

delay the democratic process in the House and put a spoke in our wheel. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Union of Postal Workers recently sent each Member of Parliament a paper asking them to create this Crown corporation as soon as possible, get to the final vote and carry out the proposed postal service of the future in Canada.

Although this bill has been before the House since last July and discussed at length, and although the hon. member for Mississauga South had the opportunity to speak on the bill on five occasions, the hon. members opposite would not co-operate and allow the bill to progress, making it very hard to understand the reasoning which could bring them to say: Well, at the last minute, before everything is finalized, we shall delay a few more weeks to anger the postal employees a bit more, to irritate Canadians once again, and then we shall refer this to the committee to have a little chat on Section 24. Once this is done, the bill will come back to the House for the final vote and we may perhaps suggest another minor amendment. This reminds me of what occurred during the constitutional debate until we were able to reach an agreement!

Frankly, I am beginning to have serious reservations about the real intentions of Progressive Conservative members. Canadians are waiting for this bill. The post office needs to be reorganized. Some contracts for postal carriers have almost expired. These contracts will have to be renewed with a Crown corporation or a department or be temporarily extended until the Crown corporation is established. We are now in the process of creating a new Crown corporation. We can't keep tripping over trivialities as those suggested in the amendment of the hon. member for Mississauga South.

Before we began this process, we knew that the post office was a department. We now know that it will no longer be a department in a short while, and while we are engaged in this process, various decisions are simply being delayed until the new structure of this Crown corporation can be determined and definitely established.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask members of the opposition to understand the wishes of Canadians. They want this country to make progress. They want our institutions to develop. They want us to work for the welfare of the population as a whole. It is certainly not by dealing with trivia that we can achieve progress.

After hearing all this debate, and seeing all the work done by the committee on this bill, I was hoping we would be ready this evening to settle the matter once and for all and to tell democratically to every Canadian exactly what is on our minds, but once again, the same party is resorting to the same old subterfuge and saying: No, no, not this evening. Tonight we will discuss the possibility of referring Section 24 to the committee. Why? I cannot tell you Mr. Speaker just how many hours the member for Mississauga-South was allotted in committee to debate this bill. If he had any goodwill, what he should have done at that time was to introduce his Section 24

Canada Post Corporation Act

before the committee. He could have discussed the matter then. Once again we are simply faced with a dilatory trick—

● (2140)

[English]

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could I ask the hon. member a very brief question? I know he would not accuse me of interrupting the full flow of his address but is the hon. member aware that the point at issue in the amendment, which was moved tonight to send Section 24 back to committee, concerns the question of whether there can be a sunset provision? In other words, whether or not Parliament in five years can take a second look at the post office corporation. I wonder if the hon. member is aware that was ruled out of order at report stage. As a consequence, this is the only means by which, under the rules, it is possible for us to put the matter back into this forum. I am sure the hon. member would not want to leave other members or the viewing public in any state of confusion about that.

[Translation]

Mr. Gimaël: Mr. Speaker, I thank you as well as the hon. member. I can confirm to the member that indeed I knew that Section 24, namely the amendment that is amended to refer Section 24 to the committee deals with the wish of the member for Mississauga South to have us deal again with that subject five years from now, so that the member may then review the matter of the actual creation of this Crown Corporation and ascertain if all is in keeping with our expressed intents and purposes and should so be maintained.

But what I was pointing out before the member took the floor earlier, is that it is in my view a delusion to think that after five years of efforts following the creation and development of such a corporation, we could honestly wonder if such a corporation should continue to exist. I suggest it would be foolish to think so; secondly if the member for Mississauga South really intends to evaluate the results in five years time let us then raise that issue at that time. There are various ways of dealing with Crown Corporations. All parliamentarians also have various means of putting forward their views, and it is quite out of the question for us to question the existence of some 400 Canadian Crown corporations every time a problem arises. It will especially be out of the question to consider whether the Post Office should be restored; it would take another five-year period. No, I think that if the member for Mississauga South had been serious, he would have moved his amendment in committee instead of delaying the proceedings of the House, and I continue to say so and to maintain it, and if the hon. member for Mississauga South disagrees, he will surely have the opportunity to speak.

I still maintain that if the member had been serious, he would have moved his amendment in committee because that is the place where we, as members, have more time to state and define our views; that is the place where we have more time to move amendments to all those bills. What I dislike