

Supply

wage of full time employees. Furthermore, in most cases they are not protected by unions.

Despite this situation, the only mention of part-time workers in Bill C-34, this present legislation which the Government has introduced, is to eliminate an anomaly which precludes some part-time workers from qualifying for general holiday pay. That is all that the Government thought to say about part-time workers, almost two million of whom are women without benefits of any kind.

If these amendments to the Canada Labour Code had been introduced sooner so they could have gone to committee for the necessary study and so that we could have heard representations to try to get the Government to change its mind about part-time workers, I believe that these two million people whom I am talking about could have anticipated better treatment in the workplace.

As the report of the Commission of Inquiry on Part-Time Work—better known as the Wallace Commission—illustrates, the field of part-time work is an incredibly complex one. I mention this because I feel certain that we will need time to study amendments in this field. We want to see improvements made.

More important, we need to work out a definition of what a permanent part-time worker is. That is not included in the amendments and has not been dealt with. Therefore, there is no way of working toward the prorating of wage rates and benefits until we have some such definition.

No one in this Chamber is unaware of how important committee study of legislation can be. That is why I say that I am sorry that the Government has waited so long to bring this legislation forward. I do not think it can be given the adequate time and attention it should have in committee in order to improve the working conditions and the way in which part-time workers are treated.

The National Action Committee on the Status of Women stated in a letter to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ouellet) on April 27 of this year:

The National Committee is concerned with establishing compulsory standards in the Canadian Labour Code which will ensure that all women exposed to V.D.T.s and working in sectors under federal jurisdiction are guaranteed decent working conditions.

This is another area we could have studied in detail in the committee if we had the time. I do not believe that we will have the time now.

The problem that arises is that women will be worse off because the Government did not allocate that time or make provisions for it by bringing in all of these amendments earlier. This comes back to the way in which we see so many matters of this nature treated, always being done at the last moment and always being done so that some group is deprived of adequate and fair treatment. All too often, that group of people are women.

In the few minutes that remain to me, I would like to raise briefly the matter of technological change in the workplace. It has been said over and over again that in the next decade

technological change could bring about the displacement of almost one million women from their present jobs. It is a horrendous possibility to even think about.

The proposed amendments will attempt to strengthen the existing provisions with respect to technological change by increasing advance notice of changes from 90 to 120 days, by increasing information available to employees and by providing means of redress against employers who do not follow the first two requirements.

While this may be considered a positive step, it is really unfortunate that these proposals have not been complemented by programs under the jurisdiction of other Ministers, particularly under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Notice of technological change does not mean that job loss will not occur. It simply means that people will have 30 days longer to think about it. Unless more comprehensive and more easily accessible training programs are made available, women will end up paying the heaviest price for technological change. That is a subject that has not been addressed by the Government except in a very meagre way. It is a tremendous challenge that is before us. The particular amendments that have been introduced in Bill C-34 only touched the surface. They do not go to the heart of the matter at all.

Once again, we see that women, whether the part time paid labour force or those who are affected by technological change, will be the ones who suffer the most, because there is not a sufficient and comprehensive look at the way in which change in the labour force will affect us in the years ahead. There is no doubt in my mind that had the amendments to this Bill been brought in three years ago when the then Minister of Labour promised them, we could have moved much more quickly to improve the lot of women in the future. As our Party has said, the amendments will be supported when they come before the House, but it is really an inexcusable treatment by the Government that it should wait until the dying days of Parliament to introduce measures as important as these to change the Canada Labour Code.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): There follows a ten-minute period for questions and comments.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the hon. lady a question. Where was the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party in 1959 when the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers took on the huge national corporation, namely, Canadian Pacific Railway? The issue was technological change. There were no Conservatives or New Democrats on the picket line. I was on the picket line. Where were your members?

• (1730)

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has a longer memory than I.

Mr. Turner: I was there.