

*Canada Post Corporation*

towns who are not entitled to delivery at their residence and why certain district directors in this country—who more properly should be called district disrupters—have the authority in their minds to determine that rural areas, entitled to rural delivery within one-quarter mile of the Post Office, can be declared by their whims and wishes to be incorporated villages. The justification a district director gave to the press was that everyone knows the village is a village because there are road signs saying “This is Millerton”. It happens to be my home community so I know that it is not an incorporated village, but that does not seem to make any difference. The district director decides. What he decides, because he gets his mandate from God, obviously, has to be right.

If these people decide to move the post office in the middle of the night, that is fine, too. Canada Post officials do not have to notify the people. They can write notices to every person on a particular delivery route telling them that as of such and such a date the address will be changed. There will be a new postal code and the whole bit. When that is challenged and an explanation is demanded, the answer given is, “We have no idea how that letter got written.” Despite the fact the letter was signed, that is the answer we get. You are told, “It was all a mistake, it should never have been written.” Maybe the postal corporation should pull in some of their people and give them a course in honesty and truthfulness. Maybe the president of the corporation should spend a little less time in meetings and a little more time talking to people. Maybe he should have his people answering phone calls. Maybe he should see that they are in once in a while. If some of these things were done, maybe we would have some service. But until we get that service, the post office should not go to the people of Canada looking for any more funds.

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the motion which is before the House this afternoon presented by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert). I have had a great interest in the post office for some years as a member of our own party's committee on that subject. I can appreciate the hon. member's concern with respect to the charge made for postal boxes. In my area of Parry Sound-Muskoka there are a great many municipalities, yet only one town in the whole riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka, the town of Parry Sound, has mail delivery. All the rest have post offices, both small and large. I have had a great many complaints in recent years concerning increases of 100 per cent on all boxes. A great many people—and of course many of them are not in good financial positions—are very unhappy about it. There has also been a good many complaints from people who live in rural areas where there is mail delivery, but for some reason or other—and this is a small percentage of the population—they would prefer to have their mail delivered to post boxes and to purchase post boxes. Of course they are assessed a 100 per cent surcharge over the regular rate because rural mail is available to them. I feel that this is an injustice.

• (1800)

May I call it six o'clock?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I thank the hon. member for recognizing the time. Before calling it six o'clock, it has been brought to my attention that last Friday I indicated to hon. members I would attempt to produce a solution to the question concerning the mysterious disappearance from the Falkland Islands. That solution has been found. It is called, “war brides”.

It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At 6.02 p.m. the House took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**CANAGREX**
**MEASURE TO ESTABLISH**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-85 to establish a corporation called Canagrex to promote, facilitate and engage in the export of agricultural and food products from Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** As hon. members are aware, there are 14 motions standing on the notice paper at the report stage of Bill C-85, an act to establish a corporation called Canagrex to promote, facilitate and engage in the export of agricultural and food products from Canada.

Motions Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 should be debated together with a vote on motion No. 6, disposing of Motions Nos. 1 and 8; and a vote on motion No. 7, disposing of Motions Nos. 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Motion No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave) gives the Chair some misgiving concerning its procedural acceptability in that it is attempting to introduce a new definition in Clause 2 by way of an amendment of a substantive nature. Therefore, I refer the hon. member to Beauchesne's Citation 773(10) and to Mr. Speaker Lamoureux's ruling on May 21, 1970, when he said:

... amendments of a substantive or declaratory nature should not be proposed to an interpretation clause. If such amendments were accepted, the clause would not then be an interpretation clause. I am sure hon. members realize the difficulty of accepting substantive amendments or proposals under the general classification of interpretation. I suggest to hon. members with respect that that is not the place to make proposed amendments or motions which are of a substantive nature.