

*Supply—Labour*

of our country has a just degree of equity and fairness for all concerned.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think that the words the Minister of Labour as he presented his estimates are ones that all of us must bear in mind. We must be prepared, as he said, to face clearly the disruptive forces that technological change creates and be prepared to take measures to make sure that the burden of this change is one which is shared in an equitable way by all the community and not merely by the workers concerned. In the long run, as I have said, the new engine plant of Ford at Windsor, in my opinion, is a development which will be of benefit to the community and to the workers concerned. It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that what would ordinarily be considered a favourable announcement by the community and the country was marred by lack of attention to the problems which this change would create in the short run for the workers who are in the plant which is now going to be converted. We must face up to the human problems of technological change if we want to make sure that such change will be of benefit to our country.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I will be very brief because I see the minister would like to answer. I should like to put a few questions to the hon. member who just spoke, since he was courteous enough to state that he would answer. My first question relates to his comments about an advance industry like the Ford Motor Company. Such a company knows well in advance when it is going to be laying off people. This is not a rhetorical question on my part. I am quite sure that in an area like Windsor, as in Oshawa from which I come, these questions are considered from a sociological point of view. In the latter part of the summer people from school go to work for this company and within three months they are thrown out. Does the hon. member think that perhaps we no longer can rely upon moral persuasion but should do two things: first of all, we should require the companies to give some indication when they hire people how long they are likely to be employed. There has to be some flexibility in this matter, obviously. Second, I should like to repeat the question I asked the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville: Would he be in favour now of the implementation of that recommendation in the Freedman report which refers to compulsory information being provided by companies, both to governments and employees, well in advance of lay-offs?

**Mr. Gray:** Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has raised a very important point. It is my impression that many of those to whom he refers were hired in August by Ford actually to take the place of people who were retiring in the normal course of retirement schemes. They were filling existing places in the company rather than some special expansion. It seems to me the company either should have been more forthcoming with them as to their prospects for continued employment or if, for what the company considered to be compelling reasons they could not be, the company should be willing now to do more to assist them in adjusting to the burden.

In so far as the Freedman report is concerned, I think that my approach is basically similar to that expressed by the Minister of Labour. The philosophy of the Freedman report is one which I accept. Certainly there is room for more to be done by governments to make sure that the governments themselves and the workers concerned are more aware of changes in plans by companies which could affect the workers and affect the entire country. I think in this discussion if we are going to be fair and frank with those who are following our words, we should be sure to make clear just what, under our existing constitutional structure, lies within the jurisdiction of the various levels of government. Perhaps there will be other occasions when we will be able to discuss this, and I think there will be. I think we should make clear just what the limits are under the present labour relations jurisdiction of the federal government to compel moves of this type in industries which are not completely within federal jurisdiction in all aspects of labour relations.

One may wish that our constitution had evolved somewhat differently in this regard, but we have to deal with the situation as it is. Therefore, to conclude my response to the hon. member's question, which I think was a most useful question, I feel we have to make sure that in discussing these matters in this house and outside we do not inadvertently give the impression that this level of government, for example, can do things which under our present constitutional set-up the courts have decided, rightly or wrongly—perhaps wrongly—we do not have authority to do. We should seek most actively to implement the philosophy of the Freedman report along the line suggested by the Minister of Labour, to the fullest extent of our federal jurisdiction.