One clause which I find encouraging and on which we have had a number of representations from various groups is the consolidation of the various areas of occupational health and safety within the Department of Labour. It now not only includes uranium mine workers, those in the transportation industry and in banks, but as well employees under federal jurisdiction involved in shipping, trains, offshore drilling and so on. Through complementary amendments to the Financial Administration Act it will apply on an equivalent basis to public servants with regard to occupational health and safety.

I wish to indicate my support for the improvements to the right to refuse work, strengthening the provision where the question of imminent danger is removed. Collective bargaining health and safety committee can function as the committees for occupational health and safety without being structured under some new basis. This brings the Bill into line with legislation in the provinces, including the Province of Ontario.

As the Member for Algoma, I have been lobbying very hard for several years to have this legislation brought into effect. Within the next week an agreement will be reached between the United Steel Workers, the Elliot Lake Uranium Mines, the mining companies themselves, the Atomic Energy Control Board, the federal Department of Labour and the Ontario Department of Labour to enshrine under an order of the Atomic Energy Control Act the Ontario occupational health and safety regulations. When that agreement is reached it will represent a most historic event.

There has been a jurisdictional problem there for several years. It was not clear exactly who had jurisdiction. Up until about 1978 we thought the Province of Ontario had jurisdiction. In a ruling at that time the law officers of the Crown said that conventional health and safety was under federal jurisdiction, as is the question of radiation. Therefore, this jurisdictional problem has existed since that time. An agreement was reached between the concerned bodies. The Ontario occupational health and safety legislation will be referenced to the Atomic Energy Control Act. Therefore, uranium miners in Elliot Lake will operate under equivalent provisions to those in other mining operations such as Inco and Falconbridge in the Sudbury basin. This Bill makes provision for that kind of an agreement. Clause 80.1 provides, and I quote:

> The Governor in Council may be order exclude, in whole or in part, from the application of this Part or any specified provision thereof employment on or in connection with any work or undertaking that is regulated pursuant to the Atomic Energy Control Act.

That provision provides the needed flexibility for referencing of the Ontario occupational health and Safety Act. It dovetails more conveniently all the other provincial government jurisdictions dealing with boilers and other regulations relating to the operation of the mine. There is good provision for this in Bill C-34.

The Bill provides some improvements relating to technological change. That is important in this fast-moving period of technological change. It is fast moving, making jobs obsolete. It is therefore important that these provisions be in the Bill.

A lot of the responsibility for technological change will remain with the employer. There has to be some give and take regardless of the agreements that are reached, such as collective bargaining agreements. They must take into account changes that occur over the two or three-year period of a collective bargaining agreement. A recent example in my constituency is where Canadian Pacific Railways brought in the manual block system, replacing train order people with a radio system so that train orders could be issued by radio operators rather than the train order operators, as was done in the past. This, of course, is a technological change and we do expect technological changes to occur. In the long term, I suppose it makes for a more efficient system. At the same time we would expect large companies like the CPR to operate like good corporate citizens.

● (1230)

The case that was brought to my attention was that of McKerrow where there were three train order operators who had put in an average of 37 to 40 years of service with the CPR. In April of this year their jobs in that location were made obsolete. Even though these operators had 37 or even 40 years of service, they had only reached the age of 58 and their collective bargaining agreement did not provide for an early retirement before reaching the age of 59. In one case the operator was shifted to a new location requiring the family unit to split up for the next year. When people with less than two years of seniority are bumped, their jobs may not be secure in the future.

In this case, three people are losing their jobs because of technological change. They have an opportunity to work in another location but if they do not take that oppportunity their pensions will not become effective at age 59 or 60, as is provided in the agreement, but in fact will become effective at age 65. They have the choice either to move away after 38 or 40 years of service or lose their pensions for seven years. It is an archaic arrangement and a company as large as CPR should not treat its employees like that. I find it unbelievable.

If any Member of the House had an employee working for him for 38 or 40 years who happened to be one year short of being eligible for pension, the Member would do one of two things. Either he would keep the employee on for safety considerations to oversee the operation of the new technological change—and in the case to which I referred, it is very important that dispatchers be secure—or the Member would allow the employee to take his retirement one year sooner. Surely anyone would expect a company as large as the CPR to operate on that basis.

I find it unbelievable that the CPR would force these families to split up and move to another location for such a short period of time or to forgo their pensions for seven years. I think it is important that this matter has been raised in the Bill and it is important that the Government is moving on it. I think it is equally important that the representations that have been made by the union, by the employees themselves, by myself and by other Members of Parliament should not fall on