

amount of trouble—I say this frankly—to have the scale of salaries published, but I do not think we can avoid publication if it is pressed for by hon. members. We did make a return of salaries over \$5,000, and now we are being pressed to go down the range below \$5,000 and publish those. It is a matter of great curiosity to people who are working for a private company, but people could not get that information at all if they wanted it from a private company. But the moment the information is given out, this terrific pressure starts from men who say, “I do not think I am fairly treated, because So-and-so is getting \$400 or \$300 more than I am,” and presently the board is in hot water. It may be said that this is public money and that the public is entitled to the information, no matter how much trouble it causes or how much it costs the taxpayers. All I can say is that the committee is entitled to the information but that it would do more harm than good.

Mr. GRAYDON: This discussion is going on while the hon. member who asked the question is absent on very important public business, and so far as I am personally concerned I feel like reserving any remarks I may have to make until he returns to-morrow. In the meantime, perhaps the discussion need not take the turn it has at this particular time. Personally I am not sufficiently familiar with the hon. member's views on the subject, because he has given a great deal of study and consideration to it, and he is one member on our side who has an excellent judgment in matters of this kind. I should like to have the matter left over in the meantime.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Could the item stand?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not expect that we shall get through the item to-night.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have now received the original of the return, 127Q, brought down on Friday, May 14. I think the public ought to understand that no member of the board gets any salary at all. This huge sum of money is outside the board altogether, and only two of the members of the board, so far as I can observe, have drawn anything for travelling expenses. The reason for that is that the members of the board themselves are, every one of them, in the public service already, and are being paid by other departments. That is correct, is it not? For instance, the chairman is an official of the Bank of Canada, and Mr. Sim is commissioner of customs. Mr. MacGregor

occupies a position in some other department, finance, I believe. The travelling expenses of the board itself are very meagre, in most cases none. This report goes on to indicate that there are forty-three officials with salaries of \$5,000 or over; eighty-three with salaries of \$4,001 up to \$5,000; 174 with salaries of \$3,001 up to \$4,000; 683 with salaries of \$2,001 up to \$3,000; 3,723 receiving \$2,000 and under. The total for salaries, honoraria and living allowances is \$6,714,000, and travelling expenses in excess of ten per cent of the total for salaries and so forth. Of course, travelling expenses is a big item. Whether we should press for the names in the face of the minister's statement is something I should like to consider, but if the minister takes extreme exception to giving them for the reasons he has alleged I do not want to ask for the names just out of curiosity, because that is all it is, just to know what is being done. If it is not in the public interest to give them, this is one time I will be in agreement with the minister in the use of that phrase. I am not going to press it myself, but since the hon. member for Lake Centre has studied this whole situation, perhaps this might stand over until to-morrow.

I would ask the minister to tell us about the number of legal gentlemen he has on his payroll, how they are selected, and how they are paid. Are they paid a per diem allowance? Are they on the payroll six days a week or thirty-one days a month? What salaries do they get? There is certainly a raft of young lawyers being paid by this board and going round the country. I am informed, too, that in addition to all these young lawyers permanently upon the payroll, counsel are employed in various communities; I know a leading counsel in my city is employed to prosecute cases from time to time. Some explanation is due.

Mr. ILSLEY: All the solicitors with the exception of two, have been appointed by the civil service commission. Their rates of salary have been set by the commission.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On whose recommendation?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not know about that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What do these young lawyers get—\$3,000 a year?

Mr. ILSLEY: There was a return brought down a year ago setting out all their salaries. I think it would be something like that. The amount varies.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So much for a king's counsel, and so on?

Mr. GRAYDON: They might get less.