

Public Service Collective Bargaining

I congratulate the government on bringing down this legislation. We shall wish to examine it very closely when it comes before us, but if it provides for the kind of collective bargaining for which we have been asking, if it contains provisions such as those of which I have been speaking, I can assure the government that this measure will have our wholehearted support.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, that resolution is a good omen because it foreshadows the legislation which will soon be introduced. On the other hand, I admit frankly that it is always with a little reluctance that I take part in a debate on a resolution because, in my opinion, it is a superfluous stage in our proceedings. As a matter of fact, the house loses very precious time that way.

If all hon. members would agree to eliminate the resolution stage I would be very happy. I would have liked it better if the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) had introduced the bill this afternoon to allow us to study something concrete.

But such is not the case. The Prime Minister takes the floor and tries to sell us something he is hiding. He is praising its colour and its size, but we do not know what it is, we have not seen it and we are wondering what is inside that surprise package.

That is the impression I get every time a resolution is introduced. We know that the standing orders require it. Let us get away from 1867. It seems to me that we are a little behind the times. Let us get rid of that procedure. The Prime Minister and his ministers should stop introducing resolutions and should introduce bills instead.

After the Prime Minister had told us everything the legislation did and did not contain, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the other members of the opposition told him in turn that there might be this in it, that it might be better to include some other thing. I am convinced that the bill is already drafted and I am almost convinced that all the remarks by the four opposition parties will not help to give a final form to that measure because, once again, I feel that the text of the legislation is ready and that all the remarks that are made will not change it one bit.

Therefore, why waste the time of the house? We have already lost two hours studying a resolution and today, if we are to

[**Mr. Douglas.**]

proceed as in 1867, the resolution should be introduced at the same time as the legislation to enable us to study it knowing what it is about.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): You are not obliged to talk on a resolution.

Mr. Gauthier: What do you mean, we are not obliged to talk on a resolution? We have been talking about it for the past two hours. This what I have just mentioned; nobody has to speak. As a matter of fact, nobody should speak. I am rising to say no one should speak. Two hours of the time of the house have been taken up. This is what we are wondering about; what will this legislation bring us? Let us do away with this procedure.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Gauthier: It is all very well to say: sit down. The thing is to convince the others to resume their seats and not to take up the time of the house. The hon. member opposite keeps saying: sit down. He is always seated and never speaks. We are wasting our time with all this. For the past two hours, I have heard speakers deal with the resolution. The Prime Minister himself took up 30 minutes to say that he will introduce something, while the others are wondering whether this legislation will contain anything.

Let us put an end to this procedure. Let us do away with the resolution stage so that pieces of legislation might be brought before the house.

It is not that we are against the bill; quite the opposite, we are very satisfied to have this legislation brought down.

It is said in the resolution and I quote:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the establishment of a system of collective bargaining applicable to employees in the public service of Canada and for the resolution of disputes that may arise in the negotiation or conclusion of collective agreements applicable to such employees.

This only involves a government scheme for government employees which, of necessity, will be operated by government employees and which will be negotiated by the government. This is all that is involved really.

Those people are working for the government, probably because they had good pointers from the parties. In short that is all it is, a government setup.

I would much prefer having the civil servants belong to a union completely independent of the government, just a simple union