

Supply

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Is there unanimous consent to the proposal made by the Hon. Member?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Dauphin-Swan River (Mr. Lewycky)—Multiculturalism—Proposal to establish research centres. (b) Request for establishment of western regional centre; the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman)—Olympic Games—Selection of alpine sports teams; the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—National Defence—Finding of sexual harassment in Department.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 62—TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Ms. Mitchell:

That this House endorse a program to be incorporated into the forthcoming budget that will:

1. provide for employee consultation in the introduction of technological change;
2. provide flexible work arrangements to minimize job losses;
3. ease the impact on the employees affected by technological change by having the corporate sector pay a fairer-share of the costs through longer prenotification periods and improved severance pay;
4. expand the necessary retraining programs; and
5. encourage technological changes that promote new products, industries and jobs.

Hon. Bill Jarvis (Perth): Mr. Speaker, as may have been evident from questions I put to the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) who commenced this debate, I have some trouble both technically and substantively with this motion. I hope those questions were not interpreted as implying that the issues raised by the Hon. Member are not important and ones certainly worthy of debate in the House, because if that implication was left, I hasten to withdraw it. I sincerely believe that some of the issues raised in the motion

are not only worthy of debate but demand debate and indeed direction at all levels of government.

I might indicate that I have four areas of concern with respect to the motion. It was framed in such a way as to indicate that budgetary provisions would hopefully be forthcoming from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) to deal with five separate items. I have no trouble understanding how a budget could deal with the necessity to expand retraining programs, which is the fourth point in the motion, or to encourage technological change that promotes new products, industries and jobs, which is the fifth point in the motion. On the other hand, I have serious trouble in understanding how a budget could deal effectively with points one through three in the motion.

My second concern is much more substantive. It was alluded to by the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) a few moments ago. That concern is that we attempt to put into legislation what would legitimately be contained in a collective agreement. Frankly, I am in complete accord with the Hon. Member for Lincoln when he said that we cannot legislate a good collective agreement, because there remains the basic responsibility of the employer on the one hand and the employee on the other to arrive at a mutually satisfactory collective agreement. Therefore, particularly when I, as have many of my colleagues who have been around here any length of time, have been either called back or, in the course of my business, have had to deal with emergency legislation that we generally call back-to-work legislation, that has always deeply troubled me. I am the first to recognize at certain times it is in the national interests that we in this House must interfere with the normal collective bargaining process. I greatly regret that we are put into that uncomfortable and unsatisfactory position, but from time to time it is necessary. To me it is even worse, given that unwelcome situation, that we are put in the position in effect of writing a collective agreement here on the floor of the House of Commons. Frankly, I do not believe we are suited, equipped, trained nor do we have the inclination to write a collective agreement on the floor of the House of Commons. Therefore, points one and two of the motion deeply disburbs me. To me there is a clear indication, and I hope I do not do my NDP colleagues an injustice, that the NDP would have, for example, the Canada Labour Code amended to provide for employee consultation in the introduction of technological change, in other words, in a compulsory sense. I see some nodding in agreement. I have absolutely no concern about providing a reasonable framework within which the parties can negotiate collectively, none whatsoever. But to provide obligatory measures causes me deep concern. Even more so with point number two which reads:

● (1720)

—provide flexible work arrangements to minimize job losses.

This would indicate to me that we are being urged to legislate work sharing. Work sharing itself concerns me very much because I can see that rather than its being used as a tool to deal with the very immediate and serious economic and social problems, work sharing may become a system where a