

putting on the record. I hope it will do two things: First, that it will remind the government that that is the philosophy behind the bill and therefore urge the government to do more; and second, that it will remind those who are not going to support the bill that there is something being done today, however small it might be.

The Dodge report reads:

Throughout the 1980s a decade already bearing the mark of uncertainty, there will be a need to focus more heavily on measures to facilitate the process of adjustment so that expanding industries in areas have access to the labour, including the skilled labour they require and so that workers in declining industries and areas do not bear undue costs. The benefits of adjustment are considerable and they accrue to society as a whole. Governments should therefore not be reticent about providing compensation to those individuals who are adversely affected by the process.

That is what this bill is about. It is a very small specific practical thing that it does, but that is the philosophy behind it. I might say that the committee itself was able to broaden the bill. I gather other speakers have mentioned this already, but it was one of the few times in a long time that I, as a Member of Parliament, have been able to provide some argument for changes that indeed, if not accepted initially, were accepted before the bill came back into the House for report stage. It may well be, as the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) says, that it does not help very many people, some 850. It may not be important to that member, but if you happen to be one of the 850, it is very important. But more than that, we are hoping that the government, by receiving support, is going to designate more areas and more industries as they get hurt in terms of dislocation over the 1980s and 1990s, and therefore more people will be helped.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this bill should be understood at two levels. It is the first attempt in any significant way that I know of that the government has understood the necessity of the 1980s and 1990s in relation to who should pay for the technological change that we hope we will experience. Second, it at least gives some specific compensation to people who are already hurt now. That is important.

On this side we were very concerned at the outset with the definition of industrial restructuring. How is a community or an industry designated for industrial restructuring? In our view, it is important that industrial restructuring be understood to include technological change. It was the view of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia), his deputy minister and staff, that industrial restructuring implied technological change. But all representations that dealt with the question of industrial restructuring were uniform. They did not see clearly that industrial restructuring included technological change. There is a change in Clause 2 of the bill under the heading "Interpretation" which reads:

"industrial restructuring" includes technological change;

That is an advance, not for today's delivery but for other people to understand what the philosophy of the bill is and therefore be able to argue later on that because the bill is that broad, there is other legislation to be brought forward based on that bill and the acceptance of the philosophy.

### *Labour Adjustment Benefits*

A second area with which we concerned ourselves was the establishment of the labour boards. In our view, and it is still our view—and we were not successful about this—that it would be easier and better had the implementation of the administration of the program been carried out by the Canadian employment commission. That would seem to me to have put the people applying for the benefit through one process rather than two. Indeed, it was clear from the remarks made by the deputy minister of labour that the only reason we have two systems is that someone over there decided to put the job definition with labour rather than with the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy). I am sure that you know, Mr. Speaker, that the people who will get support and help from the bill do not care if it is done by the Supreme Court. They would like it done efficiently, clearly, quickly and understandably.

I hear the Minister of Labour saying if we had amended it, it would go to the Supreme Court, and we probably would not have had it accepted. We hope that our fears are wrong, but as the Minister of Labour has pointed out time and again, it will be simpler and it will make it easier. If that is true, it will be the first time in the history of the federal government in this century that adding yet one more board, commission or special purpose body will make it easier for people to get the benefits.

The approach that says "Hello, I am from the government and I am here to help" is increasingly being met with skepticism. It seems to me that that would have been one change on which we could have insisted. We believe very strongly that what we have here is going to be an administrative problem that will not be of benefit to the recipients of the adjustments.

We also dealt with an amendment offered by the New Democratic Party, which we supported in the committee, with respect to a change in the 1,000-hour requirement. It seems to us unnecessary to stick rigidly to 1,000 hours per year. We think the average is appropriate.

We also dealt with the question of reports to Parliament. Anyone who attended the committee hearings would know that everybody agreed there is great difficulty with the various programs being offered by the various departments of government. We could find ourselves lost in a sea of paper with no one remembering who helped whom last. It is important that we have a more rapid reporting system that would impose some discipline on those who are administering the various programs so they could have some coherence about what they are doing and we would not get mixed up with three different programs from two different departments.

● (2030)

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were four or five changes, not the least of which was a motion which was accepted to broaden the representative nature of the Labour Adjustment Review Board to include employer and employee representatives. That is a good change; we supported it in committee and will now. We also had a good discussion in committee on the broadening of responsibility of the joint planning committee, which we support. That change was very significant in my view and, I think,