back the present legal support for closed shops or to act on the recommendations of the Woods report—I refer to page 150—that where hiring halls operate in industries as the effective means to employment in those industries they should be operated by the Canada Manpower service with the assistance of employers and unions through a joint labour-management committee, at least section 161 of this bill should be removed.

Mr. Speaker, unless we face up to some of these problems I am afraid that organized labour, management and government that condones this kind of practice will find themselves in a situation which may bring about a change which they will not be happy to accept as an alternative.

In the United States a poll was taken recently and the result was announced on Labour Day, 1971. It was conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, New Jersey, and it clearly showed that a right to work law is favoured by the American public by a two-to-one margin, including a majority of union members' families. The situation is not really different here in Canada.

• (2040)

What is happening as a result of this situation? The country is being put into an economic straitjacket. It could be that the fault lies not with the labour union leaders but with the imbalance of the law that makes the abuse of union power inevitable and the suppression of that abuse by government also inevitable. This is what I am concerned about. Where are we going? The answer is pretty plain. Unions have priced more and more Canadian goods out of international trade, and having made foreign imports economically acceptable are beginning to argue for the necessity of higher protective tariffs and quotas in order to give the uneconomic the necessary assistance. The consumer will not accept this situation indefinitely.

This is what is happening throughout the country today. Wage and price controls are being demanded all across the country, to the extent that I believe if a poll were taken today the majority of the people would express a view in favour of such controls. If this comes to pass it is the end of the free market and of free wage negotiations, the very things we want to preserve but which we do not really have today.

What is the cure? I do not think any organization, union or otherwise, has the right to believe it has the power to compel a worker to join a union he may not want to join in order to hold down a job. This is one of the weaknesses of this bill: it does not deal with that matter.

A short time ago I was surprised to read a report from David Archer, president of the Ontario Federation of Labour, who agrees with this contention of mine but who laments the fact that the government of Ontario does not permit agricultural and other workers to bargain collectively. He thinks it is nonsense to deny that right to any worker and contends, I think rightly so, that the proposed changes in the labour code should guarantee the right of all workers to organize in unions of their choice. I might add that these views of his were reported in "Voice of the People" of July 2 as follows:

> However, until we replace the adversary system by a radically different, genuinely co-operative arrangement, the evil notion of class hatred and conflict will continue to be a reality. Management and union will continue to be deadlocked in bitter disputes that are but the logical result of the tense, warlike atmosphere in which many contract talks are conducted. No one wants to give; everyone wants to take.



There is one exception that I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members. I think it is worth noting. It relates to the recent agreement between the International Longshoremen's Association and the Maritime Employers Association, which produced some startling concessions by union and management. The union agreed to end featherbedding that forced management to use 16 men for jobs which sometimes could be handled by eight men. Management agreed to job security and to provide nearly $4.5 million in pension funds over the life of the three-year contract. Without going into further details of this agreement, I point out that it is significant that it was arrived at quietly, in a setting that is not typical of most of the bargaining processes. Here management and union worked for the benefit of both. They did it in an atmosphere of harmony and co-operation. This bill should provide for that kind of framework and regulations should encourage this type of approach.

This has not been the pattern in the past. The decades of grinding struggle have left their mark on both labour and management. What has happened is that the trenches have been dug very deeply. We find ourselves locked in a seemingly inevitable struggle for power or counterpower. This is survival of the fittest, and it is this concept about which I am concerned.

There is just one other aspect that I would like to mention in regard to the bill. It concerns the Canada Labour Relations Board. I think it is a good thing that this board will no longer be made up of certain individuals who represent specified organizations. This is a step forward. But I believe the bill should be amended to ensure that the representative nature of the board be guaranteed by providing realistic consultative and advisory roles for labour and management in the appointment of some of its members.

It is true that several liberalizing suggestions of the Woods task force have been introduced, such as the secret ballot. The bill also includes provision to recognize bargaining rights acquired by voluntary recognition. Nevertheless, in spite of some of these positive aspects, which also include the provision that a certification ballot include the provision for no union, I believe that in relation to unfair practices the bill should have been further strengthened. Here again, the Woods report made positive recommendations on the civil rights of workers, such as the legislative guarantee of the right of union members to audited statements of union financial affairs.

Furthermore, while the bill does provide for complaints on a range of matters to be made to the CLRB, the limitation of the hearing of such complaints is unreasonable and would seriously discourage many legitimate complaints being made. Clause 187 (3) should be amended at least to read "within two months." There is no reason why a person should have to wait six months to receive justice from his union. Why should there be that kind of delay?