

*Supply*

interesting jobs in the high-tech field. However, experience to date has shown, even in our Public Service, that women do not have equal opportunity for advancement. While I believe research shows that in the initial stages of change there is sometimes an increase in jobs as new systems are being brought in, there is also a de-skilling element which occurs. There is a high percentage of women in clerical and office kinds of jobs where this happens and their jobs become more routine. I would hope that the woman on the tractor mentioned by the Hon. Member would be paid an adequate wage.

Of course, we want women to have equal opportunities in the field of high technology, but the facts are that there will not be enough jobs to go around. The fact is that women traditionally have not had equal opportunities for the good jobs. They also are not adequately paid for what they do. I would urge the Hon. Member to look at this element realistically, and at the studies which are readily available in this field showing the very sad impact of technology on women.

**Mr. Jarvis:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell). It is difficult for me to understand the motion of the New Democratic Party in part, at least. The Hon. Member urges the Government to incorporate five different programs into the Budget, the first of which is to provide for employee consultation with regard to technological change. The second proposed budgetary measure is to provide flexible work arrangements to minimize job losses. The third proposed budgetary measure is to ease the impact on the employees affected by technological change by having the corporate sector pay a fairer share of the costs through longer pre-notification periods and improved severance pay.

It is very hard for me to understand this motion coming from the New Democratic Party. I agree that the primary responsibility is the negotiations between employer and employee resulting in a mutually satisfactory collective agreement. The Hon. Member is urging upon the House, and upon the Government, that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) in some form or other should address those three problems in his Budget. I simply ask the Hon. Member, whose Party shares the concern of all Hon. Members, where we are in effect, for example, in back-to-work legislation, writing a contract on the floor of the House which I believe all of us deplore doing. The Hon. Member is now urging, in effect, that compulsory measures be put into a Budget. I do not know how you can do that. I can understand Labour Code amendments and, I might say, I agree with the need for clarification of the definition of "technological change". However, what the Hon. Member is asking is to relieve the employer and employee of the basic responsibility to arrive at a mutually satisfactory collective agreement which, in my view, is certainly diametrically opposed to where I believe the primary responsibility should lie. It is not the responsibility of the Government to interfere with the collective process, but to clearly place the responsibility on the two parties who have always had that historic responsibility and who, indeed, should continue to have it with less government compulsory legislation, not more.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member raises an important point as far as collective bargaining is concerned which, of course, is the role of the employers and employees. However, in this case the Government is the employer. We are talking about jobs in the federal jurisdiction and changes to the Labour Code which would create precedents in this whole area and establish a model which companies can follow. There are other examples of where we have had government intervention in this whole field.

I have mentioned the need for increased research and development funds. We also feel that in the planning process for each sector government, labour and industry must be involved in planning committees. There must also be appeal committees related to some of the working conditions about which we are concerned.

I mentioned the federal responsibility for establishing unemployment insurance coverage for part-time workers. There are many ways that the federal Government can set the stage to establish these principles and facilitate a progressive human kind of development in the whole field of the micro-electronic revolution.

**Mr. Jarvis:** Mr. Speaker, just as long as I clearly understand the position of the New Democratic Party, is it that Party's position, as enunciated in this motion, that government legislation will provide for a compulsory consultative process with regard to the introduction of technological change and a compulsory flexible work arrangement to minimize job losses? How you do that in the Budget, I have no idea. I do not feel it is possible. But is it the New Democratic Party's position that the Government should legislate compulsory legislation in those two areas rather than let the employer and employee within the federal jurisdiction resolve that by collective bargaining?

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I had already clarified that point. We are talking about the federal jurisdiction and Public Service area of employee-employer relationships. We are also talking about national standards which fall within the jurisdiction of the federal Government to establish. I have already mentioned those. We could talk about minimum wages as well. I mentioned the whole question of unemployment insurance regulations. However, I am certainly repeating what we said in the motion.

**Mr. Greenaway:** Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Hon. Member could fill me in a little on her idea that we should be advocating and moving toward a five-week paid holiday. Has the Hon. Member undertaken any studies or has she seen any studies on that? How can we afford to do that in this country when we are looking at such tough competition with other countries in the world? I personally do not believe that small business can stand that kind of expense. In the business I ran I certainly would have had a tough time trying to afford five-weeks' paid holiday for my staff.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, here again I feel we have to look at what other countries are doing. In Australia, for