

of the Supreme Court of Ontario, the Honourable Sam Hughes, who, if I may say so, is an ideal type of person to be chairman of the commission because, as all honourable senators know, judges are not only clear-headed, but most impartial.

In addition to the members of the commission, evidence was given by the Civil Service Federation of Canada, which has some 16 affiliated bodies, and represents some 85,000 of the 130,000 civil servants of Canada. Evidence was also given by the Civil Service Association of Canada, representing some 30,000 civil servants. The Canadian Postal Employees Association appeared, and it represents 10,500 postal employees. The Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada appeared, representing some 6,000 professional persons in the Civil Service. The Canadian Postmasters Association appeared, and it represents some 8,000 persons in the public service. The Federated Association of Letter Carriers appeared. Unfortunately, they did not state how many persons were represented by their organization. The Canadian Labour Congress presented a brief. Also represented were Le Conseil de la Vie Française en Amérique, and La Fédération des Sociétés Saint-Jean-Baptiste du Québec, which presented briefs.

The committee also heard witnesses from the Treasury Board, the Department of Finance, and the Department of Justice.

I think senators are in a particularly good position to appraise the value of the work of a committee. This was a good committee. If I have any complaint to make it is that this is the kind of measure the Senate might well have had in the first instance. It is the kind of measure to which the Senate could have given fine study before it went to the House of Commons. In these days of long sessions and crowded schedules in the House of Commons, I think we could have performed a service to Parliament if we had had the measure in the first instance. But may I say also—having in mind the quotation I placed on *Hansard* at the beginning—because of the importance of the public service of Canada to both branches of Parliament, I rather regret there was not at least a joint committee of the two houses appointed to study this bill.

Now, as the honourable senator from Cape Breton (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) has said, the features of the bill which are reproduced from the earlier bills are, first of all, the independence of the Civil Service Commission itself. This is provided in section 4. There is a reaffirmation of the principle of the merit system. This is done by sections 6 and sections 20 to 29. Civil servants are prohibited from acting on behalf of political

parties or engaging in political activity. This is reaffirmed in section 61. The powers of the Civil Service Commission outlined in this measure are in section 6 and other sections. They include the classification of jobs. The commission reviews and makes recommendations on levels of pay in all branches of the service. The organization of departments under this measure becomes the responsibility of the deputy head of the department, not of the Civil Service Commission, but the commission classifies the positions within the department. It is to be an advisory group on organization to the deputy head and to the department, somewhat in the role of a management consultant. The Civil Service Commission, under sections 20 to 50 makes the appointments to the public service in accordance with the rules laid down in that part of the act.

Appeals can be taken by employees where they are dissatisfied with departmental rulings and decisions. Section 56 deals with appeals available to employees on demotion or on suspension. Section 60 deals with appeals in cases of dismissal. Section 49, I must say, provides no appeal when probation employees are rejected. But I notice too that by section 68 (1) (s) regulations will be established to provide grievance procedure for public servants.

The important section of the bill of course is section 7, which provides for consultation between the representatives of Government and the representatives of employees in connection with conditions of employment and pay. I would like to take a few minutes to discuss that section.

In the Heeny Report, at page 10, section 19 (h), this recommendation is made:

...the basic law governing our personnel administration in the Federal Service should now provide for:

(h) greater participation by employees in the processes leading to the determination of their conditions of employment.

This is a new recommendation for the public service of Canada.

Section 32 (b) of that report deals with this subject of employee participation, and Appendix "B" sets out some suggestions as to how the machinery might be set up.

Honourable senators will realize when they look at section 7 of the bill that provision is made that the commission or the Minister of Finance or his representative shall consult with staff organizations with reference to conditions of employment, and that this consultation can take place on the initiative not only of the minister, not only of the Civil Service Commission, but as well of the staff organization. This is as it should be.