

Labour Adjustment Benefits

whatever, perhaps that hon. member could enlighten us to the contrary. However, under "Designation of Industries", Clause 3(2) states the criteria for general designation as follows:

● (1720)

An industry may be designated generally pursuant to subsection (1) if the Governor in Council is satisfied that

(a) the industry in Canada generally is undergoing significant economic adjustment of a non-cyclical nature by reason of import competition or by reason of industrial restructuring implemented pursuant to a policy or program of the Government of Canada to encourage such restructuring;

Mr. McDermid: Or by reason of insanity.

Mr. Kristiansen: The board that will administer this program will be politically appointed by the governor in council, by the cabinet. Whoever is appointed will be a political appointee.

Mr. MacBain: We're going to appoint you.

Mr. Kristiansen: It does not amount to the kind of responsible democratic structure where labour appoints someone and management appoints someone, or anything else of the kind; we are talking about straight political hacks. I suspect that hon. members opposite will not admit that what the government has certainly been doing to the forest industry is "industrial restructuring implemented pursuant to a policy or program of the Government of Canada". We may perceive it as being that. However, I rather doubt that those hon. members over there will admit to any such thing.

Mr. MacBain: Never!

Mr. Kristiansen: I certainly suspect that they will not define the problems now taking place in the forest industry from one end of the country to another as being non-cyclical in nature. It is a cycle within the business cycle. It is a regular one. It happens every few years. This one happens to be much worse than the norm because it has been encouraged, abetted and, in part, created by that government; but it will not admit to it, so it will not be covered under that definition either. Therefore, we find that one of the largest industries in Canada, one which has been harder hit than almost any other, will be exempt.

Perhaps some hon. members may say that the enabling provision will be found under Clause 3(2), or Clause 3(3), which states the criteria for regional designation. However, under Clause 3(3), we find much the same thing:

An industry may be designated with respect to any region of Canada pursuant to subsection (1) if the Governor in Council is satisfied that

(a) the industry in that region is undergoing significant economic adjustment of a non-cyclical nature;

If I am mistaken, perhaps hon. members opposite will enlighten me. However, I suspect the government will very strongly state that what we are facing in the forest industry is a cyclical problem. Will any hon. members opposite deny that? Will they say that it is an "industrial restructuring implemented pursuant to a policy or program of the Government of Canada"? Do any hon. members want to say that? They do not seem to want to say that, either. Therefore, I can only

assume that my guess is correct and that the government has no intention of providing any extra benefits or any relaxation of regulations. I assume my guess is correct if, in fact, that is what this means, and I have my doubts.

Thousands and thousands of Canadians in British Columbia, New Brunswick and elsewhere, right across the country, who are facing such dire straits within the forest industry and many other industries and now find themselves to be out of work due to cyclical markets which are being aggravated by their effect upon working people across the country, will receive no benefits.

Something else which disturbs me relates to the word "adjustment" as I find it consistently repeated throughout Bill C-78. At page 6, under Clause 10, the bill states:

The Board may certify an employee named in an application under section 9 as being eligible to apply to the Commission for labour adjustment benefits if

(a) he was laid off;

(b) the Canadian establishment from which he was laid off is part of a designated industry;

That contains the obvious limitations to which I earlier referred. It states further:

(c) the number of employees at the Canadian establishment referred to in paragraph (b) was reduced as a result of lay-offs, in any twelve month period including the employee's effective date of lay-off, by at least ten per cent or fifty employees, whichever is the lesser; and

(d) his lay-off resulted from the economic adjustment referred to in subsection 3(2) or (3), as the case may be.

Mr. McDermid: Economic adjustment!

Mr. Kristiansen: Economic adjustment! I know that the year 1984 is not very far away, but it seems to me that considering the amount of new adjustments we will be making which will affect people in the Canadian labour force, we should perhaps have waited a couple more years so that we would at least be in tune with the vocabulary suggested by George Orwell: "newspeak". The bill before us is full of "newspeak": "seasonally adjusted", "economically adjusted", "non-cyclically adjusted". These are all terms which appear throughout this entire bill.

Mr. Blenkarn: Well done.

Mr. Kristiansen: I would plead with and ask the government to take seriously the fact that Canadian working people are tired of being adjusted, whether economically, seasonally, non-cyclically, or vertically or horizontally, for that matter. What they want is to find some employment with decent wages in order to make their contribution to this country and to their own families.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kristiansen: I have been looking hard at this bill. I have searched it and searched it. I want to believe that hon. members opposite are people of good will, but it is hard to find evidence. I want to say that a number of days ago the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) asked, concerning another matter, "Why does not anyone say thank