

*Government Organization*

to do this before. What the minister is doing is cutting down the pay of every postal employee by one hour every day because he is forcing them to go back to the post office on their own time.

• (9:10 p.m.)

The minister was asked repeatedly during question period by members from all parties on this side of the house to sit down with the employees and negotiate because an agreement could not be reached. An agreement will not be reached if the minister acts as God in deciding this is what the contract says because he says so, and that he does not have to discuss this with anyone. Surely, collective bargaining means negotiation, and if you do not reach an agreement you get somebody outside to arbitrate. The minister refused to do that until today when he was faced with the disastrous effects of his policy and the fact that all the promises and statements he has made meant nothing. He said that morale was good, that the differences would be settled and there would not be a stoppage. Now that the minister is faced with a stoppage that is getting bigger rather than smaller, he is back tracking. The minister has been wrong in every step. This is the minister who has precipitated the third work stoppage, but he now agrees to outside adjudication. This is typical of this government.

We have a Minister of Labour who receives fulsome praise. Perhaps it is on the basis of the speeches he makes on behalf of the trade unions. He has spoken out in favour of the Freedman Commission report to the effect that there should be conciliation and discussion. He has spoken about the fact that no employer should make important changes in the working conditions of their employees without discussion and negotiation. I think the minister made that speech when the estimates of his department were before the house or during the Throne Speech debate. Here we have a minister who has ignored the Freedman Commission report, and I refer to the Postmaster General. Of course the Minister of Labour can go out and lecture employers about the fact that they ought to live up to the spirit of the Freedman Commission report while the Postmaster General ignores that report completely.

For the record and for the information of the Postmaster General in the event he has not looked at this report until now, and I commend the idea to him that he should do so, let me read from the official press release

29180—408½

put out by the Department of Labour summarizing the findings of Mr. Justice Freedman in the dispute between the C.N.R. and its employees. I suggest to the minister that what Mr. Justice Freedman said to the C.N.R. applies even more to the government of Canada. Let me read a couple of sentences from this official press release:

The present situation which permits management to make unilateral changes in working conditions during the contract period is a manifest inequity which clamours for attention and correction.

Was there ever a greater change in working conditions by any employer than those the Postmaster General and his lackeys in the department tried to push down the throats of a group of employees? Mr. Justice Freedman also said:

Since run-throughs are not all equal in their effects, the commission recommends—

**Mr. Kierans:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When the hon. member cites Mr. Justice Freedman I would like him to cite the page number. I have the report here.

**Mr. Orlikow:** I wish the minister would listen. I said I was quoting from the official press release issued by the Department of Labour summarizing Mr. Justice Freedman's report.

**Mr. Kierans:** All I am asking for is the source of the citation, as it appears in the report itself.

**Mr. Orlikow:** If I cannot take the official summary of the report by Mr. Justice Freedman as issued by the Department of Labour as being correct—the Minister of Labour at the time was Mr. Allan J. MacEachen—I do not know what else the minister would like.

**Mr. Kierans:** I am quite prepared to admit that the summary is official and correct. On the other hand I think I am showing a disposition to go much closer to the source of the quotation than is the hon. member who has cited it. If he wants to cite Freedman why doesn't he cite Freedman?

**Mr. Orlikow:** The minister has already complained in what I thought was a very capricious and arbitrary way about the fact that the hon. member for Brandon-Souris was wasting time, or taking up too much time. I am trying to save the time of the committee and not bore the minister with matters which he considers are unimportant by quoting from the official summary. I think it is accurate enough. If the minister does not think it is