

Canada Post Corporation

● (1700)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
Motion (Mr. Smith) agreed to.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—Penitentiaries—Showing of pornographic films and staging of topless dancing. (b) Coroner's statement on cyanide deaths; the hon. member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight)—Canadian Wheat Board—Query respecting application of 6 per cent rule to two-price system. (b) Announcement in Senate; the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Energy—Funding for oil exploration in Senegal. (b) Machinery auction sale.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[English]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil) moved:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all regulations of the Canada Post Corporation pertaining to the receipt of mail by persons living in towns who are not entitled to postal delivery at their residences.

He said: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should allay the fears of any nervous members of the official opposition by saying that there will not be an attempt this afternoon to pass any measure in five minutes. In fact, if I may refer to that particular instance, I can only say to those who are interested that the measure at which criticism has been levelled concerning the length of time that it was actually in the House was debated on the floor of the House on many occasions over a period of many years. It was actually in the committee for committee study on at least two occasions and, in fact, was even in third reading on the floor of the House. I relay that information to those who referred to the passage of a measure in five minutes. In fact, it was ten years and many hours of debate before that particular measure eventually found its way into the Senate. As I understand it, that particular measure, Bill C-201, is already in its fourth day of debate in the Senate.

I will now turn to the subject at hand, which is the Canada Post Corporation. I brought this subject up as a result of a rather unusual incident. I want to go back to a question I put

on the Order Paper some eight years ago, in 1974, to which the answer I got was:

The Canada Post Office is currently reviewing its lock box policy. All relevant factors concerning lock box service are being examined. It is important to note, however, that current Post Office policy provides for General Delivery service at no charge for persons living in areas where there is no delivery of mail.

I raised the point because I live in an area where there is no delivery of mail. I am one of the many individuals in this country who has to go to the post office in order to obtain his mail.

● (1710)

A letter signed by the president of Canada Post, Mr. Michael Warren, in March, 1982, states:

—my senior officials in retail marketing are currently undertaking a comprehensive review of the Corporation's post office box program.

That is interesting. In 1974, I read the same answer. It was still being studied in 1982. What brought the subject to my attention again this year? I will read a letter which I wrote to Mr. Michael Warren, president of Canada Post, on January 27 of this year. I said:

For years I have complained that I have to pay for a post office box which saves the Post Office money. In Hudson, we do not have postal delivery, and the boxes serve as a very convenient means for sorting the mail.

If everyone in Hudson were to abandon their box and request their mail at the counter, it would be necessary to hire at least two additional employees.

Because you save the salaries of both postmen for delivery and office personnel, I see no reason why you should charge me for a box which is for your convenience.

What precipitated that letter was a little bill I received from the post office requesting me to pay the sum of \$12. That is not too much, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless it was \$12. So I wrote to the local postmaster and said:

Your card has been received advising me that I must pay you \$12 for my post office box. Please note that henceforth mail will be picked up at the counter.

Then a very interesting thing happened. I have lived in the same house for some 35 years, with the same address, the same street number and so on. The post office then asked my wife to sign a document which it called a "Change of Address Card" and to pay \$1.50 to the post office. My wife, in disbelief, paid over the sum of \$1.50. So I wrote to the president of Canada Post again and this time I said:

It is my opinion that the Post Office owes me \$1.50 extracted from my wife for an unnecessary change of address card, because I have not changed my address in the last 35 years.

Mr. Darling: Did you get your money back?

Mr. Herbert: No, so far no luck. In February I then put a motion to the House under Standing Order 43 and suggested that the post office cease and desist these "usurious charges" for change of address cards and so on.

Just to be sure of myself, I also put a question on the Order Paper, No. 4,030, asking under what conditions the post office can refuse to surrender mail to a properly identified person