

[Text]

... Canadian workers, trade unions and employers recognize and support freedom of association and free collective bargaining as the bases of effective industrial relations ...

I can appreciate what you are attempting to do, but I wonder whether we are being fair when we look at the whole matter. I am trying to say that these two matters—freedom of association and collective bargaining—are the only bases of effective industrial relations for the determination of good working conditions and sound labour-management relations, and they need some clarifying and some appreciation of the whole sphere of industrial relations which applies when, in fact, no union-management relationship exists. I am trying to say that it seems to me that throughout the whole labour-management sphere you are talking about one third of the people who happen to be unionized. Within the federal structure, and I am not too sure of the numbers involved, this bill is not only attempting to relate to trade unions and management, the basis of good working conditions and sound labour-management relations, but it is also attempting to reach the whole sphere. All I ask is that we recognize there is more to good working conditions and sound labour-management relations than that which stems from freedom of association and bargaining. Surely there must be a lot more that does not need any further elaboration on my part except to say that under the circumstances all I am asking is that the Committee be aware of this fact, Mr. Chairman. I could read brief after brief after brief from people who do not like the preamble—that is one thing—because they do not know why it is in there in the first place. I question it too, but I am prepared to go along with it as long as there is some recognition of the relationship that management and its nonunion workers have had over the years and, as a result of this good working relationship, they have brought in conditions of work, pay and security that had nothing to do with freedom of association and collective agreements.

• 1155

If I am right in my conclusion, and I respectfully state there is a lot of merit in what I am saying, all I am trying to say is that line 10 on page 1 should read as follows:

... collective bargaining as ...
... one of the ...

... bases of effective industrial relations for the determination of good working conditions ...

Surely we should be fair when we look at the whole picture. Why isolate ourselves and why be dogmatic about a situation that calls for appreciation of further relationships. All I am asking is that we realize the effectiveness of freedom of association and free collective bargaining but, at the same time, are other matters not involved? Is there not another relationship or are there not other relationships which I think we have to be concerned about. What does a preamble mean anyway? It sets up an atmosphere, I would say. All I want it to do is to set up a true atmosphere, but as it now stands it does not really indicate a true atmosphere in terms of labour-management relations. All I am trying to do is to make us aware of other factors and other means whereby good working conditions and sound labour management relations can be acquired, and that is the basis of the amendment.

I move that the preamble to the bill be amended by inserting therein, immediately following the word "as" in line 10 on page 1, the words "one of". It is a very simple amendment and I hope the Committee will find some merit in it.

[Interpretation]

... les travailleurs, syndicats et employeurs du Canada reconnaissent et soutiennent que la liberté syndicale et la pratique de libres négociations collectives sont les fondements de relations industrielles fructueuses ...

Je comprends votre objectif mais je me demande néanmoins si l'on a tenu compte de l'ensemble de la situation. En effet, ces deux notions, la liberté d'association et les conventions collectives en tant que fondement unique des relations du travail fructueuses doivent être revues et modifiées à la lumière des cas où il n'existe pas de relations syndicat-patronat. En fait, dans ce domaine, vous parlez uniquement du tiers des ouvriers qui sont syndiqués. Or, à l'échelon fédéral, ce bill devrait tenir compte, non seulement des relations entre syndicat et patronat, mais de l'ensemble de la situation. Je voudrais donc que l'on tienne compte du fait que les bonnes relations du travail ne dépendent pas uniquement de la liberté d'association et des négociations collectives. Tout ce que je demande, c'est que le Comité tienne compte de ce facteur. Je pourrais vous donner lecture d'une série de mémoires où les auteurs se sont élevés contre le préambule, car ils n'en voient guère l'utilité. Pour ma part, je suis disposé à l'appuyer s'il mentionne les relations qui, depuis longtemps, existent déjà entre le patronat et les travailleurs non syndiqués, relations qui ont permis d'assurer les conditions de travail et un niveau de rémunération et de sécurité nullement attribuables à la liberté d'association et aux conventions collectives.

Si j'ai raison, la ligne 11 à la page 1 devrait être modifiée comme suit:

des libres négociations collectives ...
... en tant qu'un des ...

fondements des relations industrielles fructueuses permettant d'établir de bonnes conditions de travail ...

Il faut en effet être impartial. Pourquoi se montrer dogmatique au sujet de cette question. Tout en reconnaissant l'importance de la liberté d'association ou des négociations collectives, il faut tenir compte néanmoins des autres facteurs. Quel est le sens du préambule? Il crée une certaine atmosphère et je prétends que ces atmosphères ne traduisent pas la réalité des relations de travail. Je voudrais donc que d'autres facteurs influant sur les conditions du travail et sur les relations entre patrons et ouvriers, soient mentionnés dans le préambule.

Je propose dès lors que le bill soit modifié par l'insertion, immédiatement après le mot «sont» à la ligne 12, page 1, des mots «un des». Il s'agit donc, comme vous le voyez bien, d'un amendement fort simple.