

Adjournment Debate

Member should check a study carried out by Canada Post which shows that 93 per cent of its customers are satisfied with the super-boxes. That something!

I think that the Hon. Member who sits in the Opposition is doing his job, but the fact remains Mr. Speaker, that times have changed and the services of ten years ago are no longer required today.

Today, Mr. Speaker, life for couples is made easier especially when both spouses are working. Therefore business hours must reflect this new factor which alters the situation which existed previously when we had to go to the Post Office between such and such business hours.

Within most communities, Mr. Speaker, there is a post office operated by Canada Post employees and, in several cases, the locations of these post offices were selected sometimes 10, 15 or even 20 years ago. Today, the needs of the market place and all of that have changed.

The operating costs of some of these offices may absorb nearly all their revenues and even more, which leaves practically no funds to cover other costs.

Mr. Speaker, we should remember that it is the Liberals when they were in power who created the Canada Post Corporation and they should show some consistency. The policies put forward by the former Liberal Government are those which the present Government is trying to implement, since the Marchment Committee insisted that it should go ahead with the Canada Post Corporation.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I can say that in all the regions where the Canada Post Corporation has made changes, it was done after consultation with the communities, their elected representatives and the people who now really enjoy their superboxes and could no longer do without them.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—HAITI—MASSACRE OF CITIZENS—
CANADIAN REACTION

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I directed a question to the Minister of State for External Relations concerning the tragic incidents in Haiti, and I am glad to see that the departmental Parliamentary Secretary will answer me today.

[English]

The whole world was repelled by the stark tragedy that beset the island of Haiti last Saturday night and Sunday morning. We are told that 34 people were killed, 60 injured, for no greater offence than making their way to the polls to cast their franchise in an election that they thought would give birth to democracy in their long exploited, tyrannized republic.

● (1820)

When polling began at 8.30, little could they know that murder was about to strike, and that a scant 30 minutes later the polls would be closed.

We have just concluded an hour debating abortion. A social political abortion took place in Haiti when an embryonic democracy was torn from the womb of possibility and left to die. The blood of men and women was flowing in the streets literally without exaggeration.

This calls for immediate action, because it was not done by criminals alone; there seemed to be a conspiracy of at least silence and indifference, if not more.

For example, General Namphy, the head of the Provisional Government did nothing to stop the campaign violence that had been directed against candidates, members of the electoral council, and random citizens. He refused to provide protection or assistance to election workers to ensure a fair enumeration or the proper distribution of ballots.

The army did not support the election, did not provide security for candidates or election officials, and reneged on a promise to provide helicopters to deliver ballots. It roamed the streets not to protect, but to cast the shadow of a callous indifference upon those who were under attack, until the murder was finished and the pathetic body of democracy in Haiti lay dead.

The United States immediately cancelled aid to Haiti. I have asked for this adjournment debate because we in Canada should be responding with the same action and concern, not necessarily with the specifics, but effecting our aid program and using it to at least demonstrate as a country through Parliament and Government that we join the civilized world in both expressing our revulsion and in taking any action open to us.

We have been told in the House that we must wait, that we must seek further information, and then we can appraise the situation. I asked for this brief adjournment debate because I have to renew the question, what are we waiting for? How much information does the Government need? Is there any doubt that the people are dead? Is there any doubt that the elections were cancelled? Is there any doubt that the military are still on top?

Via television we have seen with our own eyes the bodies prostrate on the ground, prostrate in the streets, prostrate in the polling booths. How much more do we need to know? Along with those dead bodies democracy is dead. Can we be silent? For example, must we not go to the United Nations to express and call upon it to express the revulsion of the civilized world for this is indeed a crime against humanity. It would not be an idle gesture for no government, not even the Government of Haiti, can totally ignore world opinion. The UN should show that the November 29 massacre will not be accepted in silence. This crime against humanity will not go unjudged. These murderers will be punished.

I asked for this debate for a further opportunity to bring to the floor of the House of Commons, before the highest court in the land of Canada, this crime to be judged, to call forth from