

seems to build in, in my estimation, more discrimination against those people who have been traditionally discriminated against in the labour force. I see nothing in it which would assume special attention to people who have always been given a smaller share of the labour market, such as women, for instance, who have never had the opportunity to compete fairly in the labour market. I see nothing in it to help the under-educated or the untrained or the young. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that the great criteria are having attained the age of 54 years and having worked a certain specified number of years. That is fine for people who fit into that category, but people who do not quite fit are thrown on the mercies of this commission that will be set up. I think that is a bit demeaning for people who need help.

As I say, honourable senators, the bill is an infinitesimally small dent in the horrendous economic problems facing our country today, and as regards those people who will qualify for help under it, we certainly wish them well. As far as it goes, I will certainly vote for the bill.

Hon. Robert Muir: I wonder if the honourable senator would accept a question.

Senator Doody: Certainly.

Senator Muir: I listened, honourable senators, very carefully to Senator Neiman yesterday. Clause 3(1) of the bill says:

3. (1) For the purposes of this Act, the Governor in Council may, by order, designate any industry either generally or with respect to any region of Canada.

The reason I would like to put this question to Senator Doody is this: Does he feel that this would cover those employees who are being laid off by CN Marine at Port aux Basques in Newfoundland, and North Sydney in Nova Scotia, through no fault of their own? In yesterday's paper I read that 60 more positions had been eliminated on the boats operating between Newfoundland and the mainland.

I am just wondering what the honourable senator's views are on that. Does he think this bill will cover these men, some of whom are in the age bracket mentioned by Senator Neiman and who have no alternative employment?

Senator Doody: I think this is a question that would more properly be directed to Senator Neiman, the sponsor of the bill.

In clause 3(2), immediately following the clause referred to by Senator Muir, a description of the designations is given. It refers to an industry in Canada that is generally

undergoing significant economic adjustment of a non-cyclical nature by reason of import competition or by reason of industrial restructuring—

In my estimation, that could very well rule out most of the basic resource industries, and certainly the transportation industry could very well be ruled out. As I say, it is an interpretation that is left up to the Governor in Council, but it offers very little help for those people in that part of the world which is suffering the most in the present state of the economy.

[Senator Doody.]

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, normally, of course, we refer bills to committee on second reading, and I am not putting forward any reason why we should not do so in this case. Frequently, however, we do so because during second reading debate on a bill honourable senators speaking to it suggest that there are matters they would like to have considered in committee. According to our rules, this bill would go to the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science, under the rule that provides specifically that labour legislation shall go to that committee, where the Senate wishes it.

I am wondering if the position of the sponsor, or the position of the opposition, is that we do or do not need to send this bill to committee. I have no objection to its going to committee, but if there is no reason for this to be done, there is no point in having that committee convene just to look at something that the Senate does not feel requires further study. As Senator Doody has just pointed out, the bill has been before Parliament for some time now.

Senator Doody: Honourable senators, I have no strong feeling on this. If it were left to my tender mercies I would scrap the bill and try to deal with the causes of the disasters that we have in this country today; but I do not think those disasters are going to be dealt with by this bill, no matter how many committees it goes to. As far as I am concerned, it can pass now. I have no strong feeling on the matter, as I say.

Senator Frith: Another suggestion, honourable senators, would be that I could adjourn the debate until tomorrow to give an opportunity to those who are concerned to consider whether or not they want the bill to be sent to committee on second reading. If it turns out that the bill does not need to be sent to committee, we can have third reading next week. If, on the other hand, it turns out that some honourable senators wish the bill to go to committee, we can so move tomorrow and have it go to committee for consideration next week.

That is the feeling on this side. I leave it for comment from the other side by Senator Roblin.

Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, speaking to the point of order, I think my honourable friend's suggestion that he should adjourn the debate, to give us a little time to think about this matter, is a good one. My own prejudice is, I must confess, that the committee stage is usually productive of some good, although, as my honourable friend said, in the case of this bill it may be an open question.

If left to my own devices at the moment I would think that the committee stage would be valuable, but I am quite prepared to leave the matter open. We can come up with a definitive proposal tomorrow.

Senator Muir: Honourable senators, I agree with Senator Roblin and Senator Doody to a certain extent but, until we get answers to some of the questions we are interested in in this connection, I think it might be a good idea to refer the bill to committee. The instance referred to by my friend today, and the matter that I raised in my question to the house leader