

• (1710)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Chair is pondering on whether it should ask for the unanimous consent of the House before agreeing to the Hon. Member's suggestion. The Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) has the floor.

Mr. Rodriguez: Madam Speaker, I really wish the Conservatives would show some passion for the collective bargaining process. If they had a passion for justice in the workplace, if they had a passion to try to provide service to Canadians through Canada Post—

Mrs. Sparrow: That is what we are doing.

Mr. Rodriguez: They are not providing service. I have received letters from across the country. We have the Organization of Rural Dignity because the Government has consistently cut back rural postal services. It has consistently cut back urban postal services.

We have had demonstrations. We have had people taking the Government to court over the whole matter of urban postal services. The record is clear.

This piece of legislation and the closing of debate in the House of Commons will not improve collective bargaining in the Post Office. It is using the jackboot of tyranny to put workers back to work in that workplace.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, of course if the NDP Members opposite were to shut up, perhaps they would finally listen to what we have to say.

I would like to refer to the last speakers to show our television audience what can happen in a debate. We had earlier one of our Liberal opponents who rose quite beyond himself and told Canadians watching television what an immoral, what a horrendous thing closure was on such an important matter. It was both immoral and important because, as he said, we will be discussing procedure for two hours rather than the subject matter of the Bill. I would like to tell the Hon. Member, who by the way has just entered the House, that during the 10 minutes he spoke—of course he took two minutes to play the offended virgin, which left eight minutes during which he addressed the subject matter and the problem at the Post Office.

On the other hand, Madam Speaker, we just heard a very delightful and eloquent speech from my NDP friend. This clearly shows their attitude in this case. What a joke! They laugh, they mock the conflict to show that on the Government side what is going on is absolutely ridiculous. But what is going on on the Government side? We returned to the negotiation table after some time, and I would like to quote the following from *Le Devoir*: "After 10 days of postal strike, the Government decided on back-to-work legislation. They are 10 days

Time Allocation

too late." It is not a laughing matter. It is absolutely not a laughing matter, nor is it a matter for procedural bickering either, Madam Speaker.

What would this Bill do, actually? We are telling people: You are taking the Canadian people as hostage. You will go back to the table, we are appointing a mediator who shall within a certain timeframe, keeping a steady eye on the report submitted previously, manage to make his views known. And that is important. We should, or rather the Minister of Labour (Mr. Cadieux) could have said: I am enacting a special legislation, you are going back to work, and here are the working conditions. But no. We want to proceed in a democratic way.

But we are past the time, Madam Speaker, where settlements were taking both the Canadian people and the Canadian Parliament as hostages. The time has gone, Madam Speaker, when regulations only were taking hostage the Canadian people as well as the Parliament of Canada. Canada Post Corporation was privatized in order to remove the political aspect of the system and we have been here for a week laughing and mocking and taking Canadian men and women hostage. We agreed with the strike earlier. We do not think about older people nor the thousands of men and women who are concerned by the present situation. And in our speeches, we pretend to maintain the quality of the service. But let us wonder about the quality of service for the past 25 years. Why is it that the sales of companies such as Courrier, Purolator and so on are ever increasing? The sales . . .

An Hon. Member: Because they are private companies!

Mr. Hudon: Not because they are private companies, but they offer a better service and we paid attention to that.

As for us, when you listen to the NDP members, we have less mail, less service to offer because if those people were coming back, volumes would really be important and the quality of service should yet be improved. The best guaranty of job security is the quality of service being offered.

When I was director of personnel administration in a school board, I kept repeating that the best job security you can have depends on the quality of service you offer to the people you have been hired to serve. That is why, incidentally, Madam Speaker, the Conservative Party will be re-elected because they offer the best service Canadians want and have ever had during the past 20 years.

Madam Speaker, if you read editorials which support us, you will find one in the *Gazette*, for instance, under the headline "It had to be done". And yet, that paper is not known to be always supportive of the Party in power. You also look at the special legislation, and an editorial by Pierre Vennat in *La Presse*: Clearly, the Mulroney Government was right when it decided to end the postal dispute by introducing a Bill to that effect.