

*Supply—Labour*

chairman appointed by the cabinet. Of the four labour delegates, three are appointed by international unions or by the C.C.L. and one by the C.N.T.U. It can readily be seen that there is some disproportion when a dispute must be settled between the two bodies, namely the C.C.L. and the C.N.T.U. The number of votes is unevenly distributed.

This prompts us to suggest a first change to the minister and I feel he should take the matter into consideration. As a matter of fact, when a dispute arises between unions, the decision should not be left to a body made up of three members on one side and one on the other, because, unavoidably, or in most cases at least, the chairman and the four delegates from management form a majority on the C.L.R.B. and carry the vote. Now, as the C.N.T.U. has only one member and the C.C.L. have three, whenever there is a dispute between the two labour unions, the Canadian Congress of Labour necessarily has an advantage over the C.N.T.U.

In the end, those who have to decide on affiliation to a union are not the three delegates of the C.C.L. nor the delegate of the C.N.T.U. but the workers involved in this union dispute and the workers must have the right to choose freely the union to which they will belong.

In the present case, that is the case of national negotiation units, it is not the worker who can pick the union with which he wants to affiliate, it is the Canada Labour Relations Board that dictates his choice of a union. In this case, the choice is dictated by the C.C.L., because the C.C.L. has three delegates whereas the C.N.T.U. has only one representative on the Canada Labour Relations Board.

A second change required in view of these observations, Mr. Chairman, is that when a strictly internal dispute within the labour movement is involved, the employers are also asked to vote on this dispute, because within the Canada Labour Relations Board there are four delegates from the employers and four from the employees, or union members, and the chairman. In such a case, the employers delegates are asked to vote or to help the board to reach a decision when strictly a union dispute is involved, a dispute concerning two labour unions. Obviously, there is a second weakness there and the Minister of Labour could improve this or make a change.

A third amendment which, to my mind, should be made in the present legislation on the Canada Labour Relations Board—the C.N.T.U. brought it up recently—is that the

[Mr. Grégoire.]

chairman—the one who listens to both sides of the discussion—is not always in a position to understand the arguments introduced by certain groups when these arguments are presented in a language he cannot understand. Obviously, there is simultaneous interpretation of these discussions, at least in the majority of cases, but this does not enable the chairman, who is more or less the judge on these matters, to understand fully the scope of all the arguments that may be brought forward.

That is why I suggest to the Minister of Labour that he amend the act on the Canada Labour Relations Board so that its chairman may be perfectly bilingual, and therefore able to converse in English or in French with those who come before the board.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, there is also the fact, which I want to point out to the minister, that the Canada Labour Relations Board is now studying the case of C.B.C. employees in connection with the splitting up of national units into natural units.

All C.B.C. employees are now members of the same union. Regardless of whether they work in British Columbia, Newfoundland, Quebec or Ontario, or whether they speak English or French, they belong to the same union.

The C.B.C. employees in Montreal want their own union because they no longer wish to belong to an international union that never looked after their interests in the past. They want their own union for the employees of the French network of the C.B.C.

That request is absolutely justified, because the C.B.C. saw fit to divide its radio and television network into the French and the English networks. And yet, today, the employees of both networks are compelled to belong to the same union, while the employees of the French network would like to have their own union.

Well, I wonder why they should be refused that since it then becomes a natural unit of negotiation.

And the refusal of that right is the more serious that it would constitute a grave precedent in labour relations for the future.

We will soon have unions of bank employees. Those employees will not come under provincial labour relations boards, but under the Canada Labour Relations Board. Then, if the same policy is adopted, Quebec bank employees, either from the Bank of Montreal,