

### Supply

to ask us for increased postal rates, not only the two cents highlighted in the newspapers but annual increases and increases tied to inflation and to uncontrollable costs. The President of the Post Office admitted before the committee that he was looking toward a 40 cent stamp. That was only his estimation. What will it be in reality by the time the five year plan is up? The Post Office has a series of other increases in rates which has not been shared with us. We do not know the full implication of the cost increases to pay for the Post Office which Canadians will have to bear. The tragedy is that the Government is asking us for increased postal rates at the same time as it is asking us to put up with continued reductions in service.

The reductions in service are so drastic that people in rural areas are up in arms. They are saying that they will not allow them to sabotage the service upon which they depend, a service which is part of community life. Urban people are saying: "Stop discriminating against us; stop imposing supermailboxes upon us". Canadians in general are saying that they want reliable mail service. They want their mail to arrive on time. They want to use the Post Office rather than use couriers.

In conclusion, the plan which Canada Post has presented and which the Government has supported until now calls for increased postal rates and continued reductions in services. This spells disaster for ordinary Canadians. It is time Parliament sent a message to the Government that we will not put up with such an approach to postal services. They must go back to square one and completely rethink their plan.

**Mr. Murphy:** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to make a few comments at this point. I should first like to thank the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) for presenting his motion. It is a very timely debate in that many Canadians are concerned about the level of service of the Post Office and the direction in which the Government appears to be taking it. I also thank him for raising the matter in this particular manner. It allows government Members to vote on how they feel about the Post Office and the role it plays without being forced into a situation of casting a vote of non-confidence in the Government. That is a very important distinction. It is a distinction which the people in charge of parliamentary reform deliberately set out as a new direction which could be taken by Members of Parliament. We are no longer forced to vote strictly along party lines. On days such as this, we will be able to vote according to what we believe should be happening without reflecting upon government actions.

I have a question for the Hon. Member. After his extensive travels to all parts of Canada on behalf of the NDP caucus, what does he believe to be the essential concern of Canadians; is it rapidly increasing costs of the postal service, or is it that service is deteriorating and people no longer have faith in Canada Post to deliver their mail in an appropriate length of time?

**Mr. Keeper:** Madam Speaker, the primary concern of Canadians is in the area of deterioration in service. People want the Government to take a serious look at the Post Office and redesign it so that they receive their mail on time and receive equitable service. They want the Government to work out a plan to fund the service. However, they want the Government to acknowledge first that the Post Office provides a service and that it is the Government's job to design it in a way that the Post Office can deliver the service. They also expect the Government to develop ways to finance the service. They are not satisfied with the Government's attitude that all we need to do with the Post Office is balance its books; that it does not matter what happens to the service in the process, as long as the books are balanced. The Government has a greater responsibility. It must ensure service at the same time as it ensures adequate revenue in order to support it.

**Mr. Felix Holtmann (Selkirk—Interlake):** Madam Speaker, I rise today as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Government Operations to address the motion of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper). At the outset I can do nothing but condemn the action of the Hon. Member.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Holtmann:** I will deal with the reasons for condemning the motion today. It is quite obvious that the Hon. Member has no respect for the House. A week ago a similar motion was introduced and they filibustered it. It was a total waste of an opposition day. They came to the House with a similar motion, presented petitions, and talked about every other thing so that they did not have to bring forward the motion. That is what they did last week. What kind of action is that from an Hon. Member from Winnipeg? What purpose was there in such action? On the basis of that alone, we must condemn the action of today.

**Mr. Keeper:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I enjoy the vigour of my hon. friend's comments. However, I wonder if we could have a little guidance on whether or not it is entirely parliamentary for the Hon. Member to indicate that I have no respect for the House. Perhaps that is carrying the rhetoric a little too far.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** I think the Hon. Member for Selkirk—Interlake (Mr. Holtmann) would agree with the Chair if it were to remind him to talk on the motion before the House today, not on events which happened last week.

**Mr. Holtmann:** Madam Speaker, I will try to refrain from further comments on that particular issue.

I should like to deal with the Canada Post Corporation and how it became such. Let us think about that for a minute. In the past there were tremendous disruptions in the postal service. Before I was a Member of the House there were strikes or disruptions, sometimes every eight months. There