

and refer it to committee for 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

• (2210)

**Hon. Mr. Grosart:** Honourable senators, perhaps I should say that in yielding I tried very hard to be co-operative in this matter, and if there is any problem I can only say that one member cannot co-operate alone in the Senate.

I agree with what has been said about the experience, the knowledge, and the wisdom of the sponsor of the bill. He has had a great deal of experience in labour relations, and has a very distinguished record. I do not think he has been always right. Perhaps he has been more often right than wrong; perhaps he has been more successful than unsuccessful, but no one has a perfect record. In undertaking to defend some of the clauses in this bill this evening he has, in my estimation, diminished his record a little bit. The position he has taken is completely untenable in terms of employer-employee relations in Canada. I am referring specifically to those clauses which he dealt with at some length, and that Senator Manning dealt with, clauses 149 to 153 under the heading "Technological Change."

I have to say to Senator Goldenberg that I think he would agree, on reflection, that in most of the arguments he put forward in favour of these clauses he was begging the question. He talked of humanistic values, the importance of job security, and the Gallup Poll.

**Hon. Mr. Goldenberg:** Would the honourable senator excuse me? May I ask: Does Senator Grosart, as a senator, question the importance of job security?

**Hon. Mr. Grosart:** If Senator Goldenberg would allow me to finish my statement, I think he would understand what I am saying. I am saying that, in raising those issues in the way he did to support those clauses, he was begging the question, because the objections to these clauses have nothing to do with the questions of job security and human values. He went one step further and said the opponents of these clauses have failed or refused to understand the importance of industrial peace in labour legislation.

**Hon. Mr. Goldenberg:** I never said that.

**Hon. Mr. Grosart:** I took it down and I am sure that we can look it up in *Hansard* tomorrow. If I have misquoted Senator Goldenberg I will apologize now, but I have some assurance that he used those exact words, "the opponents of this bill have failed or refused to understand".

**Hon. Mr. Goldenberg:** "Understand the facts," is what I said earlier.

**Hon. Mr. Grosart:** To understand you—except that those opponents had not been concerned with your speech. I can assure Senator Goldenberg that those who have opposed this bill have not opposed it on the grounds that it will diminish the potential of industrial peace in Canada. On the contrary, the opposition to this bill is that it runs counter to the basic concept of a collective agreement. A collective agreement, as I understand it, is an agreement whose purpose is to assure, by common consent, a stated certain period of industrial peace.

What does this legislation do? This legislation deliberately introduces another opportunity, perhaps even a provocation, for one side of the collective bargaining group to disturb industrial peace. It provides an opportunity that does not exist at the present time. For that reason, I oppose it. That is the reason it has been opposed by distinguished and learned experts in industrial relations.

Honourable senators, the preamble to the bill sets forth this principle:

And Whereas the Parliament of Canada desires to continue and extend its support to labour and management in their co-operative efforts to develop good relations and constructive collective bargaining practices, and deems the development of good industrial relations to be in the best interests of Canada in ensuring a just share of the fruits of progress to all.

I suggest that the clauses to which the sponsor referred run counter to that pious hope, that pious endorsement of the concept of industrial peace.

It is interesting to note that the body responsible for the bill, the federal government, exempts itself. It is all very well to impose these conditions on other people but, in two places in the bill, the federal government, in its role as employer, is exempted from those provisions.

It will be said that this act comes into force only when a situation arises, brought about by technological change or intended or proposed technological change, which will affect "the terms and conditions or the security of employment of a significant number of employees." The fact of the matter is, of course, that this whole cumbersome, bureaucratic burden relating to technological decisions will come into force long before there is any question or suggestion of job security. That is another reason why I object to it.

What other method could be used? Perhaps that should be left to the experts. It seems to me very obvious that the way to solve a problem such as this is to incorporate whatever requirements are necessary in the original collective agreement.

Interestingly enough, Senator Goldenberg took credit, and rightly so, for such a solution in the settlement of the last railway strike. Why not in this bill? Senator Goldenberg said it is working very well, where the whole question of technological change is discussed in the original negotiations and not left to some sudden change that comes along, and perhaps a necessary change.

I would instance the utter inadequacy, I would even say the inanity, of the definition of "technological change" in clause 149 of the bill. It is provided that in that clause and clauses 149 to 153, "technological change" means:

(a) the introduction by an employer into his work, undertaking or business of equipment or material of a different nature or kind than that previously utilized by him in the operation of the work, undertaking or business.

That is one requirement. If an employer introduces new equipment or material that was not used before in the operation, that is technological change. Then paragraph (b) says: