

iority, they become main contributing factors to this feeling of unrest in relation to the loss of security.

I think it is fair to reveal my own interest. I function, as honourable senators know, in a full-time capacity in the labour movement. I function with the philosophy in my organization that everything must be done in the negotiations in order to effect a contract or settlement.

My personal philosophy is that when a strike takes place it is really no more than a public declaration that, on either side, we are not intelligent enough, or reasonable enough, or fair enough, or mature enough to find a solution. When a strike or lockout takes place it is really a public declaration of that failure.

I have been involved personally in many industry settlements this year. Contrary to all the unrest across the country, which I freely acknowledge, in my own organization we have been successful in making not less than six industry-wide settlements without any work stoppage. It is based on the philosophy that everything must be done to effect a settlement, and a large amount of consideration must be given to the question of job security.

Our best example is in the dairy industry of British Columbia, where we settled the industry contract there a few weeks ago. That makes 53 years of collective bargaining in that industry through that union, without a single day lost as a result of a strike or lockout.

It seems to me that if I had to describe how that came about, I would have to say it has simply been through good aggressive top management on one side, and a similar type of worker representation on the other. Those two parties were primarily concerned for the employee, for the industry, and for the community they serve. In that industry we have gone through technological change, automation, and merger, yet we have been 53 years without losing a single day of work. There are many examples like this in industry throughout the country, and we do not spend much time in talking about them. Nor should we do so. It seems to me that it is fair that we spend our time talking about areas where conflict does exist.

Honourable senators, although the question has been dealt with at some length, it may be timely for me to make a few comments on technological change. A question has been raised about the definition of "technological change" in the legislation, and it has been said it is too broad. I cannot agree with that; if anything, it is not broad enough.

It seems to me that we should simply say that if anything happens in industry that would result in the displacement of large numbers of employees, or a majority of the work force, some instant remedy must be found. Until this time there has been no provision, other than that negotiated directly between trade unions involved and the industries involved.

It should not be overlooked that the legislation would apply only to the organized companies and organized trade unions and that the unorganized work force, which is the large bulk of the work force, being almost 70 per cent of the total, will not have the protection of this legislation. I think the important principle has to be, if a situation is going to develop where workers are going to be replaced and no remedy has been negotiated between the parties, that there must be some very speedy decision-

[Hon. Mr. Lawson.]

making process available to those workers. I think it is fair to state that in 1972 there is no point in talking about denying this remedy to the workers involved, because if large numbers of workers are displaced arbitrarily or unilaterally by an employer or a particular industry, legislation or no, and if there is not a speedy remedy available, those workers will indulge in the sort of self-remedy which we are now witnessing in Montreal. They will simply lay down their tools and close the operation until some fair measure has been applied.

It cannot be the type of shotgun approach where we say, "Well, we are going to retrain them all." We went through that process of retraining large numbers of workers before. We took labourers who had been laid off and retrained them as iron workers. There were no jobs for the iron workers, and so all we succeeded in doing was to increase the educational level of the unemployed. We did not put anybody to work.

We also have to examine the psychological factors involved in respect of people who may be laid off or unemployed in eastern Canada, because they may just not be prepared to move to Ontario, western Canada, or anywhere else to find employment.

These are the kinds of things that have to be considered. But, more specifically, in the provision of the legislation there must be a broad definition. There has to be an easy remedy, by which applications can be made for a determination. From my own experience I am satisfied, whatever type of grievance may arise—whether it is one in respect of technological change or some other type of grievance—that it is a rare occasion that a strike takes place solely because of economic issues, because of the question of wage increases. In most cases in my experience it has been the lack of job security and a rather callous attitude—or perhaps careless attitude, would be a better description—on the part of the employer or industry resulting in long-service employees having their employment terminated without anyone even bothering to check or to care. Away they go. Grievances are left unsettled. Very small grievances are allowed to fester and ferment, and by the time contract time arrives the workers have saved up all their grievances collectively, and these little irritations are the ingredients of a major confrontation and a major strike.

That is why many times you wonder why, in spite of a very generous offer of wage increases and fringe benefits, you still do not get a settlement. That is why you find many times trade union officers recommending settlements and the members rejecting the recommendations. And many times it is because nowhere in the proposal is there any provision for punishing the so-and-so personnel officer or manager who did not take care of the worker's grievance at the time it was very real and important to him.

These are major contributing factors. I agree with Senator Macdonald that the question of unemployment is of very real concern, but if you are also concerned about searching for the major cause of the unrest that is taking place all across Canada today you must look at many of the psychological factors that are involved in the minds of employees—in other words, grievances, real or imagined. I know you must look at these because in my own experi-