

and our arbitration methods to the modern conflicts which have modern causes, like automation.

I see the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) who is present and who is showing remarkable leadership in dealing with a conflict in postal services. Well, Madam Speaker, this proves once again that the minister's only way out is the recourse to the oldish grievance procedure which takes—and on this the union leaders are right—tremendous time. So, the postal workers have no other choice but to resort to violence and to voluntarily exclude themselves from the democratic process, because they no longer believe in it, because it is outdated, because it takes too much time.

Madam Speaker, today we have moved this motion, which I find positive, and have asked our colleague from Kamouraska to do so because he knows this field. It is precisely to make Parliament fully aware of the situation of conflict we are constantly experiencing from sea to sea. I want to point out to my colleagues from the other provinces that those conflicts are not restricted to Quebec alone. It is imperative that we should notice it, and take this opportunity today to think positively and try to convince the minister that the act should be brought up to date in its widest sense that it might adapt to our modern times.

Madam Speaker, this is extremely important. Electronic automation is replacing man increasingly. More and more thought is being given to reducing work hours, to improving work conditions, to reducing the work week, precisely because the machine is replacing man.

In a second stage, after having modernized our negotiating institutions, we will inevitably have to tackle our social security system to guarantee an income to our workers who will have been replaced by the machine.

Madam Speaker, will we wait for the ridiculous situation where union leaders will ask to throw out the machines under the pretext of guaranteeing the worker job security?

How ridiculous for us to have reached that point! It proves that the source of the evil, for the workers, is the lack of income or income security, and not so much job security.

That is why, Madam Speaker, we are happy not only to have raised this debate but also to have heard useful comments from both sides of the House. This is the third time that we have launched such a debate in the House to speak of the sharing of employees in company benefits and to speak of unemployment, which is particularly acute among our young people who really wish to get satisfaction out of their work.

Contrary to many of our predecessors, Madam Speaker, this is our third attempt at raising the issue. We shall try and do so again later, but we are quite happy with today's reaction to the motion, hoping that it will contribute to the rallying of goodwill in Parliament as well as in the country, so that finally, all Canadians will unite to build their country and stop holding records for more man-days on strike than at work. Madam Speaker, when we have such a high unemployment rate in a country of our size with such a small population, we cannot allow ourselves, in a state of economic crisis such as the one we are now facing, to play

Adjournment Debate

the game of union leaders who abuse their powers or the game of some politicians who dream up gimmicks with union leaders.

That is why I feel the federal government should show leadership in this field.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order. It being 10 o'clock, I must point out to the House that under—

Mr. Olivier: I should like to rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker, before you call it 10 o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): The member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) wishes to make a point of order.

Mr. Olivier: This may be a minor detail, Madam Speaker, but to my right it is 10:02, 10:05 in front of me and 10:01 behind me. Perhaps somebody should look into it some day.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): This matter has been raised in the past.

Mr. Fortin: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker.

● (2200)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) on a point of order.

Mr. Fortin: I wish to thank the hon. member for Longueuil for keeping a close watch on time, probably because of his great interest in what the Social Credit members were saying. I thank him.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that, pursuant to Standing Order 58(11), the proceedings on the motion have expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS—REASON FOR FAILURE TO ADOPT STANDARDS FOR ASBESTOS FIBRES UNDER CLEAN AIR ACT—POSSIBLE PROTEST FROM UNITED STATES

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Madam Speaker, on March 20 this year I asked a question of the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) which dealt with the problems relating to asbestos in this country. There are really two aspects to the question.

I asked first why the minister has not brought in regulations concerning asbestos under the Clean Air Act so we can have a national environmental standard in an effort to help to overcome the problem at Thetford Mines. I could also mention Cassiar Mines in British Columbia, Clinton