

*Government Orders*

policies and you should listen to what we are saying because it is important to Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Della Noce:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has got it wrong. I would just like to set the record straight. He was talking about profits of \$196,000.

**An hon. member:** Million!

**Mr. Della Noce:** But I think he meant \$196 million. That is not quite the same thing, but the Liberals have trouble distinguishing thousands and millions of dollars. I think he meant \$196 million.

[*English*]

**Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Essex—Kent on his intervention as the postal critic for the Liberal Party. He has had a lot to do with the whole issue and the evolving process that we have been going through in the last two months.

I wonder if my hon. friend would tell us what his sense of the back-to-work legislation is, what issues it may solve and what issues it may not solve. There is a sense out there, and in many cases it is the spin that members of Parliament and the government side put on a particular issue, that once we have dealt with this as back-to-work legislation or, as I would like to call it the essential services legislation, somewhere down the line this whole process is going to have to be revisited.

I wonder if the hon. member would like to comment on that particular scenario which seems to be on peoples' minds.

**Mr. Pickard:** I would like to thank my colleague from Kenora—Rainy River for his question.

I was first going to answer my colleague across the way, but I note that he did not stay to hear an answer. His question could not have been so pertinent or important. I find that quite Tory-minded.

My colleague from Kenora—Rainy River has pointed out that when we come to legislating people back to work, there are ramifications of that process. Certainly when we stop and think about ramifications, we are taking a movement upon a group of people and I guess you have to weigh these things: do they feel in the end that they were treated fairly? Do they feel in the end

that they were winners? Do they feel in the end that they can live with what comes down? I cannot make that judgment.

It would seem to me that when going through a process for two years, attempting to resolve problems to which they did not get a proper resolution, when they walk away and are legislated back to work, they feel animosity toward that legislation. They feel anger that they have not been heard and dealt with in a fair, open, free way.

That is why we have the collective bargaining process in place and that is why we use the collective bargaining process. I am not in any way saying that anyone wants to see a strike. However, what we do wish to see and what I recommended to the minister as late as Thursday of last week was that as long as the parties are sitting at the table negotiating, let them work out their differences. Let them work out the problem, let us not interfere and cause added problems to it. Let us not interfere so that some groups feel they are losers.

I think interference is not the best at this time. It could have been much more appropriate when negotiations stopped.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity this afternoon to speak to Bill C-40, whose purpose is to force Canadian postal workers back to work.

[*English*]

How did we get into this mess? The government across the way of course will say it is the fault of Jean-Claude Parrot or of anybody else who happens to disagree with the government. That is the standard Tory line.

It is not that simple. First of all let us remember that in 1986 the government across the way approved the corporate plan of Canada Post. So Canada Post's approach to management, the broad concept that it is aiming at right now has been approved by this government. No one forced the minister to approve that corporate plan. I did not see Jean-Claude Parrot successfully twisting the arm of the minister in order to have the corporate plan changed, nor was the opposition able to convince the government to do otherwise.