

maintain the differential." We are going through rapid change in this country and all the gnashing of teeth and wringing of hands will not prevent changes from taking place.

● (1650)

I say to those who suggest instant answers to these problems through legislation or other means that they are either naïve or foolish. Over my years in the House I have heard at one time or another the whole range of fantasy from compulsory arbitration to an industrial disputes commission. If solutions are to be developed, they will have to be developed by the social partners, labour and management, acting in unison with government. Only in this way, through participation, can we achieve the commitment to make policies work. It is for this reason that we are in the process of establishing a tripartite type of council to cope with the problems now besetting us and which will intensify in the next decade. I have high hopes for this council, but let me sound a note of warning. The adversary nature of our industrial relations system, which has been fostered since the days when working men had to meet secretly to discuss their conditions of employment, will not be dissipated overnight.

It would be premature to speculate on what the council will deal with, but among the things it may well turn its attention to is the creation of an independent research institute which would be the source of reliable and generally accepted data on which the parties could agree as the basis for negotiation.

Another area where experimentation is long overdue is that of industrial democracy and job satisfaction. I am glad to note that my colleague, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey), plans to give the concept of workers' management a trial in the Post Office. I wish him every success and trust this will be the beginning of a new era in labour relations.

I see in these initiatives the prospect of getting at the root causes of the labour unrest which the motion decries. What we have to do is to provide the stimulus, the framework and the resources which will enable the practitioners themselves to alter their thinking, their traditions, their bargaining structures. At the last meeting of the tripartite council I attended, I was mightily impressed by the tremendous enthusiasm of both labour and management, the determination to get on with the work of the council and give it the time and resources necessary to get on with this type of job because they fully realize the challenges which must be met if we are to maintain a free, collective bargaining system which we all value so highly.

**Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) for introducing this motion into the House at this time. That is about as much as I have favourably to say about what he said. He has introduced the matter at an important time. I must say his interpretation of the Rand formula going back to 1946 pretty well left me astounded, because he does not seem to have understood the difference between a closed shop and a union shop. To say, as he said, that he rejects dues payments that would be irrevocable, or what he calls compulsory—which is called the agency shop in the

### *Labour Relations*

United States—and to say he is all for dues being voluntary, is just to say what the management of the United Aircraft plant was saying at Longueuil—now Pratt and Whitney—to the workers there.

I do not think he would say that to the medical profession or the legal profession, and so on, who would not accept into their ranks, into their types of unions, people who would only voluntarily contribute to the good of that union. Mr. Justice Rand, in his famous decision in the UAW case in 1946, pointed out that workers who do not belong to a union and insist there be freedom of decision on their part nevertheless have to recognize that the union is a group working on behalf of the workers, and as such gets certain benefits through the collective bargaining process and these benefits redound to the benefit of everyone in the bargaining unit, so workers who do not want to join the union must at least pay union dues if they are to get the benefits the union provides. In trying to bring about a compromise, he said it is unquestionably right for the people who do not want to belong to a union to be protected, but at the same time they must make a contribution in terms of union dues since they will get the benefit of the work of the union acting as an agency on behalf of all the workers.

Some hon. members know about the compulsory arbitration system under Australian labour courts and tribunals that has been tried, and I for one am very leery to see too much legalism put into trying to reach a compromise between labour and management in such situations in a free society. The fact is we have too much legalism, in my opinion, in the situation now. Labour courts or tribunals are not going to help very much.

The last part of the resolution the Social Credit party presents, urges corporations to set up shareholding and profit-sharing programs, and so on. I think we can go along with that within a certain framework and subject to certain constraints which I will mention as I go along. The point I want to make, as far as the Progressive Conservative spokesman is concerned, is this: I take little objection to what he said. I was glad to hear him remind the minister that the tripartite council he proposes was something coming out of the Woods report, and although it is a very belated recognition by the minister of this important suggestion, nevertheless we all agree it should have a valuable role to play.

The spokesman for the Progressive Conservative Party notes the colossal waste of production because of the number of man-hours lost through strikes, illegal and otherwise. We all know that this type of statistic is easy to get at, and in parallel we should also note—and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) should recognize it when he makes a speech as he did today—that when you deliberately create unemployment as the government did in 1971 and 1972, and as they are doing now to fight inflation, you should have a figure amounting to \$5 billion or \$10 billion for goods and services lost through unemployment.

My point is that the amount of production lost through strikes is always noted, but very seldom the amount of goods and services lost through the deliberate creation of unemployment in the economy. I would agree with the minister, though, that we should not be looking primarily for a legal solution in labour-management relations.