

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the purpose, the aim of his bill, Bill C-223, we understood way before he did through all the changes made in the Canadian Labour Code. A while ago he was telling us again that as far as we are concerned, job security and health hazards on the job are not important. Mr. Speaker, I think he did not really read the new legislation. I do not understand how such a brilliant member can venture to say such things.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a study mentioned by my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Dupont), who told us about the Woods task Force on the problems and the percentage of trade unionism, which bears a direct relationship to Bill C-223. Mr. Speaker, I will read some of the recommendations made in the Woods report:

(1) Unless a union can demonstrate at least 35 per cent membership, its application for certification should not be entertained.

These people have studied it well.

Where a union can demonstrate 65 per cent membership, it should be entitled to a certificate without a representation vote.

Where a union can show at least 35 per cent membership but less than 65 per cent membership, it should be entitled to a representation vote.

The hon. member wants to reduce that to 20 per cent. They took the time to consider things, Mr. Speaker, they took the time to diagnose the problem. He selected some figure at random, it could have been 15, or 12, or 10 per cent, or 25 per cent for that matter, I wonder. Unfortunately, he picked up 20 per cent. And although I try hard to read through his explanations, this is not consistent at all with his views.

Certainly I share his view on greater unionization, but I do not agree that where one individual wishes to have an union out of 20 working in a shop, everyone should have to join. I still believe in democracy. There will be the kind of employer tactics he referred to, and he is right as far as certain aspects are concerned, when he indicates there are employers wilfully preventing workers from joining a union, arbitrarily using legislation that may be improperly drafted. But this has just been amended, although there are continuous law suits to block further unionization. We should not generalize however.

I have known hundreds of unions, 99 per cent of which are excellent. There could have been the odd one less perfect than others, but this is by no means suggesting the whole group is bad. What I cannot understand is the hon. member for Nickel Belt's (Mr. Rodriguez) rationale.

And coming back to the definition given by Woods, the Woods group, to refute the points made by the hon. member for Nickel Belt:

Where at least 50 per cent of the employees voting, as distinct from 50 per cent of employees eligible to vote, vote in favour of the union, it should be entitled to a certificate; we considered recommending a minimum percentage of the work force that must cast ballots before the election would be considered valid, but decided against it on the ground that it runs contrary to normal electoral practice and would constitute an invasion of the free franchise inas-

### *Canada Labour Code*

much as it would operate to the advantage of the employer or a rival union to discourage employees from entering the polling booth.

I believe that those arguments are valid, Mr. Speaker, and that we should take the time to study them. Consider now the fifth recommendation of the Woods task force:

A representation vote be conducted by the Canada Labour Relations Board at the place or places of employment.

Where there is no employment situs, Mr. Speaker, or if the vote is by mail, there is no problem. This has been checked so those provisions help. And I continue to quote:

There be provision for taking a pre-hearing ballot of employees at the request of the applicant to determine the wishes of the employees close to the time of application for certification should the results of a representation vote become relevant as the application is processed.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I refer to section 118.1 dealing with that problem in the amendments that have been made.

The Canada Labour Relations Board have power to determine whether a ballot should be taken with a show of less than 35 per cent support, and whether a union should be certified without the required demonstration of support by ballot on a consideration of the impact of any employer unfair labour practice.

Where a union can show over 65 per cent membership but there is evidence that the membership was obtained by misrepresentation or there is evidence of misrepresentation in the records, such as to cast doubt on the union's degree of support, the board should have discretion to order a vote or to deny a certificate.

Mr. Speaker, for many years the party I represent has tried to improve labour relations and to establish a Canadian Labour Code more adequate and more relevant to the present situation. What was the result of the latest amendments? Very simple. Earlier I heard the hon. member speak against the Bankers' Association. That is his right. However he knows that with the new provisions in the code, his arguments no longer stand. I always have the impression that he and I do not read the same thing. He is entitled to his own interpretation, but I still hope he will be able to look into this.

Mr. Speaker, even though Bill C-223 essentially aims at wider unionization I must say that it does not go far enough. We have a code which goes even further. Why change it? Why restrict the problem? I can hardly understand the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). We have succeeded in greatly improving labour relations this year, a 150 per cent improvement compared with the situation which prevailed last year as regards strikes and lockouts. What is the reason for that? As I said earlier, it is because the government took its responsibilities when it set up a 14-point program a year and a half ago. But it seems that my colleague opposite is not aware of these things.

The problem with opposition members is that all government actions are bad from the start. I do not want to have to give a definition of the conception the opposition members have on that matter, but I presume that from time to time we must certainly do a few things that make sense. I suppose that all those changes that have been made—