to collect his thoughts and possibly to understand the government position.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I was just thanking the hon. member for Swift Current for the opportunity he's given me to introduce the students. I introduce them as well, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my hon. colleague and seatmate, the member for Thunder Creek who, unfortunately, cannot be present in the House today to introduce the students.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly a group of Grade 11 students. I understand they are six in number and are accompanied by their teachers, Hilary Proud and Fred Mathieson. I would hope you have had an enjoyable and educational afternoon. I would just relay a very brief message that we are currently in the House discussing a motion of priority of debate. It's regarding the current milk strike you would be familiar with. So that gives you a slight indication as to what is happening in the House. I will be prepared to meet with you after at the time designated, 3:45. I would just wish you a good afternoon, a safe trip home, and ask all members to join with me in welcoming you to the Assembly this afternoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### PRIORITY OF DEBATE (Continued)

**MR. HAM:** — I apologize to the Minister of Labor if I appear repetitious. If I am repetitious then I am repetitious. I sometimes get the distinct feeling, when I witness a lack of attention by those who should be listening, that if they would only listen, and come back with a response that's reasonable and relevant to the questions we are asking, we could be less repetitious.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I made reference earlier in my remarks to the youth, the infants, the children of Saskatchewan and those adults who require milk as a day-to-day necessity. I would like to bring to your attention the remarks made by the member for Kindersley, Mr. McMillan, in 1978, with respect to milk as relevant to the strike today.

Many people in this province depend entirely upon an adequate and consistent supply of milk (I'm one for what it's worth) in order to maintain a level of health. Whether they be infants in institutions in Saskatchewan (primarily hospitals), whether they be infants

May 8, 1980

at home with their parents, or young children who require milk on a consistent and regular basis as a main source of nutrition, many people in Saskatchewan need this mandatory supply of milk in order to maintain their level of health.

This is as large an emergency (he says, big emergency) for people in the consuming public as it is for the producers. The government opposite has to date, in its limited time (and this is 1978) not 36 hours after a strike was precipitated, but 24 hours or more, had since yesterday noon to discuss this problem. I'm sure they have discussed the problem but the results of the discussions are obviously clear. The member for Kindersley at that time suggested that you were sitting on your hands. I won't suggest that you're sitting on your hands but one could anticipate that if it carries on any further that you might be accused of sitting on your hands.

At that time the Premier was quoted as saying that there was no emergency situation in the legislature. Then he admitted it was an emergency, but he said, no doubt there is an emergency. Then he goes on to say, 'Accordingly, I think prudence dictates that we leave it to the people who will be dealing with this until it is clear that their efforts are not going to be successful.' I think those words somewhat paraphrase the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labor's response in question period yesterday and today.

There was a government in this province in the '60s that promoted emergency back-to-work legislation. I recall an election in the '60s where they used Sweden as an example in respect to the labor courts. I'm sorry I'm repetitious, but I want to refer to the circus atmosphere of 1978 when the bells rang, and I watched the Minister of Labor nearly wear that carpet out running back and forth also. There is no need for that kind of situation to arise in this institution. There is no need for labor legislation such as that proposed by the Liberal Party in the '60s.

The woman I spoke to today about her friend in Moose Jaw, who doesn't want a strike in the dairy industry, who belongs to the labor union, agreed with the fact that there is no need for confrontation meetings or confrontation labor problems. There is no need at all. There is no need either for the minister to feel he is interfering in a collective bargaining process when he is not. It never ceases to amaze me that in strikes (and this strike is an instance) that a great number of people on strike don't want to be there. They either feel they are intimidated or perhaps they feel they are unjustly treated, but a lot of them don't want to strike. I don't think that is an unfair statement or an untruth.

Needless to say, the producers don't want to have to dump their milk down the drains. Also why is it necessary for any member of this legislature to stand up and present a priority of debate motion? Or for the member for Swift Current to stand up here and be accused of being repetitious? WE have other business before this House we would like to discuss also. Members of this legislature, I'm sure, would have been happy to leave at the end of April. How then would this have been handled, Mr. Minister?

I would like very much for the minister, in his remarks, to explain (without politics, if possible, without prejudice towards, or bias to any particular group he might have) the reasons for his lack of concern with respect to the potential loss to 200 producers.

Back to these remarks again from Mr. McMillan, the member for Kindersley in 1978, paralleling our problem situation today. The Premier said at that time that we do not anticipate any absolute shortages of milk because of the difficulties. I don't know if the minister can give us that assurance today, because by Saturday we will, for the most

part in Saskatchewan, be short of milk. He went on to say that 36 hours after the strike went into effect, three-quarters of most of the major shopping centres and stores in Saskatchewan — Co-op, Safeway, the Dominion stores — were out of milk. That was in 1978.

I happened to stop at a store in a small town this morning and I made a comment to them. I see you have a supply of milk. Where did you get that? She said, we're on the Regina route and we had a delivery this morning. But he didn't expect any tomorrow. And there wasn't a supply that would satisfy many members of this legislature for too many days.

Fifty per cent of the stores, in 1978, in Regina could not offer the consuming public the Premier's then-quoted 'adequate substitute of powdered milk or canned milk.' So obviously, Mr. Speaker, the people tend to hoard the product when the obvious becomes evident, that there may be a shortage. And the sad thing is that if it carries on, it will be more than just a shortage of milk; it will be a shortage of producers.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I will be very definitely seconding the motion.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, we have a labor strike today that affects milk. Why do we have a labor strike? This will be called a milk strike debate. Mr. Speaker, \$140,000 to \$150,000 worth of milk per day, I understand, starting this evening and tomorrow morning, will start being dumped down the drain. Why have negotiations broke down?

