

a statement which shows the ratio of the aggregate annual salary group to operating revenue. In table 2, reporting division number 1, executive general officers and assistants, class 1 steam railways, including switching and terminal companies, who are not restricted, as you will note, to the five or six senior officers of the railway company—it shows that the ratio to operating services was in 1933, 1·08, in 1932 1·45, and in 1931, 1·30.

Hon. Mr. MANION: Are those percentages?

Mr. HANBURY: Percentages as of the operating revenue. In 1932 it was 1·45. I was just making the comparison with the Canadian National railway. Their percentage to operating revenue is approximately ·80. In that connection I also note that—

Hon. Mr. MANION: May I ask one question in that regard? Aren't you going down below a \$15,000 salary?

Mr. HANBURY: I am going down below \$15,000, but there are more included in going below \$15,000 than we are including in our comparison here for the Canadian National railways.

Hon. Mr. MANION: Can you make a comparison?

Mr. HANBURY: I understand, Dr. Manion. But if the comparison was made on the basis of the information we have from the Canadian National railways, it would be, I realize, different; but I am putting this for the purpose of the record. The point I wanted to bring out is this that of these class 1 railroads in the United States, as at March 1, 1933, two of the railroads showed that their senior executives were receiving between \$80,000 and \$90,000 a year, five of them were receiving between \$90,000 and \$100,000, one was receiving between \$100,000 and \$110,000 and one was receiving between \$120,000 and \$130,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. MANION: That is in 1928?

Mr. HANBURY: That is in 1933, and I am putting these figures on record to substantiate the argument I advanced the other day that I do not think the fact that conditions have made it possible to grind these men down where they will take almost any salary rather than lose their positions, in view of the fact that this is a national system, that we have any right to be proud of that fact.

Hon. Mr. MANION: I do not want to get into any argument about it, especially at this stage. I think we have had enough politics.

Mr. HANBURY: I am not talking politics.

Hon. Mr. MANION: I know, but I have a statement made by the railway company itself showing that at the end of 1933, in the Canadian National railway there are forty-three officials receiving over \$10,000. I give this because the figure six over \$15,000 did look low, although it agrees with the Canadian Pacific. I want to put that fact on record associated with the facts I have stated.

Mr. HANBURY: In that connection, Mr. Chairman, the other day I asked Mr. Fairweather if he would procure some figures showing the ratio of the Canadian National in comparison with class 1 railroads as to executive salaries.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Well, the question asked was: what relationship to the salaries of the higher paid officials of the C.N.R. bear to the gross revenue, and how does this compare with other class 1 roads.

Answer: The most nearly comparable group of employees including higher paid officials for which statistics are prepared of class 1 roads, is executive