

*Canada Labour Code*

about chip technology. He suggested that these benefits will come to people if the union leaders act responsibly. He never suggested that employers must be responsible. I assume he is content to have employers be irresponsible, and in fact some of them are in their treatment of labour.

The Hon. Member claims that benefits like workmen's compensation, the minimum wage, the Canada Pension and Unemployment Insurance came about because this is an enlightened country. He tried to do away almost entirely with the history of how those benefits were achieved. Each was won after a long campaign by organized labour. I do not remember any campaign by organized employers to provide these benefits. Employers conceded them as the most convenient way of regularizing certain situations, but in almost every case the thrust to develop those benefits came from organized labour and in many cases from the only parliamentary Party that sympathized with organized labour, the CCF-NDP.

We heard that two-thirds of the work force does not have the opportunity to join a union and that unions are not interested in organizing them. That is probably beside the point of the Hon. Member's argument but as a taunt it should be answered. It is false. The unions spend a great deal of energy, time and money trying to make it possible for workers to join unions. It is the employers who will spend and have spent thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars and at times even hire known criminals in order to intimidate, beat up, spy upon and lie against workers trying to organize a union or those engaged in the conduct of a legal strike. It shows ill grace for a supporter of business to taunt workers about not having the chance to join a union when the main obstacle to that is the action of many employers.

The Hon. Member also taunts unions with not having produced jobs. He must never have read a labour contract, at least not in the Province of Ontario. By law in Ontario every contract must have or is deemed to have a management rights clause which says that it is up to management to run the plant, to decide what work will be done and who will do it, subject only to its agreement with the union and the laws of the Province and the country. It is management's responsibility to provide jobs. To taunt the unions with not providing jobs suggests that the Hon. Member wants some kind of society entirely and exclusively ruled by unions. Whether he would call that socialist or not I leave it to him to say, but it is not what we have in Canada at the present time. As long as the company has the responsibility for providing the jobs, the unions do not.

Finally, we heard the plea for freedom of association. No person should be compelled to join a union or party. That is fair enough. The members have obviously voted for a union; if they had not there would be no union. They can choose whether to work in a union shop or not. I have friends who

have refused jobs because they would not work without the protection of a union. Members can not only change the officers but can decertify the union if they do not think it is doing a good job, and this happens, Mr. Speaker.

There is freedom of choice within a union. If a union wishes to put some money into a political party campaign it must ask permission of members through legal channels at a union meeting. That is a different situation from that of the board of directors of a corporation which can and in many cases does spend shareholders' money supporting the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party without asking shareholders if that is what they want to do.

It borders on hypocrisy for the Hon. Member to accuse unions of taking away freedom of association when in fact there is far more freedom of association for members of a union than there is for either the employees of the company as employees or, in many cases, for the shareholders of the company.

I have attended shareholders' meetings of a large mining company in this country on two occasions. It was evident to me how little power the average shareholder had, attending one meeting in a year. He was not provided with the full information about what was going on in the company; a group at the head table monopolised the time. That does not happen to the same extent in a union.

**An Hon. Member:** He could sell his shares.

**Mr. Heap:** An Hon. Member said he could sell his shares. He might just as well say to the employee that he can quit his job. For many people that is a choice and for many others that is not a choice. It has nothing to do with the quality of the internal democracy either within the shareholders' group or within the union group.

● (1620)

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as long as the Hon. Member keeps being re-elected, we will probably have this debate every two years. I was glad to say my piece this time and I am sure the next time the Hon. Member brings it up there will be some new Members of the NDP caucus here to give him an answer.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order, please. It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings, pursuant to Standing Order 24(2).

[English]

Shall all items listed under Private Members' Notices of Motions preceding item No. 69 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.