

*Summer Recess*

me; I do not always plead the cause of members. A week ago tonight I made a speech the other way. The more I think of it, the more I wish I had made it a lot stronger, I wish I had been more effective, and I wish the hon. member for Davenport had had more supporters over on that side. That is gone; but all told it seems to me that reason, common sense and fair play suggest that it would be the better part of wisdom for us to get out for a while and, in particular, to let Judge Alan Gold do the job we want done for all the people of Canada.

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West):** Mr. Speaker, this particular debate follows a long parliamentary tradition. It is an adjournment debate which is strangely brought forward by the government at this point in time. I will comment on that in a few minutes.

Essentially the purpose of an adjournment debate is twofold. First, it is to provide for the recess of the House to a particular point in time.

**Some hon. Members:** To adjourn!

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** I know hon. members on the government side are preoccupied. They sit there mute and silent and simply say, "aye, ready, aye" to whatever their leader does regardless of the stupidity of what he says.

**Mr. Chénier:** What do you do to your leader?

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** I can understand their desire to get back to the comforts of home.

The second purpose of an adjournment debate is to allow individual members of Parliament, without constraint or without any limitation respecting the relevancy of any particular bill, to raise and articulate the grievances he or she has with respect to what is happening in Parliament, with respect to government policy, and with respect to suggestions they have which may aid the government of the day better to administer the affairs of the country. This latter responsibility on the part of parliamentarians is very important. It should be considered at this point in time. The fact of the matter is that there is no particular limitation on the extent of the debate and hon. members are given reasonable opportunity to express their points of view.

Every once in a while there are rules which reflect the fact that parliamentarians are sent here to represent their constituents and the interests of the public at large. I think there is a very interesting, ongoing phenomenon. It has been stated and generally accepted across the country that parliamentarians cannot work in a vacuum, that occasionally parliamentarians must be ready to serve in the public interest at times when the public interest determines and dictates it. I am rather proud that we in this party were prepared, unlike hon. members of the other parties in the House who wanted to get out into the country, to stay here and were successful in influencing the commencement of three significant events which took place in the postal dispute.

Up to very recently the government indicated that it was its intention to allow the postal strike to carry on all summer and

into the fall. This was the position of the President of the Treasury Board. The government knows that at least certain hon. members of the House of Commons are concerned that there be serious and positive negotiations on the postal front. We have now influenced the government to take these negotiations seriously, and we have now seen the commencement of negotiations with mediation. The government and CUPW have indicated that they are agreeable to the mediation process, and an eminent Canadian, Judge Alan Gold, in whom we have the greatest confidence, has now been designated to act as mediator with the agreement of the parties.

A novel proposition was put forward by the Minister of Labour, who is a very unusual spokesman for the government in this particular debate because he has been shut out of almost every aspect of the negotiations on the postal issue. He simply has not been included in this matter so far, or at least he was not deemed to be appropriate for involvement in this issue. He now appears as the great spokesman of the Liberal party. But the novel proposition he put forward, which gives us all food for thought, is that somehow whenever there is a collective bargaining process going on between the Treasury Board and any public service union, Parliament should adjourn. Somehow he seems to think that because Parliament is sitting that will influence the negotiations. I think this is what he is saying. It is the most preposterous proposition ever put forward. The parliamentary secretary nods his head in agreement with me.

● (1620)

It is incumbent upon us to examine the real reason why the government wants us to adjourn this House. First, I want to point out the fact that when the adjournment motion came forward, it was debated for a limited period of time. The government then had an opportunity to consider whether it was really serious with respect to adjourning the House or whether it wanted to play games. Unfortunately, it took the latter option. The government revealed itself immediately upon the conclusion of the first day on the adjournment debate. It did not carry on with the adjournment debate. Today the government members have been heard to say that they want to get out of here. They had the opportunity to carry on with this motion. It is the government which calls the orders of the day, not the opposition or the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. It was the government which decided to move into other government business. This was done notwithstanding the commitment which was given personally by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre. He was told that Bill C-48 would not be discussed until the fall.

**Mr. Collenette:** That is not true.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** The parliamentary secretary knows it is true yet he continues to protest. The fact of the matter is, when it comes down to the question of who I believe as between the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, I will take the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre every time.