

Government Orders

If the hon. member is looking for a single reason to support this legislation it is surely coming from his colleagues in Ontario. The Ontario government is saying that workers should be stakeholders. They should be more than employees, they should be participants in the ownership of companies.

The single reason that the member is looking for is the benefits. Consider the phrase that members of the Ontario NDP, your colleagues, are using. They are the benefits of worker participation.

What are the benefits of worker participation? Obviously, when somebody who is an employee becomes a shareholder, a stakeholder in an organization they have more interest in the success of that corporation, in the efficient management of that corporation, in the delivery of better services for that corporation and in the establishment of better labour management relations for that corporation. Those are four benefits. There are now four reasons why you can support it, and standing right behind you is the NDP government, your colleagues, in Ontario. It obviously has recognized that this move is the right move. Comments?

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, I know my hon. friend was not serious when he put those questions.

This legislation prohibits employees from having meaningful participation in Canada Post. It says: "You will not be able to vote on anything we do in Canada Post". I have a savings account with a local credit union. I have more voice simply by having a savings account with a credit union than these employees would have by having non-voting shares. He knows that. He knows he is simply making some nonsensical gesture in this House to mislead.

On another point. Surely to goodness if you want to—

Mr. Turner (Halton—Peel): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure the hon. member erred in the inflammatory language he was using. He alleges that I have sought to mislead the House. I have not. I would ask that he withdraw.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I do not think that the hon. member for Kamloops was saying that the hon. member for Halton—Peel was deliberately trying to mislead the House, though he was getting very close to impugning motives to the hon. member. Maybe the hon. member

for Kamloops could have the opportunity of concluding his comments.

Mr. Riis: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The hon. member obviously did not know what he was talking about then. I do not think that he would intend to mislead the House. His suggestion that this legislation will give employees meaningful participation in Canada Post is absolutely false. It is a falsehood. I am only assuming that he has not yet read the legislation.

Second, the employees already own this business. The employees own the business. He is now suggesting that they can have further ownership. I do not understand the points my hon. friend makes.

Ask anyone who has studied or bothered to read a single book on labour-management relations how to encourage the maximum amount of efficiency and productivity from your operation and they would say that it is wise to include people in a meaningful way, in terms of ownership and participation in management. That is what the New Democratic Party government is suggesting we do in the province of Ontario. That is what we would like to see done right across the whole country, not this scam or illusion that somehow this is going to enable people to play a meaningful role in the management of Canada Post.

Mr. Harb: Madam Speaker, are questions and comments finished?

Madam Deputy Speaker: There is a minute left before we go into statements pursuant to Standing Order 31. Does the hon. member have a question or a comment for the hon. member?

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre): Madam Speaker, I am quite interested in the tone of the debate. I wonder if it is not time to bring this whole debate to a civilized level so that we could have some meaningful discussion on the pros and cons of this legislation.

It is an extremely important piece of legislation. It is an historic one in a lot of ways. I would not want to take the time of the House of Commons to debate the details of it at this point in time. I can see that we are getting close to eleven o'clock.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Maybe the member will have his wish after Question Period.

As it is eleven o'clock, we will now proceed to statements by members pursuant to Standing Order 31.