about 25 per cent higher, enabling neighbouring states within the United States to market the same resources, often to the same customers, at lower prices that we can offer. The resulting slump in the economic activity only adds to the umemployment and inflation rates recently registered in British Columbia.

Let us endeavour to develop a system based upon participation and co-operation. In 1975 only Italy had a higher percentage of man-hours lost due to strikes than did Canada-among industrial nations surveyed. If we do not stand to benefit from the current program then we are foolish to maintain it. I do not wish to destroy the bargaining power which unions possess. In all fairness, many of our labour leaders have exhibited a great deal of restraint and intelligence in recent years. Meetings between members on this side of the House and labour leaders have been held in recent years and they understand some of the problems which are facing us. They know there is a need to compromise and to restructure the system, but they have little faith in a government which is offering the kinds of negotiations which have so far been inherent in the industrial relations process.

The unorganized worker is simply not getting his fair share. Public confidence in collective bargaining as a method of reaching agreement on wages and benefits is sagging. Union leaders are not satisying half their members, and high wages are blamed for the economic woes we are experiencing. These factors indicate to me that the time is ripe to restructure the framework within which unions operate—not to restrict their activity but to expand it in a co-operative way.

Unions are not the only ones guilty of irresponsibility today. We all must shoulder a certain amount of the blame for our present problems, especially those members who sit on the opposite side of the House. I urge my colleagues to support the measure before us in the public and the national interest. We have seen the beneficial effects that right to work legislation has had in other parts of the world. We know that it is viable both in theory and in practice. It is time we awoke to the reality of our dilemma and developed new tools to improve our situation. That is our duty and our purpose for being here. I appeal to all hon. members to support this legislation, which would constitute a most important first step toward a more up-to-date, fluid, and cohesive industrial relations system.

Mr. Robert Daudlin (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, in presenting the bill before us, presents a tidy package, one tied up with a presentable and attractive bow. But I think that when it is opened ,one finds a degree of cynicism which makes it rather unacceptable. The hon. member seems to start from a position which it would appear he would not want to be seen to support, that is, that the unions should not have rights with respect to security in terms of those areas where they now enjoy certification.

The hon. member says he does not want to see certain rights removed from the unions—their security—but he feels that by tying up his package in terms of right to work legislation he will be able to make the terms of Bill C-239 acceptable. I find I cannot take that candy pill. It seems to me that what we are dealing with here is perhaps, in some form, a misconception by the hon. member in terms of the current state of the law in Canada.

Looking at the Canada Labour Code, one reads under certain sections, such as section 161, that nothing prohibits parties to a collective agreement from including in the collective agreement a provision requiring, as a condition of employment, membership in a specified trade union, or granting a preference for employment to members of a specified trade union. This is permissive legislation, not mandatory legislation requiring that when certification takes place only a certain number from a union may work in a shop.

It is true there are situations where negotiations have taken place which have resulted in a closed shop. But surely that is as a result of negotiation, not as a result of any kind of mandatory decision by the government, management or the union. It would seem to me that labourers have the right, first of all, to join a union—the hon. member has admitted that. In addition, labourers enjoy the expanded right to negotiate with employers a situation in which they are the only source of labour. I see nothing wrong in that, provided it is not imposed. It seems to me all the legislation provides the format and the mechanism whereby, if that situation is being abused, decertification of a union could take place and control could once again be gained by the labourers.

More important is subsection (2) of the amendment proposed by the hon. member. I quote:

> No provision in a collective agreement requiring an employer to make a deduction or deductions from the remuneration paid to an employee to be credited to a specified trade union, is valid unless such deduction or deductions are authorized by the employee.

I am a product of a law school which had the honour to have as its first dean, Dean Rand, the noted Supreme Court Judge who, after retirement from the bench, went on to teach men and women such as myself what the law was all about. I had the pleasure to study law under the man who, as hon. members know, was the author of the Rand report which emanated from my part of Ontario, Windsor, during the Ford strike. He came up with what has since that time been known as the Rand formula, which has been heralded in all corners of the world as probably one of the most progressive pieces of judicial decision-making that has ever been made in the field of labour-management relations. I hearken back to that decision and note that, among other things, it has this to say:

● (1620)

> That we cannot draw back and try to reverse the whole progress of the last 100 years in labour-employer relations, that we must go through to a higher evolution of them must, I think, be accepted as axiomatic. On that assumption there are two fundamental views to be taken on the mode of bringing that progress about: either to leave it as the issue of economic war in all its ferocity and waste or as the gradual rationalization of an area where interests are both common and conflicting. That we must have some sort of law or convention regarding these relations is inescapable:—

It seems to me that that formula derived by Judge Rand, which brought the Ford strike to an end and allowed the principle of compulsory checkoff, reasoned that if an individual were to work in a plant which was not a closed shop and