Let me read one of the things the union asked for . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . From what am I reading, Attorney General? Proposals by one of the unions. Here is a proposal: drugs and supplies, including contraceptives. They want drugs. They want birth control. That's part of the negotiations that is causing the milk strike. That's what they asked for, contraceptives. That's what they asked for. It's in here. It's in the proposals.

What's bargaining getting to, Mr. Minister of Labor? As I said to you during the labor estimates, we're going to have troubles because you aren't making everybody follow the rules set out for everybody to follow so good bargaining takes place. If those unions would have been at the table at the proper time, as required by the rules, if those unions would have got down to business, we wouldn't have this problem today. That's why we have it, because you sat on your you know what!

Well, let's talk about union proposals. You and I both know why we have a strike. It is because two unions are in a fight over who's going to represent whom. That's why people of Saskatchewan are going to suffer.

Mr. Lyons and Mr. Banting are trying to up one another, and if you want to check that, look at their proposals. One suggest annual holidays and sys four weeks vacation after five years. That's what one wants. But the other group comes in with a proposal just a little bit different — four weeks after five years. It's the same, sorry. The next one, five weeks after 15 years. What does the other union want? Five weeks after 10 years. Hey, how does the management of Dairy Producers, which has to bargain with these people ever get it together if the unions can't come up with proposals that are even similar? they're coming in totally different. Why? Because that guy sits on his hands. If he'd get them to the bargaining table when he should, we wouldn't have this today.

Let's talk about the contracts because there are four unions involved and they've gone to the negotiating table. Where were they last week when this was coming down? Off to a union meeting. We couldn't negotiate because we were away to a union meeting. Hey, we're into a crunch guys. You don't take off. You stay to settle the issues. You get to the bargaining table and you settle the issues. You don't go to a union meeting. If you want to settle the issues, get into the same room. The union boys have to agree on what they want, and come in with some kind of proposal that's unified — not one guy over here, and the other guy over there, and they don't want to even talk to each other. That's what's happening with issues.

You want me to talk about the proposals. I think the minister knows that all union members are given the proposals if they ask their union rep for them. That's what I have copies of, the proposals taken to the membership.

It's unfortunate the two members who spoke prior to me don't have their figures straight. But that's O.K. That's normal. The last strike in '78 cost this province dairy producers. Every time we dump milk (and it's going to start tonight, and if not, by tomorrow for everybody) we lost a quota. And quota is not replaceable.

It's interesting to note in perishable areas, we've got a much more difficult problem than in the other areas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What's the solution, the Attorney General says. I'd like to tell you, Attorney General to start that minister doing his job right. That's the solution . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right.

How does he start to do his job? He enforces the laws that are presently there. He says, guys, you're supposed to give notice, you're supposed to get to the table at a certain time, not after the contracts over. You get there ahead of time to start to negotiate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you want to put your finger up in the air, you take yourself and move it right out too. You have no concern for the citizens of Saskatchewan the way you sit there and ignore . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . all the jokes. This is serious, Mr. Attorney General. You know I've nicknamed you the minister of no responsibility. It gets proven more and more all the time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I think it's common practice that the members direct their comments through the Speaker and not personally to other members in the Chamber. That way we can add much light to the debate and less heat.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, let's start by saying, as I said earlier, the reason we have a strike is because, as usual, the minister fiddles while the boys aren't at the table . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh well. Well, we've now got a real problem. Eight hundred dairy farmers are going to put the crunch to them. That's what's happening. They have to feed the cows. They have to put in their labor. They have to pay their interest, principal and so forth, with nothing coming in. That's the situation we're going to be in. You know, you go through these proposals, and I'll tell you, Mr. Attorney General, it sure bothered me as I read them because I've been to the bargaining table.

And it says, of all things, that's more important than other things. That's what they went to the table with. I don't know but I sure hope that's not one of the issues that negotiations broke down over.

But let's look at something I referred to earlier, the vacations. It's a normal thing to request lengthening of vacations. The unions can't even agree on what they want. After



20 years, one union want six weeks holidays. The other union after 15 years wants six weeks holidays. What's management supposed to do?

I always heard that when you negotiate with one employer, you get together, you know what you want. But no, that's not what we have going here. We have one union trying to better the other one because the two unions are in a fight over jurisdictions. They are trying to steal workers from each other. Who is the guy that's caught in the middle and going to suffer? The dairy farmer.

That's what has happened. In a fight between two unions the first one to suffer is the dairy farmer. The next ones to suffer are the citizens of Saskatchewan. Because within days, as was indicated, milk will slowly become less available.

As one who knows what it's like to spend a little time on a dairy farm, I know how crucial it is when a cow is producing. You can't turn it off. It just doesn't work that way guys. There's no tap. It keeps on coming and you keep on putting the feed in. But you guys aren't really concerned because you're worried about those voters who are union boys. They are voters, I agree with you. But treat them fair and they'll be fair. You negotiated fairly and management negotiates fairly. Make the rules fair for all and you won't have problems.

Now, we talk about where we lay the blame for this strike. I must repeat, Mr. Speaker, blame it on the Minister of Labor because he and his department should make sure the people get to the table when they are supposed to, exchange their proposals and get down to bargaining. It has become the custom in this province in the last few years to wait until the term of your contract has expired then start to bargain. You don't do it ahead of time. You do it after the contract has expired.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the important thing in the whole issue of labor-management problems is the importance of the referee making sure both sides are playing the game fair, just and according to the rules so no third party, if possible, will ever be injured. If it's a fight between two guys, let them get out in the middle of the ring to slug it out. That's a manly way to do things — not take the little guy and pound on him as he stands in the sidelines and watches. That's what we're doing. You pound on the little dairy farmer while the two big guys stand out there and slug it out. The two unions in the fight are picking on the guy in the middle. It's interesting.

