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tion. During a recent ten year period in Britain, 400,000 mine workers, two-thirds of the labour force, were made redundant also without a major work stoppage».

Worker representation on company supervisory boards is the other major component of Co-determination. To illustrate the representative's role one must be aware of the boards' function under German company law. Ultimate power to decide all company affairs rests with share holders at the annual general meeting. The managing board (Vorstand) exercises day to day control over company's policy. Supervisory board meetings, where worker representatives are in the minority, are held about once every three months. Annual company reports and future plans etc., are presented by the Vorstand for review.

As a member of the supervisory board, worker representatives have the same responsibilities and legal duties as other share holder appointed members. It is of little consequence that they have been elected by the workers. They must act in the best interests of the company as a whole. The precise nature of such «interests» is of course, determined by the share-holders. Several studies, including the Biedenkopf Commission confirm that worker representatives seldom oppose management investment decisions but rather try simply to mitigate the effects of such decisions on the work force.

Generally, the value of co-determination to individual workers seems to be less than Connaghan suggests. Rank and file workers are increasingly prepared to challenge the immense power wielded by the high level union bureaucracy (Contracts can be negotiated and signed without membership ratification). From 1964 to 1968, 83% of all strikes were unofficial. Since then widespread unofficial strikes have occurred in 1969, 1970, 1973 and 1975. It has been suggested that a militant shop steward movement is emerging to represent shop floor dissension. The remoteness of industry-wide bargaining often leads to significant wage drift and further questioning of the technique itself.

Finally, most remarkable about the report is its failure to raise several issues crucial to any discussion on industrial relations. For instance, what is the precise relationship between Works Councils and collective bargaining? Why has German trade union membership dropped from 40 to 30% since Works Councils were introduced? What is the effect of extending wages and conditions negotiated by unions to the non-union sector? To what extent do Works Council agreements actually compete with or undermine collective agreements?

The absence of such questions may be due to Mr. Connaghan's background as management's labour-relations practitioner for the B.C. Construction Labour Relations Association. As far back as 1971 Mr. Connaghan was insisting that trade unions had become too powerful. The legislative pendulum was «swinging farther and farther to labours' side. Governments were afraid of labour unions.» This unsubstantiated pronouncement led him to conclude that collective bargaining is «coughing and sputtering along and personally, I'd like to push it off the road onto the scrap heap,» because the «process is simply out of step with the society in which it lives.» Moreover, «in a period of serious and rising unemployment there's something obscene about a strike or slow down, especially when the work stoppage has a cumulative effect on other industries.» From managements view point perhaps collective bargaining has failed. It is understandable, then, if management seeks to minimize threats to its' power by introducing participative schemes. From an organized worker's view point however, collective bargaining has probably been quite successful. Efforts to weaken that system are likely to be strongly resisted.

To conclude, one gets the impression that Mr. Connaghan's choice of Germany as a model is not accidental. (France's post-war economic development has been no less impressive than Germanys'). Perhaps he and the Federal Government feel that introducing parts of the German system will help to restore Canadian management to its «rightful» position of absolute dominance over its workers. If so, the next few years will be important ones for all trade unionists.
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The Author of this book, a professor of Occupational Health at the University of Pittsburg, has had a long career in industrial medicine. He has served on numerous U.S. government agencies and is a medical consultant to the Machinists Union.

Traditionally, workers have been dependent upon employers and governments
in matters regarding occupational health. This dependency has resulted in numerous unnecessary diseases and deaths. Dr. Mancuso is one of several professionals providing a badly alternate source of occupational health data.

The book is intended to provide accurate, practical information to the average worker. Indeed, much of it is in the form of concise responses to letters written by concerned workers. Many first appeared in the 1974-1975 editions of the union’s journal, The Machinist. There are four main sections in the book. The opening section is called «Recognizing an Occupational Illness». Exchanges such as the following occur:

Q. «I have been an auto mechanic for 40 years. I have worked in poorly ventilated shops all this time. I have also breathed brake dust from many thousands of brake jobs. I have bad legs, back, and no wind. I don’t smoke cigarettes. I do smoke cigars. Is there any state compensation?»

A. In brake lining dust you would have been exposed to Asbestos dust that lines the brakes. Asbestos produces a fibrosis of the lungs called asbestosis and asbestosis causes emphysema. Now, if your chest x-rays show evidence of asbestosis, or some stage of asbestosis, then you would have the basis for an occupational disease compensation claim...»

In similar types of exchanges workers are constantly alerted to possible health hazards.

The next section discusses the question, Occupational Exposure: How Much Is Enough? It’s purpose is to «Help you understand the significance of the air contaminant standard... to tell you what air sampling and testing is all about — how results are interpreted and evaluated, what the concentration levels mean; how air samples and tests identify the nature and extent of the health risks on the job and how they affect your compensation claim.»

A reprint of O.S.H.A. air contaminant standards is also included.

A section on Control Measures follows, outlining, in detail, means of air contaminant control such as ventilation. Elimination of the contaminant source is judged the most desirable method, while individual worker protection the least. Owing to differences in U.S. — Canadian laws, the final section of Worker’s Compensation is not very useful to Canadians.

Overall, Dr. Mancuso certainly succeeds in providing occupational health information to workers in a language they can understand. One disappointing feature of the book however, is its apolitical nature. For example, the author states, without further explanation, that the purpose of present legislated standards is to «Protect your health by specifying the limits of exposure to these toxic substances during the course of your employment.» Unfortunately, the process of standard setting is not simply a scientific exercise.

Many standards were and are inadequate by objective criteria. Morton Corn, head of O.S.H.A. recently noted the «concensus standards include many regulations which appear to have marginal, if any, effect on eliminating potential hazards in the work place.» The requirement that O.S.H.A. submit Inflationary Impact Statements on proposed regulations also reduces the likelihood that standards will be solely based on medical-scientific criteria.

In reality, the Unions, backed by scientific research, demand the safest possible standards. Companies, also backed by scientific research, insist on the cheapest possible standards. The legislation finally enacted is determined as much by political forces as scientific data. In this sense, Patrick Kinnersly’s book, The Hazards of Work, is more useful. Nevertheless, Dr. Mancuso’s guide is extremely valuable. It should be read by Canadian workers.
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Déjà un peu plus d’un an s’est écoulé depuis la parution de ce volume que l’auteur considère lui-même dans sa préface comme une édition révisée de Canadian Labour Economics publié en 1970. Le professeur Peitchinis qualifie même cette révision de substantielle, ce qui explique sans doute le fait que le présent volume se présente comme un nouveau, non comme une édition révisée, et en plus avec un titre différent The Canadian Labour Market. Quoi qu’il en soit, le présent volume m’apparaît essentiellement une édition révisée de celui de 1970. En effet, deux seules différences