

amazing statement that, in fact, more employees would be hired. How can you save money and hire more employees, I do not know. Only somebody with the convoluted logic of this minister would make that kind of statement. So, is it any wonder that the employees are upset, that they are going down to the wire with the likelihood of there being another postal strike?

I must also refer to the statement made by the minister on Tuesday, May 19 last. I realize my hon. friend from Hillsborough has already alluded to it, but I should like to put it on the record again. As reported at page 7062 of *Hansard*, the minister said:

People who seek contractual obligations sometimes seek not the work but the pay without the work.

Following that statement my colleague from York South (Mr. Lewis) tried to raise a point of privilege to get a correction, but the Speaker did not permit him to do so. I would have thought that if the inference taken by most members of the House with regard to what the minister was saying was incorrect, the minister himself would have made a point correcting it. But no, the minister sat in his chair, just as he is at this moment. I say there has never been a more anti-labour statement made by a minister of any government in the federal parliament, or in a provincial legislature, in the history of Canada. Is it any wonder that, given this kind of stupidity and stubbornness on the part of the minister, we are close to a strike? What surprises me is that we have not already had a strike.

In the few minutes I have left may I deal with a couple of other postal problems. I suggest that the main reason we are close to a strike is the mistakes that were made in the provisions of the Public Service Employment Act and the Public Service Staff Relations Act. The government failed to incorporate into those acts provisions spelling out that job security, lay-offs, promotions, demotions, transfers, etc. are not within the authority of the arbitration and conciliation boards. I have on the Order Paper a private member's bill which seeks to make such changes. I do not know whether it is useful to make a suggestion to the minister, but I would nevertheless suggest that as long as this imperfection exists in these acts, that as long as these matters, which are negotiable with any private employer, are excluded from the legislation, we are likely to have strikes.

Nor has there been any action taken by the government, despite the honeyed words of the

22375—39½

### *Postal Service Policies*

Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) who knows how to say all the right things but very seldom takes any action, to implement the major provisions of the Freedman report.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Order.

**Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie):** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House I should like to revert to routine proceedings for the purpose of tabling a committee report I should have tabled this morning.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Has the hon. member unanimous consent to lay the report on the table?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Fifth report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Mr. Watson.

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—GOVERNMENT POSTAL SERVICE POLICIES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Macquarrie:

This House repudiates the government's postal service policies and censures those Ministers of the Crown responsible for the mismanagement of the postal services which, within two years, have deteriorated through fewer mail deliveries, fewer post offices, higher postal rates, disrupted and irregular services, and deplorable labour-management relations, to the prejudice of all Canadians, postal employees, and the national economy.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, before the luncheon adjournment I was outlining what I considered to be the