

Railway Act

the same. As I read the proposed amendment, when a chief commissioner retires he automatically becomes a puisne judge of the exchequer court.

Mr. Chevrier: That is right.

Mr. Green: And continues as such until he reaches the age of 75 years.

Mr. Chevrier: That is the position.

Mr. Green: Why is it necessary to have a provision of that kind? Why could they not be covered by a pension scheme? Why do they automatically go to the court?

Mr. Chevrier: This does not change the position that prevailed heretofore. It simply makes the present incumbent's position the same as that of his predecessor; he is chief commissioner at the same time he is a puisne judge.

Mr. Green: Could the minister give the salaries of other officials who come under his jurisdiction? I would like to know the salary of the deputy minister of transport; the salary of the members of the Canadian maritime commission; and of the members of the air transport board.

Mr. Chevrier: The salary of the deputy minister is \$13,500; the salary of members of the maritime commission is \$10,000; I think the chairman of the air transport board receives \$12,000, while the members receive \$8,000.

Mr. Green: The figures I have are \$12,000 for the chairman of the air transport board and \$9,000 for the members.

Mr. Chevrier: Perhaps there was an increase from \$8,000 to \$9,000.

Mr. Green: I have the chairman of the maritime commission receiving \$12,000, with the ordinary members receiving \$10,000. I have figures indicating that the chairman of the Canadian pension commission under the Department of Veterans Affairs receives \$12,000 and his deputy \$10,000, with the ordinary members of the commission receiving \$9,000. In the case of the war veterans allowance board, the chairman receives only \$9,000 while the ordinary members are paid \$7,500. Vice-presidents of the research council get only \$10,000. The chairman of the board of grain commissioners is paid \$12,000, while the ordinary members of the board receive \$10,000. The amendment brought in by the government today seems to make the salaries to be paid out of line with the salaries paid to other officials holding similar positions. How can we justify differences of that kind?

Mr. Chevrier: I gave some reasons earlier today why the government was disposed to accept the recommendations of the committee. The first was that the royal commission on administrative services had recommended that members of the board of transport commissioners should receive at least \$2,000 more than members of other boards. That explains the discrepancy in the salaries the hon. member has referred to. I indicated also what was said by the royal commission itself. Otherwise there would be a great discrepancy between the salaries paid to members of the board and the salary of the chief commissioner.

Mr. Knowles: I believe I heard the minister state that the salary of the deputy minister of transport is \$13,500. I have in my hands the estimates for the current year and they indicate that it is \$12,000.

Mr. Chevrier: There has been an increase to \$13,500.

Mr. Knowles: How does he get a raise without our hearing about it?

Mr. Brooks: Just before the recess at six o'clock I asked for the dates of the appointment of the commissioners and the dates of retirement. The minister gave a partial answer and I understood him to say that he would give a complete answer later on.

Mr. Chevrier: I could not get it during the recess, but I will give it to the committee when this bill comes up again.

Mr. Follwell: Provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the bill are to come into effect on the first day of January, 1952, and there would then be a vacancy for the position of puisne judge of the exchequer court.

Mr. Chevrier: No.

Mr. Nowlan: I think we should have the information asked for by the hon. member for Royal before this section carries, because it certainly goes to the question of whether the board is being strengthened. If members of the board who have been recently appointed or reappointed are going to continue to sit from six to ten years, without making any comment as to their qualifications as being strong or otherwise it is obvious that we will not be strengthening the board by increasing the salaries. I have not the recommendations of the royal commission before me, but as I remember they recommended or said that the best way to strengthen the board was to extend the tenure of office of the members and make the appointments for life on the basis of good behaviour.

I think the minister referred a moment ago to a vacancy on the board and said that an appointment is to be made. I assume that