The President of the Treasury Board will now have a great deal more authority, and, what is perhaps more important, a great many more duties than heretofore. I should also like to remind members of the committee that the Treasury Board from now on will be in effect the employer of the public service; in practical effect, if not in law, it will be the Treasury Board which will be the employer of every civil servant who works for the federal government. It will be the Treasury Board which will be negotiating with the certified bargaining agents; it will be the Treasury Board which will agree or disagree with any proposal made by the employee association; it will be the Treasury Board which will be signing collective agreements. So while this may appear to be only a technical bill making certain changes in the Financial Administration Act, it really places on the Treasury Board a whole range of new responsibilities and duties, including responsibility for collective bargaining under Bill No. C-170.

One can only express the hope that the representatives of the Treasury Board when negotiating with the employees will act in such a way as to make this employer a model employer in Canada. The President of the Treasury Board indicates it is already the model employer of Canada. He will forgive me if I say that if I wanted to take up the time I could show him a number of instances where the model needs a great deal of redesigning. I am hoping that Bill C-170, which this house has passed, affords a structure within which this redesigning can take a proper form in actual bargaining between the employee representatives and representatives of the Treasury Board.

I told some leaders of the public servants whom I met last Wednesday, and I repeat it now, that I was most impressed by the attitude of the secretary of the Treasury Board, Dr. Davidson, and Mr. Douglas Love, when they appeared before the joint committee. They appeared to me to indicate an attitude which augurs well for the future of the collective bargaining régime. I hope the actual process of collective bargaining will not revive any managerial prejudices which are below the surface at the present time—that they will remain sunk, even under the pressures of collective bargaining.

I am taking nothing away from the hon. member for Carleton when I take the liberty of reminding, or informing, members of this committee that I had occasion to battle a great deal about the right of appeal for persons dismissed for security reasons. Like the hon. member for Carleton I am dissatisfied with the provisions for inquiry contained in clause 3 of Bill C-182. I still cannot for the life of me understand why the government members could not have agreed to the inclusion of a decent form of appeal in the case of dismissal, for reasons given in the relevant clause. I was told in the joint committee that one of the reasons for this attitude was that a royal commission of inquiry into security matters is now in progress, and that it would be wise to await the results of that inquiry before setting out any complicated appeal machinery.

I was unconvinced then by this argument, and I am still unconvinced. Surely there would have been nothing to prevent the government from making any changes which the report of the royal commission on security might have recommended as necessary or desirable. In the meantime, anybody affected by dismissal for safety or security reasons could resort to a definite form of appeal.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I am glad the government went so far as to agree at least to provide statutorily for an inquiry, but I draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the inquiry is being made in accordance with regulations of the governor in council by the person appointed by the governor in council, and without any requirement that the person concerned is to be given details of the charges against him or, detailed information as to the reasons why he was dismissed, so that he would have a case that he could meet before such an inquiry. After all, it is the essence of any kind of inquiry that is really worth while that the person charged, accused, disciplined, discriminated against or in any other way dealt with as a result of some allegations, should know the precise nature of those allegations and be able to meet them in the proper way.

I therefore echo the criticism made by the hon. member for Carleton and criticisms which I made in the joint committee as loudly and as annoyingly as I could, that this provision for an inquiry, although a step forward, is simply not adequate. I hope that between now and the time the royal commission of inquiry into security matters reports, the government will have no occasion to use the powers conferred by this clause of the bill or that anyone will suffer injustice—because injustice there will be if there is no more adequate provision than this. I also point out