

Mr. MUIR (*Lisgar*): Just to clear that up: you do not see any danger of the C.B.C. operating under what is called Parkinson's law?

Mr. CARTER: We are constantly on the lookout to avoid that.

The CHAIRMAN: May we move, Miss Aitken and gentlemen, on to "F", review of trade union contracts and possibility of "feather-bedding"? Any questions? No question; thank you.

Mr. CHAMBERS: Stop thinking of that deadline, Mr. Chairman!

The CHAIRMAN: You have a question?

Mr. CHAMBERS: As we have brought Mr. McKee all the way here we should ask something.

The CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

Mr. CHAMBERS: How many separate trade union contracts has the C.B.C.?

Mr. CARTER: Am I permitted to answer?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CARTER: If we talk about contracts covering staff relations we have nine, with seven unions. Some unions have two contracts covering different bargaining units.

Mr. CHAMBERS: This question was asked in the same form before; but, none of these contracts is a closed shop?

Mr. CARTER: No, sir.

Mr. CHAMBERS: They all follow more or less the Rand formula?

Mr. CARTER: There is a modified form of the Rand formula in each of them, I believe.

Mr. CHAMBERS: There is a question here on feather-bedding; and you have to have different personnel to do very similar things. Do you feel the corporation is put to extra expense by any of the provisions of these contracts—unnecessary expense, I mean?

Mr. CARTER: "Feather-bedding" is normally used to describe the attempt by a union to require an employer to pay unneeded workmen, to pay for unnecessary or duplicating jobs, or to limit the amount of work done in a day.

As such, we have no "feather-bedding", but we have jurisdictional problems which arise because of the fact we have many unions to deal with. But the jurisdiction of those unions has been defined by the Canada labour relations board. However, there are some areas which at times create some problems, and place certain restrictions on the corporation's ability to engage in the assignment of multiple functions—that is, to have one employee engaging in work in several different job functions, as may be done on certain non-unionized private stations.

The corporation, however, is no different from any other large employer with a multi-plant, multi-union organization.

We have certain restrictions on the performance of job functions; and an example of that would be the performance of a job within one union's jurisdiction or area. This problem has been resolved in Montreal by a finding, and a binding ruling of the arbitration board. In late 1955 the Montreal TV operation decided in the light of experience and operational practice that the job of propsman (set)—responsibility for placing desks, chairs, tables and other small properties, on the set—could be combined with that of stagehand—the responsibility for the erection of the set, and so on.

After an experimental period of approximately six months, the new method of operation went into effect in June, 1956. After 16 months of operation the union grieved to have the two separate job functions, which it should be noted were at the same rate of pay, re-established in Montreal.