

will be women, and those women will be receiving, in most cases, salaries at the minimum wage level.

● (1530)

It is interesting to note that in this debate in the House of Commons we have not heard from the Minister responsible for the status of women. We have not heard from any government Member defending the franchising-out position and what it will do to women workers across this land. Not one Conservative of the over 200 who are in this House has got up to defend what will happen to the salaries of women who will be doing the work that is presently being done by Canada Post.

We have had the Minister responsible for Canada Post in his usual unbiased way talk about the costs being too much in the Post Office and that things are terrible. One would almost think that he is not the Minister responsible for Canada Post because he says things are so terrible there. He must be doing a terrible job as the Minister responsible. But things will get worse if we take away those wicket jobs, the preferred jobs, the jobs that people work for years and years in order to get, in order to have day-time jobs, fairly clean jobs, from them. They will then obviously not find those compatible, acceptable, and rewarding jobs.

To do that simply because the Government wants to privatize part of the postal service is completely ridiculous. It is unnecessary. It is, as I said, causing the national strike that we have taking place at the present time. I would ask the Government again, because it does have the opportunity to debate today, why it is so essential to take those jobs from women and make them minimum wage jobs? Why is that so essential to this Government? That is what will happen. The Government knows that is what will happen.

The Minister responsible for Canada Post got up and said that no one will lose jobs as a result of this measure. He said, "We will make sure that Canada Post will do something to ensure that those people who are presently at the wickets can go and sort mail. They can do other jobs in the Post Office". But that is not necessarily a good option.

First, the jobs that people have worked for years and years to get will be taken away. Second, it is not always the case in some of the smaller post offices across the land that four more mail sorters are needed, because there are already four mail sorters. They are there doing that work at that time. Eight mail sorters will not be needed. What will happen? Will people be forced to leave the communities they work in, or will they have to quit working at the Post Office?

This is a matter of job security. Because it is a matter of job security it belongs at the bargaining table. Yet you have heard from the Minister responsible for Canada Post, Madam Speaker, say, "No, it is management rights. We will not negotiate that". That is not management rights. It is the security of those families across the land. They have a right to take that to the negotiating table. It is the pigheadedness of this Government and its refusal to allow negotiations to take

place at the negotiating table that have caused a national strike.

#### *Time Allocation*

If the Government was willing to move, if the Government was willing to allow the issue of franchising-out to be negotiated, where it will take place, when it will take place, how it will take place, then I think this issue could be resolved. But the negotiations have to be allowed to take place. If the Government is saying that it will not discuss the item, then, obviously, it will not be resolved. A mediator may come in and there may be an arbitration award handed down in two or three months. That may make people think that the labour dispute has been resolved because the arbitrator has acted and made recommendations. But if the issue is not satisfactorily resolved for both sides, both management and the workers, then we will have more years of disputes within the Post Office. I am not saying violence. I am not saying provocation, but it will obviously set a very bumpy relationship between management and the workers, because they could not discuss at the negotiating table the item that is of concern to both parties.

So, Madam Speaker, we have to oppose this measure. We continue to oppose it. What we want to see from the Government is an indication not only that it will accept some of the amendments we have suggested but also that it will allow negotiations to take place at the bargaining table. The only way that that can happen is if the hands of Canada Post are freed and it is allowed to negotiate this item at the bargaining table.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Madam Speaker, I would like to start by saying that we on the side of the House regret that the Government has decided to use time allocation, a procedure that amounts to gagging Members in order to speed up the debate on Bill C-86. Ironically, using this procedure will probably make the debate go on longer than it should, because when the Minister introduces the motion for time allocation, it is followed, as you know, by a two-hour debate for the sole purpose of finding out whether the motion will be adopted. This means we spend two hours talking about procedure instead of discussing some of the amendments that could be made to this Bill. While the amendments would not make it perfect or even acceptable—depending what the Government wants to do with its majority—they would at least have the effect of making us to stick to the substance of the Bill.

It is regrettable that, once again, the Government, supported by its vast majority, is using a Standing Order of the House to impose its will and to try and get approval for a Bill that has some very dangerous aspects.

First of all, I may say that as far as we are concerned, it was not the right time to introduce this Bill.

[*English*]

I want to say that in our opinion the timing with respect to bringing Bill C-86 before the House was wrong. First, I think