Once again, the minister for no responsibility likes to get into the debate but I think we'll just ignore him because he's not responsible for much.

Now, let's get back into some more of these proposals in the union negotiations. Let's get into some of this stuff. You know, the member for Regina something starts yelling anti-union. Listen boy, I have been to the table and I know what it's like. I have been on the bricks too and I know what it's like so don't you give me that razz. But let's be . . . There's an old rule, Mr. . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I know for all members it's difficult at times to resist the temptation to get off the subject, and I don't want to have to warn the member for Rosthern again. That's the second time I have warned him he has been off the subject. He should resist the temptation to get off the subject and stick to it because this debate has to be specifically on the subject. That's why this time is set aside, so we have to stick to the subject.

May 8, 1980

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I was starting to remark before the interjection that I was having trouble resisting and I thank you for assisting there. Let's go down and look at what people are asking for. The overtime provisions by the unions are not even the same. How does the guy negotiate? One's trying to one-upmanship the other all the time. That's the problem here. I have four proposals before me and you know I do find some things similar. But doggone it, it's got to be tough on management to try to negotiate all these various differences. The way I am informed as to what's been happening while Mr. Sig Walter has been involved, is that he runs from room to room, and I don't mean from management to union, which is the normal thing when you get into some pretty tough problems but he runs from union room to union room. I had never heard of that until last night. Maybe I'm naive. Maybe I haven't been around as long as the Minister of Labor has been around union negotiations. But I always thought when it came down to the point where you were getting somewhere near, you would at least wait until one side got its proposals and its act together. But you know, the act isn't together. We notice that one union (and I only see it in one union) wants a health plan really. They call it family dental care, with a whole bunch of proposals. Proposals being . . .

You know, the Minister of Labor is making comments from his seat. Because of the charge he is making, I would like to answer it, Mr. Speaker, and tell him something. Members of a union, when they vote on something, usually are given a proposal and have copies of what their negotiating team goes to the table with. Usually if you ask them for it they'll give you a copy. And if the minister doesn't have a copy, I suggest to go see some members of some of the trade unions. They may give you a copy too. You know, Mr. Speaker, I'm so tempted to get in and answer some of those comments but I will try to follow the suggestion that you made earlier.

Let's look at the proposals. The proposal from one group is about three pages; the proposal from another group is four; the other proposal is about three. And the other proposal of course that I have been referring to most is the largest. You know I understand, Mr. Minister, hopefully in 25 minutes or so from what the street talk says, the parties will be back together. I hope that's correct. I hope they find quick settlement, and the unions can bury their hatchet among themselves and get down to serious negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, you know the minister from his seat says to me — mind your own business. His department, the Department of Labor, will do it the way it wants. You know, that sounds like a dictator to me. I wonder about the minister making those comments from his seat. I'm trying to stay on the topic, but that's the Minister of Labor who is responsible. He says, stay out of it. Mr. Minister, it is the business of citizens of Saskatchewan when you don't do your job. That is why we are in this debate today, because your department muffed it. Now back to this problem.

I think a lot of the members know the retail price of milk in Saskatchewan is higher than either of the two provinces on each side of us and so are the wages paid to the employees. But, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be two major losses because of this strike. Here they are. The loss of quota will happen as milk goes down the drain and is not recapturable. The other one is loss of revenue to the farmer when he has to dump this milk.

Who is affected directly by both those issues? The farmer, the fellow who milks the cows. That is who is affected. Obviously the economy of the province will be affected and so will those who are working for the dairy industry. You know, Mr. Minister of

Labor, as I said just after I opened my comments, I have been concerned about the possibility of this strike.

I was hoping (as many other people were) that it wouldn't happen, that there would be a settlement, that cool heads would prevail and the petty differences between two unions would be set aside, while a negotiated settlement came about which would be satisfactory to all sides. At this point, that has not happened. Hopefully, within the next few hours, that will happen. Hopefully, they will get to the bargaining table. Hopefully, the two unions will say, O.K., it's time to get down to the crunch. Let's tell them what we want and what the bottom line is. We'll make some movement. Hopefully, management will make some movement and we will all come up with a fair and equitable solution.

That's the key word, fair and equitable, for both sides: one the producer can live with; one the employer can live with; one the employees can live with; one the citizens of Saskatchewan, the consumers, can live with. But for every day of delay, starting at the latest tomorrow morning, milk will hit the sewers. And the farmer will start to take his loss.

The dairy farmer has a bad year coming, Mr. Speaker. The hay crop doesn't look like it is going to be good. There are a few of us worried about that right now in the industry. Even the beef man is starting to worry a little because that is a major input.

You know, union negotiations usually end up with a back pay settlement retroactive to such and such a date. But when milk has gone down the drain, how do you pay for that retroactively? I don't know. You know, the feed went in the cows. The power bill went on. I don't see Mr. Messer, the minister responsible for Sask power, standing up and saying they will forgive the power bill. I don't see the Minister of Agriculture on his feet suggesting that we may, as they used to do during the depression years, allow the payment to be put on the end and forgive one payment if there is a problem.

