

*Industrial Relations*

**Mr. Hugh Faulkner (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, in common with other hon. members I was looking forward very much to the remarks of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Fawcett) on a subject about which, I think it is fair to assume, he is probably more expert than most of us, having had long experience in the railways industry. In his notice of motion he presents a problem which is very severe and real and is encountered not only in the railway industry but in all industries. I hope I shall be forgiven if I express considerable disappointment in his remarks, particularly with his suggestion that since the Freedman report came out, nothing has been done. Later in my remarks I hope to demonstrate adequately that something has been done by the parties themselves.

Most particularly, I take exception to his suggestion—and I am disappointed in this allegation—that the task force which was set up with the very best of intentions by this house is, according to his interpretation nothing more than a delaying device. In my view he has done a grave disservice to the men who are working on that task force.

Not only has he done that, but his allegation at this stage of the game, when the members of the task force are working and in which he proceeds to dismiss the task force as a delaying device is premature and precipitate. In the process he has cast doubts upon the integrity of the men who are working for it. If his intention is to advance the cause of the railroader, and I am sure it is, then the hon. member has not adopted the best approach.

As to the sum and substance of the hon. member's notice of motion, I do not think anyone in this house would take exception.

**Mr. Winch:** Will you vote for it?

**Mr. Faulkner:** It is important, in considering the notice of motion, to consider not only its substance but also to some degree the timing, and the methods through which we may achieve the legitimate and desirable objectives which the hon. member for Nickel Belt has set forth. I think it is possible to argue that at some stage legislation may indeed be required to accomplish the goal set out in the hon. member's notice of motion. I should like, though, to discuss some of the developments which have taken place within the private sector between management and labour through collective agreements which have in recent years accomplished those goals in some measure.

I think it is important to take this notice of motion in its total perspective, and to judge whether right now it is particularly urgent that we proceed to do that which it seeks. There is a provision in the notice of motion regarding technological change and its effect on job security which I think is important and which the hon. member did not mention. It seems to me there is an area where eventually we shall be required to bring in an amendment to the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, and this has to do with the unorganized sector of labour. It is in the area where collective agreements do not exist that, possibly, protection will be sought through the medium of legislation.

As I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is the opinion of most if not all hon. members, that the objectives set forth in this notice of motion are commendable. I think we all share an equal concern about the effects of technological change on workers. The history of the labour movement, the history of free enterprise in this area, is characterized by a series of developments, all of which point to one thing, that technological change, improvements in technology, improvements in machinery and improvements in methods of production have almost invariably been purchased at the expense of the livelihood and best interests of the workers. That was so if we look back to the nineteenth century. That was the *raison d'être* behind the movement of the Luddites. That was the condition which governed the attitude of the Tolpuddle martyrs and others, right up to fairly recently.

I think it is true to say that in most instances technological change has been purchased at the expense of the interests of the working men and working women. I think therefore that it is perfectly natural that within the labour force there should be this resistance. But, I think it is imperative to recognize that the resistance to technological change is not resistance to technological change per se, but a resistance to the ramifications of technological change on the lives of working men.

That is why in the past within organized labour, and indeed outside the ambit of organized labour, there has been fear, misgiving, and indeed opposition to technological change which is applied arbitrarily by a decision of management and which affects the working conditions of men and women within factories.