

tion, I think, not under federal jurisdiction, and that condition would not be corrected by the bill he is proposing for consideration this afternoon. He seems to be most disturbed by the power of unions and seems to think that his bill somehow will enable us to consider the question of Canadian unionism as against international unionism.

● (1730)

The hon. member is asking for model legislation. He feels we have not yet found an effective tool for settling disputes. He is against business tycoons and foreign control of our labour force. On the other hand, we find that at the centre of the hon. member's bill is an extremely interesting concept, one which can be debated without raising all the other elements I have mentioned. It concerns the responsibility of an individual who chooses not to join an organization which benefits him. The hon. member apparently believes that an individual who, in his work, enjoys the advantages of wages and fringe benefits which are the result of a lengthy and elaborate process should not be obliged to contribute financially to the support of the union which represents the collectivity of employees.

This is a view which is shared by others. We have heard it put forward by organizations which base their representations on religious grounds. They argue that certain religious convictions, if sufficiently strong, should excuse an individual from the obligation to join. It so happens, however, that economic conditions have improved and that society has done very well as a result of the ability of employees to organize themselves. Unionism is not a phenomenon limited to non-professional workers. There are many well-established unions among professional people such as doctors and lawyers who have found it desirable, though in a different manner and using different techniques, to group themselves in a way which permits them to defend their interests and also to provide, I suppose, for certain standards of performance in the interests of their own reputation and, supposedly, of the public at large.

If we were to accept the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River, it would mean that certain individuals would not be obliged to contribute to the bargaining units to which they belong, and their employers would not be under an obligation to make the relevant deductions from their pay. It seems to me that if we weigh the pros and cons of this issue it will be seen there are great weaknesses arising from any decision which would permit this to take place. The union or bargaining unit representing the workers would no longer be able to come to the full support of those represented by it. Moreover, it would be reasonable to ask why a man or a woman who is deriving a benefit of some kind from the work of a union should be excused from the reasonable burden of contributing in the form of dues and fees to the maintenance of the bargaining unit which is working in the interest of the group, including the individual concerned.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Caccia:** It does not take a genius to see this side of the question. I was somewhat disturbed to hear the hon. member describe unions as though they were monsters, as though they were entities beyond control, as though they

#### *Canada Labour Code Amendment*

were not, in reality, the sum total of the individuals who were trying to form and run a reasonably democratic institution. In the end, a union is simply an organization of human beings; it will be as good or as bad as the people who form it.

When the behaviour of a union leaves something to be desired, it is usually because its members have failed to take an active interest in its operations, failed to attend the regular meetings of their local or to take an active part in the organization. Of course, this applies not only to unions but to all organizations of human beings. To conclude that unions are negative entities, or something to be afraid of, is to display a lack of understanding of what the union movement is all about.

As I say, the hon. member has raised an interesting point for debate. I imagine it was discussed 100 years ago and I would not be surprised if it were discussed for years and years in the future. It really comes down to the rights which an individual should enjoy in society. In my opinion, the amendment which the hon. member proposes is not acceptable.

● (1740)

**Mr. Paddy Neale (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose Bill C-104, and I do not think that catches the House by surprise. Frankly, it is beyond my comprehension why the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) would even attempt to introduce this regressive amendment to the Canada Labour Code, except that I notice that in the Parliamentary Guide he is listed as a businessman in the town of Chetwynd, B.C. I can only assume that he is engaged in monkey business in Chetwynd, because that is what his bill smacks of to me. Frankly, it will not help one bit his petty little beef with the union in his industry.

As the previous speaker said, this amendment would only cover workers under federal jurisdiction. All the outpourings of grief on the part of the hon. member dealt with unions certified under the labour legislation in the province of British Columbia. It seems to me that what the hon. member is really after is to make an obvious and blatant attempt to weaken and destroy all trade unions falling under the jurisdiction of the Canada Labour Code, which proves to me that the hon. member is tremendously anti-labour, and consequently anti-worker, in spite of his protestations that he was not rising to make an attack on trade unions, the workers, but was going after employers and others. I did not hear any comments in his speech that were not directed against trade unions and against the workers. For the whole of his 20 minutes, that was the diatribe I listened to. This really should not surprise me because I have ascertained since coming to this House that the great majority of the members of the Tory party fall into exactly the same category—anti-worker and anti-labour.

I was active in the labour movement in the hon. member's province, namely, British Columbia, for over 30 years before being elected to this House and I feel I am more than qualified to speak on this subject. The hon. member stated that he had been a member of the IWA. I joined the IWA in British Columbia in 1939, and I am still paying my \$8 a month dues into that organization, even though I