

which the parties may be subjected and it is better to fix the remuneration beforehand than to leave it to the good will of the minister or the Governor in Council. If my hon. friend will read clause 53 he will see the reason why the amount may appear a little high in section 52. We propose to allow \$20 for the chairman and \$15 for the others for a day's work. We do so because it is provided in section 53 that

No member of the board shall accept in addition to his salary any perquisite or gratuity of any kind, from any corporation, association, partnership or individual in any way interested in any matter or thing before or about to be brought before the board in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

We must have as far as possible a disinterested board above suspicion, and in order to ensure the working of the Act, and to secure for it as much respect as possible from the public, we should pay fairly the members of it. The parties who will be called upon to sit at that board may be parties occupying very high positions and having large salaries, and it would not be fair to ask such parties to sit for a trifle.

Mr. LOGAN. Besides getting the confidence of the general public we must have the confidence of the parties to the strike. Suppose a man who was getting \$2 a day at his ordinary occupation is chosen as one of the board of investigation. He suddenly jumps from \$2 per day to \$15 per day. Are we not liable to create a suspicion in the minds of some men that the sessions of the board would be unduly protracted? There might be some man who would be mean enough to take advantage of his position to protract the sittings of the board for a long time because of the fact that he was receiving \$15 per day. From the first discussion of this Bill to the present time I have in any part of the discussion in which I have been engaged and in any amendments which I have moved advocated the necessity of providing for expedition. We want to make this matter quick, short and sharp and anything that tends to protract the length of the sessions should be eliminated from this Bill. I do not like to disagree with the minister in this matter, but it seems to me that the provisions of the Railway Disputes Act for \$10 per day to these men is a reasonable compensation. After all, the big man is not going to be influenced by a matter of \$10 or \$15 or \$20 or \$50 per day. It is only a matter as between a reasonable payment of \$10 a day and a payment of \$15 a day. It does not seem to me that we will be able to get any better class of men for \$15 a day than we will get for \$10, and, after all, \$10 a day will only apply to two of the men whereas the third man will be paid \$15 per day. I think we should try to avoid the suspicion that might be created in the minds of some per-

Mr. LEMIEUX.

sons that a man would be tempted to keep this investigation dragging on for an indefinite period on account of getting \$15 per day when he was only earning at his ordinary occupation perhaps \$2 or \$1.50 a day. It must also be remembered that we allow \$5 per day for three days before the investigation commences and that in addition to that we allow them their travelling expenses.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend refers to the Railway Disputes Act, clause 17 of which says:

The department will pay to each member of a conciliation committee or board of arbitration his actual travelling expenses and also to each of them other than the chairman, ten dollars per day for each day that he shall attend a meeting of the committee or board.

A man may sit one hour or half a day under the Railway Disputes Act and he will receive \$10, while under this Bill he would receive only \$7 for a half day's sitting. However, I am inclined to be governed by the committee in this and I would like to have the sense of the committee.

Mr. LOGAN. Stand.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is easy to decide that now. If the committee is of the opinion that I should reduce it to \$10 instead of \$15 I am quite willing to do it. Is it the sense of the committee to reduce the salary of the members of the board except the chairman, to \$10?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Leave it \$15.

On section 53,

No member of the board shall accept in addition to his salary any perquisites or gratuity of any kind, from any corporation, association, partnership or individual in any way interested in any matter or thing before or about to be brought before the board in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The accepting of such perquisite or gratuity by any member of the board shall be an offence and shall render such member liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Under this section would the paid secretary of a union be prevented from acting as one of the members of the board?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, the unions are free to employ any one.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What do you mean by salary?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The special salary for the work he is doing on the board.

Mr. CONMEE. Could the paid secretary of a labour union sit as a member of that board at all?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Unquestionably he could.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. And draw pay?