

It is no wonder that Canadians from coast to coast, especially those in rural communities who have been specifically victimized by this corporation, are up in arms and have absolutely no faith in the credibility of this government, especially when it comes to delivering basic services like the mail.

This government is swallowing some outdated concept from mini-WAC, old Bill Bennett in British Columbia who privatized the B.C. Resources Investment Corporation and saw shares go from \$6 almost down to zero in his attempt at privatization. It was the same kind of policy that the Minister Responsible for Constitutional Affairs in that government espoused when he was Prime Minister for a short period of nine months. He wanted to do it to Petro-Canada and the people turfed him out, especially the people in British Columbia who could remember what the Socreds did to their resource corporation and turned an effective corporation into a scrap heap that was worthless.

How they think they can adopt that same kind of policy and that somehow it is going to improve morale among postal workers and do anything to turn around the attitudes of Canadians to have a more positive outlook on their postal services really boggles the mind. It is beyond imagination.

When the Crown corporation was first created in 1981-82, my colleague for Kootenay East was the postal critic for our party. I was postal critic for the next two or three years following that. Michael Warren had a mandate which he pursued very effectively. He met on a regular basis, at least two and sometimes three or four times a year, with postal critics from all caucuses in the House. If you had a problem you had an answer back in writing directly from Mr. Warren, often within 24 or 48 hours. Attention was paid to the problems that were raised, specific local problems as well as national problems. The attitude totally changed in the work force.

If the government really wants to do something about improving labour relations, one of things it ought to do is get a collective agreement, an honest collective agreement, because it is now two or three years that postal workers have not had one, between the employees of Canada Post and the corporation.

One of the other things it could do is restore what we had when the corporation was first set up when there

were two representatives of labour, not necessarily directly from postal employees but on the board of that Crown corporation, so they had some direct or indirect input into the corporation. Those directors were kept on when the government changed to the Tories. Slowly but surely they were frozen out. Resignations were virtually forced upon them.

• (1340)

Once again the bridge that connected the employees to the management of that corporation and gave them some feeling of participation in it was dissolved.

Some of us in this place have had some experience working within Crown corporations that have had employee representatives sitting on boards. You do not need ownership for that to be effective. You need a partnership in which the employees of the corporation believe that their opinions on non-labour relations matters—let us not confuse it with a bargaining relationship—are listened to, from the implementation of new technology, funnelling through engineers' reports to see how they actually work on the floor of an industry, to delivering a product. In a myriad of ways you can begin to develop some meaningful relationships between the ideas employees have and the day to day operations of that corporation.

Giving 10 per cent ownership of non-voting shares is not going to accomplish a damn thing. It means nothing. It is seen as cosmetic by the employees. It is certainly seen as cosmetic by any one who has had any past experience with that kind of marginalized employee participation and ownership because it is not participation. They are non-voting shares.

How can the government think for a moment that simply because 10 per cent of its shares belong to some of the employees who have no voice it is going to make a difference in attitude among 99 per cent of the corporation's employees? They have no vested interest even from a straight economic point of view in what is going on in the corporation.

At the same time the corporation goes out and hires scabs, provokes violence on the picket lines. I use the term provokes violence not lets it happen, advisedly, having seen it first hand on a number of occasions over the last couple of years. How it thinks that is going to turn attitudes around I do not know.