

*Time Allocation***POSTAL SERVICES CONTINUATION ACT, 1987**ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER SECOND READING STAGE
OF BILL C-86

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, under Government orders, you will note that we have on the Order Paper a motion for time allocation. Immediately prior to moving that time allocation motion, I would like to inquire once more if there is any disposition on the part of the opposition Parties to expedite debate. The Government is prepared to complete second reading, to move into Committee of the Whole House and to complete third reading this evening in an effort to pass this very important Bill. We are concerned and we want to get the parties back to the bargaining table. We want to prevent any further violence on the picket lines and we want to keep the mail moving. I would like to ask once more of the opposition Parties, if I may, prior to moving this motion, if there is any disposition to expedite debate so that we can complete third reading of this Bill tonight?

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, as much as we are not happy with the contents of Bill C-86, we believe we have reached a stage where we could probably better put our points across by moving amendments. To do this, we would welcome moving to committee stage.

Because of the language of the Minister, I do not know if he is still swinging the sword of Damocles of time allocation over our heads. I would urge him not to do that because this would necessitate a two-hour debate on procedure which, in my view, is meaningless. I would rather discuss the substance of the Bill. It would probably take longer if we go through time allocation. That is where we are in the Liberal Party.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, we will not be co-operating with the Government. We believe this legislation is not balanced. It is not fair. The Government has the ability to move time allocation, and if that is the action it wishes to take it can take it.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from the Liberal Party. Regretfully, I move:

That, in relation to Bill C-86, an Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of postal services, one further sitting day be allotted to the second reading stage of the Bill; and

That fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this Order and, in turn, every question necessary in order to dispose of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated just a few moments ago, we do not believe this is fair legislation. I think there is an attempt by the Government to railroad this legislation through the House of Commons. It is unfortunate that that is the case. Our Party has indicated in our

speeches in the House the areas on which we believe there should be amendments to make this legislation more fair and equal in its treatment of both management and the workers. To date we have not received a response from the Government to indicate which amendments it is likely to accept and which amendments it is going to reject.

We would hope that in the two-hour time period we have now that the Ministers of the Government will rise in the House of Commons and give us some indication of whether or not they will be open to amendments to this legislation. I have already spoken to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Cadieux) and told him what areas of the legislation we believe should be amended in order to make it more fair and compatible and more acceptable to both sides in the dispute.

Having said that, we do believe that as long as postal workers have the right to strike, as they have under the law of this country, the Government should allow the dispute to continue or, even more constructively, should allow Canada Post to negotiate. As I said in my opening speech on this debate, it is the Government that is causing the strike. It is the Government's refusal to allow Canada Post to discuss at the bargaining table the issue of franchising that is causing this strike. We in the New Democratic Party caucus believe that the workers, through their union, have the right to take that very important matter to the bargaining table and that they should expect that Canada Post will discuss this matter. It is this item that is causing the strike. It is the major item in dispute. As long as the Government, for its own political agenda, refuses to allow this item to be negotiated, we are going to have a labour dispute in this country.

It is the Government's refusal to negotiate in good faith, and I want to make that very clear, on the matter of job security that is causing the strike at the present time, just as it was the Government's move to introduce the legislation in the House of Commons that provoked a national strike. We did not have a national strike until this legislation was introduced into the House of Commons, it was only after this unfair one-sided legislation was introduced that a national strike right across this country was provoked.

I have difficulty understanding why the Government will not allow this item to be discussed and negotiated. After all the speeches made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), and the Minister responsible for the status of women about the need for affirmative action and the need to ensure that women have jobs with adequate salaries, it seems completely contradictory to have a Government policy which is going to take these jobs, with fairly decent salaries, which are basically held by women, and franchise them out to a number of locations right across this country. Again, women will be hired, but on a part-time basis. They will receive basic minimum wages—no benefits and no likelihood of a decent pension plan. The Government has to be responsible for what it is doing. It knows full well that the net result of this franchising-out policy is that jobs at the wickets in Canada Post right across the country will disappear. Yet the people who will be picking up the new jobs