

Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford): Carried.
Report adopted.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Honourable senators, I am quite sure that the bill in connection with the Alberta railways, known as the Pine Point Railway, will come to this house later today.

I move, therefore, that the Senate adjourn during pleasure, to re-assemble at the call of the bell at 8 o'clock this evening.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

At 8 p.m. the sitting was resumed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

NEWSPAPER REPORT—PRIVILEGE

Hon. John J. Connolly: Honourable senators, I rise on a question of privilege. A story appears on the front page of tonight's *Ottawa Journal* headed "Liberal Senator Backs Government. Urges Careful Approach to CS Bargaining".

I do not object to the second part of the heading but I do object to the first part and to many portions of the story as written by Mr. Richard Jackson of the *Journal*. For example, he says:

Senator Connolly wondered whether even "consultation" as it has been provided for in the new legislation did not go too far.

Honourable senators, I did not say that, either in my remarks last night or in the committee this morning. In fact that idea was as far from what I said and the general tenor of my speech as anything could be.

He says further:

He suspected that the "consultative" section of the bill might intrude on Commission independence.

What I in fact said last night and what I said in committee this morning was this, that as a result of the enactment of section 7 the independence of the commission might be intruded upon. I felt, before the explanation was given, that as a result of this legislation, the commission and the Government were to be on one side of the bargaining table and the staff organizations were to be on the other side. I would say that that would be an unfair distribution in so far as the staff organizations were concerned.

I would also say that the point about the independence of the commission, which has always been a feature of this legislation since the commission was established, is a

most important one, and I think the commission should not be an arm of the Government in any negotiations.

The article says further:

He agreed that the Government had been correct in opposing demands that the Civil Service be given the right to negotiate.

I did not say anything of the kind. I do not think the Government did oppose the demand that the civil service be given the right to negotiate. The only point at issue in the committee of the other place was whether the word "consult" went far enough, and it was urged that the word "negotiate" should be used. I quite agree with the stand taken by the Government, that the word "negotiate" may not be completely appropriate in the circumstances of dealings between Government employees and the Government. The word may have a technical meaning arising out of provincial legislation and arising out of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. But as a result of the Opposition and the staff organizations raising the question in the other place it was made abundantly clear that the idea of negotiation would in effect be carried on and would in effect be incorporated into the regulations.

The report further says:

Senator Connolly agreed that there had to be "fair, reasonable and attractive working conditions" in the civil service,

—this part is fine—

but direct negotiation and collective bargaining would hardly assist.

Honourable senators, I do not know how that kind of interpretation can be placed upon the remarks that I made last night, because I agreed with what the Heeney Report suggested about having more direct contact between Government on the one side and the staff organizations on the other. I support that, and I say the onus under this legislation now is upon the authorities to see that proper arrangements are made and proper procedures and machinery set up so that adequate negotiations in which the staff organizations can participate fully can be carried on.

Finally the article says that I

...took a position mildly opposed to that assumed by the Liberals in the Commons.

Well, it so happens that I have read all of the debates in the other place and the evidence taken there, and I am not even mildly critical of what the Liberal members on the other side did, because as a result of their criticism, it is abundantly clear now what are the intentions of the Government. I would say that the prospect of the staff