

Government Orders

Mr. Lee Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would not want this opportunity to go by without commenting on the remarks of the turncoat member for Edmonton Southeast. It is not surprising—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. You will have to address your question to the Speaker instead of any other member in this House.

Mr. Richardson: That is fine. We do not know what side members are going to be on, flip-flopping across the House and supporting the NDP one day, the Conservatives the next.

In any event, I will deal now with the member for Edmonton East who was referring to the earlier comments of the member from Elk Island who referred to this socialist manifesto here. He raised the matter of the secret national constitution adopted by the postal employees. He even referred to it as "our constitution". I do not know if he used to be a postman. He is also the NDP energy critic. We heard earlier today the wisdom of various NDP critics.

For example, we heard today the critic for unemployment in Hamilton discussing training programs, welfare and unemployment insurance. This NDP critic said that the government should look at just printing the money it needed to spend its way out of the recession. I just want to quote from *The Hamilton Spectator*. The NDP critic said: "When we borrow money to do a project that money has to be repaid. Instead of borrowing the money we create—"

Mr. Fulton: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The government members were rising just a moment ago about matters of relevance. I think many viewers would be interested in knowing that the national debt has doubled under the Tories. They are the real money printers.

Mr. Richardson: I appreciate that the various NDP critics are a little touchy over these matters when we quote the wisdom they bring to the people when they say that all we have to do to get out of debt is to print more money. There it is, I have just quoted the critic.

We are now dealing with the energy critic. I wonder if the energy critic would support this constitution which he referred to. I will have a look here at one section, section (d)(20) with regard to natural resources. This is the relevance the member for Skeena requests. This is

the national constitution adopted by the Canadian Union of Postal Workers.

Let me ask their comrade from Edmonton East if in fact he agrees with (d)(20), the position in the constitution on natural resources which is: "The union calls for a nationalization of all resource industries without compensation". Would that be the view shared by the two members from Edmonton?

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, no.

An hon. member: That is your union.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): It is not my union. My union, when I was a member of it, was the Office of Professional Employees International Union. I have never been a member of CUPW. I would be curious to know whether or not what he was quoting was in fact the constitution of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers or a policy document appended to the constitution? It is a small thing but I would be interested in knowing that.

Last, I do not know that it is really our part here in the House of Commons to be debating the provisions of the constitution of a duly constituted union within Canada. It may be a point of some considerable interest, but surely the hon. member would be serving his constituents and the people of Canada better were he to concern himself not with the provisions of the constitution of the Canadian Union of Postal Employees, but with the provisions of Bill C-73.

I can only suspect that the provisions of Bill C-73 are themselves so indefensible and that, by the way, is why there are no government members rising to participate fully in debate this afternoon. They feel themselves compelled to pull out of the hat whatever rabbit they can and wave it around hoping nobody will actually see Bill C-73.

Mr. Garth Turner (Halton—Peel): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the member opposite his feelings on recent moves by the NDP government in Ontario to involve workers more in the participation and the ownership of enterprises?

The recent throne speech in Ontario promised worker ownership legislation to come forward soon in the province of Ontario. The proposed reform of the Ontario Labour Relations Act proposed in November of 1991 has, under this heading, the government's social and economic agenda: "Encouraging worker investment and ownership in Ontario companies in a manner which