

### *Supply*

a responsibility to report it to the Government or to the Workmen's Compensation Board.

I have been reviewing the material prepared by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West in the summary of the proposed amendments to the Canada Labour Code. I believe we have a reincarnation of the Hon. Michael Starr who was the Labour Minister in the Diefenbaker Government and Canada's most successful Labour Minister, who brought co-operation and harmony to labour and government.

Let me comment on some of the items in his document. He points out that the proposed changes in the Bill to amend the Canada Labour Code are the result of two years of extensive consultations with labour organizations and employers' associations and are intended to ensure that the Canada Labour Code continues to meet the rapidly changing realities of today's workplace. I am sure that we all agree with that, especially with respect to safety, which is the subject we are debating today.

Furthermore, on April 16 of this year, my colleague from Fraser Valley West presented a motion in the House under the Business of Supply on an allotted day in regard to technological change and the Government's delay in dealing with that issue. Therefore, our Party does not have to apologize to anyone for not being interested in labour problems or dealing with advances in the future. We are all labour. Before coming here we have all had to work in different occupations. Regardless of whether one is in the Conservative Party or the New Democratic Party, we are still all of us labour.

There is another area I would like to discuss with regard to a Private Members' Bill of mine with respect to an amendment to the Canada Labour Code. I would suggest to the Government that it give serious consideration perhaps to introducing a government Bill dealing with the issue I will raise in a moment. It would certainly be much faster than having to wait for my Private Members' Bill to be dealt with. It is in regard to injury to personal feelings and the different manner in which some industries and Crown corporations treat their employees. There is a double standard in their dealings with their employees.

I would like to read the explanatory note of this Bill into the record. It states:

This amendment to the Canada Labour Code would ensure that the administration of a collective agreement would not have a discriminatory or detrimental effect on the employees covered by that agreement in comparison to other employees not covered by the agreement.

Let me give some examples of how this affects people in Air Canada. It concerns Air Canada's golden handshake policy in which it applies a double standard when rewarding its management for long and faithful service. For instance, in 1977, 356 management people took advantage of this benefit. At the time, the union raised a grievance at the headquarter's level, contesting the fact that the early retirement program only applied to management personnel and not to employees covered by the IAM collective agreement. That is clearly a double standard that is causing great concern among many of the machinists at Air Canada. The grievance was denied by the

company on the basis that no surplus situation existed with respect to people covered by the IAM collective agreement.

Since that time, the membership of District Lodge 148 IAM-AW has been concerned with this discriminatory policy. As a result of a resolution passed by members who were present at the 1981 convention, District Lodge 148 executive board set up a one-man committee to look at all aspects of Air Canada's golden handshake program. It provided early retirement for many senior officials in Air Canada. Twenty-one million dollars was set aside in the golden handshake program. Instead of using some of that money to keep machinists on at that particular time, they were being laid off.

Further meetings between the company and the union on this issue took place in 1982. At a meeting in September of that year, the company talked about a VSP for IAM members, but it would be substantially less than one being offered to management. That is why I presented my Bill, which would call for the same compensation for employees at retirement or lay-off, whether he be a white collar worker or a blue collar worker.

I do not want to hold up passage of the Bill. I think there has been excellent debate. We are all in agreement that the Government must take immediate action before we adjourn at the end of June. I understand that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain) wishes to enter the debate, and I want to give him that opportunity. I am sure he can discuss the British Columbia question in an excellent manner.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Are there questions or comments? The House will now proceed to debate.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, in my response to the Opposition motion concerning Bill C-34, I would like to stress a very important point. The major changes to the Canada Labour Code cover not only occupational health and safety but also labour relations and labour standards. I would like to speak more specifically to the latter today, since it is a subject that was not necessarily discussed by our colleagues opposite.

Although all the amendments proposed are important, two of the changes which relate to labour standards are fundamental: the guarantee of a work place free of sexual harassment and the availability of leave of absence for child care to fathers and adopting parents. These innovative provisions are meant to cope with serious social problems. Before presenting the proposed amendments, the Government asked for the opinions of all parties that would be concerned by the legislation.

In December 1979, Mr. Speaker, the Government submitted all amendments to the parties concerned. Consultations went on until last March, and the result is a series of carefully balanced amendments which reflect the concern of the principal groups involved.