

of Ontario. Therefore teachers as a group do not have a decertification process. It is recognized that once you organize and are collective, you stay organized. If the teachers do not like who is running the outfit, they vote them out.

● (1712)

Another precedent in Canadian experience is the medical profession. Once you begin to practice in the province of Ontario or some other provinces in Canada, you become a member of the medical association within that province. There is no process for decertifying the Ontario Medical Association.

The same is true in the legal profession. If they do not like who is at the top, they can vote them out of office. However, they cannot abandon the professional organization.

We provide a tool within the Canada Labour Code for those who are opposed to collective action by workers. They are provided with the tool to destroy, to waste the time of the trade union and tie up the trade unions' resources, both human and financial, for lengthy processes of fighting decertification and going back in later years to certify a work place that had been decertified.

There is no doubt, in my mind, that the Canada Labour Code leaves all the loopholes for any employer or owner of a business who is determined to destroy the collective in that workplace to do that. The process is there. It is permissible. Our bill aims to speed up, encourage, and facilitate the organization of trade unions in Canada within the federal jurisdiction.

No one can say that somehow or other it is a myth that employers attempt to block the formation of a trade union. I mentioned previously the case of the banks. At the present time the banks have undertaken a program to fight the unionization of their branches within Canada.

Some time ago in committee we were dealing with Bill C-8, amendments to the Federal Labour Code. Representatives of the banks appeared before the committee. They were emphatic about their support for the organizing of workers within the banks. I quote some of their comments:

Despite our general support for the principle of the bill, namely, justice in the work place and improved working conditions, there are several clauses of the bill which we believe should be amended before the bill is passed back to the House by the Committee.

They agreed with the principle of Bill C-8. That was Mr. MacIntosh, vice-president of the Canadian Bankers' Association. Later on he said:

It is our sincere belief that the objective of any amendments to the legislation should be to promote free collective bargaining and not to substitute for it.

Later on he talked about the need for a ballot to verify the signatures of all persons purporting to be members of the applicant trade union.

Throughout the hearing the witnesses supported the principle of trade union organizing within the banks. However, when it comes to the practical application, we find there is a contradiction. What they said in committee is not practised in the work place.

Canada Labour Code

The latest example has to be a most fantastic situation at a branch of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce in Gibsons, B.C. SORWUC, the Service, Office and Retail Workers Union of Canada, attempted to organize that particular branch. Mrs. Dulyk, one of the workers in the Gibsons branch, attempted to get members to sign cards so that there could be a certification vote in that branch.

The minute the manager found out that Mrs. Dulyk was trying to sign staff to cards, she was called in and offered a transfer to Vancouver. Here is a married woman with a family. Gibsons is only accessible by water from Vancouver. The management offered her a transfer to Vancouver, an offer he knew she could not accept. She could not accept it and was fired.

The union approached Mrs. Quigley, another employee in that branch. Mrs. Quigley then attempted to sign workers in that branch to cards. Again the manager found out, called in Mrs. Quigley and guess what? Right. He offered her a transfer to Vancouver. It was fairly obvious that Mrs. Quigley could not accept the position, and she too was fired. That is not an isolated incident.

The committee also had before it the Tweed branch case. In that case the manager found out the workers were signing cards to form a union. He called in the employees one by one and told them, "We are one great family here. We do not have to form unions to get anything. How can you do this to me? You are putting a knife in my back."

Everyone in that branch became extremely tense. There was fear in the minds of the workers, and the union was never organized. Because obtaining 35 per cent took considerable time, the employer was able to launch a counter-attack.

The Canada Labour Code is not for the employers. It is for the workers. The Corporations Act is for the corporations of this country. The Canada Labour Code should be a progressive document which facilitates the organizing of workers into collectives in order to improve the quality of life and the quality of environment in the work place.

To finish the story of the SORWUC incident, they took it to the Canada Labour Relations Board, accusing the employer of unfair labour practice. In the worst judgment in labour relations history that I have read, the Canada Labour Relations Board said in their finding that the union did not prove that there was an anti-union bias in the mind of the employer. How does anyone prove anti-union bias in anybody's mind? One has to judge the actions, and in the two cases in the Gibsons branch, Mr. Speaker, it was fairly obvious that the actions of the employer would by no stretch of the imagination be seen as divorced from the activities of the two workers in trying to organize the Gibsons branch of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce.

● (1722)

That has been the sad history of union organizing in this country. I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that on Saturday a very historic event took place in my riding. At Laurentian University they honoured the man who was largely responsible