

this tough, competitive existence certainly have to be moderated. As a democratic socialist I say frankly that I see a role for certain kinds of competition, but there are certain degrees and intensities in place where it exists which I for one want to get rid of, but that is a subject for another discussion. But we are in a world where we have to deal with that, so therefore we must modernize. We cannot be Luddites. But if we are going to modernize, fairness requires a certain attitude toward the workers. If I am going to say to the men and women whom I grew up with in Oshawa and who are working on lines in General Motors or in that industry that we want to become in that industry, that town and that small part of our country, as efficient as anywhere else in the world, then I want to be able to say: Yes, please co-operate with the introduction of technological change. That is my appeal and that is what the Government is saying. But if the Government is to get support for modernization, it must produce legislation which says that six months' notice at least has to be given to workers if it is going to introduce technological change. They, too, are human beings and, having worked there for 10, 20 or 25 years, they have a right to be participants in the decisions which are going to change their lives profoundly. So the first thing we as a Party say is that you cannot just have technological change which benefits the corporate side of the ledger only. The workers have to get at least six months' notice.

● (1540)

Beyond that, where a union exists, it ought to be involved in these changes. While some good firms might do this, I am under no illusion about what the majority would do given our environment, and we ought to have legislation which says that the terms of technological change ought to be a bargainable item. In the final analysis that means that if you cannot agree, the workers have the right to withdraw their labour. But I would hope, as happens in 90 per cent of the cases, and the Leader of the Opposition has had some experience with this, that if it is a bargainable item there will not be strikes. In most cases, there will not be because they will reach a settlement.

Where there are no unions in existence, Mr. Speaker, which is the case for a majority of Canadian workers now, then in legislation in the federal domain where we can set an example we ought to pass laws which make it obligatory to establish what might be called technology committees in the workplace. The workers as well as management would be compelled to sit down and sort out the terms of the introduction of such change.

Finally, we ought to have very sophisticated retraining programs. Other countries in the world have established these programs so that displaced workers—and there are going to be displaced workers, no doubt about that—will be able to be retrained in a humane and sophisticated way so that they will be able to spend the rest of their lives doing some kind of alternative labour.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say it is an absence of fairness here. We get this nice talk about modernization and the need for technological change, but that is one side of the ledger. If you

want workers in Canada to be mobilized and feel good about their country and co-operate with the Government, then you should have the kind of legislation I have talked about to provide them with some real security about their future in case of technological change.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Many things could be said, Mr. Speaker, about the fate of women in Canadian society. A few minutes ago I said that, along with most Members now in the House—and this was not always the case—we are pleased to see the changes women have made, the increasing equality which has been achieved, particularly in the 1970s. I want to say that we should be under no illusions, and I speak as a man, that like all social change, the change that has been wrought upon our society has been made by those who needed the change. The women themselves created the pressure that brought about the changing attitudes in a lot of us which finally led to certain legislative improvements for Canadian women.

If the Government wants Canadian women who are working outside their home to feel part of our great land, to be part of the sense of community, which is one of the goals of the Speech from the Throne, then it should recognize that 71 per cent of the part-time workers in Canada are women. It should recognize that part-time workers in Canada, with very few exceptions, do not have the same benefits that full-time workers have. So we in this Party say that this is another area for reasonable legislation. If a man or woman works full-time in a bank, a mine or a forest, and they are entitled to a certain pension plan or to sick benefits, then the time is long overdue in Canada that part-time workers, most of whom are women, were able to get precisely the same kind of benefits on a proportional basis. They should not, and I use the word with care, be the victims of continued exploitation simply because they are part-time employees. I repeat, if we have a sense of fairness about it, and we want to mobilize support, then giving legislative testimony to that notion of fairness in this domain is something we ought to be doing and doing now.

There are two other domestic matters I want to talk about, and one is the notion of recovery. Again the Government has talked incessantly about that in recent weeks and months, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), who is not here today—and I do not say that critically because I hope he is doing something that his ministerial responsibilities require him to do—has talked very much in recent weeks about recovery. I have said that in many cases the most revealing part of *The Globe and Mail*, and I am tempted to say the most honest part of the paper about what goes on in the nation, is the business section. It really tells you in cold, hard statistics about what is taking place. Day after day in recent weeks we have seen references to economic recovery. But I ask the Prime Minister and the Government through you, Mr. Speaker, is this a shared recovery? Is it a fair recovery? What is really going on? Since 1981, when the recession really started to bite, the following has taken place. As you will read in *The Globe and Mail* or any other business report, profits for the third