

who buys, sells or packs fish—wants three things particularly from the department. First he wants efficiency, then he wants speed and in the third place he wants economy, though he is not so keen on that because the cost does not come directly out of his own pocket. Efficiency and speed are very material to him, and here is an opportunity to improve both, at the same time effecting economy to the extent of something like \$35,000. The minister is here in a dual capacity; he is also Minister of Marine. Perhaps if we saved this \$35,000 he would not have to cut by ten per cent the men drawing the miserable salary of \$65 a month on marine boats. Let us economize in the right places, and then we will not have to scrimp ten per cent from a married man getting only \$65 a month.

I should like to make the suggestion that we save the cost of this office. Why is it necessary in British Columbia to spend this \$50,000 every year to supervise an expenditure of only \$117,000, when in Nova Scotia we only spend \$22,000 on an expenditure of \$153,000? In all courtesy I might say my brother members from Nova Scotia have not the record of being unwilling to spend government money when they get the chance. Nova Scotia is always willing to milk the federal cow when the opportunity offers, so I suggest that when it comes to economy we in British Columbia should be at least on a par with them.

Mr. VENIOT: I object to that reference to Nova Scotia.

Mr. NEILL: I should like the minister to give to us an explanation of the great difference in cost as between the two offices.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend has based his whole argument on a comparison of the administration of the fisheries in the eastern provinces as against British Columbia. I do not think the base of his argument is very sound, in the first place because there is a great difference between the fisheries in the east and in the west, and also because geographical conditions make a very great difference. It is really impossible to make any proper comparison between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. For instance, the sea fisheries on the Atlantic coast, which produce nearly one-half of the product of the fisheries, in value, need no supervision on the sea. On the other hand all the fisheries on the Pacific coast, with the exception of the halibut and black cod fisheries which make up less than ten per cent, of the total, need close supervision and administration.

That is one reason for the difference. Again, all along the coast and rivers of the maritime provinces there are good roads, so that

a great deal of the work can be done more economically from land. Hence the cost of our land service there, made up of supervisors, inspectors and guardians, is relatively large. On the other hand there are practically no coastal roads in British Columbia, so the work has to be done mainly by boat, though necessarily there is a large amount of work to be done in protecting the spawning salmon in interior waters. Hence the cost of the land service in British Columbia is relatively small as compared with that in the maritime provinces, while the cost of the boat patrol service is very much larger.

I have some figures for the year 1930-31 which will clarify this point. I do not like to give too many figures, but I think in fairness to the committee and to my department I should place this statement on Hansard. For supervisors and inspectors the expense by provinces was as follows:—

Prince Edward Island.. . . .	\$ 21,459
Nova Scotia.. . . .	118,268
New Brunswick.. . . .	63,642
British Columbia.. . . .	138,093

Now take the cost of the guardians:

Prince Edward Island.. . . .	\$ 4,667
Nova Scotia.. . . .	56,669
New Brunswick.. . . .	42,779
British Columbia.. . . .	28,714

I give these figures to show the committee that the argument of my hon. friend is not sound, because in some parts of the country we must spend more money on certain branches of administration, because of geographical conditions or for other special reasons, than we spend in other parts of the country. My hon. friend has directed his criticism principally against the head office in Vancouver, and he has given \$50,000 as the cost of that office. I think my hon. friend is mistaken; he must have taken the figures for the whole district. I have here the cost of the main office in Vancouver, and if you compare this with the expenses of the eastern division you will not find very much difference. Take salaries, for example; in Vancouver they amount to \$27,960. Deducting ten per cent leaves about \$25,000 for salaries. The whole amount is \$23,419, and for the eastern division the amount for salaries is \$21,660; so the difference is not very large. In the west the amount to be expended for contingencies is \$8,000, including telegrams, telephone calls, freight, cartage and so forth, and in the east contingencies amount to \$2,500. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that these expenses are not incurred simply for the pleasure of incurring them. We have to incur them on account of geographical considerations and because of the difference in the