

Labour Relations

Ultimately good communications are the essence of good human relations. If each of the parties involved in the bargaining process knows what the other is trying to introduce into the discussions, if the parties talk to one another and listen to one another, if there is a positive attitude of goodwill and good faith, the success of any negotiations is far more likely. This is the only way in which we can overcome our present difficulties. If the work situation is unhappy, collective bargaining in a spirit of good faith is next to impossible.

Perhaps I can close by quoting one of the outstanding leaders in the field of labour relations in Canada, Senator Goldenberg, who said it was clear that the evolution of any new system must command support on a national basis. Just as international treaties do not prevent wars, we find that laws do not necessarily prevent strikes. There are problems in human nature which cannot be solved by law alone.

The dilemma outlined in the motion moved by the hon. member for Kamouraska can only be solved if the government accepts its responsibility by trying to encourage consensus rather than precipitating confrontation. This applies to the whole of the government from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) down, because the right hon. gentleman has been quoted as saying that one of his outstanding traits is that he swims against the stream—he is inclined not to accept accepted opinions. This is no way to establish a consensus, and I trust his colleagues will steer him in the right direction.

[Translation]

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to participate in this debate and congratulate my good friend and colleague, the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne), on the motion he introduced this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, it is an opposition motion that we wished to bring before the House for a long time. Today its importance and its urgency can no longer be ignored. For some time, we have noticed an increase in labour-management disputes in this country. Consequently, our party thought it advisable to draw this House's attention to some suggestions which we feel would result in more harmonious relations between management and labour, above all in fields where profit sharing can be applied.

Mr. Speaker, before coming to the heart of the matter, I want to say that as the time allotted to me is very limited, I shall restrict myself to one aspect of the motion, employee profit sharing, while also referring to the necessity of a labour participation in the development of Canadian business. But before considering this aspect of the motion, it would be appropriate, I think, to review the current situation.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that anybody who actually wants to work in Canada must first of all submit to a union, that is, join a union. In other words, he must pay monthly dues. In Quebec, it is called the Rand formula, but in fact they are union dues. We really believe that compulsory union freedom, established by the provincial legislatures in Canada, goes against the Canadian bill of rights. Therefore, it seems natural that the people are entitled to demand the abolishment of the compulsory

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

check-offs; otherwise, it is clearly a serious breach of the worker's freedom of non-association and, in the end, the security of this country is greatly threatened by the power of union leaders.

We have no objection to workers being free to belong or not to unions. What we really want, is that they remain free. On the other hand, we oppose what is now happening. Because, in our view, when one feels compelled to pay dues to some union, although it does not fulfill one's objectives, this is highly similar to the franchise in communist countries.

If we are really intent on upholding private enterprise and on giving back their freedom to workers in the process, in order that the people be finally assured of having at all times the services they are entitled to, there must be an immediate end to the Rand formula of compulsory check-offs now in use in Quebec.

According to a Canadian Institute of Public Opinion survey published in *The Citizen*, of May 3rd, a majority of the people are in favour of a curtailment of strikes. Most Canadians, that is 56 per cent, wish that strikes be forbidden in essential services.

● (2020)

Approximately a third of the people, or 34 per cent, feel they should not be prevented, and 10 per cent have no opinion. Those figures are almost unchanged from a similar survey conducted in 1972, although our economy is faced with labour conflicts.

If I remember correctly, at that time some 57 per cent of the people felt that public service employees should not be allowed to strike. And further back in 1969, the figures were approximately the same.

Indeed, I read on March 5 in the *Montreal Star* that a survey by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion indicated that 37 per cent of the people were severely hit by strikes in the three preceding months, either in their jobs or in their lives.

If we start with the fact that in Canada, there are now approximately 14 million adults, we can see that more than 5 million Canadians have had to reduce in some way their standard of living. Now, if we glance at the number of man-days lost because of strikes or lock-outs, we can see that Canada would hold first place for this doubtful distinction in the western world if it were not for Italy.

This is not very reassuring if we consider that by the end of the present year, the economic rate of growth in Italy will probably have gone down by 3.9 per cent from 1973. In 1973, 5,776,140 man-days were lost, while in 1974, the grand total of man-days lost was 9,255,120 days. If we go further, from 1901 to 1970, an average of 1,332,740 man-days were lost. From 1946 to 1970, there was an average of 2,527,410 man-days lost, and from 1960 to 1970, the grand total was 3,351,490 man-days lost.

We can therefore note, Mr. Speaker, that these figures clearly show the dramatic increase in the number of man-days lost because of strikes or lock-outs. Despite the very high number of man-days lost in 1970, the average from 1901 to 1970 is just over one million. This is due to the fact the number of man-days lost during the last year is extremely high compared with that of the previous year.