I understand 500 plus dairy producers are on FarmStart loans. We have ads in England looking for dairy farmers. My understanding is that our basic production, dollar-wise at least, seems to be lower in 1980 than it was in 1978. I wonder if it is because of the dairy strike that was held in 1978 and some people said, I've just had enough. That's the suggestion coming down now, that 200 farmers will pack it up within days of the dairy strike. They're just going to say, I've had enough. We are below our present national quota and we are trying to get dairy farmers; we can't afford to have 200 plus farmers pack it up. There is just no way we can afford that. There is just no way the farmer can absorb the financial burden he has been asked to absorb.

You know it's a tough position for the dairy producer to be in. He respects his brother who is out working in union work or wherever; but he says, don't always pick on me. Let's be fair. We don't hear of any compensation, we don't hear anything about while the striker stays off the strike line that he may receive pay. We don't hear of the farmer receiving any pay for the milk he must drop down the sewer.

Mr. Speaker, this is a grave situation. The cure is left in real truth, the final cure, between the unions and management. The only thing we can ask of this Legislative assembly is to find a way to assist them to get to that final cure. The solution is in agreement.

The motion we are debating seems to indicate that the motion the member for Nipawin will attempt to move later, if I read him correctly from his comments and also the comments of the member for Swift Current, a 90-day cooling-off period. That is what I

May 8, 1980

seem to read from their statements. But, Mr. Speaker, we're not even 90 days past the closing date of the original contract they are on strike over. If they had started negotiations on time, we wouldn't have to talk about 90 days because they would have had at least that many days to sit down at the table to try to settle the problem.

Mr. Speaker, in winding up my comments, I suggest the best thing the Attorney General can do is turn to the Minister of Labor and say, if you had done your job we wouldn't have this mess and we wouldn't be embarrassed today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Now that is really the problem. The Minister of Labor should inform his department that they have to stop being so easy and allowing both sides to take their time. We don't have to stand over them with a club and hit them but we should say, hey guys, the rules say that you're supposed to be changing proposals at such and such a time and we would like, if at all possible, that you be negotiating from the time you exchange, in good faith and as regularly as possible, to make sure that the settlements available prior to the ending of the former contract.

We wouldn't have this problem and all of the members of the House would applaud the minister if he were able to arrange that. You know, it is the second time in a row the problem has come about. I hope it is not the forerunner of a problem every two years.

I only say, in wrapping up, that as I went through the proposals I found one proposal that bothered me, the birth control pill being one of the concerns of negotiations. I sure hope this whole thing isn't over that, Mr. Attorney General. I hope it's over something at least worthwhile. But then why does the farmer, why does the primary producer have to feel the blow? Why does he have to? Just because of the way you guys have allowed that Minister of Labor to do his job. If you ever would shake your finger at him more often than us, Mr. Speaker, we might have things running more smoothly.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They hate the farmers, the babies and the handicapped.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Time will see what motion we get from the members who moved the priority of debate; time will see what comes about. And let's hope that maybe even before we leave this Chamber this evening, God willing, and both sides of the bargaining table willing, we'll have a settlement.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labor):** — I am not going to dwell today or to speak at any length with respect to the motion that's before us. I am more interested, Mr. Speaker, in getting out of this Chamber with the Minister of Agriculture and accomplishing some other things, rather than adding to the length of the debate. I'm not that interested in scoring debating points and that, obviously, was the sole purpose of the member for Rosthern, to attempt to score debating points on a matter that I think is of considerable importance. I feel inclined to deal only for a short few moments with the remarks of the member for Rosthern, because I believe they deserve very little attention, in light of the fact I think this was one of the most insincere and one of the most irresponsible performances I have ever seen by the member, and by any other member on the other side of the House.

This hon. member, Mr. Speaker, during the debate two years ago when the same issue

was being debated in this Chamber, involved himself not only in the debate in the House, but has the unmitigated gall and the audacity after the conclusion to the agreement, after the parties to the collective agreement met in my office, to burst in and infect the place with the overburden that he carries with him. Mr. Speaker, I only want to warn the member that from now on, when he comes to my office, he knocks on the door and I wish he would observe that courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his entire remarks he drew attention to matters that are totally irrelevant and utterly untrue with respect to the bargaining process that is going on. I can only accept the word of the conciliator who has been involved. He tells me that the former difficulties or the current difficulties between the two unions involved — retail-wholesale and the Canadian Union of Commercial Workers, the old United Packing House or more latterly by another name — have not been an impediment in the collective bargaining process at all, and I choose to take Mr. Walter's words far ahead of the member for Rosthern. I must point out to him that when two unions bargain with one company often different circumstances merge. The hon. member for Kelsey-Tisdale will tell you that in negotiations between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and OCAW (Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union) and IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers), obviously there will be features on the collective bargaining table in each instance which do not correspond one with the other.

But I think for the member to stand and read from a list of what was obviously an initial set of demands being made by one party, served up by the union in this particular set of circumstances, and obviously countered by management on the other, under these circumstances can do nothing but inflame because it really has nothing to do with the bargaining process currently taking place.

The matters he so gleefully drew attention to, I believe, are not matters that are even being bargained or discussed at this point in time. Yet he would have the general public and this Assembly believe that the addition of the question of supplying oral contraceptives somehow was responsible for the breakdown in communication between the parties. He knows that to be utterly false. He uses that in a way I think is despicable and inclined to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

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

**MR. KATZMAN:** — The minister has indicated I know something which I say I do not know. I wish him to withdraw that statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. That's debating.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Mr. Speaker, I hardly expect the hon. member to be in order because he is out of order a great majority of the time. I don't intend to prolong the debate. I think it started on a rather high tone.

