

of the law, which makes it very valuable from the student's point of view, is the way in which legislation has been necessary to supplement and correct the common law development. This is a subject in respect of which the modern law is an amalgamation (not always easily achieved or satisfactory when completed) of the older common law and the newer statutory provisions made necessary by social and economic changes. Further, by the introduction of legislation some of the differences adverted to earlier between the formulae and methods adopted in England and those of such countries as Canada may have disappeared, in practice even though they possibly continue to exist and to operate in theory.

The English situation is brought out in copious detail, but with great clarity, in Professor Goode's book. Throughout, the learned author makes reference to authority in Canada and the United States, as well as other Commonwealth common law countries. He has also been at great pains to relate the law of hire-purchase to other, connected areas of the law, such as sale of goods, contract generally, tort, property, etc., wherever there is any overlap or materiality. As a work of careful, thorough, and well-researched scholarship, the book is a paradigm. As a source-book of the law and practice of hire-purchase it almost defies challenge. Admittedly in recent years there have appeared on the English market several books on this subject, notably that of Professor Guest. But this book by Professor Goode, which, if I am not mistaken was the first large-scale study of the topic, as opposed to other brief and inadequate accounts, is still an outstanding and leading work. As I have already indicated, it may not be of immediate and significant interest or importance to the Canadian lawyer or law student. Nonetheless it ought not to be ignored in this country at a time when the situation of the credit purchaser is under serious consideration by lawyers and law reform bodies. If they are seeking, for comparative and educative purposes, a comprehensive and intelligible account of the English approach to the legal problems and issues raised by this particular fact of economic and commercial life, then they would do well to resort to Professor Goode's work for satisfaction.

—G. H. L. Fridman\*

\* Dean, Faculty of Law, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

---

**THE CRAFT BARGAINING UNIT.** By J. A. Willes. Kingston, Ontario: Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University. 1970. Pp. xiii and 43.

This work provides an examination of the "lost constituency"<sup>1</sup> of collective bargaining, the craft unit. It points out that, except in the construction industry, the craft unit is indeed vanishing, and examines the policies of legislatures and labour relations boards that have contributed to bringing this about.

The problem of the craft unit is one of insuring a group of employees, exercising a particular craft and with a strong community of interest,

<sup>1</sup> Carrothers, *Collective Bargaining in Canada* 242 (1965).

the rights of self-determination in the face of the possible disruptive effects of this right on industrial efficiency and stability. Also weighing against the establishment of craft units is the deleterious effect that their exclusion from an industrial unit might possibly have on the balance of the unit. In general, policy making bodies have favoured industrial units in the face of the potential fragmentation and instability which could result from the certification of craft units, and have limited the scope of these units to those comprised of employees exercising traditional craft skills.

Professor Willes directs his attention to the policies laid down by the United States National Labour Relations Board and more particularly to those of the Ontario Labour Relations Board. He feels that present policies tend to restrict the emergence of new crafts and the development of craft bargaining units in industries where the skills involved are not within those categories traditionally classed as crafts. Professor Willes sees problems arising if policy making bodies do not recognize the needs of those with emerging skills, especially since boards which deny them separate certification often insist on the formation of separate bargaining units for such groups as office and professional employees. In addition, it seems that some industrial bargaining units are establishing constitutional protection for craft groups thereby introducing the exact kind of problem which the boards are seeking to circumvent.

In order to assert the right of these employees to self-determination, one possible solution, Professor Willes asserts, would be to certify the craft units separately but to require joint bargaining of the unions certified within the plant in order to preserve stability in labour relations.

After reading Professor Willes' careful exposition of the policies of the Ontario and United States Boards and of the problems involved, one is left with some feeling of disappointment that he did not include within the scope of his inquiry the approaches or non-approaches taken to the problem in other Canadian jurisdictions and his reactions to them.

It is also to be regretted that he did not see fit to canvass more thoroughly other possible solutions to the problems. In this regard, for instance, his view on whether setting of policy in this area ought to be done by the board or by the legislature would have been interesting.

—J. P. Lordon\*

---

\* Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.