

*Labour Relations*

mirror of reality, if a social body automatically issued new credit to finance any new production, there would be no need to abolish capital domination because that evil would not even exist.

Money capital would be raised as competent technicians and workers would start and pursue the development of our country's raw materials and this capital would in turn be at the disposal of those who are thus creating new riches.

All workers of various categories would find an acceptable solution to their many income problems if they finally decided to really get together and change the financial system which is depriving them, instead of going on strike to fight those who are paying them.

On June 15, 1972, I introduced in the House a motion about the possible reorientation of all labour legislation towards employer-employee profit-sharing. My motion read:

That this House deplores the fact that the government has not adopted the appropriate measures for involving workers in Canadian firms through profit-sharing and stock purchase programs as a means of promoting social stability, reinforcing our country's economy and ensuring greater co-operation between capital and labour.

I had expected the reaction of some members who are too easily satisfied with existing situations, who prefer to take refuge behind the present federal jurisdiction and believe that a labour legislation governing employer-employee profit-sharing comes instead under provincial jurisdiction. I had tried to allocate the respective responsibilities in a problem of concern to all Canadians. Although the implementation of the suggested measures was restricted to industrial sectors under federal jurisdiction and a great many workers were employed in various administrative services, we feel that the government should set the pace by establishing, whenever possible, a profit-sharing scheme for the benefit of workers. There exists a great many ways to favour such participation.

Several Social Credit members had given at that time several good reasons which warrant employer-employee profit-sharing. I had the opportunity to hear a number of excellent speeches from various members, namely the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) who mentioned that incentives and policies should be applied to promote a greater participation in investments by Canadians.

● (1540)

The Minister of Labour of the day said he was glad that the Social Credit Party through me had asked that the question be debated, since he realized that we were searching for every means to improve labour relations and increase peace in industry. He then pointed out that the federal government's labour relations legislation was promoting a system in which the workers can have their say in the terms and conditions of employment through freely elected bargaining agents.

I take this opportunity to point out several mistakes made in the name of that so-called "freedom". It is a rather disreputable word nowadays, judging from its interpretation by certain advocates of freedom. We know some people who claim the freedom to bring down the system, after having secured from that same system the freedom

to set up regulations on the compulsory check off of dues. Anything can be said, anything can be written in a democracy, but we find that this freedom is not enough for some. We tend to forget that whatever privileges we have, we got them from someone.

I have here an article published in Montreal's *La Presse* on June 3, 1972, entitled: "The freedom of others". There are some passages worthy of some thought which I will quote to you:

The post-industrial world is witnessing a strange situation. It finds that the freedom of some people sometimes destroys the freedom of others. Some freedoms do not exist yet. The worker has freedom of association, but not freedom of non-association. Neither does he have the freedom to choose a union other than the one certified where he works.

There is more. A journalist, for example, may break his contract because of a change in the ideological orientation of his employer, but he does not have the right to withdraw from a labour union for the same reason.

Hospital workers have the right to strike, but when they exercise it, they endanger the patients' life, who have a clear strict right to attentive and sustained care. Public servants have the right to strike, but when they do exercise it they are depriving old people, pensioners and welfare recipients from the right to get their always eagerly expected cheques on time.

Air Canada controllers and technicians have the right to strike, but when they do exercise it their action is detrimental to the interests of people living in the North who are fundamentally entitled to supplies. They nearly caused the death of a child because of the impossibility of sending a rare serum by air.

Teachers have the right to strike but when they do exercise it they deprive children of their basic right to a peaceful and stable education.

Post office employees have the right to strike, but when they do exercise it, they deprive the population of an essential service and seriously prejudice many companies who do their business by mail.

It must never be forgotten that "The right to live" for all and everyone springs from a natural right and that must be given priority over the right to strike and other ones.

I am in favour of the right to join a union, having been myself in charge of the Quebec loggers' organization for ten years, that is from 1952 to 1962. I must add that I am still a "trade unionist" but not a striker. I point out the difference.

In those ten years of union work, I sat through several rounds of negotiations with representatives from large lumber companies and we have always been able to agree on improving the living and working conditions of bush workers, and without ever going on strike.

The right to strike is a precious one, but it smacks of blind egotism when it deprives abusively other citizens of their own rights. Who would dare claim that the rights of union workers must take precedence over all others? Would it be that we have a deranged sense of justice? Going through a red light, parking one's car the wrong way, stepping on other people's toes, shouting at the top of one's lungs out on the street, in public places, are serious matters. But it seems people are unaware of the fact that it is far more serious for an organized group of citizens to use their rights at the expense of the rights, every bit as precious, of those citizens who are not organized.

We grant without any hesitation whatsoever that it is quite normal, quite in order to acknowledge the right of all workers to belong to the union of their choice. Still, if we really want to respect the freedom of those very workers, a text of law written in clear and specific terms should