

*Supply—Labour*

government of Canada would have been given an adequate time to deal with the problem in a way more compatible with the seriousness of the situation. One wonders indeed if even seven days notice would have been given, if it were not provided for in the collective agreement between the company and the workers.

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

**Mr. MacGuigan:** I will be pleased to take any question at the end of my remarks.

Then there is the question with respect to overtime. Overtime in the Windsor operations of the Ford Motor Company is compulsory. Even at a time when there are not enough jobs for those people employed with Ford—338 have been laid off, and some 600 more will be laid off—the company is able to give extensive overtime to the rest of its workers. This is the reason why I suggest relocation is not the answer. The work is there in Windsor, at the actual plant affected by the layoff. There is work for a great many more men than are presently employed but it is taken up by way of overtime.

This is not of course a question for the government alone; it is a question for all the parties involved. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, that is the final point I would like to make. Matters such as this are not matters for the company alone or for the working force alone. These matters require a tripartite approach, involving the government as the representative of the public, as well as management and labour. We are long past the day when one can speak of management's prerogative to make on short notice fundamental changes which affect, and in some cases greatly impair, the lives of those working for them.

This is not a question which ought to be left to management. It is not a question which ought to be left even to management and the working force. It is a question which concerns the whole public; and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if no solution can be found by way of agreement, if we cannot have co-operative efforts between the three forces involved, then it will very soon be time for us to consider whether or not some solution should be brought forward by legislation. I would hope, although I am not always confident, that the solution would be found by co-operation and negotiation.

I would emphasize the fact that in this age of automation, and even cybernation, the old

[Mr. MacGuigan.]

ways cannot be allowed to go on unhindered by government. I would commend to the minister the changes I have suggested, and hope that the government will act as a party between management and labour in matters such as this.

● (8:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. member a question. In view of his criticism of the Ford Motor Company's rather hasty announcement to lay off these people, and the equally short notice given the government, would he agree with the suggestion made by a number of people that the government should not wait for the Woods report before answering the question about making it mandatory that advance notice be given both to the government and employees about a forthcoming lay-off.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** Mr. Chairman, I would be in favour of awaiting the Woods report. I do not believe this is a matter which can be considered wholly in isolation from the other problems of labour relations. As a result of my knowledge of what the Woods task force is doing, and my knowledge of the people in this task force, I expect a great deal from the report, and I have reason to believe it will be before the house before many more months have passed. I would think that unless the report is delayed long beyond the time when I would expect it, we should be willing to await it before proceeding on this particular matter.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Can the hon. member suggest even one possible argument against this part of the Freedman report that would warrant any rational justification for waiting. I am not suggesting that we have labour legislation in many fields; I am restricting it to this one field on which the hon. member focused his attention in his argument.

**Mr. Lewis:** The report is two years old.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Yes, the report, of course, is two years old. Can the hon. member suggest one argument a rational man might use as a ground for hesitating.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** Had I been in the house at the time the Freedman report was presented I think I would have pressed for its speedy implementation, but now when we are within a month or two of the completion of this report, I think we should wait the additional time. Undoubtedly some action must be taken, but the question is how far one should go,