

Mr. Danis: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this so I cannot give consent, but I am ready to check. However, at this time I cannot give consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did approach me to find out whether he could take time from my private members' hour to do this because there was agreement from all three House leaders. Therefore, I am wondering if the government side would reconsider and live up to its commitment of offering unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): When the question was asked, unanimous consent was not given. However, if the same hon. member wants to ask for unanimous consent again later, the Chair will entertain his request.

* * *

[*English*]

POSTAL RATE SUBSIDY

REMOVAL OF SUBSIDY ON DIRECT MAIL ADVERTISING

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of removing the postal rate subsidy for all firms using direct mail advertising and not using recycled paper.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in keeping with Canadian interests of implementing and putting into practice programs of sustainable development, I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of removing the postal rate subsidy for all firms using direct mail advertising and not using recycled paper.

This motion is a result of the complaints I have received from many of my constituents about the huge volume of junk mail placed in their mailboxes. The rules of the House of Commons prohibit me from using props although I hardly need to illustrate the huge volume of paper advertising left on the front doorsteps or shoved into mailboxes every week: flyers, coupons, contests. According to Ed McMahon, he can comfortably retire on the millions he has supposedly won from publishing houses.

Private Members' Business

I received another bundle of junk mail from a constituent, Alan Upton. With this package of junk mail he attaches a letter which says: "Dear Sir, the attached flyers represent 10 days of delivery, month in and month out, year in and year out, to nearly every household in this country. The decimation of trees and landfill required to hide it is monumental and criminal. When in the name of reason will something be done? Or is it beyond the powers of the House? That which is so obvious and so curable continues unabated. Signed, Alan Upton". As he said, this is delivered to every household in Canada.

The challenge is a very serious matter and must be addressed by all departments of government but especially Canada Post. Canadians are alarmed by the depletion of our growth forests and for what? We are cutting down valuable resources needlessly. Should we not be using recycled paper instead?

I am not saying that print advertising should be abolished. When you take into account the flyers carried in daily and weekly newspapers, I am aware that close to 200,000 Canadian jobs rely on printed advertising. It is an integral part of the free market process.

What I am saying is that we need to reconsider our priorities. In just a few short years there has been a tremendous effort to verse Canadian consumers in the three Rs of sustainable development, reducing, reusing, recycling. We should add another R and that is the R of rethink.

One of my constituents, an environmentally concerned citizen named David Alexander, suggested to me that in consideration of this motion we need to rethink our approach to advertising, rethink our approach to distribution. We need new, creative ideas.

How about giving a break to advertisers using recycled paper? A cheaper rate should be available from Canada Post for companies using recycled paper in their advertising materials. My constituents of Parkdale—High Park suggest that we take this idea one step further and provide a lower postal rate to companies using 100 per cent recycled paper products in their advertising, a higher postal rate for companies using less than 100 per cent, with the highest rate being charged for products using no recycled paper content, technically known as post consumer fibres.