aimed at the creation of the kind of climate that will encourage responsible and healthy industrial relations amongst all parties concerned?

I believe that our existing legislation serves that aim and purpose and leaves to the bargaining parties the responsibility of negotiating the substantial provisions of their collective agreements. That is where responsibility belongs and that is where it has become recognized as properly belonging by those who have been negotiating agreements in the federal field in recent years.

Do we not all agree that something which is arrived at voluntarily has more significance and offers a greater degree of satisfaction than something imposed from outside, since a voluntary agreement will have the support or at least the acceptance of both sides, all of which is of the greatest importance.

In arriving at such a voluntary agreement, is it not more likely to retain vitality and recognition if it must justify itself from year to year or from agreement to agreement; and that is very important for the long-pull angle of the situation, this being conducive to a quasi-permanency of amicable relations.

There are, of course, already in the industrial relations act provisions for protecting the rights of the employees to join unions and to carry on lawful activities. There is also the further assurance that nothing in the industrial relations act stands in the way of inserting in a collective agreement such a provision as is contained in the bill we are discussing. It would, therefore, appear to me that this assurance should warrant ample protection for unions which are able to enlist the support of a majority of their members who want the things set out in this bill.

In so far as union security is concerned the field in which the provisions of the bill could operate, even if it were law, is a very small one indeed. The security accruing to the unions therefrom would also be very small. Last year on February 8, at page 960 of *Hansard*, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg) gave a report on the result of a study of check-off provisions in collective agreements under federal labour laws. Other than employees of the government, of the total workers under such agreements more than 80 per cent already had obtained some form of the check-off agreements. Only about 19 per cent of the 80 per cent had apparently thought it worthwhile to bargain for and obtain the kind of check-offs set out in this bill. The remaining 81 per cent, of the 80 per cent group, had obtained forms of check-off which are, one must assume, more advantageous from their point of view.

Since last year there has been a slightly higher proportion of employees in some groups, notably air transport, covered by the check-off provision. The submission of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada stated that the provisions of the existing federal legislation "are reasonably adequate". Later in the same week the railway transportation brotherhood submitted their brief in which it was stated:

> It is the considered opinion of this committee that the provisions of the act are reasonably adequate for collective bargaining.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the present system of collective bargaining represents, to a certain extent, the quintessence of voluntary negotiation which, after all, is the democratic way of negotiating. It is held by some, and rightly so, I believe, that should this house enact the present bill we may be accused by some, and again rightly so, of setting a precedent of interference by parliament in collective bargaining which has been functioning rather well if we take all things into consideration. There is no one who will again say that everyone is for union security, and the difficulty arises not so much in connection with the aim to be attained but rather the procedure to be followed to attain that aim.

Had collective bargaining steered away from the principle of union security, then there might be some reason for the present bill. But the fact that collective bargaining has succeeded in establishing, whenever feasible, union security and this, by mutual and amicable procedure, then I believe that we should leave the matter to the scope and province of collective bargaining which has succeeded in the past and which will undoubtedly continue to bring practical results in this field in the future.

If we refer to past debates on the subject matter we find that members of this house have repeatedly expressed themselves on the freedom that should prevail in the establishment of management-labour relations. For example, in 1950, during the fall session, at page 51 of *Hansard* we find the following statement by the then member for Spadina:

> I believe that compulsory arbitration means the death of collective bargaining. It is all very well to say that we shall apply this principle only in one case, but we shall have done damage to a fundamental principle of freedom.

Again on the same page of *Hansard* we find this declaration by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

> It is of primary importance, and in the public interest, that there be no interference with the principle of free collective bargaining.