

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Angus	Assad
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bélair
Bellemare	Berger
Bevilacqua	Boudria
Brewin	Caccia
Catterall	Comuzzi
Dingwall	Dionne
Duhamel	Ferguson
Finestone	Fulton
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gauthier	Grey (Beaver River)
Harvard	Harvey (Edmonton East)
Heap	Hovdebo
Hunter	Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	MacLellan
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
McLaughlin	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills
Nowlan	Nunziata
Nystrom	Ouellet
Pagtakhan	Peterson
Proud	Prud'homme
Rideout	Riis
Rocheleau	Rodriguez
Rompkey	Simmons
Stewart	Stupich
Tobin	Vanciel
Volpe	Waddell
Walker	Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—62

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

[English]

CANADA POST CORPORATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, May 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre that Bill C-73, an act to amend the Canada Post Corporation Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Departmental envelope; and on the amendment of Mr. Boudria (p. 10744).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When Bill C-73 was last before the House there were seven minutes

remaining in the question and comment period following the speech of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls): Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words concerning this particular legislation before the House. Of course it is an act to amend the Canada Post Corporation Act in the name of the Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

The motion made by the official critic for the opposition is that this bill be read six months hence. In other words, that it just simply be thrown into the garbage can for this particular session. The actual wording "six months hence" is the wording that has been adopted under the British parliamentary system going back to Westminster in Erskine May and repeated in Beauchesne and then in the Standing Orders, a custom I believe that goes back to 1622, which says you would not look at the bill again, that it be ripped up and discarded by members of the House of Commons.

I have had an opportunity in the last couple of moments to examine very carefully the wording of this legislation. Nowhere in the legislation before the Chamber dealing with Canada Post does it talk about service to Canadians. Nowhere in the bill does it talk about the time it takes for a letter or a parcel to get from point A to point B in Canada or internationally. Nowhere in the bill does it talk about lost mail. We have an incredible number of cases. We have seen a substantial increase in the number of complaints from people who mail letters in this country that are never received at the other end.

We have had a substantial increase in the number of students who complain that their applications to university, their registration for university and their requests for the syllabus and entrance information are being lost in the mail.

We have a lot of complaints from senior citizens who say that their letters never reach the destination written on the front of the envelope. Of course, we see Canada Post then coming back and saying: "Oh, no, we have got all these statistics that say we have a better service in Canada than we ever had before" and within two days a letter will go to its destination in another part of this country.