I appreciated the remarks of the hon. members who spoke previously because I think they approached the thing with a degree of sincerity.

While I disagree with their approach, at least I don't believe they were out deliberately to score debating points in the manner the member for Rosthern did. I think the debate, since it reached level, is inclined to generate more heat than light. Accordingly, I don't intend to spend a great deal of time on it.

May 8, 1980

I want to indicate that on this side of the House we regard this whole matter as being extremely serious when milk is being dumped. As a person who is a product of the depression years, I regard it as extremely serious any time foodstuffs are being wasted.

I think it has to be acknowledged that it was something in the order of 26 hours or 28 hours ago when this strike began — a limited strike, not involving all of the dairies at this stage. Since that time there has been a good deal of consultation. Since then we have put in motion some strategy which I hope, in the final sense, will produce a settlement. I believe it will. I'm hoping it will. In any case I am quite prepared to see the collective bargaining process given one last chance. This is what I'm hoping will emerge over the next number of hours; this is what I trust will be the normal outcome.

Some of us on this side of the House, and I expect some on the other side of the House, have some allegiance to the collective bargaining process. It's a process which has evolved over many, many years and has been won in a very hard, painful and difficult manner.

Collective bargaining has been described as one of the noisiest processes known to man. It is because it's done in a very public way, in many instances through the media and the like. It has no active substitute, Mr. Speaker. I think this is very reminiscent (as has already been pointed out) of the debate we had in this House in 1978, when there seemed to be an overwhelming anxiety on the part of members opposite to rush to the back rooms and draft legislation to force the heavy hand of government upon the two parties. I think that is a bad, bad feature.

By the same token, the suggestion by the hon. member who moved the emergency debate, the hon. member for Nipawin and the hon. member for Swift Current . . . I think they failed to take into account some very sensitive matters. I think they failed to appreciate the fact that a 90-day delay in this whole operation, having reached this stage, will result in a degree of frustration. It will further impede a settlement which may very well be arrived at today, or hopefully within the next number of hours, in the event it is given that kind of opportunity to work. There is an urgency of the moment now. I think talking in terms of a 90-day delay, adds an indecisive flavour to this. It is inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, when the wheels are in motion at this time for the parties to make their moves and be required to get back to the bargaining table with the good office of Sig Walter being offered at this point in time.

I don't suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I can provide any ironclad guarantees. That just is not possible. I do suggest to you that collective bargaining is the most appropriate way to approach this matter. I think bringing legislation to this House at this very delicate moment would be an impediment, rather than one which would hasten an agreement. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the member when he moves his motion misreads the tone of things and fails to really sense the nature of the problem at this stage. Notwithstanding the fact we recognize fully there is a very difficult matter at hand which has to be dealt with and has to be dealt with in a very expedient manner.

With that idea in mind I hope members will consider the fact the opportunity still presents itself to arrive at this solution in a manner which will, I think, be one which is best accepted by most political parties and members of political parties. Accordingly, I would hope that would be the route we would pursue.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, in joining in this urgent debate, urgent situation, I would like to assure the members opposite and the Minister of Labor, that my intention is not to score any debating points, but to bring the seriousness of the problem as seen by people in my area and throughout Saskatchewan, to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture in the hope he will do something within his power, his influence, to have this strike settled and settled very soon.

I think each and every one of us in this House, I know on this side and I imagine the same is true on your side, Mr. Minister, have been receiving phone calls this morning from very concerned dairy producers about the situation which is going to be facing them if this strike isn't resolved in a very short time.

We hear from the member for Nipawin, quoting from the head of the dairy producers, saying if this strike goes on for even 48 hours it could affect at least 200 dairy producers in this province. To me that is a very drastic and very serious situation. I am sure you, Mr. Minister, must share that concern.

When we talk about agriculture in this province and diversification, wanting to help the young producers, I know some of these young boys in my own constituency. I remember very well when I last asked your department, Mr. Minister, to supply some help to them for feed if they had to truck in all during the winter. The situation looks like it could be the same this year. These fellows are really up against it. They have had a tough go. Now we see their product . . . As the members on this side have been saying, once the milk comes out of the cow, if you can't see it, then that is lost profit. You can't get retroactive pay. There is nothing you can do. That's their bred and butter and it's gone. Unless you take some action, if this strike continues these people . . . (I understand about 90 per cent of them are on FarmStart loans).

I had a call this morning right from my own constituency from the area of Indian Head where a young fellow is losing \$250 a day during this strike. In listening on my car radio while driving in, I heard some people are losing up to \$800 a day. This was on the open line show. That's right, Mr. Minister, a lady phoned in. You're calling that lady a liar? She is in the business, Mr. Former Minister. She said she was losing \$800 every two days. Now that's a lot of money, isn't it? Can you afford to lose \$800 every two days? I sure can't and I don't think anybody in this Chamber can. I think it is very unjust if you don't get at this as quickly as possible to get it solved. If people are losing \$800 every two days, then it is quite conceivable many of them are going to go broke in a very short period of time.

We have to look at this. What about their quotas? There is a potential loss of their quotas. If these quotas are lost then we look down the road and this is certainly going to be a cost to all the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. Where are we going to get them? Are these fellows going to come back into business next week? No way they are! We are going to be losing markets. We are going to have to be importing dairy products from the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta — our neighbouring provinces. (We are now, my seatmate says.) These are serious ramifications for every person in Saskatchewan. I think it is time we get on with the settling of it.

