

Canada Post Corporation Act

Motion No. 12, standing in the name of the hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn), the effect of which is to dissolve the corporation, based on Parliament sitting or not sitting in a particular year on a specific number of days, seems to be out of order on the ground that it goes beyond the scope of the bill.

The long title of the bill reads:

An act to establish the Canada Post Corporation, to repeal the Post Office Act and other related Acts and to make related amendments to other acts.

I refer the hon. member to Citation 773(1) of *Beauchesne's* fifth edition which reads as follows:

An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the bill, beyond its scope—

For that reason, regrettably I cannot accept the hon. member's motion.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You are suggesting that the motion is out of order because under *Beauchesne* it goes beyond the scope of the act. But we have to take a look at what the act says. The title of the act is "Bill C-42, An act to establish the Canada Post Corporation, to repeal the Post Office Act and other related acts and to make related amendments to other acts."

This act establishes a Post Office corporation. All this particular amendment does it to provide that the Post Office corporation's life terminates in five years.

This is vital. This is precisely what the act is all about. How this amendment can be out of order on the basis of your *Beauchesne's* citation is certainly beyond me and beyond—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I call to the attention of the hon. member that this is a decision of the Chair, and the decision cannot be appealed.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-42, to establish the Canada Post Corporation, to repeal the Post Office Act and other related acts and to make related amendments to other acts, be amended in Clause 10,

(a) by striking out lines 26 and 27 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) The board may appoint and fix the"

(b) by adding immediately after line 29 at page 6 the following new subsection:

"(3) The salaries fixed by the Board pursuant to Subsection (2) shall not exceed such amount as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council for the Corporation."

He said: Mr. Speaker, you read the wording of the amendment which I proposed concerning this motion. Perhaps it might be useful to bring to the attention of the House, in explaining the need for this particular amendment, how Clause 10(2) reads at the present time. It is brief, and is as follows:

The board may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, appoint and fix the salary of such number of vice-presidents as it considers necessary.

The effect of the motion which I am moving tonight, if we are to amend the Post Office Act, would be first of all to strike out that particular subsection; in other words, the provision which says that the governor in council should be required to

approve the appointment and the salaries of various vice-presidents. The reference to the governor in council should be taken out. Then we would include a new clause which would specify that the governor in council would have the right to fix a maximum remuneration to be paid to vice-presidents of the Crown corporation.

It is probably a matter of some concern to members of the House to ask why is it necessary that we make this amendment. As hon. members will remember, under the Clark government we proposed a Crown corporation omnibus bill which was designed to bring into place a regime for accountability in financial management for Crown not just for the Post Office, but for all Crown corporations for which the federal government has responsibility. We had counted over 400 Crown corporations and there were a number more we believed existed but had not been able to locate at that time. We felt it essential to bring in an omnibus bill which would come to grips with the problems of management of Crown corporations and to try to bring into place some generalized rule by which all Crown corporations would be expected to abide.

That particular bill was introduced because of the fact there were numerous incidents which had taken place in the management of Crown corporations. They burst into the attention of the public because of decisions which had been made or actions taken which were embarrassing to the government, costly to the taxpayer and of great concern to Canadians. Consequently the Lambert commission, the public accounts committee and the Auditor General all expressed concern about the way in which Crown corporations were being run and the fact that the regime for accountability of Crown corporations was not adequate.

• (2140)

This is why within six months of assuming office the Clark government introduced in Parliament a bill which was designed to regularize the proceedings for Crown corporations. It was to ensure that Crown corporations, be they the Post Office or other Crown corporations, would have a regime of accountability and a regime of management which was standardized, available to all Canadians to see and which could be justified to the Canadian people.

We felt it was important that Crown corporations conduct their activities in a way which would win the confidence of Canadians, which would satisfy Canadians that their money was being well used and that the Crown corporations which were operating on a business basis were also being operated on a businesslike basis. This is why Bill C-27 was introduced on November 26, 1979.

When it came to the responsibilities of boards of directors, what we did was to spell out once and for all; first, the regime of accountability for these boards of directors in running their Crown corporations and coming back to justify their activities to Parliament and the executive; and second, we said that having built that regime and created a system of accountability and a system of management for Crown corporations which