

Mr. BROWN: (Deputy Minister of Labour): Well, most of these pieces of legislation provide for an advisory council and so on, and for remuneration of that kind; it is pretty general practice to leave it to the Governor in Council because the rates vary from time to time over a period of years.

Mrs. FAIRCLOUGH: That has developed fairly recently. This Act itself is an example. When this first came into being it was not thought right to put the rate in the Act. Now there is developing a growing tendency to leave these things on an adjustable basis, and I am not convinced that it is in the public interest.

Mr. CROLL: Is it not for the purposes of achieving some uniformity? You take a generous hearted fellow like our Minister of Labour here, and he gives ample allowances, and someone else might decide to get tough about it and he gives meagre allowances. Is not the purpose of this section to bring about a uniformity so that everyone is treated in the same way? That is what I thought.

Mr. DESCHATELETS: You may get a generous Governor in Council?

Mr. CROLL: He has many of them before him from the various departments and operates on a uniform scale. That is the purpose of it. It would be more difficult for him to put it in each Act than to leave it in this fashion.

Hon. Mr. GREGG: That is the answer, Mrs. Fairclough. There are in my own department and in U.I.C. a number of advisory bodies. I am glad to have them. There is a variation even between departments. The whole thing once got out of line and an attempt was made to standardize and to work out an equitable basis that would be appropriate from time to time. It did seem that the best way of doing that was to not wait until the Act happened to be amended, I do not think, if there was nothing else but the amount under the Act that the minister responsible would want to bring in an amendment to an Act just to amend the amount of the per diem expenses.

Mrs. FAIRCLOUGH: How do you find out exactly what the allowances are, by asking what is paid on that basis?

Hon. Mr. GREGG: No, a survey is made of what appears to be an equitable basis based upon the time involved and the task in hand.

Mrs. FAIRCLOUGH: I think this present Act actually is one of the few Acts where the amount which is to be paid appears?

Hon. Mr. GREGG: To members and an advisory committee who are actually specified.

Mrs. FAIRCLOUGH: As I said before, this is a fairly recent innovation. That may be the situation, but nevertheless it has all developed within the last few years. I am not at all convinced—two wrongs don't make a right—and I am not at all convinced that it is in the public interest to have the amounts varied somewhere. I agree there should not be a variation as between boards and that the matter should not be left, as Mr. Croll says, to the generosity or otherwise of the ministers, but I think if you agree a certain man has a proper allowance for members of advisory boards then why not have that amount set down? Is it true, would you say, that all advisory boards are now receiving under this system by reference to the Governor in Council exactly the same amount for their attendances?

Hon. Mr. GREGG: I cannot say offhand, but I would doubt if it were so.

Mrs. FAIRCLOUGH: I would doubt it, too.

Hon. Mr. GREGG: But I will say, after all, this occurs not more than four times a year—is that right, Mr. Crawford?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Twice a year.