

• (2220)

a change in the manner in which the employer carries on the work, undertaking or business that is directly related to the introduction of that equipment or material.

This we are told is a definition of "technological change" for the purposes of this act, which the Parliament of Canada is asked to endorse. I say it is absurd. This would mean that if an employer found it necessary during the course of a contract, or during the course of his work, to seek a new supplier, new material of some kind because other material was not available, and he had to change his methods to some degree to cope with that new material—which is something that happens over and over again in business—that, by this act, would be technological change. It would be subject to the imposition of this whole cumbersome business. I ask honourable senators to read that definition very carefully. I say that anybody who has the least knowledge of science, technology or both, or science policy, would say that it is hard to think of a more absurd definition of technological change than that found in clause 149, subclause (1), paragraphs (a) and (b). This kind of looseness of definition is the sort of thing that, in my view, the Senate should have something to say about. It may be just bad draftsmanship. It may be another case of casting the net so wide that anybody you want will be brought in to your bureaucratic cumbersome procedure; but, whichever it is, I say it is bad legislation.

If it is desirable, as no doubt it is, to have in this act a definition of technological change, surely somebody should have looked up the definition in a dictionary or in some of the current works where there are scores of good definitions of technological change to be found. This certainly is not one. If it appeared in a paper or in a scientific work it would be laughed at; and it deserves to be laughed at, even if it is presented to us in a proposed bill of Parliament.

Senator Manning, on the positive side, made the very important point that if there is anything Canada needs today more than anything else in its economy it is incentives to technological change. Here we have a horrendous piece of disincentive to technological change.

I am aware that Senator Goldenberg said, "Oh, no. I don't believe that this in any way is going to retard technological change." Surely he was not serious.

Honourable senators, I will not go step-by-step through the cumbersome load imposed by this act. I will not take the time tonight, but I can assure senators it is a cumbersome load. It says, in effect, that two situations can arise after collective agreement has been reached by both sides, signed, sealed and delivered. For the moment I will not deal with the prior exceptions concerning what could happen in the original collective bargaining agreement, but if technological change is proposed during the lifetime of the agreement, two situations can arise. The employer can give notice to the bargaining agent on the other side. I might say I am surprised to find that the bill seems to assume there is only one bargaining agent because it seems always to refer to the bargaining agent on the one side. At any rate, if he gives notice, the trade union can take certain steps. The effect of those, without any decision by anybody, is to determine that the proposed tech-

nological change comes under the act whether or not it would affect the job security of anybody. Before any decision is taken the whole intent of technological change is held up and cannot be proceeded with. If the employer does not give notice, almost the same thing happens.

As I read the act there can be no doubt that the effect of clauses 149 to 153 is to stop, immediately, any proposal of technological change, defined as widely as it is in clause 149, subclause (1), paragraphs (a) and (b). I say this is an absurd disincentive to technological change at a time when we need technological change more than perhaps any other major innovation in our economic policy.

I want to refer again for a moment to one or two of the points made by Senator Goldenberg. I should like to say to him that so far as I am aware the opponents of the clauses in the bill are not opposed to job security. Surely it must be clear that employers have every bit as much interest in job security as employees. It has been said, of course, that the private enterprise system works at times in a manner that separates people from their jobs. Senator Manning said that we have made provision for this situation. We accept it as inevitable.

We have, of course, an unemployment insurance scheme. It is regrettable that at one point not very long ago—I think the date was December 31 last year—690,000 Canadians were receiving unemployment insurance. The very fact that we have unemployment insurance surely indicates that separation from jobs at times is inevitable for some part of the population.

I know Senator Goldenberg will say that he was referring to an employee who has spent many years of his life in one job and now finds that that job is redundant. Admittedly, that is a real problem. But I would say to Senator Goldenberg, to anybody who really believes that this bill is going to do what Senator Goldenberg thinks it is going to do, that surely the important thing in the long run is the totality of jobs that the Canadian economy provides in relation to the totality of the labour force. Surely it is axiomatic that if we are to reach full employment, whatever that may be—3 per cent or 4 per cent unemployment—we must have more and more incentives to technological change, and, as Senator Manning has said, much better provision than we now have in the Unemployment Insurance Act, in Adult Re-training—which has been a colossal failure for the reasons given by Senator Manning and, indeed, for other reasons. Surely we must have a better answer than to say, "Let us stop technological change; let us impede it; let us provide, for the first time in our history, disincentives to technological change!"

• (2230)

I have and I always have had the utmost sympathy for the position of organized labour in insisting on its rights under collective bargaining. In Canada we have, I believe, established a distinguished record, one that despite a few minor differences here and there is comparable with the best in the world, and I am not excluding the Scandinavian countries when I say that. And we have achieved this by enshrining, on both sides, the sanctity of the concept of a bargain, for that is the word—it is a "collective bargain"—"a collective agreement."