

*Private Members' Business*

with Canada Post. This is compounded by subsection 13(5) of the Canada Post Act, which says:

Notwithstanding any provision of Part I of the Canada Labour Code, for the purposes of the application of that part to the Corporation and to the officers and employees of the Corporation, a mail contractor is deemed not to be a dependent contractor or an employee within the meaning of those terms in subsection 3(1) of that act.

Therefore, I urge the minister responsible for Canada Post to introduce legislation that would repeal this discriminatory subsection. I urge him to do so on a priority basis. The importance of the repeal of this subsection is two-fold. First, as it now reads it has implications with respect to section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in that it prevents a rural route carrier from receiving equal pay for work of equal value. Certainly the hon. members can see the hypocrisy of a Crown corporation whose legislation contradicts our charter. Second, an amendment to the Canada Post Act would ensure that Part I of the Canada Labour Code would apply to rural couriers in the same way that it applies to all employees of the corporation and most Canadian workers.

I see I only have one minute left. Canada Post, in its desire to act like a private corporation, has put money before people. I call on all members of this House to support me in this motion and I call on the minister to take action immediately to rectify this situation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I like both the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona and the hon. member for Crowfoot. However, I had the hon. member for Crowfoot down first, so I must recognize him.

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I thought you were going to recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona first. I probably should tell him that I am not ready yet, or something like that.

I thought that today might be a refreshing day and that something very unique and different would happen. I was hoping that I would hear a Liberal member of Parliament come to this House and put forward a Private Members' Bill that would talk about cutting the expenditures of money. That would have been an unique idea, very rare and never before experienced. That is really the case. Never before have I seen a Private Members' Bill from the opposition side that advocated the cutting of money.

He talks about an injustice and an unfairness. Quite frankly my first criticism is the lack of evidence to establish that fact. I begin with some prepared comments

that I would like to make today, I think that can be established and established clearly, as is also the case with numerous court hearings on this matter. They came to the same conclusion that the allegations of injustice simply are not justified.

I express some sympathy for the individual who signed the letter he read into the record. For a person who is earning \$16,000 as their sole income it is obviously a significant hardship. It is not the intent of a rural postal contractor to serve as a person's sole job.

Most of these positions are part-time. They are coupled with people's other occupations. There may be extreme cases where this is some people's only job. That is not the intent of the work at all.

In many parts of Canada we examined the whole question of rural routes. At least in certain parts the activity is redundant. It is redundant with a community lifestyle in which people go to town for repairs or to purchase food. They visit their small villages, hamlets, or towns so frequently that a more legitimate question for Canadian society to ask is why if they are visiting a place where the post office is do we have a rural post office service and rural delivery in the first place.

I come from a very large rural constituency whose north section could be described as a farming area, some of it receiving rural delivery. The southern half could be described as a ranching area. My constituency is about the size of the province of New Brunswick.

I say to the hon. member for Haldimand—Norfolk that in many ways I could build a case to say that Canada Post has its criteria wrong in terms of how it establishes rural routes. If we look at the tax base of the ranching industry and the tax base of the oil and gas industry that co-exists with that ranching area we will find that there are enough tax dollars there so that instead of using the frequency of the number of persons per mile to justify a rural route probably a long and hard look should be taken at the opposite perspective.

I have constituents who travel 60 miles one way to get their mail. In other words, a return trip of 120 miles. In the farming areas most of those people are in town on a very regular basis, or members of their families. The very long hauls are where a postal service is more needed.

I am rising on the matter raised by my hon. friend for Haldimand—Norfolk. He asks to repeal section 13(5) of the Canada Post Act and seeks to change the status of Canada's rural route carriers and make them full-time employees of Canada Post Corporation.