

*Canadian Arsenals Limited*

frankly, this is perhaps the first of many privatization moves. What will happen when the Government privatizes Petro-Canada which is 100 times bigger than Canadian Arsenals? We want to ensure that there is a procedure that at the very minimum will benefit the workers. We want to know whether there will be a corporate plan. We would like to see successor trade union rights. We want to know what will happen to the pension plans.

The pension plan is a cause for concern in the private sector when there are mergers or takeovers. Problems arise with early retirement plans being carried over from one company to another.

**Mr. Bradley:** Read the motion.

**Mr. Waddell:** These matters have to be considered. The Member asks me to read things. I invite him to read the submission made by the Public Service Alliance of Canada to the legislative committee on this Bill.

**Mr. Bradley:** I was there. Where were you?

**Mr. Waddell:** Perhaps the Hon. Member will recall this. I invite him to look at Clause 27 concerning mobility rights and Clause 22 concerning the rights of employees. These are matters about which I am concerned.

**Mr. Bradley:** That is the reason for the amendment.

**Mr. Waddell:** That is why the Member for Ottawa Centre put forward this particular clause. The Public Service Alliance stated at page 8 of its brief that in Clause 2 in the general area of employee rights, confusion abounds. Bill C-87 is silent on the issue. Despite the fact that the sale requires a justification change for labour relations purposes from Canada to Quebec, there are no transitional provisions to protect the collective agreement. I invite the Hon. Member to speak about this.

**Mr. Bradley:** I already spoke.

**Mr. Waddell:** It is a new amendment. He can speak again. I regret that I was not here to have the benefit of his speech.

**Mr. Crosbie:** You are floundering, Ian.

**Mr. Waddell:** I know that he is a senior Member of the House.

**Mr. Robinson:** The Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie) wants to speak.

**Mr. Crosbie:** You are floundering.

**Mr. Waddell:** I would not let the Minister of Justice speak. Not only would he privatize the corporation, he would move it to Newfoundland.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** At this stage, I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired.

**Mr. Waddell:** Perhaps I could have unanimous consent of the House for more time.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** What is it the Hon. Member wanted?

**Mr. Waddell:** I asked for unanimous consent to extend my time, but I heard someone say no.

● (1530)

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is one with which I fully agree, namely to postpone this measure until December, 1987. First, it seems to me that whenever we decide to privatize a publicly owned company, we should ask ourselves why we are doing so and whether it is in the best interests of the public and the employees of the company. In that sense I am not convinced that this Bill has been the subject of a thorough and thoughtful analysis. In the case of Canadian Arsenals, as I understand it, the competitive situation in the market-place would be reduced because Canadian Arsenals would be purchased by a similar company thereby reducing competition in the market-place. Second, I cannot understand why the Canadian Government cannot own a successful company where the returns go back to Canadian taxpayers.

Petro-Canada has done extremely well and is perhaps a good example of how companies owned by the public sector can be competitive with the private sector. It can do that very effectively. That view has been expressed by a lot of Liberals before me.

The suggestion to put off this decision until 1987 has merit from the point of view of the people affected. There is a fundamental principle at stake. We cannot decide to sell a public asset and in the process divest the employees of their hard-earned social security programs and, in this case, the pension benefits which the employees of Canadian Arsenals were planning to enjoy at retirement had the company not changed hands. It seems to me, therefore, that a clause needs to be inserted in the Bill which deals with the management and treatment of the social security enjoyed by employees of Canadian Arsenals until the point of sale. I would challenge any Tory back-bencher in this House to say that there should not be the continuation of the same benefits to employees of Canadian Arsenals once it changes ownership. I am sure they could not say it. That leads me to believe that this Bill was hastily drafted and certain considerations were not examined before it was introduced in this House. We should not do that to the employees of any company.

The element of protection of social security benefits which accrue to the employees of Canadian Arsenals is crucial for two reasons; first, because otherwise the employees would lose them and, second, because it sets a precedent. While we are all in favour of positive precedents, this one is negative. It would set a precedent for similar losses to be incurred by employees