

Not long ago I heard over the radio or TV that there had been 155 strikes in the Province of Quebec this year. There are still strikes that have not been settled, especially that of Air Canada.

I find that this bill may have a different interpretation. In fact, in the explanatory notes "stevedores" are mentioned. On the other hand, in the bill the definition of "multi-employer employment" is not clear, and there is nothing in the bill which mentions that it applies only to stevedores. It should apply also to employees of the chartered banks—

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): It might; that is true.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: In fact, honourable colleagues will admit that it would apply to all classes of employment which could be compared according to the relationship of employer and employee—to the shipping industry, the banking business, or to the railways, or anything else. Therefore, we have in this legislation provisions that apply to the whole labour world, and it is described as innocuous. I cannot agree to that, especially when we have to deal with trade unions as they are now, when the leaders of the unions are so exacting, and when there is in the House of Commons a piece of legislation which would allow the civil servants to strike.

Permission was given by the previous government of the Province of Quebec to strike, and many strikes are occurring there. There is always the threat of a strike in the public service.

I have been interested in labour all my life. At one time when there were 800 railway employees, some working on the trains, others in shops, I had to work for them, I had to do the work of the union leaders and I had to travel from Moncton to Toronto for the defence of the rights of the railway employees. That is known especially by all the railway employees east of Montreal. The union leaders smoked big cigars and wore big gold watch chains, and they were eating continually.

At one time a former union leader had an appointment by Mr. Mackenzie King to a position in the service. He did not call himself a civil servant; he was a public servant. He was eating all the time. If I went to a restaurant and saw him, he would be munching all the time, so much so that I said to Mr. King, "If you appoint him again, put him near a cafeteria so as to satisfy his hunger." I will not give you his name because he is dead and he must be with the blessed ones in the great au-delà.

I spoke to Humphrey Mitchell who was then Minister of Labour. At the time of the Ford strike in Windsor, men were coming to Parliament to canvass, in spite of regulations. However, I met a group of nice fellows and I said to them, "Do you think it is the best thing to do to come to me and to speak over the head of your leader?" I repeated that and they said there was something in it. That is true. The people who belong to unions do not always agree with what is said by their leaders, because they are free men and free women, but they belong to an organization which is supposed to help them.

Why is freedom famous and extolled by all the labour unions? It is that a man who works somewhere is free not to belong to any union or in a closed shop. He is free provided he pays his dues. The Rand formula means freedom for a worker to pay union dues if he does not belong to the union. Everybody knows that.

To conclude what I have to say in the friendliest manner, one of the unions said that they were sending observers to see what we are doing in the Senate and in the House of Commons, to see what Parliament is doing and to check up on us. They would be welcome, and if they came here and attended a sitting of this house or one of our committees they would be greatly surprised to see the quantity of work being performed by the Senate. The same applies to the House of Commons. I have no power of attorney to speak for you, but I myself invite here all union leaders and all of those who belong to unions, especially the working men who are not on the executive, upon one condition, that they do not make false reports of what is being done and said here.

If they cannot come, they have only to subscribe to *Hansard*, which records our debates faithfully. They should read *Hansard* of both houses and the reports of committees of both houses. However, they must not have a false impression of what we are doing here.

Union leaders are not the only ones who look after the affairs of labour. Many men I know and respect are friends of labour and never miss an opportunity to defend the rights of labour, even when they are abandoned by the union leaders.

Honourable colleagues, you may ask all the employees on the trains, the conductors, the brakemen, the men who look after the cars, and the employees of the express companies, if they have friends who are not the heads of their unions, and they will answer that there