

this country have had a repetition of much the same kind of policies that we had in 1971 and 1972, although not as restrictive as that period. One would think that the government had learned their lesson; they were almost thrown out of office in 1972. Since we are 3½ years away from the next election, the government probably feels more secure today.

The high rate of inflation in this country, coupled with a high unemployment rate, make a much more serious contribution to industrial unrest and to the kind of illegal work stoppages we have been experiencing than any other one variable mentioned this afternoon. I repeat for the second or third time that I am surprised the Minister of Labour did not make this point an essential part of his argument. But once again I congratulate him for having the courage to say that it is a myth that Canadian wage settlements are far out of line with United States wage settlements. That should mean that no one, including editorial writers and people in the government, can any longer try to make labour the scapegoat for our problems.

● (1710)

It was interesting this week to watch the minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) working hard around the country trying to sell the notion of industrywide bargaining. The minister developed that idea this afternoon and I was pleased to hear him do so. But I would consider it a little premature or presumptuous on the part of the Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister, having announced the establishment of a tripartite labour-management-government advisory council, to then suggest or tell that council that industrywide bargaining is the solution to our problems in the labour-management field. What makes them so sure of that? There are many examples of industrywide bargaining in the United States which would indicate that it could create even more difficulty. This matter is so complex that it has to be looked at very seriously by the experts in this complicated field, although the minister and the Prime Minister did not suggest that this should be done earlier this week; they just offered it as a solution.

I think we are facing the danger of creating an oversimplified panacea, which obviously the minister should want to avoid. It is all right to look at the Canadian steel industry, as one journalist pointed out today, in terms of industrywide bargaining. This type of bargaining seems to be made for that type of industry in which the firms in Ontario control 70 per cent to 80 per cent of the production of all steel products in this country. But what about Dofasco which never had a union organization? How will you get industrywide bargaining in a situation like that? What about Sidbec, in Quebec, which is owned by the provincial government? What about our provincially-owned poor version of Sidbec called Sysco? The federal government practically washed its hands of that when it refused to allow the Cape Breton Development Corporation to take over the steelworks. I say that despite intermittent DREE grants made to Sysco.

I give the federal government full credit for setting up the Cape Breton Development Corporation, but it took away one of its most important controlling aspects when it did not allow the corporation to take over the Sydney Steel Works, forcing that industry back on a relatively

Labour Relations

financially weak province which did not have the civil servants, expertise or the know-how to tackle the difficulties in creating an internationally competitive steel industry. We are paying for that failure in Nova Scotia today.

When we talk about industrywide bargaining, these are some of the critical problems involved. We have to be very careful now even talking about voluntary arbitration as a good solution. I know George Meany in the United States came out in favour of this, but let us not do the work of the council before it even sits.

Having said that, let me congratulate the minister for having accepted the recommendation of the Woods report and setting up the council and making it a reality. If this is a by-product of the labour unrest due to our inflation and high unemployment, all well and good. I think the references in the resolution to industrial democracy in terms of profit-sharing and workers' shares should be seriously considered by this council as a tool for bringing labour and management together in the 1970s and the 1980s. I join with the minister in wishing the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) well in his attempt to make industrial democracy work in the Post Office.

Perhaps I could just have one or two minutes more, and I will be through, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): The hon. member's allotted time has expired. He can be allowed to conclude his remarks if there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Hogan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and fellow colleagues. I just want to make this point about the profit-sharing scheme mentioned in this resolution. I think shares going to the workers is a fine idea and I am all for it. I think if we had had some workers on the board of directors in the Cape Breton situation, the 1971 fiasco there would not have happened. I do not want to take the time of the House by going over that matter now, as time is pressing.

Let me remind Social Credit members and everyone else here of what the minister implicitly mentioned today. He said that in no way should these things such as profit-sharing be substituted for collective bargaining as a key implement in our free society. They are good ideas so long as they are not used to subvert union organizations or the organization of certified unions. Having said that, let me suggest that I feel there is a conservatism in the trade union movement, coupled with excuses for not attempting to establish industrial democracy, which are the kinds of things the minister's council well have to consider and overcome in their attempts to accomplish what has been suggested along the lines of the last part of this resolution. They are all part of the over-all picture.