

*Public Service Collective Bargaining*

will see that at page 87 of the report of the preparatory committee it is indicated that this is being reviewed and that recommendations will be made to the governor in council. I should like to know whether they have been made and what is the nature of them.

I should also like to know what the government proposes shall be the future role of the pay research bureau. I have what I might describe as a paternal interest in this bureau, because one of my earliest actions on entering this house in 1957 was to endeavour to persuade, and I did persuade them, the right hon. gentleman who is now the Leader of the Opposition, and the then minister of finance, Hon. Donald M. Fleming, to establish this bureau which the staff associations had theretofore sought unsuccessfully. I believe it has played a most useful role, that its techniques of research, which were shaky at the outset, have been consistently improved, that its work is needed in the future as a source of complete and impartial information about the comparability of salary and wage levels in various grades and classifications.

The Prime Minister has indicated this afternoon that if a system of collective bargaining is to be successful a drastic rearrangement and simplification of the existing classification and salary structure is a *sine qua non*. The Prime Minister has told us this afternoon that this will be completed some time next year. Indeed, I think this could be one of the most significant and advantageous by-products of the institution of collective bargaining.

Since 1929 this simplification and rearrangement has been urged periodically by various commissions but these recommendations have been largely ignored. The work of the Royal Commission on Administration Classifications in the Public Service was virtually pigeonholed by the St. Laurent government. The Glassco commission report was the latest to find the system "too elaborate and complicated", and recommended radical simplification. Yet in this as in other matters the present government has paid scant attention and virtually no respect to the Glassco report.

Last July, when the preparatory committee on collective bargaining in the public service submitted its report, the then 138,000 continuing positions under the Civil Service Act were found in over 700 classes and 1,400 grades. The special committee will want additional details in this regard to those given this afternoon in the house by the Prime Minister as to how far in fact the work of

[Mr. Bell (Carleton).]

simplification and rationalization has proceeded. It is very evident that the very number of grades and classifications at present would cause collective bargaining to bog down.

I have no doubt, sir, that there will be many growing pains in the application of new and simplified classifications. It is exceedingly difficult to bring about reasonable uniformity of conditions of employment when there is such an immense variety and diversity of public service jobs. Obviously a clerical job may be very different, although the grade or classification may be the same, for persons working in the embassy at Prague, in an Atlantic seacoast town, at departmental headquarters in Ottawa or in a post at Frobisher Bay.

In addition to the reduction and simplification of the grades and classifications, there are certain other essentials, I submit, if a plan of collective bargaining is to be fully successful and its integrity established firmly. I suggest that these essentials are a basic and integral part of industrial relations law today.

First, there must be full freedom of choice on the part of a civil servant to join whatever organization he wishes. Second, there must be firm prohibition of any discrimination, direct or indirect, against any civil servant as the result of his belonging to an organization of his choice. Third, there must be prohibition of any interference by the government, or any agent of the government, with any staff associations or organizations, including provision of appropriate penalties for threats, reprisals or acts of intimidation. Fourth, there must be provision for an adequate system of redress of grievances and for full investigation of complaints.

Finally, I should like to say that the calibre and ability of the persons appointed to the board and to the arbitration tribunal must be so high and distinguished as to command and retain the confidence not only of all public servants but of all Canadians generally. There is no place for patronage, either political or bureaucratic, in these appointments.

● (5:10 p.m.)

When I refer to the arbitration tribunal may I mention what to me is one of the astonishing features of the report of the preparatory committee as found on page 78:

The awards of the tribunal should reflect the view of all three members, a majority including the chairman or the chairman alone and, in any event, should be signed only by the chairman. There should be no provision for minority reports.