

attention of the government and the Canadian public that their situation was desperate because their wages were so far behind everyone else's.

They went on strike illegally. Summarily, within 24 hours the government had an injunction brought down against those people and they were forced back to work by the order of the courts. Even the judge who granted the government the injunctions said that the government's action was Draconian but he had no other choice than to order those people back to work, and they obeyed.

In this round of negotiations the government failed to designate these people as being essential. They have to do that within 20 days of receiving notice from the union of a desire to bargain. If the government does not do it, anyone who is not designated as essential by that time is simply not an essential service person and free to carry on the whole process of collective bargaining, including striking, as any other free Canadian is entitled to do.

I suspect that in most instances an employer finding itself in a situation such as this would have accepted reality for what it was, realized that it had made a mistake and continued to bargain, one would hope in good faith, to come to an agreeable settlement to both sides. That is not what this employer did. That is not what this government did. The government, having made a mistake, went to the courts to try to get its booboo overturned.

I do not know the levels of the courts; that is more for the lawyers in the House. In any event, the first level of the courts it went to, the government lost. As if that was not enough, still in an effort to try to designate these people as essential servants—and I think there is something important to point out here. Many of the civil servants are designated as essential. There are some areas of the public service where it is 60, 50 or 40 per cent. The minister's official told us yesterday that it may even go down to zero of those who are designated as being essential.

In the whole history of the hospital services group and numbers like 60 per cent, or 40, or maybe, zero. It has always been 100 per cent. Believe it or not, Madam Speaker, there have been instances where it has gone as high as 110 per cent. It really does escape me how one could do that, but I presume they may even include some

of their supervisory staff, I do not know. Or maybe they spread themselves into some other department in order to make sure that these people are going to cause no embarrassment whatsoever.

The government lost at the first level of the court system. Not satisfied with taking its lumps, it still went to the second level in order to try to get this 100 per cent. Make no mistake about it, we are talking 100 per cent designation in the case of these two groups; 100 per cent designation in the case of these two defenceless groups for all intents and purposes.

If you do not believe they are defenceless, look at what is happening to them in this House today as a result of their perfectly legal action. We are ordering back to work a mere 3,900 people, of all the hundreds of thousands of civil servants. These are the poorest paid people in the civil service. There is no joy in the House of Commons today to be doing such a thing. I think it would be most appropriate to borrow the words of the judge in the case of the previous round of negotiations when he called the government's action Draconian.

In the case of the ships' crews there are not all that many outstanding issues. There are some misconceptions which ought to be clarified here as well. From the government side, in response to a question from this side, said that these employees were asking for 14 per cent, or something like that, a year over the next three years. Of course that is not the case. What they are asking for is something around 5 per cent, 4.8 per cent and 4.6 per cent over 42 months. As far as that is concerned, most of it has been settled anyway.

The one outstanding issue is that of sea duty. It is a very common thing in the maritime industry, something which the private sector certainly has. I am led to believe it is the one remaining outstanding issue which would bring a settlement about in the case of the ships' crews group within the public service, for a total cost of somewhere around \$5.5 million. In the total government budget for wages, it is not a large amount of money.

The total amount of goods and services and value to everything from the buoys, which these people so efficiently distribute as a guidance for shipping throughout our waterways in the St. Lawrence, I understand that they are now quite probably being either destroyed, sunk or becoming loose and floating around causing danger to shipping themselves. Compared to the value of that in