

*United Aircraft*

receive a record that Johnny So-and-So was indeed a very bad boy, an incorrigible. And so the teacher already had the answer to all the questions before he ever dealt with that child in class. That system is not supposed to be in force any more.

It is considered bad, really bad, to have that information which is secret and unavailable to the person concerned, but it is equally bad if you reveal the information which makes it no longer secret, because people make judgments that are not the judgment that teachers made when they wrote that correspondence.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** So Johnny So-and-So became a Liberal M.P.!

**Mr. MacFarlane:** I can give another example. As a dean working in the students' area in university I know I quickly came to this conclusion with respect to the loaning of student finances from the university. Sometimes I found it very necessary to make notes on paper which would indicate what the problem was, whether it was something that existed at home, whether it was something that existed in the person's own life, whether it was of a moral character, or whether it was of a criminal nature. It really was a very incorrect thing for me to put that on the correspondence file for someone else to read it at a different time, and in a different way.

● (1750)

Indeed, I remember that at the end of each year I would destroy each and every such file personally, leaving only a record for the accountant of what was owed, be it \$300, \$450 or whatever, because somebody else reading what I wrote at that time, reading what my assessment was, would not read my comments in the same light, or have the same information that I had. So this kind of privileged correspondence is important. Certain things are said in relation to the events at the time.

I think the time has come, if we are to get along in the field of industrial labour relations, when we must think of companies within the corporate image as a corporate family. Companies, in the same way as labour unions, are people, not inanimate objects. Their character can be smeared. They can be set up for attack by people, and maligned if what is stated in one simple sentence is extracted and presented in the wrong way.

Therefore I am proud to associate myself with those who have spoken against the production of these papers. However, I am also pleased to associate myself with concern for the workers along with the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, who I know is sincere. But like the person who calls for another person's record to clear that person, sometimes the presentation of the record is detrimental to the parties concerned.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please. The hon. member is rising to ask a question. Would the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain allow a question?

**Mr. MacFarlane:** No, Madam Speaker; I never open my mouth in front of self-styled experts.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. J.-J. Blais (Nipissing):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join in the last comments addressed by the hon. member for Hamilton-Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), when he refers to his interest in labour relations. I also want to join in the compassion expressed by both the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain and the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby concerning the problem at United Aircraft in Longueuil. This problem has lasted too long and I want to endorse the desire of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby to see the end of this dispute.

Unfortunately, I do not think I can agree with the motion presented by the hon. member. Obviously, he tried very hard to find a justification for the production of the papers but, Madam Speaker, he has not been able, to, because the papers he was asking for contain information which he claims he has already obtained from the minister.

[*English*]

You will recall, Madam Speaker, that the two main arguments that were made by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby were, first that he supposes that the correspondence between United Aircraft and I.T. and C. would indicate some pressure coming from I.T. and C. with reference to labour matters; secondly, that the contract which there allegedly was between I.T. and C. and United Aircraft would contain a prohibition preventing United Aircraft from transferring work from Canada into its United States plants.

With all due respect to the hon. member, so far as those two arguments are concerned he already has the information. He asked a question in the House of the minister regarding whether there was any correspondence that referred to the labour matter, and he was given a reply that implied that it was none of the business of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) what the labour relations might be between the workers at Longueuil and United Aircraft.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is very conscious of the jurisdictional obligations of the federal government, much more so than the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, who evidently does not understand that when there are labour conflicts between workers in a province and a company within that province, those relations must be dealt with by legislation enacted by the provincial legislature. Effectively the conflict at United Aircraft is one involving workers who are completely within the province of Quebec and a company that operates within the province of Quebec; ergo the whole problem is one that falls within that jurisdiction.

When we were debating Bill C-32 we heard a lot clamouring from that corner of the House about protecting provincial jurisdiction. One of their Saskatchewan members said that the federal government was poking its nose into provincial jurisdiction and matters that did not concern it. I am amazed that the leader of that party should attempt to stick his nose into something that does not concern him, and which does not concern the members of this House.