

As long as we fail to replace the system of adversary confrontation by a completely different approach based on genuine cooperation, the bad faith stirred by economic conflicts will continue to be a sad reality. Management and unions will still be paralyzed by bitter conflicts which are only the logical result of a tense and quarrelsome atmosphere surrounding many collective bargainings. Nobody wants to yield; everyone wants to win. It is like the game of tug of war: the stronger wins, the winner takes all.

Considering the drastic changes occurring in our society, we should ask ourselves whether the present system of collective bargaining can really enable us to establish economic and dynamic social justice. The Woods task force stated it quite clearly and I quote:

Over the years an increasingly complicated range of issues has found its way onto the bargaining table. The introduction of elaborate fringe benefit schemes, especially in the health, welfare and pension fields, and intricate job and income security arrangements, have forced the parties into more sophisticated relationship requiring something beyond crisis bargaining.

According to Dean Woods and his colleagues, unions and management have failed to adapt the new technology to make work a more enriching activity of man. They insist that this regrettable failure is partly due to the fact that "unions and collective bargaining were not designed to handle problems growing out of the nature of work itself". The authors of the Woods report have expressed a sound criticism, and I quote:

Unions do not seem to have recognized the magnitude of the problem. Organized labour has long talked about alienation from work, but its answer seems to have been to ensure workers more generous pay to compensate for their frustrating life on the job with a good life off the job. This has not and will not solve the problem and overtime will likely become an increasingly ineffectual and expensive palliative.

It is obvious that we must interest the worker in his job. There are various means at our disposal to achieve that purpose. A few months ago the government was prepared to provide fairly large amounts of money to union organizations and it was inclined to do it—I have the statement before me to prove it—and actually accepted the idea. If that is the case, we must see to it that this money is properly spent and we must recognize at the same time that there is a genuine need for education among workers and the employer and we must also have those who are doing any kind of work understand that they must interest themselves in their job, what are the results expected from them and the reason why such a work has to be done.

So, if we insist upon maintaining an attitude which has existed for so long, we will continue to face situations which are often impossible and which require backward legislation such as the one which has just been introduced.

● (2032)

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I will quote an article which appeared in *La Presse* of Montreal quite some time ago now but which is still of current interest. The article is dated June 3, 1972, and is entitled "The freedom of others". And I think that we must consider the freedom of others. It is fine to be

Postal Service

free, it is highly commendable but one must respect the freedom of others. And several examples are mentioned in that article which should bring those who love their own freedom to consider also the freedom of others.

We are witnesses to a strange situation as we enter the post-industrial age. We notice that the freedom of some may at times destroy that of others. One also notices that certain freedoms do not yet exist. The individual worker enjoys the right to join a union but not the right not to do so.

I have already spoken on that issue. One has to join a union because he is compelled to do so, he has to pay his dues but he has no right to get out of it. This is a point which I have already discussed to some extent in this House.

There is no freedom either to choose a union other than the one which is certified to the management.

Furthermore a newsman may for instance break his employment contract because of an ideological orientation change on the part of his employer but he has no right to withdraw from a labour union for the same reason.

This is somewhat pertinent to the circumstances where there are strikes in newspapers as is the case in the province of Quebec.

Hospital workers have the right to strike but when they do exercise that right, they jeopardize the lives of patients who have the basic right to receive attentive and intensive care. Civil servants have the right to strike but when they exercise that right they are depriving elderly people, pensioners and people on welfare of their right to receive in due time a cheque which is eagerly awaited.

Air Canada's controllers and technicians have the right to strike but when they do, they do so to the detriment of an essential right of the residents of the Arctic which is to receive supplies. They were almost responsible for the death of a child because a rare serum could not be forwarded by plane.

Teachers have the right to strike but when they do, they are depriving children of their essential right to uninterrupted and worry-free education.

Postal workers have the right to strike but when they do, they deny the population an essential service, thereby inflicting a serious prejudice to many businesses depending on the mail for their daily operations.

One should never forget that the right to live for each and everyone of us stems from a natural right and that it must take precedence over the right to strike.

[English]

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am going to take part for a few moments in this debate. At the outset I want to say how pleased I was to listen to the speech made by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). I think he has done a tremendous job in attempting—to the extent one can from this side of the House—to bring the parties together in what has been an ongoing and deteriorating situation between workers in the postal service and the Treasury Board.

The situation has reached the point where postal workers in Canada do not trust the Treasury Board, do not believe in the Treasury Board, do not find it responsive; and the Treasury Board has taken the same view that the post office management has taken of the union. Collective bargaining is adversary by nature, but if it is to be effective it must be based on some trust, some understanding and some communication. The fact of the matter is that communication has broken down. If we are ever to get rid of the problem and keep the postal service