

participants, neither the industrial nor the provincial representatives to the clothing committee, representing the government of Manitoba, will agree to the publication of this report. We concur in this stand.

In brief, if the House were to approve this motion it would result in the government breaching a contractual agreement with a provincial government and a major Canadian industry. It would violate a promise to the working people of Manitoba who participated in the study and were given an assurance that what they said would be held in confidence. We will never betray that trust given to us by the workers of Manitoba. This could cause them painful embarrassment in many cases because I assure you some of them were very frank in some of their comments. It would destroy the usefulness of an effective economic tool which conceivably could be used to employ a lot of other Canadian workers in the future. In other words, this is a technique which has been highly successful in removing many of the problems from the garment industry in Manitoba. It is a technique which can be used in other provinces. If we were to break trust with the workers of Manitoba it would no longer be possible for this government to go to any workers in any part of Canada and say, "Place your trust in us, tell us all your problems", because at some future date all their remarks may be placed on some public record to their severe embarrassment and even perhaps to their economic danger.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the House that the question be put at this time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Carried.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is negated on division.
Motion (Mr. Orlikow) negated.

* * *

POST OFFICE

REQUEST FOR COPIES OF LETTERS COMPLAINING ABOUT SERVICE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris) moved:

That an order of the House do issue for copies of all letters received by the Postmaster General or any other members of the

Postal Service

government since January 1, 1971, complaining about postal services and the replies thereto.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when this motion came up for consideration yesterday, the parliamentary secretary declined to accept it on the ground that it was physically impossible to gather all this correspondence in one central location as the correspondence is spread throughout the country. He also said that the cost would be enormous and asked under the circumstances that the hon. member withdraw his motion. I raised slight opposition to the interpretation of my motion because I do not believe it is quite accurate in terms of the wording of the motion before us today in which I ask for copies of all letters received by the Postmaster General or any other member of the government since January 1, 1971, complaining about postal service and the replies thereto. Actually my motion was quite specific. I was not talking about complaints which came into the local post offices across the country. Rather I was attempting to zero in specifically on complaints which came to the Postmaster General or to the other members of the government. Therefore, I cannot understand why the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Jerome) talked about gathering all correspondence in one central location and stated that the correspondence is spread throughout the country.

I believe Ottawa is the seat of government, and any one who would be affected by the motion I have before the House would be located in Ottawa. This, I believe, would considerably narrow the terms of the notice of motion at least from the standpoint of the interpretation placed on it by the parliamentary secretary. Therefore, once again I should like to ask the government if it would give us copies—this covers only a period of a year—of the letters of complaint received. If that should be too large a task, as I suggested in my remarks yesterday, perhaps we should be given a sampling of the mail since I imagine much of it would be repetitious. It perhaps could be broken down into groups of topics. In this way the government could give us some idea of how the public feels about the rather disastrous deterioration in the mail service over the past three or four years in Canada.

I should like to mention some of the topics which come to my attention. I am sure all hon. members can verify this. One of the most active areas of correspondence, and even in this regard there is considerable delay, is that related to complaints we receive from our constituencies concerning the decline in the quality of postal service, which used to be one of the best to be found anywhere in the world, while at the same time skyrocketing costs in the past four years have increased the cost for class A mail by 100 per cent. Nobody in these days of runaway inflation objects to the idea that an increase in costs demands an increase in the price of stamps and so forth.

• (1720)

The real complaint arises from the fact that while the cost of mail service is increasing the quality continues to decline. Perhaps the major complaint concerns the inexplicable delays in mail delivery from time to time. There are occasions when a letter within a large city will take as long as three or four days to travel from one point in the city to another. There have been examples of a piece of