I understand there are approximately 800 dairy farmers in this province. Mr. Minister,

May 8, 1980

we lost about 200 of them last year. If we have this strike and these people are put into financial hardship, when you as Minister of Agriculture stand up and say the only way to go is to grain, how do you think these young men out there feel. Do you think there is any assurance — staying in the dairy business, working seven days a week for your livelihood as you well know, Mr. Minister, and then having to lose \$800 every two days? They are not going to stay with it. I can say I don't blame them if there isn't any assurance and more backbone from this government. You knew this strike was coming. The papers were indicating this. It has been indicated for some time. Today are you getting them in.

You remind me of the little boy in Holland — when the water started to leak he put his finger in the dike. You didn't try to have any movement to try to bring these people to the bargaining table, to get them going, to use any kind of influence to try to avert this thing. You can shake your hand and jump around all you want, but I am telling you what the people of Saskatchewan are feeling about your department, Mr. Minister. You either like it, or you don't like it, that's your prerogative. But this is what the people are feeling; they don't want the strike. You go out into the streets of Regina, you go out into the dairy farms, and you are not going to be a very popular fellow today. I say this with respect, Mr. Minister.

Getting back to the Minister of Agriculture, because it was to him I wanted to address my concerns — what is a young person wanting to go into the dairy business thinking today in this province? Last year, as I say, we lost about 200. Your government, your Premier, was over in Europe. I've got the ads — you know I have them, from your department — in Europe saying, 'Come to Canada and enter the dairy business.' Come to Saskatchewan. We will give you land, you can get land through the land bank. You can get the FarmStart, come into the dairy business. Well I hope those English boys weren't foolish enough to come. I say, let's put our priorities with the Saskatchewan boys. I say you are making it very, very difficult for anyone in this province who has hope of getting into the dairy business to make a profit and a good life from this.

You talk, Mr. Minister about diversification. Then on the other hand you say that grain is the way we have to be going. I'm afraid, Mr. Minister that if this continues no one is going to believe you out there about diversification. They are not going to believe the government is really sincere in diversifying agriculture. We have already said (and you have heard us many times) how much of the agricultural processed materials are coming into this province from the province of Alberta at this time? You know, the hamburger is coming in and that our hogs are being shipped out. The next thing which is going to happen is that our milk is going to be coming in (and probably is in the western areas now). Our ice cream — I understand the price per litre is 3 cents cheaper in Alberta at this time and it is suggested that our price may be 10 cent higher by the fall. What is going to happen, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, to our dairy industry in Saskatchewan and why are we not working toward processing right here in the province of Saskatchewan rather than importing from the other provinces?

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I join in this debate with a great deal of interest. I was most interested in the comments from the member for Nipawin, and I want to address those comments in a few minutes. But I was more interested in the comments from the members of the Conservative Party, in particular the member for Rosthern. I think the member for Rosthern, who is the spokesman for the Conservative Party on labor issues, put his finger on the policies of the Conservative party with respect to collective bargaining and with respect to labor-management disputes. I think, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the most unfortunate speeches the



Conservative members in this House have ever delivered since I've been in this House.

Mr. Speaker, we're in a very delicate situation. For the hon. member to get on his feet and say this side is to blame or that side is to blame when we're attempting to arrive at a settlement which affects not only the parties involved but, Mr. Speaker, affects the producers and affects the consumers, is indeed unfortunate and it is tragic.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't mind the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley getting on his feet and beating up the Minister of Agriculture. I accept that. That doesn't bother me. But the tirade from the member for Rosthern could affect the meetings the Minister of Labor and the Minister of Consumer Affairs and I are going to attend. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate.

I say to the hon. member for Nipawin, I agree that this is a very, very serious situation. I indicated that yesterday in this Assembly. I've indicated it in the Assembly and outside of the Assembly. Goodness know, I say to the hon. member, my phone started ringing before 7 o'clock this morning. I think the producers started phoning before they started milking and they started phoning after they were finished milking — and they milk at a great variety of times. They don't all milk at the same time. I continued talking to producers throughout most of the morning.

What were the producers saying to me? Well, I think the producers were saying to me what was identified by the executive of their association who met with me in my office. They said to me, what we would like you to do is use your good offices as a minister of the cabinet to get the parties back to the table so we get a sensible negotiated settlement. That, in fact, Mr. Speaker, was our decision as cabinet ministers. That in fact was supported by the producers and that in fact is the procedure that has been set up.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate, therefore, to try to interfere with the process that has been set up by the motion put forward by the hon. member for Nipawin, and additionally most unfortunate, by the outrageous tirade from the member for Rosthern. I would call on all hon. members to support the efforts of the cabinet ministers of this government in their attempts to get the two parties back to the negotiation table to assume their responsibilities as management and labor, acknowledge the difficulties the dispute has created, wish the negotiators well and support our efforts to get a negotiated settlement as early as this evening.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel it is unfortunate. I have to spend my time in this Assembly today discussing a problem that, in all likelihood could have been resolved by the Minister of Agriculture, and by the Minister of Labor, had they moved into discussions earlier — not, am I suggesting, to intervene in the collective bargaining process, but to move to have both sides at the bargaining table (and I don't say, all sides). I have to accept some of the comments of the member for Rosthern. I say some of the comments of that member, because I had to meet with some students and was not able to hear all of his comments. Some of the comments of the member for Rosthern alluded to the idea of two unions vying for the membership of Dairy Producers' employees.

Certainly it would create a difficult situation, Mr. Speaker, when we would have the two

May 8, 1980

unions vying for the membership, and at the same time, trying to resolve the demands of the union, Mr. Speaker. I want to place the emphasis in this matter with the actual dairy producers and their marketing organization, the Dairy Producers' Co-operative.

