

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: I am not aware of a report in 1946 unless it is the Gordon Commission report.

Senator LAMBERT: Yes, that is it. As Senator Connolly said last night, it is a very interesting report for perusal at this time.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: Yes. What we have done as you are probably aware, senator, is to divide the highest ranks of the service into three groups of senior officers in ascending order. Senior Officer 1 is the lowest, above him comes Senior Officer 2, and then Senior Officer 3. Senior Officer 3 gets the highest salary in classified civil service, and those appointments are made by the commission, and salaries are set as a result of the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission to this day, and under this bill the same situation will prevail.

Senator LAMBERT: Just to be specific about it, I think the deputy ministers' salaries were advanced to the level of \$15,000 per annum as a result of the Gordon Commission's report in 1946. There were two salaries above that which were set at \$17,250 per annum, and then there were the so-called principal officers other than deputy ministers whose salaries ranged from \$10,000 to \$12,000. Those levels were established then. Before that time deputy ministers' salaries were fixed pretty much at the level of \$10,000 per year. Since then I know that there have been advances in the salaries of deputy ministers to \$20,000 and \$22,000 a year. I suppose in connection with those very important posts in the senior civil service the Civil Service Commission is consulted to a certain extent? I wanted to find the category; that is all.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: We have nothing to say about the salaries of anybody who is appointed by the Governor in Council, and those people include deputy ministers, members of boards and commissions, and so forth.

Senator BRUNT: Would they include associate deputy ministers also?

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

Senator LAMBERT: And assistant deputy ministers?

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: No, assistant deputy ministers are members of the classified service.

Senator DUPUIS: But with respect to cases such as those mentioned by Senator Lambert, in the fixing of wages, if there is a difference of opinion between the associations who are consulted, who has the last word? Is it not the Governor in Council?

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: That is right.

Senator PEARSON: I should like to ask a question about the confidential arrangement between the staff representatives and the commission. Do not the staff representatives have to report back to their associations as to what arrangement they have made or discussed with the commission?

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: You are now referring to the procedure that is contemplated under the bill?

Senator PEARSON: No, I suppose not. You talked about keeping certain matters confidential. I was just wondering how it can be kept confidential if the staff representatives have to report back to their associations.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: Well, so far as the Pay Research Bureau reports are concerned the confidence has always been well kept. I do not know that we can object to extending the circle of consultation among the staff associations themselves, as long as that confidence is preserved. I am not thoroughly certain of what I am saying now but I think the Pay Research Bureau reports are rather jealously guarded by the senior executives of the three major staff