

fighting because of different political Parties with one belonging to this provincial Government or that and the federal Government. People want an end to the old fights and arguments. That is why I say, let us go forward in the common interest.

Mr. Berger: Madam Speaker, I do not have the experience that the Hon. Member has in this House of Commons. I was quite astounded when the Member said that there was nothing new in this agreement and that this is what we have been doing for the past 20 years. The Member also said that the provinces are getting no new powers in this agreement. When I say I do not have the Member's experience, and if the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle—Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) does not believe me, I could say I could refer to somebody like former Senator Eugene Forsey who has a bit more experience than I do and who matches the Member's experience in some areas. I was looking at one of Eugene Forsey's comments while the Member was speaking. He talks about admitting new provinces.

Would the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle—Moose Mountain not agree that there has been a dramatic change when it comes to admitting new provinces? For many years it was the federal Government alone with the concurrence of the provinces to be, that decided whether there would be a new province. In 1982, under the amending formula it became seven out of 10 provinces that had to agree with the decision of the federal Government. Now we are talking about requiring the unanimous agreement of all the provinces and the federal Government. I would suggest to the Hon. Member that this, indeed, is something new.

Mr. Hamilton: Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is quite right. This is something new. It is just putting into practice what we have always done. Former Senator Forsey is quite right. This is quite new. Ex-Senator Forsey is very experienced. His love of law and writing is well known. What I am trying to say, not just to the Members of Parliament but through you, Madam Speaker, to the whole country is that this is no time for lawyers. This is a time for honest-speaking politicians to tell these intellectuals—what shall I call them—the rationalists who believe that science and common sense will conquer all. There is such a thing as instinct and civility that makes a government, a country and a family work. Yes, ex-Senator Forsey is absolutely technically correct. But we are not talking about technicalities here, we are talking about building a nation in a spirit of compromise and co-operation and, quite frankly, we have a long history ahead of us in this form of attitude.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Since it is now two o'clock p.m. and pursuant to the Standing Orders, the House must proceed to other business. The remaining 12 minutes of extension resulting from the ministerial statements will be added to Government Orders later on this day.

S. O. 21

• (1400)

[Translation]

Consequently, the hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business will begin at 5.12 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[Translation]

FAMILY WEEK

ASSISTANCE FOR FAMILIES—URGENCY FOR GOVERNMENT TO IMPLEMENT PROMISED POLICY

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, today marks the opening of Family Week. When talking about the family in the years 1990s, we are referring to the traditional family, the single-parent family, the reconstituted family, and the single mother. We know that one child out of five is poor. We also have a draft tax reform which was tabled in the House in June and which does not seem to give full consideration to the needs of low and middle income families. The gap between rich and poor families grows wider, to the extent that on the occasion of Family Week I again urge the Government to reconsider its approach to the tax field, to let families survive, and especially to give support services to young couples anxious to bear children. I think that ever since this Government took office we have been told that it has a policy to help families. Perhaps time has come indeed for the Government to implement the measures it has been telling us about for three years.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

HIRING OF STRIKE-BREAKERS—OPPORTUNITY TO CHANGE CANADA LABOUR CODE

Mr. Guy St. Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post should not be hiring scabs during the current series of rotating strikes in Canada.

When Canada Post management hire scabs they create a climate of violence, and we must all keep in mind how Bill 45 has made labour relations in Quebec more civilized.

Sooner or later Canada will have to find a solution to avoid such violent incidents.

Quebec's experience is rather unique: labour conflicts in recent years have been practically devoid of violence because Bill 45 has introduced better balance between forces.

On June 23, 1987, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to rise in this House and suggest that Canada Post officials ought to draw inspiration from the Quebec legislation.