

Government Orders

carefully to my hon. colleague, who only talked about the SkyDome suite, which seems to bother him a lot.

He also talked about labour-management relations. He mentioned as well that the company did a lot of advertising. Mr. Speaker, it is good for a company to have a sense of social responsibility, and I think that Canada Post, in my riding and in several others, has even financed advertising on figure skating for a few hundred dollars. It was not much, but I think it is all right.

When the hon. member talks about—

[*English*]

—labour relations and the turmoil.

I have been following this issue since my business people did not receive their cheques the last time. They were all calling me and they saying: "What is going on with Canada Post? For 20 years there has always been a problem".

At Canada Post in the past 20 years the president has changed many, many times. The problem we have with the union president is that I do not think it has changed in the last 20 years. At the end of every contract we have a strike or violence. I remember that. In 1984 when we took office the corporation was losing \$400 million. Today it has a profit of \$200 million. It is normal it invests in publicity or whatever it wants. I do not think it is bad.

I must ask my hon. colleague to answer these questions if he can and to take some notes. Does he really believe, if there is a strike tomorrow at noon, that all the cheques will be delivered to enterprises which create jobs in this country and try to make a buck? It has become a crime to make a profit in this country. Does he really believe that these people will get mail service because he defends so well the poor people and the poor union? What about enterprises that are suffering and old people who need their cheques? Does he really believe that the cheques will be delivered if there is a strike tomorrow at noon, as the union has requested?

Mr. Pickard: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. It certainly opens up several issues that I believed I addressed. However, I will bring it back to that point.

As far as union leadership and leadership of Canada Post are concerned, I must point out that the president of Canada Post has been there for 10 years, and I thought the hon member would know that. There has not been a change. Don Lander has been there. He was there leading Canada Post. The hon. member can check the date he was hired. It is very clear what the situation was.

The hon. member pointed out that Canada Post is a profit making corporation. What a total joke. They said they made \$196 million two years ago. They made \$96 million last year and \$14 million this year. Those were their statements of profit.

Let me point out that they received \$690 million worth of grants. They did not pay their employees. They have not been paid increases because a contract was not negotiated. They are two years behind on which they have to pay retroactive salaries. When the hon. member talks about a profit making corporation he is not talking about all the facts. He is only talking about a ton of propaganda, not truths.

When it comes to the delivery of cheques to businesses, when it comes to the delivery of cheques to seniors, this party intervened with his government, intervened with Canada Post and demanded that those cheques be delivered. CUPW made an offer to deliver them. Canada Post said: "No, we don't trust them".

I then requested the minister to make sure they were delivered and they were delivered two days later. It is the intervention of the Liberal Party that made that difference and I think the hon. member should clearly know that. The hon. member can ask his own minister if he does not believe that.

As far as the mediation goes to come to a solution, it was again the recommendation of the Liberal Party that came about with the suggestion of mediation and the process that was put in place.

• (1530)

When you stand up and say you are representing business, Canada Post has no right to buy a SkyDome box. Canada Post has no right to spend that kind of money. It is not in the best interests of Canadians. It is in the best interests of a few corporate owners. I would say to you that we have received strong criticisms of those