

*Canada Post Corporation Act*

er service which has sprung up to fill the vacuum. A front page story in *The Financial Post* says that "millions of dollars of potential Post Office revenue is being diverted to private parcel and letter carriers because these companies can offer the one thing the Post Office apparently cannot; reliability." What a sad abdication of responsibility by a once proud service which 50 years ago inaugurated air mail service down the mighty MacKenzie River delta because the horses and dog sleds took too long.

The Post Office used to rank with the armed forces and the Department of Transport as a basic function of government, a visible and tangible return for our taxes. Although breaking even was a goal of the Post Office, it was never a primary obligation. As citizens we expected service, paid for in part when we bought postage stamps, the balance coming from general revenues of the government. I cannot believe there are not thousands of dedicated postal employees who have a sense of duty and want to get the mail to its destination. Unhappily, their ethic is not shared by all their colleagues. It is both sad and paradoxical that in an age when almost anything seems possible, a basic right of citizenship, an efficient postal system, is beyond the competence of our government.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question is on motion No. 1 in the name of the hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn).

All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And five members having risen:*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

● (2130)

It is at this point that perhaps the Chair should bring to the attention of hon. members a procedural difficulty with the bill as amended and reported by the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

The bill was reported by the committee with an amendment to Clause 6, increasing the board of directors from seven to nine.

It is obvious that one of our most basic and fundamental procedures is that only a minister of the Crown may originate legislation which proposes a charge upon the revenue and this can be done only when accompanied by a recommendation from the governor general. Indeed, amendments made in committee cannot go beyond the terms of the original recom-

mendation. The amendment which was adopted by the committee offends the financial initiative of the Crown and, therefore, I must rule it unacceptable.

Motion No. 2 standing in the name of the Postmaster General (Mr. Ouellet) to all intents and purposes has the same effect as the amendment I have just ruled unacceptable and this motion is accompanied by the appropriate Royal recommendation. I will now propose motion No. 2 to the House which is as follows:

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Postmaster General)** moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-42, to establish the Canada Post Corporation, to repeal the Post Office Act and other related Acts and to make related amendments to other Acts, be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 45 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"man, the President and nine other directors".

**Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South):** Mr. Speaker, I rise only to comment. I know that my friend will agree with me that what your Honour has said is, of course, appropriate and proper, because that is the rule. However, I would like to advise the House, as my friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Ouellet) knows, this particular motion was moved by myself at committee with the consent and concurrence of the Postmaster General.

I want to record my appreciation to the House and to the Postmaster General for having introduced this motion and for now having it in a position which complies with the rules.

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, we supported the amendment set forth by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) in committee and we also recommend that it be supported here.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion, the yeas have it.  
Motion agreed to.

If hon. members will permit me a moment, I would like to give them the benefit of the Chair's grouping for the remaining motions. Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 11 seem to be procedurally acceptable and could be debated and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 6 and 7 are similar in part and should be debated together with a vote on motion No. 6 disposing of motion No. 7.