

Supply—Labour

country which have been guilty of firing people because they have participated in union activities or in organizing unions. This is a practice which is contrary to the law.

We did not hear the hon. member express any opinion about the use of ex parte injunctions which are granted against labour unions without representatives of those unions being present. We did hear an argument from the hon. member regarding the difficulties in enforcing the Canada Labour (Standards) Code and the 40-hour week provision. In my opinion, where there is a division between management and labour in respect of these matters the hon. member has taken the side of management. I think the record will show that to be so.

I do want to talk about what I think has been an unfortunate practice of the minister in the last few months, if not in the last year. The minister has been making a series of speeches across the country and I will deal with two examples in which he indicated, as did the hon. member for Edmonton West, that because of labour difficulties and strikes we may be moving toward some form of compulsory arbitration. The minister made a speech on June 17, 1967 in Vancouver to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and I should like to read one sentence from that speech. He said:

There is abundant evidence—and not only in the Freedman report—that our present laws and procedures are not adequate to deal with all of today's industrial relations problems.

If they are not adequate I should like to ask what the implication is if not that we may be moving toward a form of compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. There are any number of alternatives that arise from that part of my remarks. There is no reference there to compulsory arbitration. If the hon. member will only be fair enough to read the whole speech it will be seen that there is no such reference.

Mr. Orlikow: There may be a number of alternatives, but I think it is the responsibility of the minister, if he is not in favour of compulsory arbitration or any form of it, to spell that out at some point.

In May the minister made a speech in Ottawa to the Ontario Mechanical Contractors Association. In anticipation of the minister getting up again to say that I am inferring things which he did not mean, I should like to quote from an editorial which appeared in

Canadian Transport, the official publication of one of the large Canadian unions, the C.B. of R.T. I will read a couple of paragraphs to indicate how that union assessed the minister's speech. They refer to it in this way:

It took the form of strong criticism of strikes, and a veiled warning, that unless a better method of settling industrial disputes was found, government intervention and the imposition of compulsory arbitration on a much broader scale were inevitable.

That is how the editor of this union publication assessed the minister's speech. The editorial goes on to quote from the minister's speech and states:

He argued that, when unions resort to strikes, they "emphasize their own inadequacies...their inability to persuade."

He added that "there must be a better way—there has to be a better way!"

A strike is a difficult thing for everybody but it is more difficult for the worker who, for every day he is on strike, does not get paid. Despite what some members may think, workers do not easily decide to go on strike and they are not coerced to go on strike. If there have been more strikes in the last year or two than in earlier years we have to ask ourselves why. Why do workers take the ultimate step of going on strike? I think the reasons are very obvious to anyone who reads the financial sections of daily newspapers or the *Financial Post*. They will realize that the workers who go on strike can read the annual financial reports and know that for the last two or three years the profits of companies large and small, but particularly large corporations, have been increasing at a tremendous rate. The workers take the very simple view that when there is an increase in productivity and profits they are entitled to their fair share.

Workers also take the view that when there are technological changes and automation they have a right not to featherbed or to be paid for doing nothing but to be consulted and to sit down with management to ensure that the effects of automation and technological change will be implemented in a fair way. A few years ago there was a stoppage in the operations of our railways which led to the government appointing Mr. Justice Freedman to look into the matter and make recommendations. We received an excellent report but where is that report now? It is gathering dust in the files of the labour department.

Numerous requests have been made by labour organizations for government action through legislation. They have been met with