Mr. NEILL: What did they get?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I think the man who has the responsibility for the whole district was supposed to keep for himself ten cents per licence.

Mr. NEILL: What does the other man get?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Thirty cents. The department had a regular price for every part of the country, namely, forty cents per licence. The supervisor keeps ten cents for himself and pays thirty cents to the vendor, the man who goes from house to house. That is forty cents, or 20 per cent of the license fee.

Mr. NEILL: Prior to that we used to have this done for seven and a half per cent.

An hon. MEMBER: Two and a half per cent.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Prior to last year no canvassing from house to house was done. This system was on trial last year. Before that the inspectors had no power to issue licences; they went from house to house finding out those who had not complied with the law and they had to report to the department. Last year we tried this system of giving power to these inspectors to issue licences.

Mr. NEILL: But in previous years the department used to issue them through the dealer or postmaster on a commission of two and a half per cent.

Mr. DURANLEAU: No. When the licence fee was only one dollar, we were paying 10 per cent, or ten cents a licence.

Mr. NEILL: Now the department is paying 20 per cent.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Now we are paying fifteen.

Mr. NEILL: Twenty per cent.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Fifteen cents per licence to the dealer, or seven and a half per cent, and two and a half per cent to the regular post offices; and we are paying seven and a half per cent to about 4,000 small post offices and seven and a half per cent to some banks.

Mr. NEILL: And 20 per cent to the inspectors?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: That is 20 per cent to the inspectors who formerly used to get 10; that is my point.

Mr. DURANLEAU: This is because they have to go from house to house, to travel.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Will the minister answer the question I asked about half an hour ago?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have been asked so many questions I cannot remember it.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): My question was: What was the total amount of commission paid last year under these various classifications?

Mr. DURANLEAU: It was $119,000.

Mr. ILSLEY: Is that for the ten months ending January 31 of this year?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes. As I informed the committee, we collected $1,396,000 free of commissions.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): But the printing of the paper, the licence certificates, cost something?

Mr. DURANLEAU: That is included in the expenses of administration of the department.

Mr. POULIOT: How many licences were issued last year when the fee was $2, and how many the previous year when the fee was $1

Mr. DURANLEAU: In the previous year under the $1 licence fee we issued 598,358 licences, or nearly 600,000. This year for the ten months we have issued 735,000 licences at $2.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: Why is it necessary to pay any commissions at all? At a time like this when we need plenty of revenue, to pay men forty cents on every licence issued seems exorbitant. Why cannot the man who sells the radio simply send in a form to the department stating that so and so has bought a radio, and let it go at that?

Mr. ARTHURS: Before the minister answers, I want to show the other side of the question. It is true that the minister or someone on his behalf organized a plan to collect licence fees where they had not been previously collected, that is from those who had radios and had not paid anything to the government, the compensation being ten cents per licence to a supervisor in each constituency and thirty cents to the inspector, or 20 per cent in all. These men were given large territories, otherwise they would not have taken the job. Many men went around, spent days and days of their time, paid their travelling expenses and in the end did not get one cent of compensation for their work. The lucky men, largely in the big centres, issued licences, as the minister has said, up to a value of about $100,000, where the govern-