

this Chamber to the Senate is legislation that will protect the rights of Canadians from coast to coast.

That kind of protection should exist in this piece of legislation because the shareholders of Canadian Arsenals Limited are some 25 million Canadians: you and I, Mr. Speaker, and every other Canadian. By its very definition, a shareholder of a corporation dictates policy and should also have information at his or her fingertips. In this case, we in this Party, the workers and the Public Service Alliance are trying to explain to the Government that those Canadian shareholders are not completely satisfied with this legislation.

This afternoon, speakers from both opposition Parties have spoken to the essential concern of the union and the workers, which is that workers' pension contributions not be undermined. They are saying to the Government that if it has made the political decision and has the political will to make this company private, then so be it, but they want the guarantee that what they have invested throughout the years will be safeguarded and that if they move to a private corporation owned by this engineering firm from Quebec, that pension package will be protected. If it is not protected, they want to be the ones who will choose the package. Let us give them that choice because they deserve it.

These individuals will be working for a new company. They will be doing the same jobs, probably for the same salaries. Is it not only logical then that the contributions they have made over the years to the pension plan should also be brought with them with some degree of security so that those individuals will know that they and their families will not suffer for the change? It is logical and I would think that every Member of the House would agree with that principle. I think I can safely assume that that is so, because it is only just and fair, but we on this side of the House wonder why the Government would not clarify the situation for those 800 workers.

The Government cannot, simply because it is the Government, change the rules of the game after the game has already begun. It might be different if the Government were to describe the type of package that would be given to new workers. However, the Government simply cannot expect to treat employees, who have been working for this firm for years and years, in a very undignified manner. That is exactly the manner in which the Government is proceeding.

The Government has decided, through a Government amendment, that it will bring in the kind of pension plan that it thinks is right. It cannot do that. The Government is privatizing this company so it should do everything all at once. It should pay attention to each and every aspect of this deal.

What the Government is doing is wrong. There is the suggestion that the Government is interested in some aspects of the deal more than in others. We see that the Government is not concerned with the welfare of 800 families. The Government is not concerned with the investment made by 800 employees. To a certain degree, that is not surprising because we know what the Government thought of pensioners some

### *Canadian Arsenals Limited*

months ago. The Government was prepared, despite the social contract signed by individuals across the country, to undermine and deindex their pensions to a partial degree. The Government was stopped in its effort by the pensioners in conjunction with the opposition Parties. Today the Government is not moving against the pensions of senior citizens but, rather, the pensions of individuals who are still in the prime of their lives. The Government is now attacking working families, and that is wrong. That is why members of my Party can see some merit in the proposal to delay this legislation.

I am not necessarily concerned with the length of time this legislation may be delayed. It could be one year, two years or a month. I am concerned that there be an opportunity for more consideration to be given to this Bill. We want there to be enough time given to this legislation to ensure that the workers and not the multinationals or large engineering firms be protected, because it is the workers who have made the firm attractive to the private sector. That leads me to another point.

The 25 million Canadian shareholders also wish to know the philosophy of the Conservative administration as it concerns Crown corporations. The people are receiving conflicting signals. Only a few short months ago during the de Havilland debate, many Hon. Members rose to say that we needed to sell that Crown corporation, and when they had to scramble for a reason for that because they could not find a very good one, they said that it was somehow losing money. It is not that I agree with that narrow view or that narrow thinking, but if that was their reason for selling de Havilland, a Crown corporation, to private interests, I would think that with some degree of consistency they would look through the same eyeglasses at other Crown corporations. Why is there this double standard?

● (1600)

Canadian Arsenals Limited has consistently shown profits from 1980 to 1985. In 1984-85 it showed profits of \$11.3 million. It has assets of over \$126.4 million and has a cumulative total of \$36 million in profits over the last three years. It also has \$200 million in backlogged orders. The Conservatives have a philosophy which says that they only sell companies that are losing money, as they preached with regard to de Havilland. They did not look at every other issue at which Canadians wanted them to look. They looked at Canadian Arsenals Limited and said that they wanted to sell it. It is a profitable organization and a proud Canadian entity, yet they saw fit to privatize it. The shareholders are basically saying: "Hold on, we want to know what the chief executive officer is thinking and how you will handle such deals in the future".

I see Mr. Speaker signalling that my time is up. I ask Hon. Members to extend my speaking time because I am really getting into the issue and enjoying it.

**An Hon. Member:** No.

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, once again I am pleased to have an opportunity so soon to participate in