

procedure, which only permits a department to come under the scrutiny of the Organization and Methods Division on the invitation of the department head, does not satisfy the principle of providing an analysis of the growth trends and efficiency of individual departments. It is our view that in addition, surveys should be initiated by the Commission, thus maintaining some assessment of those departments who are reluctant to invite such an examination.

(b) The Committee also holds the view that the general recommendations of any such report respecting a survey of a department should be submitted to Parliament, so that it may be determined whether or not the recommendations have been acted upon.

(c) While the Committee recognizes that the Organization and Methods Division of the Commission has performed a useful function, it must be recognized that, as an arm of the Commission itself, its capacity to provide a completely independent evaluation is open to question.

This, we subscribe, should not be construed as a reflection on the efficiency of the personnel of this agency, but it is, we suggest, an unavoidable limitation resulting from the relationship of the agency to the Commission. We therefore recommend that Parliament give consideration to the appointment of independent consultants who, from time to time, will be authorized to analyze such matters as the administrative capabilities of the Commission, procedural methods, and the general growth trend of the public service of Canada.

11. Conclusion

Mr. Paul Pelletier, speaking as a member of the Commission, emphasized during the course of his evidence that every effort is being made to maintain the "merit system" in relation to both selection of personnel and also in their future promotion. In his initial statement to the Committee, he said in part:

"It seems to us that the commission's greatest problem in the administration of the Act of 1918 has been to function in such a manner as to meet administrative needs for flexibility, and at the same time to ensure a career service based on the merit principle as provided for by law."

While the Committee concurs in this sentiment, we cannot agree that the administrative needs or any other consideration designed to produce flexibility should provide cause for any basic deviation from the principle of the merit system. The Committee is of the view that it is not inconsistent to achieve flexibility in the administration of the Act while at the same time retaining the full provision of the merit system. While there was not sufficient evidence to indicate that there has been any substantial departure from this principle the exceptions to the rule we believe are numerous enough to warrant a rededication of the purpose and intent of the Act.

In reviewing the evidence and the recommendations contained in the foregoing your Committee wishes to impress upon Parliament the importance and the necessity for reaffirming our belief in the fundamental and underlying principle of the public service of Canada. The principle to which we refer is generally described as the "merit system" which we suggest provides the one assurance that the civil servant will remain free from political or other influences in discharging his responsibility to the Canadian public.

The Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the Secretary of State, the Under-Secretary of State and the Departmental officials, together with the Commissioners and officials of the Civil Service Commission, for the co-operative manner in which they presented their evidence.