

Government Orders

I want to set the record straight in that regard, Mr. Speaker, because it is essential for people to realize that it is something that is not normally done in this government. It is not normal in this country for the government to bring in legislation before the situation has even occurred.

Mr. Speaker, just for your information, the clocks do not work at all here, so you might have to tell us how much time we have. I cannot go by looking at the clock in this place because at the moment, for example, it says 6.30 and it is closer to the noon hour.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): You have 40 minutes to speak and you have 35 minutes left.

Mr. Nault: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I know the minister across the way is very pleased that I have 35 more minutes to go.

I want to talk about a couple of issues in the time that I have left. I also want to inform the minister opposite and the government side and all members in this place that I will be presenting a motion at the end of my allocated time. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read my motion so that everyone can reflect on it while I complete my comments.

My motion will be a little bit about this particular issue that we have in front of us today. I just want to read it and I will read the end:

—and that this Act shall come into force at the time the Governor in Council appoints a commission of inquiry under the Inquiries Act for the purpose of inquiring into labour relations between Canada Post Corporation and its employees.

That amendment to this particular bill has a lot of significance to myself and to many Canadians who are listening and to the members in this place. The reason is that on the one hand the government says that the collective bargaining process is working very well, but on the other hand the government is suggesting that after two years of collective bargaining and negotiation this whole process is still not resolved. As a matter of fact, in 1987 the same situation existed with the same government. It brought in back-to-work legislation. This back-to-work legislation in 1987 was also brought in because both sides could not resolve their differences.

Here we are again in 1991 bringing forward back-to-work legislation even though we are not sure anybody is going on strike or lock each other out because both sides cannot come to an agreement. Both sides are very up front when it comes to informing the public and doing a lot of their negotiating in the media. Both sides are suggesting that there is a lot of unfair bargaining going on, that there is no bargaining in good faith and that the other side does not want to look at the issue as it relates to its importance to the union, to the membership, to security, contracting out and to the grievance procedure. All these issues are not resolved.

On the corporation's side, the corporation is suggesting that the union is archaic and is not willing to be flexible and adjust to the realities of modern society and the needs of a modern corporation.

When you hear both sides talking like that, on the one hand the union side and on the other hand the corporation's side, it makes you wonder as a Canadian just what is going on at Canada Post. It is high time that we find out what is going on at Canada Post. It seems to me that we should have a commission of inquiry to look into the over 130,000 grievances. Anyone who has been involved in collective bargaining in this country can tell you that if there are that many grievances, regardless if some of them are fabricated as some members opposite have suggested, the fact remains that things are not well over at Canada Post. The situation between workers and management simply has to be looked at by an independent third party.

If we are going to look at legislation every time Canada Post and CUPW go to the negotiating table, in essence every two or three years, we will have back-to-work legislation. It is a fact that following back-to-work legislation, arbitrator's rulings never rectify the differences of either side. They simply delay the process, the inevitability of some sort of sense of compromise by both sides and the good labour relations necessary to make those compromises.

When I look at the hundreds and hundreds of articles, and I have them in front of me, and the communiqués of the two sides in their positions, they seem to be so polarized and of such different philosophies that no one in their right mind could stand up in this place and say