

computer will do the job, for example, which the machinist or the tool and die maker did up to now. Many of those good jobs will go, to be replaced by some relatively unskilled jobs.

Studies compiled in the United States until now have indicated that the average annual salary or wage in the new fields is \$5,000 a year less than for the jobs which have been lost in the traditional manufacturing fields. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves, where will the purchasing power come from to buy the goods which the new productivity will put on the market?

We support the efforts of the Government and industry in developing the new high-technology industries, and we support the Government in giving over \$17 million recently to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council in order to promote co-operation between industry and universities in a network for microelectronic design research. We support that because we realize that the aim is to produce university graduates who are ready and prepared for jobs in silicon chip technology and research. However, what about the jobs of these hundreds of thousands of Canadians who have worked in the established industries, which some people have just assumed will be producing with less and less people? It is not enough to continue blithely on with new programs and subsidies and grants in order to develop high technology industries while the impact of these new industries on our already existing work force is ignored, and it has been to a large extent.

The Minister talked about the new centre for productivity. We applaud and support that, Mr. Speaker, but we say what value will that be to the thousands of workers who have already lost their jobs, or are likely to do so in the next year or two before this productivity centre really gets going? The modernization of industry cannot be opposed. However, we say it must be done with the participation of those people who are affected, not just those people who will gain but those people who have been and will be so adversely affected. If the Government is to favour this modernization and provide support to the companies in the high-tech sector, it must also give the workers the means to participate in the decisions which will affect their lives.

The New Democratic Party has made a number of very specific proposals, which we feel merit consideration by the Government and by the people of Canada. We are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there is a minimum necessary protection due to employees whose positions are threatened by change. They need pre-notification. There should be consultation with the employees. There need to be more flexible working arrangements, improved severance pay and a maximizing of the number of jobs produced by high technology in this country. It is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, among others, that we say that Government must play an important role and there must be legislation to protect the workers.

Another aspect of the change which is going on is the shift to increasing levels of part-time work and part-time jobs. Any Hon. Member just has to walk into a supermarket or any retail establishment to see how much they have moved to part-time

Supply

employees, people who work a few hours a day or a few days a week. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not just that they are part-time employees, but without government legislation, they very frequently do not qualify for unemployment insurance, for pensions, for health care insurance and so on. We say that the Government must be involved because only the Government can guarantee those part-time workers the benefits which full-time workers have won through union negotiations or through legislation.

Government policy and strategy have resulted in a steady growth of part-time employment and a reduction of full-time employment. The Government, we say, must extend the basic benefits which full-time employees receive to those part-time employees. There are a number of suggestions which have been made which are worthy of consideration. In a recent article, Bob Kuttner, the Associate Editor of *The New Republic*, has suggested that what is happening because of the spread of micro-technology is more part-time work, and one of the things which could be done as an incentive would be for workers to pre-pay, along with their Canada Pension contributions, payments which would permit them at age 60 to work for the next five years two or three days a week. They would draw the balance of their pay from the contribution which they made earlier toward the Canada Pension Plan. Another similar scheme would allow young parents of a minor child to spend five years working half time while receiving full-time pay. This would be a good social policy which would allow parents to spend time at home with their children during the formative years while providing additional employment for others in the work force.

Wassily Leontief, a well known and respected Nobel prize winner in economics, has pointed out that the failure to redistribute the gains of automation could condemn society—and he is talking about the United States, but the same if true of Canada—to a paradoxical condition of rising productivity on the one hand and rising destitution on the other. The position that this Government has taken in promoting high technology while, we believe, ignoring its effect on workers, invites this very process to be realized in our country. I suggest that Members look at what is happening to people in Hamilton who work in the steel industry or people in Sudbury who work in the mines to see how they are losing their homes and everything else because they no longer have jobs.

• (1800)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order, please. It being six o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that, pursuant to Standing Order 62(11), the proceedings on the motion have expired.