

Now we are to have a civil service based not on merit—promotions and so on—but on competence and the standards of competence are now to be set by some other person. The Public Service Commission apparently is to set standards of competence which are to be measured, according to the government's definition, not against the confidence of other persons, but on the basis of standards set by the commission. I will read the section:

For the purpose of subsection 1, selection according to merit may in the circumstances prescribed by the regulations of the commission be based on the competence of a person being considered for appointment as measured by such standard of competence as the commission may establish, rather than as measured against the competence of other persons.

The hon. member for Ottawa West has proposed a very reasonable amendment. In fact, the amendment that the member for Kamloops has proposed is also reasonable. It gets rid of this offending clause.

I have some material I think I should draw to the House's attention concerning this amendment that may be of interest to the hon. member for Burlington who has been following this debate so closely.

There is apparently some official called John Edwards. He is a sycophant of the government who has been pushing Public Service 2000 down the throats of unwilling workers in the Public Service. It is not clear whether or not this man is a liar. He has given contradictory statements to the press. I would like to refer to those statements as quoted in *The Globe and Mail* in an article by that very distinguished journalist, Mr. Hugh Winsor.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being five o'clock, unfortunately, I will have to interrupt the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

I wish to inform the House that, under the terms of the motion passed this morning, the four hours provided for the consideration of Bill C-26 have expired.

It being five o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(6), the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

*Private Members' Business*

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

### INTERNATIONAL LAW OF THE SEA

#### RATIFICATION OF CONVENTION

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should, for the benefit of Canadian fisheries, urgently take the necessary steps to ratify the International Law of the Sea, and urge other nations to do so in order to reach the 60 signatures required for the Law of the Sea to come into force.

He said: Madam Speaker, it has been seven years since this government was elected to power by the Canadian people. In connection with this issue related to the Law of the Sea, it has been seven years of dilly-dallying and lost opportunities in providing leadership while this nation, as you well know, is surrounded by three oceans.

It has also been, unfortunately, seven years of piggy-backing on the Law of the Sea and using the best features of that convention without taking the responsibility for it in the international community.

It has been seven years of yielding to pressure by international and national corporate interests at the expense of the common good, namely the fisheries and the communities that derive their living from the oceans.

In a way it has been a way of allowing Wall Street and Bay Street to determine government policy on the management of the oceans. In a way, it has brought about an unfortunate development, which is the compromising of Canada's international credibility.

It has also been five years of prime ministerial high rhetoric, both at home and abroad, on sustainable development. This has created the impression that Canada is, as it should be, committed to the implementation of the principles of sustainable development.

In the light of this quick sketch that I just gave you, the question arises as to why Canada is afraid to ratify the Law of the Sea.

One may recall, that it was given a signature by 119 countries, including Canada, in Jamaica, roughly at the end of 1982. However, the signatures are not enough for an international document to become operative. It requires ratification. It is a two-step process. The signature is first and the ratification is the second.