

*Transportation*

Unfortunately this bill will be talked out. It is being used for propaganda, and I say that is a disgrace. If hon. members are honest, if they believe that in the next parliament we can change the user-pay concept and provide service for all Canadians in all parts of Canada, then if a bill of this nature is introduced again they should support it, as I will.

**Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak for very long. The title and the purpose of the bill are clear. The purpose is well outlined in the bill. It is to remedy some of the things referred to by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). The present Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) is famous for his user-pay policy. I am interested in the manner in which the explanatory note is worded. It says the following:

Government consultants have recommended to the Canadian Transport Commission that passenger trains serving less populous regions be replaced by buses in order to eliminate federal subsidies. At the same time the railways are increasing fares beyond the ability of many passengers to pay.

That is exactly what the Minister of Transport tried to sell and did sell to the premiers of the maritime provinces. For that reason I think the bill is very constructive. It is a private member's bill which is a reversal of existing government policy; and I have no hesitation in saying that I support the bill because it seems to be maritime-oriented.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Charles Lapointe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, obviously, the underlying philosophy—

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Lapointe:** Mr. Speaker, I had the decency to keep quiet and listen closely to hon. members when they made their speeches. I trust they will extend the same courtesy to me.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying principles of this bill are of course very praiseworthy and justifiable, but I feel that the present national transport policy provides all necessary barriers to enable the Canadian Transport Commission to take into account precisely those concerns expressed by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Tessier). He himself, when he made his excellent speech earlier, was able to take advantage of those CTC rules last spring when he appeared before the commission and pleaded his case for extending passenger services in his area which case he actually won.

Mr. Speaker, though I find this bill very attractive in some regards, and because I come from an area which is also far removed from Canadian metropolises and which, unfortunately, lost its only passenger service running from Quebec City and Murray Bay, though, as I say, I find this bill very appealing, the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that neither the minister nor anyone else can be blamed for trying to put some measure of order in our national policy.

[Mr. Peters.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order. The hour allotted for private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

● (2002)

[*English*]

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****POSTAL SERVICE OPERATIONS ACT, 1978****MEASURE TO ENSURE CONTINUATION OF REGULAR POSTAL OPERATIONS**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Munro (Hamilton East) that Bill C-45, to provide for the continuation of regular postal service operations, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. At five o'clock the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) had the floor. He has 29 minutes remaining to him.

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, at five o'clock I was making the point that there is an encouraging development within the Canadian Union of Postal Workers, and that is a growing sentiment among the responsible members that confrontation and polarization must end before the existence of the Post Office Department is threatened. This situation has not been developing overnight. As a matter of fact, I am sure hon. members will be aware—those who follow postal affairs closely—that it was emerging during the crisis that was brought about in the 42 days strike in 1975.

I should like to quote again from the article by Mark Nichols in the July issue of *Macleans* magazine where he refers to the following incident:

At times, the hard line positions taken by CUPW leadership appear to have run far ahead of rank and file sentiment. Toward the end of the tumultuous 1975 strike, says Bryce Mackasey, who was postmaster general at the time, "it became very evident to me that the majority of the workers were satisfied with Ottawa's offer, and equally obvious that the leadership didn't want to settle." "Had the strike continued for just a few more days," says Mackasey, the workers would have begun returning to work and the union leadership would have been effectively broken. Rather than have that happen—"because I am not malicious"—Mackasey made a few minor concessions that enabled the leadership to save face and the strike was over.

That was my own impression at the time. The loss of business was becoming critically evident, even two years ago, and the deficits have been going up astronomically since that