

impairment to the individual and to the community alike, caused by walkouts, be they legal or illegal.

As a matter of fact a recent national poll compiled by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion indicates that a majority of Canadians would like to see strikes prohibited in essential services. It is incredible to note the latest federal labour statistics which show that in the first four months of 1975, as a result of strikes, a record 1,936,540 man days were lost, and that over the full year of 1974 nearly ten million working days were lost because of work stoppages, with no apparent improvement in sight.

Just imagine what this does to the already high inflationary spiral, to have this amount of productivity lost as a result of strikes. To show the federal government's contribution to these work stoppages, we need only note that 20 per cent of all the strikes occurred under federal jurisdiction which accounts for less than 10 per cent of the national work force. We have to keep in mind at the same time that two thirds of Canadian taxpayers do not belong to any union and therefore are not protected by the permissiveness of governments relating to strikes and walkouts. Is it any wonder that the majority of these taxpayers oppose any or all walkouts and strikes, be they legal or illegal?

To this end I took the initiative to introduce in this House two separate bills dealing with the subjects of strikes and walkouts. My first bill, Bill C-386, is intended to amend the industrial relations part of the Canada Labour Code and to provide that, where a strike or lockout is against the national or public interest, the government may appoint an industrial inquiry commission to make a final and binding settlement, subject to government variation and adoption.

Today I had the opportunity to introduce another bill dealing with this subject, which deals specifically with the fragmentation of union power within the public service sectors of our economy, drastically affecting not only our trade deficit but indeed our ever-increasing cost of living. The purpose of this bill is to require union groups in a single public service sector to bargain with the Treasury Board simultaneously, and to negotiate contracts which would run for three years and expire at the same time. This would assure the taxpaying public that each essential public service sector would be strike free, except for the possibility of a walkout every three years.

Unfortunately these bills that I refer to briefly, are my own bills. I say unfortunately, because we all know what happens to the majority of private member's bills.

But where is the government with its legislation to fight inflation? Where is a budget that truly deals with inflationary problems? How can the government be so permissive as to lay down the laws of the land and then not adhere to them? This is the case, and has been the case as far as illegal strikes are concerned. This is the case, and has been the case with our immigration policy. This is the case, and has been the case with regard to capital punishment legislation, and who knows what else?

On one hand the government brings in legislation which becomes law by an act of parliament, be it on the labour scene, on immigration, or law and order. And on the other hand the same government has the gall and audacity to

*The Budget—Mr. Jelinek*

turn around and not adhere to the laws which it itself laid down. But where is this permissiveness coming from, and indeed what pressures, known or unknown, are put on our governments to act in this manner? Where are the pressure and initiative coming from for these walkouts and strikes which everyone knows hurt the economy of this country and the over all well being of all Canadians? Why are we hurting ourselves by constantly threatening our own economic existence from within?

● (1620)

Before I give the answer, which could be realistic and harsh, let me read part of the report of the Royal Commission on Security. The commission reported in 1969. The report was commissioned by former prime minister Lester Pearson, was submitted in 1969 to our present Prime Minister, and he, in 1969, promised that an early debate would take place on the report.

Section 15 reads:

Although it is true that we face a more complicated and fragmented Communist world than we did at the time of Gouzenko's defection nearly twenty-five years ago, none of the evidence we have heard suggests to us that recent developments have led to any significant changes in the adversary relationship that continues to exist between the Communist powers and the west in terms of intelligence and subversive operations and security defences. Canada remains the target of subversive or potentially subversive activities, attempts at infiltration and penetration, and espionage operations conducted by Communist countries; and, in addition, Canada can be used as a base for operations against other countries, and especially against the United States. We realize of course that the present fragmentation of the Communist world is such that there is no certainty that the intelligence policies of all these countries constitute a monolithic whole. We are not concerned however with detailed political analysis, and in the context of the problems we are considering we think the methods and objectives of these countries are sufficiently similar to justify our using the admittedly simplistic terms "Communism" and "Communist".

The reason I bother to quote from the report—I will come back to it shortly—is that, without question, as it has been established that we are justified in using the expressions "Communist" or "Communism", communists are partially to blame for the ever-increasing labour problems plaguing our economy, strikes in particular. And let us not be so naive as not to realize that Communists can use the institutions of a democratic society such as ours to overthrow it and seize total power.

Without question our society has become increasingly more vulnerable to Communist subversion, mainly because leaders and communicators whose duty it is to show us the dangers so often fail to do so for fear of being branded as "McCarthyite fanatics" or "professional anti-communists". Sad to say, this intellectual pacificism has affected British trade union leaders whose predecessors took a forthright, courageous stand against Communists on the factory floor and at the executive level. The same is happening in Canada.

Speaking as one who was born behind the Iron Curtain when there was no Iron Curtain, and as one who came to Canada for the sake of opportunity and freedom, I suggest very seriously that communists are constantly examining techniques for bringing down a country. They want to use the same techniques which brought about the communist coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948, for example. You may laugh this statement off, of course. You may say that