The Dairy Producers' Co-operative is an institution, an organization, that is doing a good job in the province of Saskatchewan on behalf of consumers on the one hand, and the actual dairy producers, on the other. Now, Mr. Speaker, to have that system disrupted and divided by a conflict between two labor unions, is, in my view, the limit. They have reached the limit of my tolerance. I see, Mr. Speaker, problems caused in this country of ours, and now of course in this province, and from time to time in the province (in this case, a strike by the Dairy Producers' Co-operative employees), because of labor.

I, Mr. Speaker, have attempted to understand and appreciate the reasons, the necessity for labor unions to protect the rights of individual employees. And certainly I do, but in my view, one has to draw the line. When it comes down to third party people (as it is in this case), with our dairy producers in this province being affected by a labor dispute, then, Mr. Speaker, they have gone too far. I don't know if I speak for all members of the opposition, but I certainly speak for myself when I say that.

There comes a time when we have to stop backing labor unions and start backing people. Through labor unions is not the only means by which to back people.

I see the member for Moose Jaw is somewhat concerned. He thinks that it's just an awful thing for a member in this Assembly to take any cracks whatsoever at the labor union.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell that member that I don't mind doing so when it affects third party people who have no means by which to strike back or even bargain and have to see their own livelihoods going down the drain. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see the member for Regina Rosemont is chirping in and attempting to interrupt. He might do well to take his place in this debate at the appropriate time and I would be most happy to hear his comments at that time.

Mr. Speaker, we have enough problems in the agricultural industry. We have a problem with our Minister of Agriculture. We certainly had one with our former minister of agriculture. We have one with the present Minister of Agriculture in that he tends to say all things are federal matters and that he has a difficult time in even supporting his position as the Minister of Agriculture. He talks about programs that assist the farmers like FarmStart and land bank. Well, if we support on the one hand that FarmStart is assisting the farmers, then let's take a look at how those particular loans (taxpayers' money invested in the dairy industry through FarmStart loans) are being affected by this strike.

If 200 farmers are going to be affected, then it would be reasonable to assume that 150 FarmStart loans are going to be affected. And if those 150 or 175 FarmStarts are affected to the point where the producers have no means by which to pay them back, then it will be taxpayers' money lost, Mr. Speaker, and it will have assisted no one. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is joining the member for Regina Rosemont. He wants to have his words and attempt to tell me who has said what and who hasn't said what. I really don't care what the members of the Unionest party have had to say with regard to this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I would rather concern myself with the things that I have to say with regard to this motion. The motion is a responsible motion. I would not mind supporting that concept. I think we have tried to bring to the attention of the government that it is a serious matter and needs to be dealt with adequately and appropriately and it needs to be dealt with immediately. We've asked questions on this matter in the House obviously to no avail. The member for Nipawin I suggest, appropriately asked for leave to discuss this as a matter of priority of debate. And I don't know that it's incumbent upon members of the Assembly to belabor the points that need to be made with regard to this motion. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that's likely to be the case. I think the member for Nipawin quite adequately made the points and the member for Swift Current as well, in their comments on this motion.

I think what was not appropriate and not responsible was the reply by the Minister of Labor. And the Minister of Labor seems to be no different today, Mr. Speaker, than he was two years ago. He simply stands in his place and say that he supports collective bargaining and that's the civilized and responsible way to handle this problem. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that notwithstanding our support as a party for the collective bargaining system, there does come a time, and that's maybe the strongest point that I want to make. And if members of this government do not feel that's a fair point, then I will leave that for them to discuss when they stand to make their arguments on this particular motion.

The Progressive Conservative opposition supports the collective bargaining system. But personally, when I see it affect third party interests, as it does in this case, then I say that it has gone too far. That's my personal viewpoint. That's the position which I personally take.

I look at labor unions and I see a lot of trouble developing because of them. There may be more problems recently because of them than there have been problems resolved. If you count up the amount of money which goes out of this country to international unions, then count up the benefits coming back, you will see that we're in a deficit position to international unions.

You boys over there are always ranting and raving about those terrible multinationals — how they're stripping the people. Well, it would look to me like there are some of those international unions which are doing the same thing to the employees of the people of Saskatchewan, and the employees of the people of this country, regardless of what union they may belong to. That appears to be the case, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I don't want to go on for too much longer except to emphasize the serious plight of the agricultural industry in general, and in particular, the dairy producers of the province of Saskatchewan. They are looking at inflationary times and high interest rates; they are looking at a dry season unfortunately, to top it all off. Having been a member of the dairy industry, a person involved very actively in the dairy industry in the province, I know what it's like when there is a dry season and you don't have the grazing which you would normally have under more or less ideal conditions. That in itself places a strain on keeping production levels up so that you may maintain productivity at a level which will allow you to make ends meet.

So when you are faced with all of these problems, productivity problems, high interest rates, the high cost of operating, and then you get hit by a labor union dispute which is going to cause you possibly within a few hours, to dump your product, your only profit

May 8, 1980

down the sewer, it is not, Mr. Speaker, a reasonable position for us as members of the Legislative Assembly to accept. How can we accept that position taken by the Minister of Labor and the Minister of Agriculture?

