

mediator. When both sides are requesting the appointment of a mediator, when the people of Canada want the mails to continue, when the talks have broken down and an impasse has been reached as of this morning, why on earth will the Prime Minister and his Government not ask that a mediator be brought in now to begin resolving this very critical issue?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the article I just cited had another interesting quote from a member of the New Democratic Party. It states:

Although condemning the use of strike-breakers, Keeper—
—the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre.
—hesitated when asked if an NDP Government would move to ban the use of non-union labour during a legal strike . . .
“Frankly, I really don’t know. It’s difficult for me to know what we would do if we were in office—”

Mr. de Jong: Appoint a mediator and quit playing stupid politics. People are getting hurt.

Mr. Andre: The fact is you cannot have it both ways, on the one hand—

Mr. Riis: What about answering the question?

Mr. Andre:—standing up here being condemnatory, and on the other hand talking like this.

Mr. Cassidy: Are you going to put a mediator in or not?

Mr. Andre: I remind the Hon. Member to read—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Everyone wants the mail delivered, but I am not sure every Canadian admires the way the Government has been handling the mail strike, to put it mildly, in a strange way. It has not intervened. It has not appointed a mediator. It has not put an end to the use of these scabs, these strike-breakers, despite the violence. The questions which beg to be asked are these.

What is the Government’s hidden agenda with regard to the Post Office? Is the Government out on a mission to try to bust the unions? Is this step number one to privatize the Post Office? Why is the Government not coming out clearly now and telling Canadians what it is trying to achieve by its hands-off approach, what it is trying to achieve through the back door?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in an article reported in *Le Droit* on June 18 the Hon. Member for Papineau had some advice. He said:

Oral Questions

[Translation]

The Government should “cut the umbilical cord. The baby doesn’t belong to the Government any more, and the Conservatives should let the baby grow up.”

[English]

When the Crown corporation was created by the House, with its unanimous consent, the objective was to remove the political interference which had caused the problems in the past. Canada Post is endeavouring to fulfil its social responsibility of delivering the mail. There is a dispute going on and the parties are in discussion now at the Chateau Laurier. I think we ought to give that process a chance to work and, in the meantime, ask all parties to behave responsibly and to avoid violence.

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I think we can safely say a Government has never behaved as mysteriously as this in a postal strike—watching events unfold without doing anything. One wonders what the Government is trying to accomplish. Is it trying to break the unions? Is that it? Is it trying gradually to privatize the Post Office? For heaven’s sake, stop this hypocrisy! Tell us and tell all Canadians what you’re really trying to do through the back door!

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the impression I get this morning from the questions asked by the parties opposite is that they don’t want the negotiations to continue. The parties are sitting around the table, and they are now negotiating. The Government has already intervened by appointing a conciliator and a commissioner. The parties have gone back to the negotiating table. Why not encourage them to negotiate? We should not get involved in the negotiations when the parties are at the table. Let them negotiate!

* * *

[English]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES NEGOTIATIONS—FILM LEGISLATION PROPOSALS

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I would like to quote to the Prime Minister from the publication which his own Government put out at the start of the free trade thrust with the U.S. in which it said that its primary goal was “new rules . . . limiting U.S. trade remedy laws, i.e., exemptions from measures aimed at others—”. Will the Prime Minister confirm that in the same week that his Government has postponed its film legislation proposals it has received from President Reagan a clear rejection of that exemption which has been the primary goal of the Government, according to its own publications?