

I may add that this method is in every way similar to that used by the government in many other economic and social sectors. The government has urged companies in the private sector to take more initiative and to depend less on government assistance in expanding their markets. This approach implies that individuals and businesses are being urged to take responsibility for their own future and to seek new ways to ensure economic growth. If we apply this to industrial relations, it means that employers and employees will have greater responsibility for settling their differences without government intervention.

The provisions of the code on conciliation and mediation reflect this approach by making the parties responsible for the actual bargaining and dispute settlement process. Part I of the code provides the statutory framework for the rights and responsibilities of employers and employees, in which the responsibility for dispute settlement clearly lies with the parties.

• (1730)

My second comment concerns the respect the parties must have for the collective bargaining system when they start the process.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my time is up.

[*English*]

Mr. Attewell: Mr. Speaker, I think you may find that there will be a consent of all parties to pass this bill at second reading and send it to a legislative committee.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, the member of course is mistaken. This legislation, as the Conservative member who just spoke, is ill-advised, ill-informed and quite incorrect. I do not see why we should move forward. We just heard an excellent speech by the government explaining why its own backbencher's bill is stupid. Of course we are not going to help and of course we will not promote its movement to committee study.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. I realize that there is not unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I noted that the hon. member perceived a consensus which I don't think exists. It seems it was all in

his head, because so far, no other member has spoken in favour of this bill, if I am not mistaken.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this is the second time in recent years that such a thing has been tried. A few years ago, there was a parliamentary committee report which contained a recommendation to the effect that during a strike, Canada Post's monopoly on first class mail delivery would be abolished. This report had been prepared by the hon. member for Halton—Peel, who was the committee chairman, and I think that government members were unanimously for it, whereas opposition members were against. We certainly did not agree with that proposal.

Now, some two years later, here we are with another bill to abolish the right to strike for Canada Post workers.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider myself a big union man—I don't hide that. However, I must say that given the way Canada Post acts towards its employees, you do not have to be a genius to understand that those employees need some way to defend themselves from Canada Post management.

You and I, Mr. Speaker, and all other parliamentarians have to deal with this corporation almost every day and God knows that it is not easy, because they are trying to close down post offices in our ridings and have us believe all sorts of things and so on. I will not go into more detail, but it is not easy for a parliamentarian to come to terms with Canada Post. Imagine what it is like for a mail sorter in Canada Post. If we members of Parliament have difficulty being heard, imagine what it is like for people who work for that outfit. It is certainly not easy.

Mr. Speaker, I must also add that I am certainly not one to rejoice when there is a strike at Canada Post.

I think that it is awful, but why does it happen? It is certainly not all the employees' fault. That is rarely the case in any labour dispute. In the case of Canada Post, obviously the corporation has a large share of responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you quite honestly that in the long term, I would not want there to be any more strikes at Canada Post, that there would be no more need for the strike weapon. I even hope that both parties would agree that they no longer need the right to strike. That