There seems to be, Mr. Speaker, a lot of problems with this government's position in terms of how it has handled the whole agricultural and dairy industry. I recall when I first went into the bulk milk segment of the dairy industry. There was not a place in the province of Saskatchewan where you could ship manufactured or industrial milk — not one place in the province. I had to ship it to Roblin, Manitoba. Now as a result of a co-operative effort among a number of young people who wanted to be dairy producers and wanted to be in the dairy industry, an industrial milk market was established and a place provided to which we could ship our products. That was handled and has been handled ever since by the Dairy Producers' Co-operative in the province of Saskatchewan.

They have marketed our product and they have marketed it well, Mr. Speaker, when I reflect on other problems we have had in the dairy industry and some of those problems when I was an active participant in the dairy industry, and the minister, the former minister of agriculture, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural) knows right well what those problems were. They were problems relating to quota. If we did not have the proper environment and the proper incentives before the people of Saskatchewan, the prospective dairy producers, to go into the business and stay in the business, then the quota allotment this province was entitled to would be lost. Granted, we had an opportunity by which to pick up that percentage of quota. But if we did not pick it up in a specific amount of time, then it was lost to the Canadian Dairy Commission and subsequently redistributed where it was required in the country.

The quotas which we lost in this province, during other troubled times in the dairy industry, were lost to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The former minister of agriculture knows right well the effort which was placed by the opposition to put the proper incentives in place, to get people into the dairy industry and the proper environment by which they could maintain their industry over, hopefully, a number of years.

That is one of my concerns today, Mr. Speaker, as we look at this current strike. If it costs the province of Saskatchewan a couple of hundred dairy producers, we are going to have, definitely, a loss of quota, unless, Mr. Speaker, the existing producers are going to be able to pick up that quota which was lost by those who had been forced out due to this strike. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it would be fair to say that we are not necessarily speaking about something that is, but about something that may very soon be. And that is where our concern is.

Perhaps this strike can be settled within a few hours, if we were able to resolve it this evening before midnight. I'm sure all members of the Assembly are prepared to sit to whatever hour is required to resolve the matter, if we can be of any assistance. Or, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we will be able to sit on the weekend. Certainly, I have a busy weekend planned. But I would be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to spend my time here in the Assembly and do the business of the government and bring about a quick settlement of the current strike in the interests of the dairy producers and the consumers of the province of Saskatchewan. Certainly, if I, Mr. Speaker, am prepared to make that commitment, all members (including the member for Pelly) would be able to make that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't, as I have said, just the problem of the current strike. It is an ongoing

problem in agriculture. It is a problem whereby there seems to be no action whatsoever taken by the Minister of Agriculture, except to stand up when we ask questions regarding agriculture and talk very calmly so as not to create any excitement in the House over the issues, to try and diffuse the issues.

I hear hon. members from the government say, good man. Well, I happen to agree, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood is a good man. If your government was to give him half a chance, I think he likely would do a good job as Minister of Agriculture. But the policies of our government over the years since 1971 have caused the loss of over 8,000 family farms in the province of Saskatchewan, have caused a ministerial shuffle which had the Minister of Agriculture reduced to Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural), bringing on what is known as a big, tall, strong individual that would bring back agriculture to the centre of focus where it should be, as our number one industry.

I say, Mr. Speaker, they did a right and proper thing in putting the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood in as Minister of Agriculture. I say, Mr. Speaker, unless the government as a government changes its position and its policy in agriculture, it isn't just going to be the dairy industry that's affected from time to time. I hope we don't have to look to a two-year strike situation as more or less an ongoing thing to look forward to every year.

There seems to be no assistance, Mr. Speaker, for the agricultural industry in general and certainly none whatsoever for the dairy producers. I will say, Mr. Speaker, they themselves do not want government assistance. What they want is fair play — fair play for their marketing institution (and that's Dairy Producers Co-operative) to be able to effectively market their products and to handle their products. That's the issue here. Whether or not Dairy Producers Co-operative will be able to continue to do its job without being hassled on an annual or biennial basis by disputes between labor unions.

If there is anyone in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that denies what I believe to be a fact, that labor unions have reached that point where they need to be carefully considered by all members of this Assembly . . . I see lots of oh's and ah's. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, in this country and in this province there are not too many people that have enough intestinal fortitude to stand up to take a stand against the labor union when it seems to be in an unfair situation.

I don't mind taking that position. I challenge all you city boys over there to talk about labor unions out in my riding. You can talk about them if you like. You just have to look back in the history of time as it relates to labor unions and strikes. There was a time, yes, when employees were being run roughshod and trampled on by management. And it was because of that that labor unions, Mr. Speaker, were brought in to place, so there would be a proper balance between management and labor. That proper balance was brought into play. That proper balance was in focus for a number of years. But it started to erode, Mr. Speaker, in my view in the last 10 years to where, really, the labor unions are running the affairs of our country.

This NDP government says what we need to do is have a government in Ottawa that will stand up to the multinationals. That may well be. This government doesn't stand up to the multinationals; it goes to bed with them. This government doesn't stand up to labor unions, international or otherwise; they don't stand up against labor unions in our federal government either. So, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that fine balance between labor and management seems now to be tilted in the favour of labor at the

May 8, 1980

expense of very innocent third parties, our dairy producers.

I see the hour has drawn close to 5 and I would, therefore, Mr. Speaker, call it 5 o'clock.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question just before we prorogue?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Will the hon. member permit a question?

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I'll let you ask your questions tonight.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.

## **CORRIGENDUM**

The name J. Schulte which appeared in the introduction of students by Mr. B.J. Poniatowski (paragraph one) of the Debates and Proceedings N.S. VOL. XXII No. 53A Wednesday, May 7, 1980 2:00 p.m. should read: Gen Schulte.

[Note: the electronic version of the proceedings indicated has been corrected.]