

only some 20 miles away. The letter took two months to arrive, and it went via Japan. It apparently landed up in the Japanese capital because the postal code for Raymond is TOK 1Y0. I wonder whether other communities across the nation are having like problems.

The letter is signed by Ernest Mardon of Lethbridge. Other hon. members will be speaking about the postal code.

Mechanization is all very well but, as the Unemployment Insurance Commission discovered, computerization and mechanization can give rise to problems; unless properly programmed, these devices can confuse the situation rather than relieve it.

Employee morale in the post office is still low. This is what an employee of the department says, writing in the *Communications* magazine for May, 1973. The employee is from St. John's, Newfoundland, and he says, in the department's own publication:

A new look has arrived at Canada Post with the introduction of Telepost, etc. The employees of the post office can now feel a sense of pride in that they are now part of the finest post office in the world.

I think he is quoting there from one of the speeches of the Postmaster General. He goes on to make this comment.

Refreshing, isn't it? The new look does exist but not entirely in the perspective of the above paragraph. Postal workers are not rejuvenated but still dejected and defiant against management.

Publications are still going out of business in consequence of the almost punitive increase in postal rates. Most of the mail which reaches my desk nowadays seems to consist of complaints about postal services. As an example, let me quote part of a resolution which was forwarded to me by the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees on May 26. It reads:

WHEREAS our brotherhood journal, labour newspaper and the Canadian Railwaymen, along with other labour publications and periodicals of non-profit organizations and threatened by ruinous postal rate increases; and

WHEREAS the postal rate increases which face us, far higher than those applying to commercial publications, would wreck our vital means of communication with our membership through publications which, unlike the commercial press, have no advertising revenue and few outside subscriptions, and are financed entirely by membership dues—

There are a few other "WHEREAS" clauses, and then the conclusion—

RESOLVED that we continue to press the issue with the Canadian Post Office Department whenever appropriate to seek a more equitable postal rate for the Canadian *Railwayman*.

A large number of similar journals have also been affected, and the organizations concerned have expressed their continuing concern in almost the same terms. This is why we on this side are bringing up the matter once again today.

The punitive increase in postal rates, as well as the decline in the efficiency of the service, has resulted in a loss of business. On February 12, a reply was tabled to a question in the name of the hon. member for Southwestern Nova (Mr. Haliburton). It indicated that revenue from first class, second class and third class mail has declined continually since 1967-68. Now, how can revenue possibly go down when there have been increases in rates such as I have described, other than because the Post Office Depart-

### Post Office

ment by its unwise managerial experimentation has driven potential business away from itself?

If members will examine the yellow pages of the Toronto telephone directory they will discover listed there no fewer than 85 private messenger services which are in business competing directly with the post office in parcel post delivery and even letter carrying services. No wonder the deficit of the post office account continues to escalate. Problems in connection with mechanization continue to exist and new difficulties are arising on the labour front, some of which I shall refer to briefly this morning. It has been brought to my attention that recently, in the city of Toronto, a new module system of work organization has been established. Judging from some of the comments I have heard from employees involved, it is not likely to enhance the morale or the efficiency of postal workers. Here is a comment by one of the employees:

The unit leaders and cell members have been selected for each of these modules. Each cell consists of 20 or more employees.

He goes on to refer to Professor Martin Moore's book "Methods of Work" in which Professor Moore describes the module system as a pressure system similar to that used by the Nazis in their slave camps at Dachau, Belsen, etc. How on earth the management of the post office feels that this is going to increase efficiency is beyond comprehension. It is almost as bad as arbitrarily closing rural post offices, as the government did to the tune of about 2,000 within a very short period of time in order to save a dollar here and a dollar there.

● (1220)

The Canadian Union of Postal Workers bulletin of April 17 deals with the introduction of the module system, and here are some of the complaints they make about it:

You can see that we are reduced from five levels on our staff to three. The most interesting point here is that P.O. L7 will be equivalent to a P.O. L6.

I guess that stands for "postal operator".

Best of luck to APOC in justifying that to their members.

They anticipate that there is going to be a great kick-back from the employees as a result of the decrease in the number of employee levels. Then, the bulletin goes on in great detail:

Approximately one year ago your education committee published an article on management by objectives (M.B.O.). Reduced to its simplest terms, this horrendous system works by establishing a goal or standard and when the person or group "Module(?) reaches the objective then a new, higher, objective is established. When you link M.B.O. with another of management's favourite procedures—"accountability"—then Ivory Tower Theorists start rubbing their hands together in glee. "Accountability" means each level in the supervisory hierarchy is responsible and required to account for the performance of his subordinates. In other words, each module supervisor would be "accountable" for the performance of his little group (module) of employees/workers. The next link in the chain is to measure production. It is already being done! The basis is group work measurement and does not measure an individual but rather a group (module) of employees on an operation. The unit of measurement is pieces per hour (PPH) and applies to magazines, circulars, letters, etc. . . .

How do we react to all this? The answer is simple—Don't! If you are doing a good day's work now, why should you change your manner of working because management makes changes? If you are not considered a poor worker now then why change? Don't let the so-called team (module) method of playing off one group