

Government Orders

shameful as to what he has said here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

The member opposite makes many references to certain items which he believes to be important. The hon. member has served in this House for a considerable length of time. I would ask him to reflect upon what was said on page 8 of a decision which was rendered today by the Public Service Staff Relations Board. Again, I repeat, it is a statute of this House, duly passed by this House, and consists of members appointed by the Prime Minister and approved by the cabinet.

Here is what this decision reads in part:

Labour relations boards in various jurisdictions have held that to insist on preconditions before bargaining for a collective agreement is contrary to the requirement to bargain in good faith.

For example, and they cite a particular case, Rolf, Clarke Stone Packaging, 1980, The Ontario Labour Relations Board. They go on in this particular case to say that the narrow issue here is whether the respondent's conduct complied with the Board's order to bargain in good faith and make every reasonable effort to make a collective agreement. It goes on to say other things.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that the board, a government duly appointed board has now made the decision, a quasi-judicial board, saying that the Government of Canada has bargained in bad faith.

Is there any wonder that we as a country trying to compete with other countries have such difficulty when our own government bargains in such bad faith with labour, with a major component of an economic unit such as labour? It is very obvious to me and my party, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened here has been a game, and I might add with some regret, a great deal of regret in point of fact, being played by the government in order to uplift, if you will, its political standings by playing on the mood of the Canadian public, who are somewhat agitated by the drawbacks that this strike is having across the country.

If the government was so concerned, if it were really concerned about resolving this dispute, why can it not appoint a mediator? That is part of the collective bargaining process. But it is swinging this way, it is swinging that way. The Conservatives want to have this

matter before Parliament. They are trying to drag it out. They are trying to incite—and I use that language respectfully, Mr. Speaker—through acts of provocation, union representatives and individuals across this country to have violent confrontations in order to substantiate and legitimize what we now know is an act to suspend collective bargaining, what we now know is an act by Parliament to put the boots to Parliament, what we now know is a breach of the cornerstone of free collective bargaining in this country called bargaining in bad faith. We know all of those things. They are trying to create the emergency, and they are doing a pretty good job. But does it not play right into the hands of a government which is desperate to hold on to political power at any cost? It is not I, Mr. Speaker, who has used the word “power”; it has been the word used by the government House leader opposite, who said in the Chamber today that this is a game about power.

Raw political power we are seeing here, Mr. Speaker, and I am confident that in the end, in the final analysis, Canadians will come to recognize that the actions of the Prime Minister, of the front line ministers, the McDougalls and the Clarks and the Mazankowskis and the Wilsons, and the respective constituencies that they represent—

An hon. member: They don't represent them.

Mr. Dingwall: Ah, that is the key phrase. That is the key phrase. They represent one thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is their political friends and their political cronies. We find it despicable, Mr. Speaker, that we have had to come in this country to this kind of confrontation.

The question I ask members of this House: Have we seen it elsewhere? It is Brian Mulroney's way, the Prime Minister's way, or no way. Did we see it before, Mr. Speaker? And we are going to see it again, as evidenced here with this particular piece of legislation. I say this to the viewing public tonight: Note the procedural gymnastics of the government opposite in order to draw to the attention of the Canadian people a sense of urgency, hoping that there will be conflict on the picket lines, hoping that there will be confrontation between innocent individuals to render their decisions, their Draconian decisions, as being legitimate.