

*Postal Services Continuation Act, 1987*

inside that plant once this legislation is passed and the management with whom they have to work.

I think that is always the Conservative response to everything. Use force and might, and might is right. When will they understand that we say "might for right" and not "might is right"? When will they learn that?

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Madam Speaker, today we are called upon to speak on Bill C-86. Needless to say, the issue of a postal strike, particularly to those who intend to vote against the legislation, does not constitute a very popular issue with some Canadians. However, I think I would be remiss in my duties if I did not take this occasion to speak against this Bill, because it is wrong. When something is wrong, it is the duty of all Members of Parliament to say so. If we do not say so, when a bad Bill is presented to Parliament, many others may be abused in the same way as the people affected by this Bill.

It has been said before that extreme law is extreme injury. It is not justice but, rather, the denial of it. The Bill that is before us today would, in my view, be one of those that I would describe as extreme law and it will cause extreme injury.

Let us for a moment examine some of the provisions of this legislation. For union members, there will be unprecedented fines of between \$500 and \$1,000 a day. For union officers, there will be fines of \$10,000 to \$50,000 a day, and for the Canadian Union of Postal Workers, there will be fines of \$20,000 to \$100,000 a day. I ask, if this is the appropriate level for fines, assuming that this Bill is correct, something I do not assume, then why is it that we have never imposed fines like that in the past?

We have just experienced a labour disruption which in my view had a far greater potential for damage to the country, and I am referring to the rail strike of last summer. Did we hear of \$20,000 to \$100,000 fines in that legislation? No. Well then, if we did not, I can only assume that the Government was wrong in the way it administered that Bill or that it is wrong in the way it has presented Bill C-86 to the House of Commons. My view is that this Bill is wrong.

At the time the Minister first raised the issue of back-to-work legislation, we were three days into a rotating strike, not a full work stoppage but a rotating strike which had lasted only three days. That is when the Government let out utterances to the effect that back-to-work legislation would be necessary.

Some five days later, eight days after the beginning of the rotating strike—let us recall that this was not at that point a full stoppage of mail delivery—the Government imposed the harshest piece of labour legislation this country has ever seen. Why? Was it a full, all-out strike? Was there violence in the streets? No, that was not the case. Yet the Government decided that this kind of legislation was needed at this time.

Of course, a number of editorials have been published which do not support the position of the Government. There are also two opposition Parties in the House which do not support the position of the Government because the legislation that is before us is wrong.

[*Translation*]

It would have been a lot easier for the Government, Madam Speaker, to let negotiations proceed as usual. I am not one of those people who would stand up and say that, even if we do not get any more mail, even if the system is totally paralyzed, there is no situation that would justify bringing the workers back, because obviously such situations do exist, as we all know. I think Members on all sides of the House will agree that when a strike in an essential service lasts for any length of time, it is time to put an end to it. However, the question is: Have we reached that stage in this case? The answer is no. The answer is no, because, as I pointed out earlier, after only three days of rotating strikes the Government decided to send messages that, as some of my colleagues said earlier, poisoned the negotiations. Five days later, this draconian legislation was tabled in the House.

[*English*]

This law is unprecedented. It is not only unprecedented because of the magnitude of the fines for which it provides, it is also unprecedented in that it was presented so soon after what could hardly be considered a major disruption.

I do not approve, of course, of the violence that has occurred over the last few days, although it has not been considerable. Nevertheless, there has been some violence. I do not approve of violence, whether on the part of union members or on the part of so-called replacement or scab workers, and of course there have been reports of both. Usually and unfortunately, one group tends to get a little more of the spotlight when it decides it will undertake a violent act, but either way, I do not approve of that kind of behavior.

I regret to say it, but neither do I approve of the union strategy of picketing the homes of Conservative Members of Parliament. I am of the view that the home of any member of this House is one place, and perhaps the only place, where he has the right to be in privacy with his spouse and his children without having to face that kind of intimidation. Because I have supported the union, it is with regret that I make this statement. However, I do not support that particular activity, and I for one can say that if they want to continue to have my support, they will have to cut out immediately that part of their nonsense.

• (1620)

Having said that, I hope both parties get back to the negotiating table to find a peaceful and suitable end to the labour disruption. You might say that is a futile hope at this point given the Bill we have in front of us, a Bill which will inevitably be accepted and become the law of the land. Not that I will vote in favour of it, unless of course the situation