

put it in another plant and leave the workers out of a job. This should not be done and I ask you to help us. The plant is noted for closing other plants after 15-20 years production, putting elderly employees out of work without a liveable pension.

I do hope you will speak on these matters in the House. It is the future of all Canadians.

Many industries in Canada are seasonal in nature. Therefore, when an employee is hired he knows what the job will be and whether it will be of short duration. This is where Bill C-20 should apply. Down through the years the trade unions of this nation have tried to take care of the problem of lay-offs by collective bargaining, but it must be stressed that barely a third of all Canadian wage and salary earners are members of trade unions. While a number of non-unionists are covered by collective agreements, the total thus protected probably falls well short of 50 per cent of the employed work force. Whether the workers need it or not, at least half of all wage and salary earners have no protection other than that stemming from individual agreements, common law and provincial legislation. It amazes me that according to a study of all Canadian industries in the year 1968, only 40 per cent of agreements—39 per cent of employees—had a lay-off provision, and 23 per cent of agreements or 19 per cent of employees specified a period of seven days or less.

We have been told that United States industries have an investment in our country of over \$50 billion. Mr. Speaker, that is a large sum of money. Why did they make that huge investment in this country? I believe they looked at the opportunity to invest and make money on our natural resources. We, as Canadians, are glad they are here because they have created thousands of jobs for Canadians. But one of the main reasons they are here is that our wage structure is much lower than that in the United States. Now that the workers of this nation have organized to try and obtain better wages to enjoy their own Canadian way of life, many of these companies have decided that it would be cheaper for them to shut down their Canadian plants and transfer the work to their parent plants. Canadian law should not permit this to happen. Many of these companies were given incentives to locate in various areas of Canada. Therefore, they have an obligation to the areas in which they are located to help stabilize the employment there. These companies should be made to provide compensation to their workers who lose their jobs through no fault of their own.

In this age of automation it often happens that a particular job is eliminated by machinery or the closing of an industry, which can cause loss of seniority and other rights. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that these machines do not buy homes, cars, furniture or the weekly groceries. They contribute nothing to the church or to the various charities. They contribute nothing to our way of life other than to take away a man's livelihood. Also, they pay no taxes and no union dues. Every time there is a strike, the management of these large companies try to think of ways to eliminate jobs by the introduction of machines. I believe they all should have a responsibility to the area in which they are located, to make certain

#### *Canada Labour (Standards) Code*

that their employees are not forced out on the street to end up on welfare.

Public benefits to qualified workers through unemployment insurance were also intended to assist the displaced worker through the period in which he might be without work. In recent years, through collective bargaining the concepts of severance pay and the availability of unemployment insurance have been merged in a variety of ways. Workers who are laid off, with or without the expectation that the lay-off will be of a permanent nature, are also realizing in cash or in vested rights and fringe benefits that which they stand to lose, together with compensation for wages lost. Traditional severance pay plans provide a cash settlement in a lump sum or in instalments to workers whose employment has been terminated. I recall that during the time of conversion of the railways from steam to diesel, thousands of workers were laid off by both railways. They did not receive any severance pay but were very fortunate to have paid into the unemployment insurance plan so that they were eligible to draw benefits.

The prime purpose of supplemental unemployment benefit plans is to provide weekly allowances to workers on lay-offs in order to supplement unemployment compensation. Usually, the lay-off is not considered permanent, that is, both the employer and the employee expect the worker to be recalled to the job. Unlike traditional severance pay plans, supplementary unemployment benefits are paid only if the worker is unemployed. Under the auto pact, transitional assistance benefits—in short, TAB—were set up by the federal government when the Canada-U.S. auto trade agreement was signed. Its purpose is to assist workers who lose their jobs as a direct result of the agreement which set out to consolidate auto and auto parts production in the two countries.

TAB and unemployment insurance benefits together range from 62 per cent, plus an additional 2½ per cent plus an additional 2½ per cent for each dependent to a maximum of 75 per cent of an employee's previous earnings. The maximum may not exceed 65 per cent of the weekly average of both wages and salaries for the industry as a whole. An employee is eligible for TAB if he has worked in the industry for 16 weeks in the previous 52 weeks, and he receives one week of benefits for every two weeks worked in the previous year. There is a maximum period of 52 weeks. Benefits are to augment unemployment insurance benefits if they lapse while the employee is still entitled to TAB. The weekly TAB payment will then be increased to offset the loss.

Mr. Speaker, this is excellent protection and should be extended to all industries in the nation so that we can eliminate some of the constant worries of people who could be laid off through a general slackening in the business world. We should try to gear our country to full employment, but in the event of slowdowns in the economy the workers of the nation need protection against the interruption of their work week patterns.

As we move ahead into the 1970's we all have much to do to try and increase the benefits of the working people