After such notice the union can apply to the CLRB for leave to notify the employer of its desire to reopen negotiations to discuss provisions for those workers affected by technology. Once notice is received the employer cannot make technological changes until the board denies the union application or an agreement is reached or the parties negotiate and reach a strike provision.

These changes were made only after extensive consultations with unions and employers and after two thorough studies. The Freedman study in the 1960s looked at the impact of technology at CN Rail and recommended a formula for labour and management to resolve disagreements over the consequences of new technology. As well, the Woods task force in 1968 examined just about every aspect of labour–management relations under federal jurisdiction. It commissioned a number of studies and submitted several important recommendations to the government.

• (1845)

I have touched on history just to show that in Canada we do not fool around when it comes to labour–management relations. Hastily ill–conceived actions however well meaning can have serious consequences in this area.

Our tradition is to only change collective bargaining laws after thorough deliberation and consultation with all the stakeholders. This tradition has served us very well. It has allowed us to develop at the federal level at least. I will refrain from commenting on the radical and polarizing swings in my home province of Ontario over the last five years. We had the NDP way over here at one end for a little while and now we have the Conservatives, some would suggest very right wing indeed, going the other way. That kind of polarization and swinging back and forth does nothing for labour–management relations. In fact, it does a disservice to the people who have to make a living by collective bargaining.

Since the last amendments were made in 1972, the environment surrounding industrial relations has undergone a revolution. Free trade, deregulation, rapid technological advances and workplace restructuring place new demands on both labour and management. In light of this, we need a comprehensive review of the Canada Labour Code, not piecemeal action as suggested tonight.

In fact, the Minister of Labour launched such a review just a little while ago. This review is looking at the big picture. We want to improve the labour code to encourage co–operation between labour and management, to reduce unhealthy and counterproductive levels of conflict and to ensure that administrative bodies are responsive to the new and always changing labour relations environment.

Since last winter, extensive consultations have been carried out with labour, management and interested and knowledgeable third parties. Many issues are being studied, including those that the member proposes to deal with in Bill C–317. It is a difficult task, as labour and management hold diametrically opposed viewpoints on these issues. For example, there is the issue of replacement workers. Let me quote Tom d'Aquino, whom we all know, and what he thinks on this ban.

Tom d'Aquino writes: "We would dramatically alter the delicate equilibrium which has been established over the course of many years between management and labour and firms which are subject to federal jurisdiction. The obvious result would be to strengthen the position of organized labour while simultaneously weakening management's position, with clear implications for the outcome of their private contractual negotiations. Government interference of this sort would violate the most basic principles of equity and fair play. It would be highly disruptive and entirely inconsistent with our open market economy. It also would override the fundamental rights of individuals to decide where and when they choose to work".

On the other side we have Bob White, whom we also know quite well. He is on record expressing the CLC's strong support for restrictions and even a total ban on replacement workers, including management staff.

Our job is to try to reconcile these deeply held, apparently incompatible positions. It will not be easy, but it is something we simply have to do.

Last June the Minister of Labour established a task force to conduct an independent review of part I of the labour code and to recommend changes. I want to mention tonight the issues and areas this task force will be looking at and to mention to the members opposite who have suggested that the Minister of Labour has done virtually nothing on this issue and that she has been somewhat reluctant to get involved in these major changes that are necessary for the economy and for the labour relations we have to deal with. The review will be completed by December 15. I am confident the people on the task force will do a thorough and professional job.

• (1850)

The task force is dealing with very critical and important issues which include the conciliation and mediation process with a view to reducing delays and encouraging settlements and the possible role of alternative dispute settlements; fact finding and special mediation; the procedures for acquiring the right to strike or lockout; and the rights of employees, employers and bargaining agents once a strike or a lockout occurs. The general purpose of the code will be looked at as will the need for labour management committees, preventive mediation programs, grievance mediation and expedited arbitration. Bargaining unit structures including recommendations of industrial inquiry commissions into labour relations at west coast ports will be made regarding geographic certification provisions. Finally the need for alternative procedures or bargaining structures for the