

I remember correctly, this is strictly a provincial statute which does not apply to installations under federal jurisdiction. What my colleague for Richelieu is objecting to is not the fact that is illegal—it is not—but that there is a feeling, an impression in the population that it is illegal, which makes it difficult for the people who must support a law allowing the use of replacement workers.

Mrs. Jacques: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the question from my colleague the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly). Our colleague the Hon. Member for Richelieu (Mr. Plamondon) probably went picketing to show after all his support for the postal workers.

Of course, Canada has a legislation allowing for the use of replacement workers, the so-called scabs. However, Quebec laws do not allow the hiring of replacement workers. Considering that the present dispute is under federal jurisdiction, the federal law thus applies even in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) for question or comment.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my colleague.

One of the problems in the conflict between the union and Canada Post relates to the franchising out program, the privatization of post offices. My question is the following: What does she think of her Government policy concerning the franchising of post offices which results in salary reduction, particularly for women? For example, in rural areas, some women were ready to accept one fifth of their old salary to take charge of a post office. In urban areas, now people can have a good salary but after franchising, they will earn only minimum wage.

What does she think of that policy which makes women pay for the deficit of the Canada Post Corporation?

Mrs. Jacques: Mr. Speaker, I would answer to my hon. colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) that the bill we would like to pass today does not deal with the issue of franchising of postal operations. Franchising is an issue that parties should settle during the negotiations.

Besides, I simply do not think that franchising will affect women any more than men. And our Government would never let that happen. I do not feel that . . . I would like to have more background on the basis for your question but, as of this moment, I do not think that franchising affects women any more than men. I do not agree with what you said a moment ago.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell my colleague that I do not doubt that she is sincere. However, does she know that with franchising in rural areas, postmasters' wages will be greatly reduced and that 80 per cent of the workers in those offices are women? The effect of that policy will be to reduce women's salaries and in a specific case of which I am aware,

Postal Services Continuation Act, 1987

that is the case of Wilno in Ontario, the lady who is the postmistress is being asked to work for a fifth of her former salary. Such is the implication.

Mrs. Jacques: In answer to the supplementary question of my colleague from Winnipeg-North-Centre (Mr. Keeper) I should like to point out that the franchising policy, as you said, is part of the problems being negotiated.

However, this policy is not only aimed at women and will not only affect women's wages but could also affect men's wages. If according to your figures there is a higher percentage of women in rural areas—but the policy is not only aimed at women.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I shall allow a last question to the Hon. Member for Lac Saint-Jean (Mr. Côté).

Mr. Clément M. Côté (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that earlier the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) in a question addressed to the Hon. Member for Montreal—Mercier (Mrs. Jacques) referred to Section 11 of the Bill which deals with additional penalties. The clause refers to additional penalties for both the union and the employer.

If we look at the interpretation clause on page 1, we find that the terms union, employer and employee are clearly defined.

My colleague the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques made allegations which are altogether wrong when she referred to the rights and freedoms of individual employees who would not be able to find work for five years, as though only the Canada Post Corporation existed. Clause 11(1) refers to the Union:

No individual who is convicted of an offense under this Act that was committed while the individual was acting in the capacity of an officer or representative of the union shall be employed in any capacity by the union—

If we move down to Clause 11(2), we read the same thing:

—while the individual was acting in the capacity of an officer or representative of the employer . . .

So, Mr. Speaker, Clause 11 does not mention any additional penalties for the employees.

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou): Mr. Speaker, speaking in the debate on Bill C-86 this afternoon, my colleague the Hon. Member for Montréal—Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) clearly described the situation and the dangers which may result from a government which is clearly seeking a confrontation with its employees and whose attitude is responsible for the current postal strike.

I would not want to repeat what he said, but I should like especially to address the following questions: Why is there a strike? How did we get there, Mr. Speaker? After a period of five years with no strike, how is it that we are now faced with a second strike in two months?

First, Mr. Speaker, we should go back a few years. Of course, we all remember and Canadians all remember that the