

fisheries as between east and west. I do not think much can be said against the expenses of the head office at Vancouver. We have there a chief supervisor, one district supervisor, one accountant, grade 2; two principal clerks, one collector of fish revenue, one clerk, grade 4, one clerk, grade 2; three stenographers, grade 2; one typist, grade 2; one messenger, one stenographer, grade 2 who is employed temporarily during only seven months of the year. My hon. friend will see by the last item that we are trying to cut expenses as much as possible because someone in the head office is employing a stenographer during the rush season only, for seven months. So I do not think my hon. friend's criticism is very fair under the circumstances. My hon. friend, however, has offered some suggestions, and I am always glad to get suggestions from him because I know that he has had a large experience in these matters. But anything that is acceptable will be studied by my department and if anything can be done to reduce the expenses we shall do it, but I am told that in the past we have done our best. If my hon. friend has any complaint to make against a particular employee I should like to hear it.

Mr. NEILL: No, I have not.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I am told that the employees that I have just enumerated, and whose salaries amount to about \$25,000, are absolutely necessary for the good administration of the fisheries in the west.

Mr. NEILL: I had anticipated, of course, that some defence would be put up and I was curious to know what it could be and what it would be, but I certainly did not anticipate such a lame reply as I have received.

To begin with, I would say in reply to the minister's last remark, asking if I had any complaint to make against any particular employee, that I have none whatever. I am not acquainted with the personnel of the office, except the head of it, and I would regret to see in these hard times any man or woman lose his position through curtailment of expenses, although many people in Ottawa have had to lose their positions. If the office was wiped out, I would suggest that provision be made to try to take these people on in other branches of the service either here or elsewhere.

As regards the criticism of my comparison, the minister says that my argument is not sound. He says that the fish in British Columbia waters are different from the fish in Atlantic waters. I admit that, but I was not dealing with fish. I was dealing with the

clerical expenses of an office. It does not cost any more to take care of a salmon than of a cod. As to the argument that there are different geographical considerations, that there are roads in Nova Scotia and the employees there can travel over the roads, I would point out that the people to whom I am referring are engaged in clerical work in the head office at Vancouver, and whether there are trails or roads makes absolutely no difference because their work is done in the office, and the roads do not affect the cost of their work one particle. I grant that where the local guardian has to travel, that would add to his expenses, but that has no relation whatever to the cost of the clerical assistance in the head office.

The minister also says that in British Columbia we have a sea patrol. Yes, we have, and it is an expensive one and I have much pleasure in saying that it is also an efficient one. But that has no bearing on this vote. The minister would almost imply that that made the cost of the office in Vancouver more expensive, but as he very well knows, or ought to know, there is another vote entirely that covers the cost of the patrol port. So that has no bearing on the subject whatever.

Again, the minister says that he will show the difference in cost, and he quotes figures which with one exception are a duplicate of my own figures. He says, with an air of backing up his own argument and opposing mine, that in Nova Scotia the guardians cost \$56,000 and in British Columbia \$28,000. That just confirms my argument. That Nova Scotia can take care of \$50,000 of guardians' work at such a low percentage of cost as fourteen per cent, while British Columbia with an expenditure for guardians of only \$28,000 requires 43 per cent, just confirms my argument and does not combat it in the least.

But the minister did combat my figures in one respect. He said that I had put too much into the Vancouver office, and he quoted the figures, and I noted one figure that he omitted. He gave the total as \$28,000, and my figure was \$31,960, and the minister said that I was wrong. But he forgot to put in the salary of the chief supervisor, who is essentially the head of the Vancouver office. If he adds to the figures he gave, the \$3,960 which the chief supervisor gets, he arrives at exactly the same figure that I gave for salaries alone. Then the minister enumerated some of the employees. I am not going to go into details. I cannot say that this man or that man is not necessary. It would be invidious and unfair for me to do so because I do not know them. I have no doubt that every man and every

[Mr. Duranleau.]