

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Will these flow from the report? Will the report be examined publicly by the appropriate standing committee of this Parliament? Will the group recommend changes in, for instance, what is arbitrable and things like classifications, check-offs, time off for union activities, and so on? Will a thorough examination of the entrenched management rights contained in section 7 be revised in an enlightened and progressive manner in terms of shared decision-making?

Management holds all the marbles at the present time. The public service can go for Collective bargaining and gain a particular kind of contract, then the government can and does juggle the classifications so that the contract is useless. The whole thing is a farce. Are these things going to be examined and changed? These are the questions we ask and need answers to now.

How can you find these things out from a group that is to report solely to the minister? Will there be an independent appellate division set up to ensure that those who rule on an issue in the first place do not handle the appeal as well? This practice is currently taking place and that, among other things, is what is concerning the people of the public service.

Will the Public Service Staff Relations Board be given powers so that it can discipline both sides, including the government? We have seen instances where the board has ruled in favour of the employees and it has turned out that they could not do anything about management decisions. The example I give will be one in respect of the public service board ruling on retroactive pay which was not paid within the prescribed 90 days. They made a ruling favouring the employees but nothing could be done about it. What kind of discipline will the government accept as a result of this? In short, this is a very serious matter in the public service. We are sorry this had to be done privately and, as I said earlier, furtively.

The public service wants to know if the review by this particular study group is to play a real role in improvement. Will its recommendation result in changes in legislation? Will this legislation then be examined by the appropriate parliamentary committee, or is this just another in a monotonous series of delaying tactics and was the group appointed merely to give the government an excuse for another six months' delay?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member indicating that he understands the importance and, indeed, the delicacy of the many issues involved in a review of the Public Service Staff Relations Act. We hope to have a thorough understanding of the viewpoints of the interested parties before taking any definite steps in answer to the many questions, some of which the hon. member raised in his remarks and some of which he left out, which come up in looking at this act and the operation of the public Service Staff Relations Board in its few years of history.

I have recently made this known to all interested parties and I hope to invite their co-operation in the review,

[Mr. Rose.]

receive their views and discuss them with the distinguished men who have agreed to work on the review. I do not wish to speculate at this time upon the result, but this much at least I can say—that is likely that the review may result in legislation being proposed to the House. I say that without prejudging the issues but simply recognizing the many points made on all sides about the difficulty in relation to the act, the board, its operation and points for improvement.

Of course, at that time I would anticipate there would be the fullest opportunity to examine in every way the issues involved in and attitudes to changes which may be proposed. I therefore see this as a process of trying to obtain a thorough understanding of the viewpoints as we move from one step to another toward making improvements which may be required in this very important law governing the relationship of those in our public service with the government of Canada.

TRANSPORT—SUGGESTED USE OF LIGHT ON HALIFAX MONUMENT AS SIGNAL FOR SHIPPING

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I make these remarks with two thoughts in mind. First, I am pleased that the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) is here, because of his distinguished service as a merchant seaman during the Second World War. I am sure these remarks will have a special meaning for him. Second, I believe the reply will come from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Duquet), who has had some difficulties. We are pleased he has won this battle and is with us.

If you go to Halifax, go to the south end and look out from Point Pleasant Park to the stone faces on the other side of Halifax harbour, you look across the broad Atlantic. It was from there the great convoys of the Second World War sailed. Many brave men did not reach the other side, or did not come back again. A few years ago the Royal Canadian Naval Association had a monument erected to these men. It is a very impressive monument and one from which a light beacon shines. But unfortunately, those who built it were perhaps more ambitious than the funds allowed in keeping this memorial going perpetually.

● (10:20 p.m.)

Therefore I was forced to ask whether some means could be found to keep lighting this monument. The problem, I think, is that while the equipment is there, what is needed is \$1,500 a year for its floodlighting. While one would expect that this request should be directed to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) and his department, I also had in mind that this monument does stare out at night onto the Atlantic Ocean and, therefore, might properly be regarded as a beacon that could be operated by the Department of Transport. Perhaps I could put it in as brief a wording as possible, to put the matter in true perspective, by quoting from a Canadian Press report which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of Friday, February 12. It reads as follows: