

If I interpret that correctly, it means that the chairman of a three-man board is himself a majority of one even though his two colleagues oppose him, and they are unable to submit a minority report. I confess that I am reminded of the story of Lincoln's cabinet. I do not know whether the Prime Minister treats his cabinet in this way but Lincoln apparently polled his colleagues and found all of them, seven in number, in favour of a certain course of action which he alone opposed. So he announced the result, "Seven yeas; one nay; I declare the nays have it." Frankly, I do not see how this particular proposal in the report and draft legislation can be permitted to stand.

There is one aspect of public service administration which I want to emphasize cannot be made the subject of collective bargaining, and that is the basic merit system. That system, which we owe to Sir Robert Borden, must be preserved inviolate as the central core of our civil service policy. Hon. members are aware of the very deep concern that I feel about possible intrusions into the merit system of factors extraneous to it. I only want to assert now that it is a matter which cannot, in totality or in part, be the subject of negotiation. It must be and remain what the Heeney report of 1958 described it as, "a permanent feature of the Canadian philosophy and machinery of government."

There are a number of other aspects of the bill to be founded upon this resolution which will require especially careful study in the special committee. Personally I am not fully satisfied that the proposed exclusions from collective bargaining are all necessarily sound. Obviously, the armed forces must be excluded, but I am not certain I know why the bill should exclude all persons appointed by the governor in council, persons locally engaged outside Canada, and the bulk of casual employees. It was not clear from what the Prime Minister said this afternoon whether the bill as introduced will differ from the bill recommended by the preparatory committee as to casual employees not being brought under collective bargaining. The latter, it seems to me, are among the employees who may need protection most.

No doubt the special committee will need to spend a great deal of time studying and hearing evidence on the question of the right to strike and the alternative processes mentioned this afternoon by the Prime Minister. Personally I want to study very carefully not

only what the Prime Minister said in that respect this afternoon, which I was unable to follow in detail, but the actual provisions of the bill before commenting in detail upon it.

On this whole question I know there are major differences among members of the house and indeed among the staff associations, and I think we should keep an open mind on the subject until all the evidence has been heard. On balance, as I am at present advised I doubt that either the recognition of the right to strike or the prohibition of such right matters as significantly as some believe. Prohibitions of this character have never been very effective in preventing persons with a sense of moral outrage taking retaliatory action. I think our eyes should be upon the goal of preventing conditions arising where the possibility of strike action could even be contemplated. That is the approach we should take. I am sure that already hon. members are receiving telegrams in this respect. Since I came into the chamber this afternoon I have received two, one on each side of this particular subject. I want to hear a great deal more discussion before making a final decision in relation to it or the alternative processes which the Prime Minister has mentioned.

The Prime Minister has indicated that the proposed right of the governor in council to set aside an award as proposed by the preparatory committee will not be in the bill he will introduce following this resolution. But he did not say what reservation, if any, there would be of the residual authority of this sovereign parliament in the event of an emergency where the general public interest requires protection. My hope would be that any such reservation would be as drastically limited as possible.

The 1961 Civil Service Act for the first time made a civil servant's pay a matter of statutory right. In my view a civil servant's pay, determined as it now will be by the process of collective bargaining, is in exactly the same position as a bondholder's interest, an elderly person's pension, a war veteran's pension or other payments which are guaranteed by statute. Nothing should interfere with that pay determined, as I say, by the process of collective bargaining. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that I mention this with some feeling, perhaps principally because the 1962 pay freeze, which I tried hard to prevent, was the reason for my two and a half years enforced holiday from this house.