

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

The House met at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 22

[English]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

DELAYS IN MAIL DELIVERY

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a matter that has caused a great deal of frustration and alarm in the city of Hamilton. All past Governments regarded regular mail delivery as an essential service which was guaranteed to all Canadians. This is not the case with the present Conservative Government. The deterioration of postal service in my riding and throughout Canada is indicative of the Government's stop-at-nothing attitude when it comes to cost-cutting.

Over the past few months my constituency office has been bombarded with complaints about poor mail service in Hamilton and the increasing number of occasions when there is no mail delivery. In the past two years 80 full-time positions have been eliminated. This has resulted in greater delays, more complaints, and an intensification of the negative view of Canada Post. On any given day 600 to 700 households in Hamilton do not receive their mail. People like Dawn Walker, Patrick and Sharon Le Donne, and Cheryl Seth are frustrated when they do not get their mail, and become incensed when they are told they can pick it up at the post office. As taxpayers these people have a right to regular household delivery.

Mothers, pensioners, and families on welfare are literally living from day-to-day and waiting for cheques that do not arrive because postal service has been stopped. Does the Government have no sense of how critical the prompt delivery of mail is? I had initially planned to mail my complaint to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Côté). However, because the arrival of such a letter is no longer guaranteed, I stand in this House to call upon the Government to cease its neglect of Canada Post.

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION

PLIGHT OF LANDED IMMIGRANT

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the case of a woman, a landed immigrant since 1972, who is now being threatened with deportation.

Mrs. Weinroth still has permanent resident status, but an Immigration Officer in the Montreal area decided to interpret the Immigration Act and Regulations very strictly and is trying to have her status revoked.

Mrs. Weinroth was educated in Quebec from 1969 to 1979. Her family lives in Montreal. Her father teaches at McGill and her mother at Dawson College.

In 1979, she went to Michigan to continue her studies, and she had two children there. Since then, she decided to return to Canada but is now being threatened with deportation. Pending a decision on her case by an arbitration officer, I think it is unfair to threaten Mrs. Weinroth with deportation. She is now battling the U.S. courts for custody of her children, and I think the last thing she needs is to be worried as well about being prevented from taking up residence in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is of the utmost urgency to deal with this case and ensure that residents and permanent residents can feel safe and secure. At a time when family re-unification is the order of the day, I think it should be relatively easy to deal with Mrs. Weinroth's case.

* * *

● (1405)

[English]

SOCIAL SECURITY

PHILOSOPHY OF NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY—PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview with *Le Devoir*, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) presented his Government's blueprint for creating a society of "haves" and "have-nots". He said: "Canada must rethink its social philosophy."

The social philosophy we hold provides all Canadians with certain rights and services, such as medicare and old age pensions, and certain safeguards against the vagaries of a capitalist economy, such as unemployment insurance and