

*Railway Act*

cabinet, and that therefore the committee could recommend the increases. Members of the official opposition who were on the committee opposed the recommendation for these increases and, as I have said, we propose to oppose the resolution today.

The salaries now being paid to the members of the board of transport commissioners are \$15,000 per year to the chief commissioner, \$12,000 to the assistant chief commissioner and \$10,000 to each of the other commissioners, including one who is known as the deputy chief commissioner. Those salaries were increased just four years ago from \$12,500 for the chief commissioner, \$9,000 for the assistant chief commissioner and \$8,000 for the ordinary commissioners, including the deputy chief.

As I have said, Bill No. 12 does provide for an increase in the salary of the chief commissioner from \$15,000 to \$16,000, so that he would then be getting the same amount as the president of the exchequer court. It also goes further and provides that if at any time he should retire from the position of chief commissioner, then until he becomes 75 years of age he is automatically one of the puisne judges of the exchequer court and, as such, would receive a salary of \$14,400. There is no provision that he must be needed on the exchequer court. He is just made a judge of that court and continues as such at this salary until he becomes 75 years of age.

The amendment proposed in committee, as set out in the report of the committee to be found in yesterday's *Votes and Proceedings*, provides for increasing the salary of the assistant chief commissioner from \$12,000 to \$14,000, for increasing the salary of the deputy chief commissioner from \$10,000 to \$13,000, and the salaries of the other commissioners from \$10,000 to \$12,000. I would point out that county court judges are paid only \$8,000, but we are being asked to approve an increase of \$2,000 for the ordinary members of the board of transport commissioners. No argument was presented to justify this increase. It has just been pulled out of the hat, so to speak.

As a matter of fact the Turgeon commission on transportation recommended that the board of transport commissioners should be strengthened. Obviously the royal commission was concerned about the capabilities of the board of transport commissioners and recommended that it should be strengthened. But the royal commission did not recommend that the present members of that board be given an increase of salary of \$2,000 for the ordinary commissioners, of \$3,000 for the deputy chief commissioner and \$2,000 for the assistant chief commissioner.

**Mr. Brooks:** That is hardly strengthening the board.

**Mr. Green:** I submit that does not carry out the recommendation of the royal commission on transportation that the board of transport commissioners should be strengthened. This legislation might very well make it the more difficult to do anything about strengthening that board. It is not my intention to say anything further on the matter, but I repeat that the official opposition feel this is an unwise step to take under the conditions, and we propose to vote against the resolution.

**Mr. J. M. Macdonnell (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, it is much more pleasant to speak in favour of increasing salaries than it is to object; therefore I do not particularly relish the task before me. However, I am going to vote against this resolution and I think perhaps I had better give my reasons. The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green) has explained the rather unusual way in which this came about. I think it is fair to say that this does not come to us as the original considered judgment of the government. Presumably it is a matter which must have been much in the mind of the minister because it has been discussed a good deal; nevertheless the proposal did not come from the minister when the committee first met and the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra has explained why.

My approach to this matter is a simple one. I regard \$10,000 as a large salary. The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra compared this salary with that paid to county court judges. County court judges are men of some eminence in their profession. I know something about university salaries and I know a university would be delighted to be able to pay \$10,000 to its professors. However, we cannot pay that salary. Many eminent men are getting very much less. I have some knowledge of business, and I know that \$10,000 jobs do not grow on every bush. A man who gets \$10,000 is generally a man of ability and service and experience.

Therefore I feel justified in voting against this resolution, but in doing so I do not mean it as a criticism in any way of the members of the board. I do it purely on the basis of believing that \$10,000 is a good salary for men doing work of distinction and importance in the community.

**Mr. Clarence Gillis (Cape Breton South):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my friends to my right propose to call a vote on this resolution, I think I should say a word or two. The two hon. members of the official