

I should also like to draw his attention to item No. 10. This item was much sought after by the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Alexander) who presumably has access to this document. I suggest that since it is now in the hands of the government whose members were so anxious to get it in the last Parliament, he should also give his attention to producing this document for all members of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Shall the notices of motions stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### WAYS AND MEANS

#### PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION ACT

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources)** moved that a ways and means motion to amend the Petroleum Administration Act, laid upon the table Monday, October 22, 1979, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

\* \* \*

#### PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION ACT

##### INCREASE IN EXPORT CHARGE

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources)** moved that Bill C-16, to amend the Petroleum Administration Act, be read the first time.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

\* \* \*

### POST OFFICE

#### MEASURE RESPECTING CERTAIN POSTAL RATES

The House resumed from Monday, October 22, 1979, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fraser that Bill C-11, respecting certain postal rates, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

**Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, the other evening I was participating in debate on second reading of Bill C-11, which is really a bill in principle to retroactively approve by Parliament an order in council made under the Financial Administration Act to justify and legalize increases in postal rates. I said at that time, Mr. Speaker, that we agreed in principle with the bill. We have no quarrel with it. Indeed, we

### Postal Rates

welcomed the new approach that, in effect, orders in council made under the Financial Administration Act be brought to Parliament. That was a good principle that was being established by this government and we had no problem with it.

We then turned our attention, Mr. Speaker, to problems we felt this government could have solved with respect to postal services in this country. We would have hoped they would place the same assiduity into solving problems in the Post Office as they had done in dealing with retroactive postal rate increases. We said first off that they were well aware of the importance of the postal service to the people of Canada. Indeed, they were well aware that it is probably the most important public service problem in this country today.

We further pointed out that, in effect, knowing that problem, we now have a ministry related to postal services—a Postmaster General (Mr. Fraser) who has been given dual responsibility. One would have thought that the Postmaster General would have his hands full just dealing with problems in the Post Office and trying to bring about harmony in the post office which would result in good postal service for the people of Canada for the taxes they pay. That is the first problem.

Why did the government lay on the Postmaster General the onerous task of dealing with post office problems? It seems to us on this side of the House that there should have been one minister with that responsibility. We said that, in effect, while they were in opposition the Conservative party knew well the problems in the Post Office. Indeed, their speeches could fill books and books of *Hansard* in which they properly identified the major problem in the Post Office, which is a human problem—the relationship between management and workers in the Post Office. The government therefore had an opportunity, a golden opportunity, to make a new beginning. They did not have to apologize for the government of the past. It was not of their political stripe. They could have dumped the problem on the previous government and had a new beginning. Why did they not wipe out the 60,000 grievances which are hanging fire and which are the cause for much of the abrasiveness in management-personnel relationships within the Post Office? They are allowing those grievances to stand.

● (1540)

We also raised the question of the leadership in the Post Office. In particular, I will be emphatic in saying that the deputy postmaster general, Mr. J. C. Corkery, and Mr. J. A. Paré, the assistant deputy postmaster general, personnel, ought to have been removed from their positions. What a wonderful opportunity it would have been for the government to have removed them. It could have blamed them for being Liberals. Maybe someone found out they were Tories, I do not know, but it would have been a wonderful opportunity to wipe them out.