

*Railway Act*

I understand the point of order, the hon. member is trying to discuss a matter concerning the Hillsborough bridge on this resolution. Surely that is entirely out of order. He also wants to discuss the matter of freight rates. If he wants to deal with the increase in the salaries and the duties of the board, that is another thing. In fairness to the committee, since we did not allow a discussion on the freight rates on the bill when it was before the house and on the earlier resolution, surely we should not allow it at this stage.

**Mr. McLure:** During the discussion of these things I was endeavouring to show that in getting these extra men who are to be appointed at high salaries, we should get men who would not bring in unwise reports such as the one I referred to. I will go this much further and say this. The board of transport commissioners that I have had anything to do with for the last six or seven years never gave us any consideration because they did not know where they were in regard to it. What I should like to see brought in is another amendment washing out the board of transport commissioners entirely. We have far too many of these things. We have the maritime commission for the railways, we have a controller of boxcars and reefer cars and all these things. After all, anything that our province has to do with the railways cannot be done through the board of transport commissioners. They have no jurisdiction to set freight rates. We cannot deal with subcontractors. Our contract is with the Minister of Transport and the government, and that is the reason I want to express myself at this time to the effect that the board of transport commissioners, as applied to the problems of our province, are not worth a pinch of snuff.

**Mr. Knowles:** I should like to ask a question with regard to the wording of the resolution. It says that the present commissioner is to be now an additional puisne judge of the exchequer court. Then, later on it says "on retirement therefrom". Which is it? Does the present chief commissioner become now a judge of the exchequer court or does he become such upon his retirement from his present position?

**Mr. Chevrier:** Both.

**Mr. Green:** What procedure will be followed, once this resolution has been passed? Will it be an amendment to Bill 12, or is there to be a new bill entirely?

**Mr. Chevrier:** When we reach the end of this discussion I propose to move that this resolution be referred to the committee of the whole on Bill 12, and then when we get to the section dealing with the salary and

position of the chief commissioner I propose to ask my colleague the leader of the house to move an amendment to that section.

**Mr. Green:** And will the minister clear up the situation with respect to the chief commissioner becoming a puisne judge of the exchequer court? As I read Bill 12, upon his retirement from the position of chief commissioner he will become what is called a supernumerary judge of the exchequer court, and will continue to be such supernumerary judge until he becomes 75 years of age. Presumably as such supernumerary judge he will draw a salary the same as other puisne judges of the exchequer court, namely \$14,400. And he will do that regardless of whether he is functioning as a judge of the exchequer court. Am I wrong in that summing up?

**Mr. Chevrier:** I wonder if my hon. friend would allow me to explain that when we get into committee of the whole on Bill 12, because the amendment which I shall ask my colleague to move will deal with those very points. I undertake now to make that explanation, and I hope I shall do so to the satisfaction of my hon. friend.

**Mr. Knowles:** Perhaps the amendment will be clearer than the resolution.

**Mr. Chevrier:** It will be more detailed, I can assure you.

**Mr. Herridge:** What are the minimum educational requirements and administrative experience required by the government in making an appointment to the board of transport commissioners?

**Mr. Chevrier:** If my hon. friend would take the trouble to look at section 1 (2) of the Railway Act as it now stands he will find there the qualifications required to become chief commissioner and assistant chief commissioner.

**Mr. Herridge:** I have asked for the qualifications required for commissioners.

**Mr. Chevrier:** The qualifications required for the chief commissioner and the assistant chief commissioner are that they be judges of a superior court, or at least barristers of ten years' standing. There is no qualification set out in the act with respect to commissioners. I take it that men of standing in the community, such as have been appointed in the past, would be appointed in the future.

**Mr. Knowles:** What community?

**Mr. Hodgson:** I understand the commissioners get \$10,000 a year now, and this increase brings them up to \$12,000; is that right?