

mind that this type of remuneration should not be extended but should be cut out, and therefore when other cases started to come before us, where a similar arrangement was recommended by a department, we sent them back and said, "Either pay them more per day or do something, but do not pay the wife's expenses." There are two or three judges—I do not know whether it is confined to these, but there are two or three in exactly comparable circumstances, who were paid on that basis. There have been many other judges in respect of whom a similar matter came up when the treasury board decided not to extend the practice. We did many exceptional things under stress of circumstances in time of war. Sometimes one tries desperately to get some man to take hold of something or another the next day and he attaches importance to some peculiar arrangement like that. After all, it does not make much difference financially which method is followed. I agree with the auditor general that it is an unusual practice and one which should not be extended.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is amazing that a person in Judge Archibald's position, who every day turned down requests for increased wages by people who were barely getting enough on which to exist, insisting on his own travelling expenses; that he would not undertake a position of this kind when the nation needed a person to do this work, unless he received his expenses. I am not at all convinced that Judge Archibald was just the man to do it. As a matter of fact, the consensus of the two large labour bodies is that if the national war labour board is to continue with Judge Archibald as chairman it might as well be abolished. Every day he turned down requests for increased wages, and yet he made it a condition of his serving the government that his wife should receive her expenses while she was here, and that he should receive his. It is an astounding state of affairs.

Mr. ILSLEY: I know Judge Archibald well; I have high respect for the quality of the service that he has rendered. I am not now talking about his decisions as head of the national war labour board, although I have no criticism of the decisions of Judge Archibald. During the war he put in a great deal of hard work and I certainly do not think that he has been overpaid in any particular.

Mr. MacINNIS: Neither were the workers whose requests for increased wages he turned down.

Mr. ILSLEY: Here again I do not think the hon. member's criticism should be di-

[Mr. Ilesley.]

rected to Mr. Justice Archibald or to the national war labour board. If it is valid criticism it should be directed to the persons who are responsible for framing the order, namely, the government. The national war labour board had to carry out the order. I do not want to take all the burdens and attract all the blame, but I not not think it is just to attack boards and officials who are administering orders in council. If there is anything wrong it is in the order in council itself. We think the orders in council were all right. We thought they were necessary as part of our anti-inflation policy. The national war labour board tried its best to carry out these orders according to the letter, spirit and intent. At any rate I do not think it should be criticized for what is in the orders in council.

Item agreed to.

FISHERIES

Department of Fisheries—

661. To provide for transportation, dressing and dyeing, and other expenses incidental to receiving and disposing of fur seal skins accruing to Canada pursuant to provisional fur seal agreement between Canada and the United States by exchange of notes dated December 8 and 19, 1942—further amount required, \$100,361.34.

Mr. McLURE: Year after year this committee goes on voting money and I do not believe one-half of the members in the committee know what it is for. This is money voted to a partnership which is doing business, and have possibilities of doing a large business running anywhere from \$6,000,000 to \$25,000,000 annually. Canada is a one-fifth partner in this two-partner business. Can the minister tell us what Canada's net profit was in last year's business? There must be a record. If there is no net profit, why should we continue voting hundreds of thousands of dollars annually without knowing whether this business is on a paying basis. The item says that this amount is to provide for transportation, dressing and dyeing, and other expenses incidental to receiving and disposing of fur seal skins. Should we not have a breakdown of these different items? To whom are they paid? Are they all paid direct to the company or to the different companies that do the manufacturing and disposing of the skins? We were practically promised the information during last session. I should like to hear from the minister in regard to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have a small amount of information with reference to this item. Its purpose is to provide for a book-keeping entry. It had been the practice where fur seal skins were processed and dyed and then