

*Government Orders*

mount in the House of Commons. But she must not forget that, at that time, we were already debating back to work legislation.

Why is it that her government, a government that she obviously supports, did not take the opportunity of that first labour dispute to set up a commission of inquiry on labour relations that were already a cause for concern.

• (2150)

Why did we wait so long? Why did we not learn from that first labour dispute and the passing of special legislation several months ago. It is because of all this deteriorating process that we are puzzled by the action taken by the minister.

I want to take this opportunity to really invite my colleague to make an impression as Minister of Labour. We all know that she is a determined and brilliant woman and that she is able, if she wants to, to take advantage of this labour relations review process to bring the parliamentarians to participate in this debate on whether or not we should have an anti-scab legislation at the federal level. We believe so and we have an opportunity to evaluate a model which is the one established by the Quebec National Assembly.

The Minister of Labour, who is a few years older than I am, will recall that this anti-scab legislation has proven right in Quebec, which used to be the champion for lost hours and days of work. The anti-scab legislation played a crucial role in pacifying labour relations. This is what we must aim at in the days to come.

We have to keep in mind, because it is important to do so, that we have two classes of workers, since three provinces have passed anti-scab legislation: Ontario, British-Columbia and Quebec. Thus, this is to say that some 60 to 65 per cent of the Canadian workers are protected by anti-scab legislation. Therefore, there are two classes of Canadians. This situation is far from healthy or acceptable.

To conclude, I want to say to the labour minister that she and I have something in common. Like her, I represent here a Montreal constituency. As hon. members for Montreal, we are obviously concerned with the continuing situation in the port of Montreal.

The minister says she is confident that we can avoid resorting to special legislation and that a negotiated agreement can be reached. I am sure the parties involved will take advantage of the mediation offer aimed at a negotiated settlement, so that we can have a collective agreement that is desired.

To avoid the kind of situation we are now in, it is important to maintain the optimum conditions for dialogue. However, these optimum conditions, that we would like to see for Montreal, can obviously not be maintained on the West Coast, because if the

bill is passed, working conditions, non-monetary clauses as well as salary clauses, will be imposed by arbitration.

The Reformers' impatience is hard to understand, because it must be said that they have been behaving in a very unruly manner tonight, and I am sure that my colleagues will agree with me because everyone knows that the members of the Reform were unruly.

In conclusion, we agree with the return to work, but we would like to see ideal conditions for dialogue maintained, which is incompatible with a special bill.

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Finally, with apologies, the hon. member for Lethbridge.

**Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on third reading of Bill C-74.

We want to move those ships out full of western Canadian grain. I appreciate the member from Winnipeg's indicating that to this assembly.

For many years in my period of time as a member of the Alberta Legislature there were numerous opportunities, I remember about 12, where governments of Canada, both Liberal and Conservative, did not have the gumption or the aggressiveness to deal with this problem.

• (2155)

We in Alberta moved resolution after resolution asking the federal government to pass legislation to put the workers back to work. The governments did it but to a major cost to western Canadian farmers over and over again.

A year ago it cost us a lot of money, \$35 million in demurrage and penalties. The Alberta Wheat Pool tells us there was \$100 million in terms of loss to the Canadian economy and \$450 million in lost sales for grain farmers. That is provided by the figures from the Canadian Wheat Board.

Many dollars were lost. Even in this short time that the workers were off work, we suffered serious losses. One of my colleagues illustrated in the House earlier that the strike cost one of our alfalfa shippers \$250,000 because they could not get it off the boat and into the marketplace. That market was lost to some American producers. I do not think that is fair.

I understand the minister and the government were advised several days ago that an agreement could not be reached. Why did we not bring legislation into the House so that if a strike did occur we could act immediately and put the workers back to work?

This is the first step in a series of responsibilities the House will have. We have not settled the matter with regard to Montreal. My colleague, the member for Lisgar—Marquette, has illustrated that point very well on how one of his producers