

Supply—Transport

ports, I would ask him to take the same into favourable consideration, so those towns may get an adequate air service as soon as possible.

[Text]

Item agreed to.

73d. To provide that section 115 of the civil service regulations shall apply to any person notwithstanding that he was not employed in the civil service on the date that the regulation was made

(a) who ceased to be employed in the civil service at any time during the period commencing on the first day of April, 1962 and ending on the 28th day of February, 1964 and

(b) who immediately prior to becoming employed in the civil service was employed by Canadian Marconi Corporation, \$1.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may be allowed to speak very briefly in explanation of this vote after which, if it is found objectionable, I will not pursue it. I am not going to take up the time of the committee by pressing this item, but I think it will be acceptable.

This item as I see it does not attempt to change legislation but simply changes certain regulations which have the effect of providing for one individual—possibly for several others—to come within the provisions of section 115 of the civil service regulations. This individual was seconded in some fashion or another from a private company to the civil service in the manner of—I am trying to find the wretched explanation. Perhaps somebody could tell me what the number of this vote is.

An hon. Member: It is 73d.

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, I have now found it. This vote is in reference to one Wilfrid Serrick, and I will read the gobbledygook.

This is to authorize the application of section 115 of the Civil Service Act and of the sections referred to in section 115 to the case of one Wilfrid Serrick a former radio operator, St. John's, Newfoundland, and to the former employees of Canadian Marconi Corporation who were taken over by the department in 1957 and who retired from the civil service prior to the coming into force of section 115.

The facts of the Serrick case, and particularly the matter of a payment for 26 weeks retiring leave, were referred to treasury board in July of 1964 and, in essence, the board suggested that the department deal with the situation by placing an authorizing item in these supplementary estimates. In so doing, Mr. Serrick, as well as other former Marconi employees who are in a similar position to that of Serrick, would receive the same treatment for leave and pension purposes as though they had been employed continuously in the public service from the initial date of employment with the Canadian Marconi Corporation.

[Mr. Laprise.]

It does not seem to me that this is the kind of case that would normally require an act of parliament. This simply brings employees who formerly worked for a company, and whose pensions were taken over, to be integrated into the public service.

Mr. Leboe: Will the minister tell us whether he expects there will be many more cases in Canada of this kind requiring this sort of thing to be repeated?

Mr. Pickersgill: This vote does not change anything. It has reference to a man who retired before the act was passed so that he can be treated in the same way as other employees are treated.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I am not inclined to agreeing that we should make changes in order to compensate individuals who, through no fault of their own, have run afoul of the regulations, and thereby experienced difficulties in respect of income or pension. On the other hand, I am aware of two employees of the post office in the city of Prince Rupert who suffered an injustice as the result of similar circumstances. I do not intend to relate the circumstances involved at this time, but these two individuals were performing identical work, and had identical classifications. One employee received different treatment from that applied to the other because of the date of the coming into effect of the new Civil Service Act and the regulations thereto, which allowed an increment applicable to the particular position. These two individuals were doing identical work and had identical classifications, but received different wage rates because one happened to be promoted to that position before the other, who came within the beneficial parts of the new regulations. This case has been referred to the civil service commission and has gone around and around in circles, but has ended up in the same way. That service indicated that nothing could be done in that regard because of existing regulations.

If parliament is now being asked to allow these regulations to apply to individual cases because of certain existing circumstances, I think they should also be made applicable to the individual to whom I have referred on a parallel basis.

Perhaps the minister will be kind enough to tell me how I can draw these circumstances to the attention of treasury board, or whichever board is responsible, so that this individual can be treated in a like manner.