

*Postal Services Continuation Act, 1987*

The Hon. Member raises an interesting situation. This is a mechanism to assist in breaking the union. There is no doubt that the people who lead this union enjoy the confidence of the rank and file. If they are prohibited from holding elected office for five years, they are likely to be voted-in anyway, which will lead to a confrontation between the Government and the union. The Government could then move to put the union under trusteeship, thereby accelerating the union-busting procedure.

This is the most blatant example of union-busting I have seen in a long time. It sets the conditions by which the Government can now have more tools to force the destruction of this union.

I am extremely concerned that the Government did not choose the other route and enforce the Corporation to adhere to the principle that it must bargain with its employees in good faith and adhere to the Canada Labour Code.

Once example of that lack of adherence is the grievance procedure. Management regularly violates the contract and dares the employee to take it through the four stages of the grievance procedure. That is a long procedure and the individual who is suspended, deprived or penalized in some way must endure that long period of time. Therefore, an increasing number of workers are reluctant to do anything but submit to oppressive management. The harassment and intimidation as a result of management refusing to adhere to the grievance system helps to break the union by creating fear among the employees.

The point raised by my colleague today is the end result of one of the most Draconian pieces of legislation we have seen in the House. It is the continuation of a policy that begins with shop management on the floor of the Post Office who have been given the direction to harass and intimidate employees, and fail to follow the established practices in labour-management relations that allow grievances to be dealt with quickly and effectively. The practice of the management, assisted by the Government, is one of the worst examples of labour-management relations I have seen.

**Mr. Shields:** Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member began his speech this morning by saying that there is no one in the House who would condone violence. How does he square this with the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) who said in the House that there are times when violence could be condoned? His Leader also indicated that he supported the statement that there are times when violence would be condoned. Does the Hon. Member, like his Party, condone violence?

**Mr. Skelly:** Madam Speaker, I have profound respect for my colleague, the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields), who is one of the most thoughtful and diligent people in the House. I think he knows that his remark was made in a mischievous fashion.

I assume he would not have participated in the Second World War conflict to overthrow Hitler. I suppose he is trying to tell us that violence on the part of Canadians in order to re-establish democracy and fight for self-preservation was not condoned.

I believe my colleague, the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett), was basically saying that the administration of South Africa has inflicted such terrible violence on black South Africans that there are very few options left to them but to rise up and throw off the yoke of violence that has been flung around their necks.

I would ask my colleague why he was opposed to the use of violence by Canadian Armed Forces to overthrow Hitler's regime in World War II.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Madam Speaker, first, I might say that I am surprised that no government Members are rising to speak in defence of this particularly ignominious piece of legislation.

This morning, the Minister responsible for Canada Post, from what he referred to as his notes, cited a litany of excesses which had apparently prompted this legislation. However, the one element the Minister forgot to mention in his speech was that the litany of excesses that have occurred were not prior to but as a result of his Government's imposition of a proposed back-to-work order on the workers involved in the postal dispute.

Further, the Minister laid his cards on the table for the people of Canada when he claimed on the one hand that he had not taken a position with respect to the matters in negotiation while, on the other, he stated quite clearly that the mail is getting through and talked about excessive union demands.

The Minister's statement that the mail is getting through suggests to me that we do not have a national emergency. Furthermore, his statement about excessive union demands quite clearly demonstrates that the Government has a hidden agenda, together with Canada Post, to break the backs of workers across the country. This intent is demonstrated quite categorically by the Draconian measures which have been embodied in this Bill and particularly by the Government's claim that we should consider the recommendations of the Foisy Report.

The Government is laying out the plan for a settlement before one has been negotiated. I remind the Minister and the Government that it was the union that first called for a mediator and that the union was prepared to go back to the bargaining table.

However, it was not in the interests of Canada Post or the Government to have a negotiated settlement because of its agenda which includes breaking the back of the union. What better way to do so than by knowingly and willfully introducing back-to-work legislation that will have the effect of