

Mr. DUPRE: The object of the amendment is to add a subsection to section 28 of the Judges Act, which is chapter 105 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927. The purpose of the change is to provide that any judge of a superior court of any province or the Yukon territory who continues or is continued in office after attaining the age of 75 shall suffer a reduction in salary to an amount equal to that which he would receive by way of retiring allowance, if he were retired at 75, less any sum which he may receive from the provincial government by way of additional remuneration. The new salary rate will commence when the judge attained or attains the age of seventy-five years, or on the first day of July, 1933, whichever is later. In the case of a judge who would not be entitled to a retiring allowance if retired at the age of seventy-five, the operation of the act will be postponed until he is eligible for a retiring allowance.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RADIO ANNOUNCERS—QUEBEC

Mr. JEAN:

1. Who are the official or temporary announcers of the federal radio commission in the province of Quebec?
2. What is their nationality?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. member is dropping this question?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I gave the hon. gentleman certain explanations and he is willing to have the question dropped.

Question dropped.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

ADVANCES TO BANKS

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What were the annual advances to the chartered banks and savings banks under the Finance Act from August 22, 1914, to March 30, 1933?
2. What was the rate of interest charged?
3. What was the aggregate amount of interest received by the government on these advances?
4. What were the total advances during the aforesaid period to each bank unit?

[Mr. Dupré.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ADVERTISING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston City): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion) based on a long letter which I have received. The question is this: Have the Canadian National Railways sold to a private company a franchise to erect and maintain illuminated and other outdoor advertising signs on the Canadian National right of way across Canada?

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was good enough to tell me he was going to ask this question, and I think one or two other hon. members of the house are interested as well, notably the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), who said he was going to ask a question along this line.

In brief the facts are that the management and directors of the Canadian National Railways have entered into an agreement with a Montreal company—I think McArthur-Irwin is the name—not to erect signs across the entire right of way, as the hon. member suggests, but to place advertising signs on their bridges, under proper conditions. I am informed by the management and by the directors that this should bring in a reasonably good income which has not been enjoyed by any railway in Canada previously. I may add quite frankly that I entirely agree that this is a wise step to take, particularly in view of present financial conditions.

Mr. C. B. HOWARD (Sherbrooke): May I ask the minister if he is aware of the fact that last year the province of Quebec passed legislation forbidding the placing of advertising signs along either side of the highway even on private property?

Mr. MANION: I was not aware of that fact, but I do not know what bearing it would have on this matter. I understand that the agreement relates only to bridges, and of course that advertising would have to be within the laws of the various provinces. I am informed that the agreement amply protects the railway company in every possible way, so there is no danger of any conflict with provincial laws.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that an exclusive contract, or is it open to other companies as well?

Mr. MANION: I understand that it is an exclusive contract. I do not think it could be anything else, as a matter of fact.