

Time Allocation

In four or five minutes, Madam Speaker, we will be called upon to vote and I will support time allocation for the debate on that issue, because we have been discussing procedure for the past two hours, discussing closing the debate. The debate must be closed. We must give back to Canadian men and women who are entitled to services, the power they have as citizens. At this point, after two or three weeks, we have had enough and that is final. The best safeguard, the best work quality as I said is the quality of service they should provide. They said this was a sad day. It is not necessarily so terrible, except that we may have wasted two hours—we should have passed the Bill earlier in order to move to other business that is important to Canadians.

I think that everything has been covered by the Hon. Members who spoke and we are now coming to the end of the debate and I would like it to be serene and calm. Are we rich enough, can we afford in Canada to deprive all our citizens of services they are entitled to? This we will never repeat too often. The Canadian Parliament, the highest authority in the land—of course the Senate has a different view—the Canadian Parliament essentially has the power and the right to give back to the citizens the services they should have, and we should stop listening to a few people who, in a system like ours, in a democratic system, have a right to make their views known, but the fact that they have a strong voice to bellow out their points does not necessarily make them right.

I like to refer to the old story of the parishoner who one day went up to the pulpit to read the sermon prepared by the parish priest for the next day. The sexton had written in the margin: "Weak point, use loud voice." When one is not too sure of what to say, one makes jokes, one uses a loud voice, one shouts to impress one's truth. I can say that in the constituency of Beauharnois—Salaberry, in Valleyfield, there are dozens of people who are calling because they expect service. I represent them also. It is not only on behalf of union leaders whom I hold in high esteem that I am speaking out, but also on behalf of mothers, senior citizens and all those who are expecting something through the mail.

I suggest that the time has come to put an end to this hostage-taking of the Canadian people and that the parties should get together—a corporation has every right to change the direction of its operation as it pleases. Madam Speaker, in Valleyfield, which is not a city as big as Montreal, with between 30,000 and 33,000 inhabitants, not a week goes by without some convenience store owner showing up at my office to say: Mr. Hudon, it would be nice if I could get a small postal counter. I think it is a very good idea. Why not? Everybody agrees that we should bring the service closer to the customers, provided that this does not endanger any job security or other rights.

As I was saying earlier, Madam Speaker, the best security for these people would be in the quality of their service. Why refuse them that? Every application for a postal counter should be judged on its merits, and very often, we are faced, not with arbitrary decisions, but with decisions such as: Here,

we may have gone a little bit too far, it would be necessary to make personnel cuts. I am sure that the postmasters . . . the Valleyfield postmaster at any rate, would take this into account when making such a decision. However, I should say that it is sometimes much simpler to make a decision when the staff is reduced and that normal rather than Draconian steps are taken.

This is quality service. Such service for Canada Post would be as that provided by Courier and Purolator which pick up letters and make home deliveries. They do not say: "I have your letter and I will deliver it when I feel like it".

The quality service is a kind of decentralization. I feel that people should be ready to accept such a move. It will give Canada Post a greater volume. People have lost confidence. The Member for Beauharnois—Salaberry (Mr. Hudon) cannot restore confidence and I fully agree. However those are fruitless and childish struggles that we are facing now and they prevent us from going any further.

I think that we should be serious enough to see that this is justified and I appeal to my colleagues from the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party to stop performing antics with this issue and to vote really for the well-being of Canadians and for quality service.

The parties will return to the negotiation table and for 90 days, the Bill will appoint a mediator who will be instructed to consider all disputed issues and to try to find a common ground of agreement between the parties. But this is excellent! They do not say: Go back to work, you have 4 percent and we do not talk about it any more. This is excellent! If they have persuasive arguments, Good Heaven, it will be a good table to put them forward . . . an area of agreement with the parties . . . if he cannot do it within 90 days, he will make an arbitral decision on each point of controversy.

I trust the skills of the judge or mediator-arbitrator who will be appointed. I am confident that with this, with good arguments, Canada Post Corporation will sit at the table with the Union and that the parties will put forward their arguments; maybe we will see the light at the end of the tunnel, Mrs. Speaker.

• (1720)

[English]

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Madam Speaker, in the two minutes remaining in the time allocation motion, I have a couple of comments. When the Deputy House Leader for the Government moved the motion today he indicated that time allocation was not needed and, therefore, the Bill was needed to do three things: to get the parties back to the bargaining table; to end violence on the picket lines; and to keep the mail moving. The Government does not need any legislation to get the sides back to the bargaining table. It needs to instruct Canada Post to start bargaining fairly and that it is no longer bound by the corporate plan directed by the