

*Canada Labour Code*

shall determine those wishes as of the date of the making of the application or as of such other date as the Board considers appropriate.

I fail to grasp the purpose of that section and I must say this in defence of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) who was very active in the examination of the amendments to the Canada Labour Code. But I have the impression, Mr. Speaker, that something must have escaped him. The new Canada Labour Code significantly promotes unionization and the hon. member himself stated that earlier. Unfortunately there are many people who have not yet caught up with our times and find that the new Canada Labour code practically allows 100 per cent of people to be organized into trade unions. That is not the purpose of the Canada Labour Code. What is the purpose of the Canada Labour Code? It is to try to have orderly industrial relations because there are not strictly only unions and employers. There are not only bad employers; there can be bad unions.

You just have to look at the amendments which have been made and the hon. member for Nickel Belt is well aware of this. A year and a half ago we introduced a 14-point program to improve relations between unions and employers and to educate employees and employers so that they would stop tearing at each other. It was decided, Mr. Speaker, to create a committee where everyone would have his figures, which means data from the union and data from the employer, so that they might be compared, and that committee would help improve relations.

What has been done for the education of Canadian workers? What has been done about grants to labour bodies without any requirement on the educational program they should provide? I think the program which has been established has considerably improved the knowledge of labour issues and therefore paved the way for better and wider acceptance of unionization.

Mr. Speaker, we have just passed those amendments. There were and still are disputes. Very shortly, a large portion of the bill will be proclaimed and we were not afraid, Mr. Speaker, to deal in the Labour Code with the problem of the first collective agreement. It was decided that once and for all the problem should be solved. So what happened, Mr. Speaker? We said: when the Canada Labour Relations Board certifies a union, when a union negotiates in good faith and an employer also negotiates in good faith and it ends up with a lockout or a strike, we simply say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister may intervene to ask the Canada Labour Relations Board to appoint an arbitrator to settle the dispute. That, Mr. Speaker, increases both the strength of a union and the extent of unionization, which is the purpose of Bill C-223.

I fail to understand the philosophy behind Bill C-223 where it speaks specifically of 20 per cent of employees. Is that being militant? It is all well and good to have a union, but members must take an active part in their union.

[Mr. Olivier.]

Mr. Speaker, I spent nine years in the labour world. I was president of a union for eight years. I was treasurer of a federation representing 95,000 union members. But officers must try and help members to participate in the management of their federation.

The problem with the hon. member for Nickel Belt, Mr. Speaker, is that he thinks he speaks the whole truth and nothing but, and that everybody else is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, he is always long-winded in the House. He would like to speak day after day to say what? That is the problem.

On the other hand, if these laws are in effect, by what party were they brought before the House? Who is responsible for the structures within which central labour congresses are powerful in the country? Which party did that? It is surely not the New Democratic Party, because it has never been in power. It is a highbrow party, but the problem is that the workers must foot the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy for the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) to try to blast the amendments which constitute, and rightly so, a renewal in union circles nowadays.

Mr. Speaker, I heard a while ago the hon. member for Nickel Belt tell us that a right-wing wind was blowing among the unions. Well, I fail to understand that. Either he has not stepped out of the House of Commons for a long long time or he has not taken part for ages in a union meeting. He will realize that unions are not going to take it lying down, that they are much more active than they used to be and that they are far from encouraging a shift towards the right.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt is telling us that our trade unions are too far to the right but I suggest he is insulting them. I think that the hon. member for Nickel Belt does not like to be told the truth. He does not like to be told what to do on subjects he deals with or interprets in his own way. As usual!

Mr. Speaker, trade unions in Canada have no lesson to take from the hon. member for Nickel Belt on how to manage their unions. If he finds they lean too much to the right, he could tell them so but I have the impression that the president of the CLC will tell him to mind his own business. I suspect that the president of the CNTU would tell him also to mind his own business.

I find that really amusing. He speaks to us of unionism and does not seem to know anything at all about it. Had he attended a union meeting, he would have learned something about it, at least at the meetings of the Confederation of National Trade Unions. I was reading again articles in *La Presse* which made front page headlines after a major conflict where, on the contrary, unions were called groups of communists. I cannot understand what is going on. Either the hon. member for Nickel Belt has a hard time understanding the situation, or else he does not want to understand.