

kind of an atmosphere people are worked up and urged to damage trucks and buildings. That is the pervading atmosphere before the vote is taken. Once people are over-excited they listen to hotheads such as Michel Chartrand.

Let us now look at the type of information reaching workers.

This is conveyed to union workers in an atmosphere which does not always favour serene and responsible thinking, and union leaders recommend that they accept or turn down the employer's proposals.

Do not argue. Accept or refuse. Period. That is all you have to do.

Employers are forbidden to have direct contact with their employees—

This is where boxing gloves are handed out. The employer is a human being just like the worker, but the worker is not allowed to speak to him. It is always the chap who is neither employer nor employed who dictates to both, worker and employer. He is more important than the employer. Think of Chartrand in Montreal. Look at William Houle in the Post Office Department. One evening, recently, I was watching television. One would have sworn that one was hearing the future president of the new Crown Corporation announced by the minister. He is the one who decides if, tomorrow, my mail will reach me or not. He is the one who decides if, tomorrow, the letters I sent out will be delivered or not. The decision does not rest with me nor with the worker, but with Mr. Houle.

Employers are forbidden to have direct contacts with their employees—

They are two species to whom it is forbidden to agree.

—in order to make known to them their offers and their views. There is a strange similarity with the voting procedure in a totalitarian country, where a single party controls all information given to the electorate. As for the vote itself, can it truly be stated that it is carried out in a climate that favours participation and the free expression of one's views? We believe that, on the one hand, the employees should receive all necessary information from two authorized sources.

Information from their union, of course, but also from the employer.

If the employer or the union leaders are liars they will be able to find that out at the same time.

Employees should receive all the required information from two authorized sources: their union and their employer. Besides, they should vote under the best conditions and one of the best ways of doing it would be for the union members to vote by mail.

Postal Service Policies

Otherwise, when they are brought into a room, if one of them says he is against the strike and shows it even so slightly, as I said previously, he is called a traitor, a Judas and a scab. Maybe this guy has argued for a week or even ten days with his wife about what attitude he should have in the event of a strike. But, once he is in the union room, the results of his discussions no longer matter. His union leaders and a group of bullies who are probably paid for it will threaten and call Judas, traitor, and scab and so on anyone who has different views.

Liberty is all right for them but not for those who think differently. That is the mentality of some union leaders. Not all but a good proportion of them are like that.

In the first place the union members should be able to send their ballots by mail to the polling station.

The counting of the votes should take place in the presence of representatives of both parties and of an impartial third witness.

In such cases, representatives from the union and the employer are in attendance with an unbiased third party in order to ensure an appropriate and honest counting of the vote. I continue the quotation:

● (2:30 p.m.)

It might involve major disadvantages, but we are far from sure of that. It is up to the unions to prove it.

As to the strike vote recently taken in the Post Office Department, I should like to mention that all of us recognize the tremendous work which the Post Office employees have to perform. When we meet the mailman on the road, we know that he works hard. It is also the case for employees in post offices. We know that their income should be increased if possible in accordance with the capability of the country to make available to all classes of society the goods and services it provides.

When a union asks for job security for its members because of automation, the use of machinery, science or progress, I submit that labour leaders are in the clouds, that they are running around in circles. Let us increase salaries, prices, let us maintain our position although we do not need all the things we are asking for. This is not logical.

However, there is a suggestion that if man is replaced by machine, he will soon be unemployed. This is what the government should be concerned about. The Postmaster General knows the answers. I am accused of