

*Labour Relations*

to do. The managers of the company are not afraid to say so.

● (2040)

After that, Mr. Speaker, the company makes an offer, and says: We are no longer ready to take these people back. We are ready to offer 250 jobs to these people. As for the other 700, we will see if we ever need them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very difficult to accept such a position from an employer. I feel that such a type of management leads much more surely to anarchy than the type of unionism practised in certain sectors throughout Canada. It is true that in some sectors, union leaders have proved lacking irresponsible. It is also true that some Canadian enterprises, or rather pseudo-Canadian enterprises that represent American interests in Canada, have made decisions that are contrary to Canadian traditions, contrary to the interests of Canadian employees as well as contrary to people living in Quebec.

That is what happened in the case of United Aircraft, that is what entailed violent incidents that I condemn in all respects. What I wish to prove here, is that exasperation or the way to negotiate with a union may incite individuals, or a small group of individuals, to abandon everything, to disobey legislation and make their own laws. I feel that in a society such as ours in Canada, such a situation is unacceptable. Such situations must not be tolerated in Canada, and must not be tolerated to any greater extent than any violence either by management or union.

Which leads me to say, Mr. Speaker, that when I witness people in Canada rise to their feet because American companies come here and say to us: Well, Gentlemen from the Montreal Locomotive Works, you shall not sell any trains to Cuba, I find such a situation unacceptable. When I see people rise in the House of Commons to say it is an awful thing for Americans to come and dictate to us why we should not sell anything to Cuba, I cannot agree with them. But I have yet to see people rise to say that it is awful for Americans to come and tell us what industrial relations we should use with regard to their companies in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the present concept of industrial relations in Canada should be that such relations should not be dictated to us, either by Connecticut or by a foreign country. They should be established by our own people, here in Canada. We have enough experience to manage our unions and make our own decisions, which would result in much more harmonious relations.

I also heard several people who took part in this debate and wanted to disclaim being anti-labour. A lot was said about the Cliche Commission. Mr. Speaker, if there are bandits in one area of the labour movement, it does not mean that everyone in the labour movement is a bandit. If there are bandits within a government agency, if there are one or two troublemakers, it does not mean that everyone in there is a bandit. This calls for qualification. I think that what has happened in the Quebec construction industry might be the result of *laissez-faire* in that area, *laissez-faire* also on the part of those who were running the province of Quebec. It must also be borne in mind that what happened in the Quebec construction industry came

under Bill 290, that provided the powers which exist now. It must also be borne in mind that it is under another legislation, Bill 9, that bargainings which were taking place illegally before were more or less legalized. So, when you do that, whether it is in a National Assembly or a Parliament, you contribute more or less to the erosion of authority. So, one should not indeed imagine that because one area was corrupted, as the construction area in the province of Quebec, the whole labour movement in Quebec is a corrupt system. It is not true and I think that those who so suggest are indeed quite short-sighted about what is happening within the labour movement.

There are many people, Mr. Speaker, who really work for the advancement of that cause, and if we had not had the labour movement in Quebec in particular, and in all of the rest of Canada, we would still be in the stone age in many areas. Fortunately, there were people who stood at the forefront of companies and established a system—just remember the years prior to 1960 in Quebec—because if there had not been people to fight for humanitarian ideas and also the respect of individuals who worked within these corporations, and if there had not been a labour movement in Quebec, I wonder where we would be now.

It is not because there is a gang of tramps, Mr. Speaker, who managed to invade a whole segment, that that segment must be condemned in its entirety. We must absolutely not try to embark in that system. Otherwise, we will also be condemned later.

I hear people say: We are in favour of strikes, in favour of this or that, in favour of unions and a lot of things, but when unions exercise their rights, we no longer agree with them. We should decide once and for all if we want to grant civil servants the right to strike. When they will go on strike, of course it will be a nuisance, because they will have a power which will enable them to tell their boss: "You better do something, or I will go on strike". That certainly harms some people. Some are deliberately unaware and publicly say, performing quite a political stunt: I am with the unions. Big deal! But as soon as a strike occurs, they stand back and say: I no longer agree.

We should be conscious of our own decisions and also of existing legislation. There is a number of things which will have to be revised.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) put forward some very constructive ideas this afternoon, and I believe the House should consider the measures he suggested. He mentioned a sort of tri-partite council in which the three parties would be led to have discussions on the future. He mentioned a bank of data to keep labour as well as management from being so obstinate. Who is right when one says that the inflation rate is 12 per cent and the other says it is 10 per cent? If we had a bank of data to show that the inflation rate is 15 per cent, everyone would be on an equal footing.

Union structures might also be taken into consideration. In the Post Office Department for instance, another union does not agree, they go on strike, and the whole problem starts anew. Maybe the unions should also review their own structures.