

*Canadian Arsenals Limited*

of other Crown-owned agencies or companies like Teleglobe, for example. I am sure Teleglobe has been mentioned by speakers before me. Should the time come, perish the thought, that the Government sells Teleglobe to the private sector, the employees of that company would have the same fate. The Government could say: "The precedent has been set. We did it with Canadian Arsenals' employees. Why can we not do it now? It was accepted at that time and we will roll along on the same route". It is important, therefore, to ensure that these considerations are made part of this Bill.

The social considerations which affect the employees' right now have been raised by the unions. They ask how this will affect employees of other Crown corporations which may come under the process of privatization. As I said earlier, I am not a great believer in this process at all. I think Canadians have been served well by Teleglobe, Canadian Arsenals and Petro-Canada in public ownership. There is nothing wrong with these Crown corporations being owned by Canadians. There is actually much to be gained from that approach. It provides a balance in a particular sector between public and private ownership, which is very healthy and adds to the competitive spirit. What the Government is inadvertently doing, I suspect, is reducing the competitiveness in this particular field.

One can ask why the Hon. Member for Davenport would put forward such a notion without really basing it upon his own experience. But I am told that there are cases where privatization of a publicly owned institution has been accomplished in a thoughtful manner and not at the expense of the social security coverage and protection of its employees. First, it happened at Deer Lodge Hospital in Manitoba, a hospital in New Westminster, British Columbia and a hospital in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

**Mr. Bradley:** They are different cases.

**Mr. Caccia:** Yes, I can see they are different cases in different provinces, but it tells me that there is the political will at the provincial level. I notice one case involved the Province of British Columbia which is not famous for being one of the most socialistic inclined Governments in this country, and if it was possible in British Columbia, surely an approach of this nature with the same considerations could be developed by the Progressive Conservative Government of Canada. It is only a question of political will. It is only a question of giving these considerations to the Bill at a time when it is to be introduced.

In conclusion, I must say that I support the motion to postpone this decision. The impression I have is that the Government did not think about the implications. It did not have, perhaps, the experience to include these types of clauses to protect the benefits of the existing employees. The Government still can do so, however, and ought to do so in consideration of the fact that it would set a precedent for other corporations which the Government, perish the thought, may intend to sell.

I see that you are indicating that my time is up, but I have only spoken for 10 minutes. I have been very sober in my intervention but I know that my colleague would like to speak at this point and I will give the floor to him.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that I have to call the Hon. Member to order. I love to listen to him but he only has 10 minutes in this particular debate.

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** It is always a challenge, of course, to follow the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), Mr. Speaker.

● (1540)

**Mr. Robinson:** I rise on a point of order. I seek clarification in terms of the speaking order. I know that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), sought to speak at this point.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Since the Hon. Member did not rise, I recognized the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi).

**Mr. Heap:** I was rising.

**Mr. Marchi:** If the Hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) wishes to participate in the debate, then I would yield the floor to him and speak after he has finished.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that I did not see the Hon. Member for Spadina rise. If he wants to speak, then I will recognize him, if that is all right with the Hon. Member for York West. I do not think the practice of yielding the floor to another Member should be a practice to follow. However, we will do it today. The Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), on debate.

**Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) for yielding the floor to me.

The problem with the Bill, as I was mentioning a little while ago, and the problem which requires the putting of the motion to extend the proclamation time, is that the interests of this company and the interests of the workers in the company are not well served. There must be more time to give it proper consideration and, perhaps, even to come back for certain amendments which might be quickly dealt with once they have been properly discussed.

The respect in which the interests of the country are not well served is that there has been no clear reason shown why the company needs to be sold or why it should be sold. It is a healthy firm. It employs a total of about 800 people near Quebec City and at Ville Le Gardeur near Montreal. It has been successful. Their jobs are about as secure as any jobs can be in the country. To start changing ownership without giving a clear reason for it does not make very much sense, especially in this day and age when companies which acquire their competitors often shut down one or the other of their plants.