

conditions of work, including pay. Now, I know it is going to be difficult to work out these regulations, but I am troubled in my own mind as to the independence of the commission. Under the act the commission and the members of the commission can only be removed from office by joint address of both houses of parliament, so the commission is a very independent body. I know that you do not want to insulate it from everything, because it is there to perform functions on behalf of the Government and on behalf of the employee. However, as I said last night—and here I am not asking a question and am not making a suggestion, but I am just wondering if in section 7, and not only in section 7 but also under section 10(3) of the act, the commission is not getting into the position where it is with the Government, the side of the employer, on the one hand and on the side of the staff associations on the other hand.

Let me give you an example. Frankly, I admit this is hardly a question; it is a speech, but I have to do it this way. Under section 7(1) the minister or the staff associations can initiate discussions with reference to pay. But it is also provided that the commission sets out the suggestions for the Government in respect of pay, and that it consults with the staff associations with reference to that. So you come along with your suggestions as to what the pay should be for a certain position. Then, I suppose, under section 7(1) the staff associations can go to the minister?

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): Maybe he is for you, and maybe he is against you and is for them; but you are right into that argument. I would think, depending upon what attitude the parties take, you are either on one side or the other. I am wondering how the independence of the commission is then affected. I do not think I can explain it in more precise language than that.

Senator BRUNT: You might get a unanimous report.

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): Yes, you might get a unanimous report but, on the other hand, you might not in labour relations.

Senator HAYDEN: Are these provisions much different from the present act on this point? In the present act the commission may, in effect, arrive at rates of compensation, but they do not become operative until the Governor in Council approves them. Under the present bill the commission has the power to recommend rates, but the Governor in Council is the one who has to activate them. Since that is spending people's money, it should be the Governor in Council or Parliament that should make the final determination. I do not see anything in the connotation of the word "consult". I think it is the part of wisdom for them to consult every place they can, and certainly with the associations to see what their viewpoint is. But, surely, if you pick the right men they can be independent enough and exercise the authority they have in their field? They have an authority above them which is the Government and the Governor in Council—and they should be above the commission.

Senator BRUNT: Would not the commission act as an independent body? They are neither with the association nor the Government. They sit down and listen to representations as an entirely independent body, and then come up with the recommendations.

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): Perhaps we are getting right to the nub of this. The commission is instructed to make recommendations with reference to a pay rise at a given time. In doing that it consults with the staff associations. So you have the commission on the one side, and the staff associations on the other side saying, "This is what we think you should do." Each body puts forward its viewpoint, and the commission comes up with a conclusion. For practical purposes the staff associations are dealing with the commission on the