

*Private Members' Business*

In Quebec, a number of unions and employers agree that anti-strikebreaker legislation has significantly reduced the number and length of labour disputes. They also recognize it has contributed to lowering the risks of violence on picket lines, which is good for both parties.

Conversely, the use of strikebreakers in recent years has only contributed to extending the duration of labour disputes. Statistics show that the more important labour disputes in terms of the number of workers involved are generally those where strikebreakers are used. It was also noticed that the longer a dispute lasts the higher the proportion of strikebreakers tends to get.

The strike of the Ogilvie flour mill in Montreal, which is still not resolved, is a good example. If I may, I would like to briefly remind my colleagues of a labour dispute that has dragged on and on for over a year now, and which could still last a rather long time if we do not act soon.

In January 1992, the collective agreement between the workers of Ogilvie Mills of Montreal and their employer, Labatt, came to an end.

In June of the same year, the Labatt's Brewery, then the owner of the mill, sold it to ADM Archers-Daniels-Midland Co., a U.S. multinational corporation.

From 1992 to 1993, negotiations to renew the collective agreement were unsuccessful, since the employer was presenting demands based on the working conditions that are common practice in the United States. Can you imagine?

From October 1993 to February 1994, the employer unilaterally imposed working conditions as established in its own proposal.

In February 1994, the union filed a complaint with the Canada Labour Relations Board on grounds that the employer was negotiating in bad faith. In fact, it was simply refusing to negotiate.

On June 6, 1994, a general strike broke out, involving 116 workers—I should add 116 families.

Only four days later, the employer hired scabs to replace these workers. Members should note that it did so through a federal employment centre. Can you imagine that?

I have here in my hands a copy of the ad that was posted in the Employment Centre of Verdun. I will take the time to briefly read some details that were given. It is really unusual.

Date: December 5, 1994, 2.18 p.m., Verdun employment centre. Job offer: forklift operator; \$10 an hour; temporary; 40 hours a week, possible overtime. Where? Ogilvie flour mill. They even have the gall to request three to five years experience. But it does not mention whether its is three to five years experience as a fork

lift operator or as a scab. There is a hidden anachronism. Further down, it reads: Attention, ongoing labour dispute. One cannot claim ignorance. Then comes the employer's address: Archer-Daniels-Midland Co. (Ogilvie Montreal), 950 Mills, Montreal, Quebec, H3C 1Y4. I will even give a phone number: 514-847-8522, and a contact: Francine Farmer. Attention, company on strike.

Mr. Speaker, this takes the cake. This is blatant proof that the government was in cahoots with a company which was hiring scabs during a labour dispute.

• (1750)

The Ogilvie flour mill is still operating, thanks to scabs, since this is not prohibited under the Canadian Labour Code. It continues to post profits and is using unusual security devices, including surveillance cameras, fences, security guards, to monitor strikers and bring scabs inside the plant.

What is at stake in the negotiations can be summed up as follows: the union's demands are quite simple—there are none. They are not trying to obtain additional jobs, to enhance job security in any way or to obtain any salary increases. The union's demand can be summed up in one sentence: to keep jobs the way they are and salaries at current levels, period.

We could not ask for a better employee attitude in today's climate. They have been very, very understanding. However, here are but a few of management's demands: first, the right to unilaterally modify hours. To put it in simple terms, this means: we will make you work when we want, how we want, how long we want, where we want.

Second, the abolition of seniority as a consideration in promotions and layoffs. In plain and simple language, the better you are at sucking up, the better your job advancement possibilities. I know no other term for it.

Loss of job security still means the same thing, so I will not repeat it. Elimination of notice prior to layoff. That means that when you leave for work in the morning, give your wife and children a big kiss, because when you come home that night, you may no longer be working for the same company and you will have nothing to say about it.

More contracting out: this means that you should not forget to tell your wife that it is possible that some guy from out of the blue will get hired to do the same job as you.

More term employees: this means that the possibility that some guy from out of the blue will come in to do your job is even more likely.