

*Government Orders*

\$1,000 per day for each worker; \$10,000 to \$50,000 per day for union representatives; \$50,000 to \$100,000 per day for union bosses.

Would you like to know which parliamentarians voted for such draconian measures way back then? Here is the list of those who said yes to such a bill. The hon. member opposite knows all about voting yes. I will read off a few names: Atkinson, Beatty, Blackburn, Bosley, whoops! Bouchard, Lac-Saint-Jean. Just look what I discovered.

• (1400)

**The Speaker:** The hon. chief whip for the government has only a few seconds left to conclude his remarks, after which we will allow the hon. member for Mercier to reply.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I had almost forgotten who exactly was responsible for imposing arbitration on public servants, with the same type of bill as this one. Who am I talking about? The Conservative members sitting at the time. And as I said a moment ago, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean, in an earlier incarnation as a Conservative, also voted at that time in favour of similar measures.

I would ask the member opposite what brought about this sudden conversion of the member for Lac-Saint-Jean. Perhaps she can explain to us the virtue by which the member for Lac-Saint-Jean and his colleagues are now possessed, but by which it seems they were not troubled on December 14, 1989?

**Mrs. Lalonde:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that at that time the hon. members opposite had voted against this measure. I also believe that, when they were elected, they gave not the slightest indication that if this sort of situation arose this is what they would do.

As for the reasons behind the evolution of the Leader of the Opposition, I can tell you that I know, and he has said so himself, that he has evolved in many areas, and that he has no problem defending himself.

And I know that those members who are now laughing promised not to do what they are doing. And they are supposed to be "liberals".

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[English]

**The Speaker:** In keeping with the letter and spirit of the law, the hon. member has approximately 90 seconds. The hon. member for Lethbridge.

**Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to state the case in one question for the hon. member for Mercier.

We are discussing back to work legislation for the purpose of protecting a third party which is being injured, the exporters, the shippers. What has happened in this House is that the Bloc Quebecois has attempted to move the discussion into the future

of collective bargaining. No one is talking about that. That is not the purpose of this debate.

We are not saying it should be done away with. All the Reform Party has said and what we are saying in this debate is that a third party is being injured. The Leader of the Official Opposition did not mention and was not even concerned about the economy or the exporters and farmers, the people who are being hurt. He was not one bit concerned.

It is time for the Bloc Quebecois members to admit whether they are concerned in the least about the third party we are talking about here, the people who are being injured, and Canada's broad economy. They are being injured by this delay, this nonsense and politics which are going on by the Bloc Quebecois.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Lalonde:** Mr. Speaker, I have two things to say. The first is that in life as in labour relations everyone finds himself at one time or another in the role of third party. Let me tell you a story.

One day I picked up a worker who was furious because the subway was not running outside peak hours, because in Quebec we have essential services during a strike. This health worker said to me: "I hope this is over soon. When we go on strike, people want to see us back at work as quickly as possible". We are always the third party in somebody's eyes. It is important that we remember this when it comes to labour relations. That is my first reply.

My second is that there should be an anti-strikebreaking law in Canada because 75 per cent of workers in other Canadian provinces are covered by one.

And thirdly—

[English]

If the Canadian economy cannot afford the Canada Labour Code, then there is a problem. The government should say so and do something about it.

**The Speaker:** It being 2.03 p.m., pursuant to the order made Saturday, March 25, 1995, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put all questions necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.