

*Official Languages*

why have the clause in the bill at all? Why not just leave it silent?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Because a lot of concern was expressed in western Canada and the Atlantic provinces that the merit system was in some way being derogated from by this bill, we wanted to make it perfectly clear that where the merit principle applied nothing in this bill derogated from the provisions of section 12 of the Public Service Employment Act where that act applied.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words—

**Mr. Nowlan:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, during his remarks the minister indicated that he would answer a question that the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) was going to put to him.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I did not see the hon. member for Cardigan rising, and I have recognized the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is agreeable we could probably recognize the hon. member for Cardigan.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I agree gladly.

**Mr. McQuaid:** In his speech the minister repeatedly said, and I copied down what he said and have it here word for word, "merit as currently defined in the Public Service Employment Act." Where does he find merit defined in the Public Service Employment Act? Nowhere is merit defined in that act that I can see.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I will try to find it for the hon. member. So far as I can recall it is defined in section 12.

**Mr. McQuaid:** I have the act here and all section 12 says is:

The Commission may, in determining pursuant to section 10 the basis of assessment of merit—

It speaks about merit but does not define it.

—in relation to any position or class of positions, prescribe selection standards as to education, knowledge, experience, language, age, residence or any other matters that, in the opinion of the Commission, are necessary or desirable having regard to the nature of the duties to be performed, but any such selection standards shall not be inconsistent with any classification standard prescribed pursuant to the Financial Administration Act for that position or any position in that class.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that does not define merit. This is what bothers me. Where are we going to find the definition of merit?

I now come to my second question. On May 20, as reported at pages 8840 and 8841 of *Hansard*, the minister gave figures showing the total number of university candidates who applied for positions with the Public Service Commission of Canada for the years 1966 and 1969. Of those who applied in those particular years, how many were accepted into the public service and from what areas did they come?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I am looking for the appropriate document because I made that inquiry myself. I am perfectly willing to table it at the third reading stage if the house would be good enough to allow me to intervene when I get the document.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to appeal to the minister to give further consideration to the proposal made by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) in the motion that is now before the house.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I knew the hon. member would support it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) says he knew I would support this motion. I suppose he probably relies on the fact that I frequently have something to say about retired civil servants, and almost every time I do I mention retired members of the R.C.M.P. and retired members of the armed forces. I do so because I have learned in my studies in that field having to do with the pensions of these various groups that it is not enough just to say retired civil servants and assume that this includes the rest. If one wants these other groups included one has to say so. I believe, therefore, that that principle applies in this instance.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Even though the Minister of Justice, I thought, argued that subclause 4 of clause 40 really was not necessary, I congratulate him for having it included in the bill when the bill was in the hands of the special committee. It seems to me the other clauses that have been quoted today do leave some ambiguity, and that it is a good idea to make it clear in this bill that the merit principle in the federal public service will not be interfered with because of the operation of this