

True dialogue means promoting the exchange of ideas to convince each party to listen to the ideas of the other and then to review and reconsider one's ideas.

We should perhaps take the following as a motto: Let us speak a little less and listen a little more. When everyone speaks and nobody listens, communications break down and tantrum sets in; that is what we often note in the course of various negotiations.

It often occurs that government and unions speak different languages, particularly when the government's wage policy and the sum total of salaries are at stake. These are words many people use but with different interpretations. There is a kind of professional distortion particular to negotiators on whatever side of the table they may sit; actually, they keep putting a new sheen on old clauses without devising any new ones.

Negotiators on both sides haggle over commas and tend to forget the basic objective of a collective agreement which is the humanization of labour-management relations. Instead of seeking to guarantee the security of all concerned, some collective agreements develop into means of provocation.

We sometimes discover that those who should be concerned with maintaining good relations, do not pay as much attention to shouldering their own responsibilities and obligations as to claiming their rights; a good many problems would be automatically solved if people would try and apply more often nature's good old law of compensation which states that a job well done should be a job well paid. In view of the changing methods of production in this day of automation, a large number of workers tend to claim high wages for too little work with the ensuing result that in various segments of the administration there are public servants who are no longer "serving".

It is important to identify the various causes of misunderstanding and to direct labour legislation towards the protection of the rights of the weak, the humble, the poor and, specifically those who are most in need of protection. Incidentally, it should be noted that the complexity of our laws often results in confusion.

I insist on this point. It is difficult to draft legislation—especially labour laws—in clear language. Let us then try to avoid these famous complexities which inevitably lead the parties into courts.

Today, there are big legal offices, as I know, having been active in the union movement. At that time, it was quite hard to find lawyers familiar with labour legislation. Now there are legal firms grouping 7 or 8 lawyers in cities like Montreal and Quebec. The legislation is so complicated that both unions and employers have to resort to legal advisers. Finally, what is the use of such complicated labour legislation? In fact, there are innumerable strikes and little agreement between the parties.

A summary listing of causes of conflict might provide food for thought to those who are really anxious to improve the situation. Considering the continuous rise of the cost of living through proliferation of taxes, levies, commissions, boards, surveys, etc. coupled with the complexity of legislation resulting in unending and expensive legal proceedings, it is easy to understand the reasons for

### *Canada Labour Code*

the strikers' mentality which causes concern to employers and workers.

Such considerations should cause the government to take time out to prepare labour legislation truly accessible to those involved in it.

It is quite noteworthy that there should be a tendency to organize minor union skirmishes on various fronts, thus perpetuating a climate of mutual incomprehension. Why so? Usually for the sake of salary increases which, as soon as they are achieved, are quickly eroded through the increased price of products.

They fight to get wage increases to make up for the dollars which are lacking without being over-concerned about finding out who is making, controlling them and determining their value. What will be the use of earning from \$3 to \$10 an hour if this is equivalent to only \$1 or \$2? This is a problem of distribution of resources, purchasing power, work and leisure, and order must reign in the financial system which does not fulfill its task. In fact, let us consider this childish scene of distribution: 10 children, 2 apples, a fight ending in favour of the strongest; 10 children who have pennies, 2 apples, the highest bidder, provided he is protected by a policeman; 10 children, 15 apples, to each his own, and for all appetites.

There is the whole picture of the present crisis. We are behaving like children. Let us therefore try and find a way of drafting a law likely to favour a more equitable distribution of commodities so that workers may work in normal conditions. We must re-establish the equivalence of the purchasing power based on the needs and the value of goods, considering that human work tends to be replaced by machines.

Some clauses of the bill deal with technology and the way it may be applied. It is just about inapplicable. The worker is hungry and thirsting for money to live and support his children. Let us give him justice so that he will not be compelled to walk about with a stick and a piece of cardboard nailed at the end of it.

• (2050)

[*English*]

**Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to what was in my opinion an astonishing speech made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). Presumably he was discussing the motion before us which would have the effect of deleting the preamble to this bill, but as I listened to the hon. member it became obvious to me that he was really not debating the deletion of the preamble, he was debating the deletion of the bill. He was, in effect, willing to throw out the baby with the bath water, to quote a hackneyed expression.

The hon. member has a perfect right, of course, to disagree with the idea of the collective bargaining process, which is obviously what the hon. member for Edmonton West was telling us.

**Mr. Woolliams:** He did not say that at all.

**Mr. Barnett:** He may believe that the whole process whereby working people have the right, painfully built up over the years, to act as a group on more or less equal terms with an employer should be abolished as far as any