

but unfortunately is not, obvious to all. An intelligent manpower training program does not constitute a long-range cost to Canadians. The contrary is the case. Quite apart from the benefits it could provide directly to the people involved in this program, it has been estimated that for every dollar spent on occupational retraining \$3 in economic growth for the country would result. The conclusion then, is that such training programs are both beneficial to the people involved and to the economy of the country.

I should like now to say something briefly about the government's attitude toward its employees. So far I have attempted to show that it has been indifferent in respect of the working force outside the government sector. I have attempted to show that its manpower training programs are grotesquely inadequate in terms of meeting the needs of the country and the needs of the people who require training. Now, I wish to demonstrate the lack of concern on the part of the government, and its misdirection, in respect of its own working force. Recently a survey was made among the employees of the government. What has this survey turned up? I have time merely to cite a few examples. The first is a common one.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired unless he has leave of the House to continue beyond his allocated time.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first example may appear to involve a trivial point. Nevertheless, it is something which affects almost every civil servant in this country. There are reports that there have been significant delays in providing back pay. According to the regulations, back pay should be provided within a period of 90 days. Reports have been received in the last few days to the effect that many civil servants in this country have waited as long as 10 months to receive their back pay, money which is legitimately owed them by the government. This is a single point, but it does suggest something concerning the attitude of this government toward its employees.

Consider also the postal workers. I shall say nothing about the Montreal situation.

Recently a union official in my area pointed out to me the present situation in respect of current negotiations with the government. First of all, the government does not wish to provide job security for elected union offi-

#### *Alleged Failure of Employment Policies*

cial. This, of course, is essential. If a union officer is to do his important job for the men whom he represents, I suggest it is necessary that he have job security so that if at some time in the future he should not be re-elected to his union position he could return to his employment. Most good employers in the private sector provide this as an automatic right. The federal government, in the postal sector at least, seems to be quite callous on this point. Second, the Post Office Department has recently gone over the heads of the negotiating team in respect of its own employees. This is a typical example of the bad management practices which undermine serious constructive collective bargaining. The Prime Minister referred to this in a negative way in respect of another matter some days ago. He should have a look at the Post Office.

Another example is that of the Customs Department. There are 700 outstanding grievances in this department. Many of these are of a routine nature, but some are not. The point is that in this department every grievance goes the full route. Normally, there are four steps through which any grievance may go, but it need not go through all these steps. If the grievance is not settled in step one, then it goes to step two. This department, however, has insisted that every grievance go the full route. There were actually some 1,400 grievances in that department but believe it or not the department lost about 700 of them and there is no longer, therefore, any record. One might ask what this indicates in the way of attitude toward, and respect for, people.

The Public Service Staff Relations Act is deficient in a very significant way. At the present time government workers can have arbitration on three or four matters only—rates of pay, hours of work and leave entitlement. There is omitted from that act important items which currently concern working people. These are retraining, technological change, work conditions, job security, and job reclassification. This act needs to be changed to include these matters within the arbitration category and needs to be changed soon.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The last department to which I wish to refer is the Department of National Defence. There are many within the department who believe that the government now has a five year plan, a phasing out operation throughout this country. The government knows when they are going to close down station X or station Y, but they are not telling the work-