

*Adjournment Debate*

**Mr. Jim Jepson (London East):** Madam Speaker, I would like to speak in favour of this well-intended motion brought forward by the Hon. Member for Scarborough West (Mr. Stackhouse). Let me focus on what I believe is the foundation of our country, that being the family unit. I know others wish to speak so I will be very brief.

This evening I have heard various comments about the organization known as REAL Women. I regret that there are people in this country who look upon the traditional views of that organization as an attack on the family unit. They are in fact reinforcing family values. I regret that this has happened, but we see attacks on the family unit from every direction and that is why it is so important to have legislation such as this. It will reinforce and refocus our attention on this very important issue.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Léo Duguay (Saint-Boniface):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to support both the motion moved by my colleague the Hon. Member for Scarborough West (Mr. Stackhouse) and the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Charlesbourg (Mrs. Tardif).

[*English*]

I wanted to make only one or two simple and straightforward comments in order to emphasize the importance of this resolution. Contrary to the myth, and it is a myth, the high marriage and remarriage rates in this country indicate that neither marriage nor the family has gone out of style. The family is the principal means through which we care for one another. It is the primary unit of learning, education and socialization. It is a source of emotional sustenance and support, and a significant unit of both economic production and consumption. If we lose sight of the family we will be weakened as a society. All of our efforts to promote the well-being of the Canadian family must be maintained. Families remain the primary care givers for children and the primary providers of emotional support for adult members. They remain the primary context in which human values are cultivated. The family today in Canada is being rediscovered and our commitment to family life in its various forms must be maintained. That is why I take pleasure in supporting this resolution and the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion (Mrs. Tardif (Charlesbourg)) agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Shall the motion, as amended, carry?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Stackhouse) as amended agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Shall I call it six o'clock?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

CANADA POST CORPORATION—(A) APPARENT CONTRADICTION IN GOVERNMENT POLICIES—(B) APPARENT INEQUITIES CONCERNING POSTAL SERVICE

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou):** Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to deal with the postal service in Canada. For the past few months, Canadians have been held hostages by this Government which is cutting essential services. In a modern society such as ours, a postal service is essential. Yet, for all sorts of reasons, the Conservative Government has decided to question its existence.

Madam Speaker, it would be appropriate to list the different actions which this Government has taken. First of all, there was the Marchment Commission which produced a very interesting report, including a recommendation that the Government allow Canada Post five years to soak up its deficit. A few months later, without any sound study, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) decided suddenly that it should eliminate its deficit within one year.

Because of that, Canada Post has taken steps to meet this demand from the Government. First, it submitted a plan of operation which the Government has accepted as such, except for a part which was referred to a committee; but it has accepted the notion, not on a temporary but on a permanent basis, that from now on, all new residences in Canada would not be entitled to postal home delivery, but that they would have access to superboxes. We learned recently on TV that these so-called superboxes are not really "super", because anybody could very easily open them and steal the mail.

We have also learned that Canada Post is planning to close several thousand post offices in rural areas, resulting in thousands of jobs being lost. Canada Post's plan of operation is also considering increases in postal rates for first class mail which are before the committee, but there are other increases which are not clear—and they are waiting to implement them—and which could have a very negative impact on publications, especially multicultural papers which are sent home; if the costs for mailing these papers were to increase, I do not think that their publishers could absorb them, so that a great many weeklies for instance would likely disappear.

So, Madam Speaker, they spared nothing, they turned the Canadian postal service upside down in the name of deficit reduction. The cause is a worthy one, but if they want to