

*Postal Service Policies*

changes that they do not worry about the people who are adversely affected. I suggest that the government should think about the people affected by the changes that they make. We have all heard of trial balloons, and it appears that the government is not prepared to put up a trial balloon in this instance. Instead, it goes ahead with its plans, being more concerned with the principle of the balance sheet.

The minister also stated he was going to wake up the sleeping giant of the Post Office, and to some extent we would agree with this. At the same time, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* for Tuesday, May 19, under the heading "Kierans hopes Post Office can find way into 20th century as corporation", there is reference to the fact that the Postmaster General has stated that labour relations and working conditions are in a mess. The article goes on:

"We've improved working conditions tremendously," Mr. Kierans boasts, "but management in the Post Office still has a long, long way to go to get into the 20th century."

It is commendable on the part of the minister to make a pronouncement of this kind so forthrightly. At the same time he is reported to have said—though we hear many versions of what he is alleged to have said—that any employee who resists new working conditions is resisting change. In fact, reference was made to throwing sand into proposals to bring about change. I am wondering whether the minister has heard of the term that has been used during the last few months, "industrial democracy". Did the minister and the government really take the employees of the Post Office into their confidence before embarking upon changes?

I should like to draw the attention of the minister to today's *Globe and Mail* which carries a report on the Canadian Labour Congress convention in Edmonton, where 1,500 delegates voted yesterday. It is apparent from this article that the government is suspect in the eyes of labour since under the Public Service Staff Relations Act the only matters that can be negotiated, apart from wages, are small things which mean very little. The resolution adopted at the convention stated that while the congress recognized that there was a division of functions between labour and management, it endorsed the extension of collective bargaining to encompass all matters which affect the worker's life.

It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that the leader of the Cr ditistes used this House as a

forum to bring the present negotiations into our discussion. In my opinion, conciliation procedures are taking place in the course of the collective bargaining process and this is not an issue that should be discussed here at this time. I was pleased that the minister stayed out of that discussion when he spoke this afternoon.

Although the postal authorities are making many changes at the present time, they are not taking into consideration the interests of those employees whose rights are affected by those changes. The *Globe and Mail* report contains this paragraph:

The Freedman report would give the unions the right to veto the changes during the life of the contract if no agreement can be reached by the parties on the changes.

We are all well aware of that.

Even more far-reaching was the proposal that bargaining extend to management's production plans, future industrial development policies, curtailment of operations, methods and processes of operations and pollution control.

● (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, it is also noted that the Postmaster General has said that if this were a Crown corporation some of these areas could be covered by collective bargaining. But the situation does not preclude this, because he has the public service regulations. Perhaps it does because the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) has his "sometimes" 2 per cent increases. But if the Postmaster General were to ask the employees' organizations how it will affect the working life of the affected employees, he would find that many of the changes put into effect are really the prerogative of the workers themselves because they have to live with them. We cannot oppose change, but we can oppose a situation in which the managerial prerogative is uppermost in the government's mind. The postal authorities seem to live with the idea that managerial prerogative is the only way in which to operate.

If they insist on this attitude I am sure we will continually have strikes in respect of all public service bargaining units in this country. We also know that the President of the Treasury Board said there is a moral obligation on the part of many people to write into a contract a job security clause. If there is a moral obligation to do this, there is a moral obligation on the part of the government to include it in their bargaining in respect of things which affect the workers. Unfortunately, too often in the past this has not hap-