

him, and I did give him, a list of the employees receiving from \$3,000 to \$5,000. I sent that to him. He said he would think the matter over. He did nothing about it for a week or ten days. I asked him again what he wished to do, and he said, "Well, I don't know; I didn't realize that perhaps the publication of the whole list might create these difficulties to which you refer. What do you suggest?" "Well," I said, "I don't know that I have anything to suggest. Perhaps you might reframe your question and ask for any particular group of salaries, or, if you are interested in any particular individual salaries you have the list before you." That was the position in which the matter stood when the question came up last Monday, and the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) asked why it had been standing so long.

Those are the facts. I asked yesterday that it be made an order for return, because, in the first place, the list of names will be lengthy, and in the second place, it will take some little time now to get out these travelling expenses to which I refer.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So far as the travelling expenses are concerned, in view of the statement made by the parliamentary assistant to the minister, knowing as I do the practice in big commercial houses, I would be perfectly willing to waive that part of the information, namely, the individual travelling expenses of individuals. I should like to know, though, if these people travel by aeroplane or if they are instructed to keep their travelling expenses down to the minimum. Great care ought to be exercised in that respect. I understood that some of them did travel by plane.

I should like to point out a case of what I consider to be useless travelling. A friend of mine operates a general store about half way between Saint John and Moncton. One day an inspector arrived by taxi from Moncton, forty-five miles away, to investigate an alleged overcharge of one cent above the price ceiling of a can of a commodity. Some person had made a complaint. The books were opened up and shown to the inspector, and it was made evident that after freight and all other expenses were paid on this commodity the retailer had a net profit of one cent, which was one cent above the ceiling. This showed that the ceiling had not been raised to cover the increased cost. The inspector went away and nothing was ever again heard of the matter. But that inspection about a one-cent overcharge—I think there were half a dozen tins involved—must have

cost this country in salary and travelling expenses \$50. I will give the minister the name of the merchant.

Mr. ILSLEY: The amount involved would not be the consideration.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No; but it shows how money is wasted. I admit regard must be had to a principle. The minister will say that a principle would be involved there. There is a principle, but to vindicate a principle often costs a man his life. A man had the right of way—you know that rhyme—but he was dead, just the same, through vindicating his position and taking the right of way. The same principle applies here. A little common sense must be exercised. There was not an office between Saint John and Moncton. The complaint came in. Instead of writing the merchant, who was a reputable merchant, and asking for the facts, they sent an inspector by taxi. Why he came by taxi I do not know, but that is the fact. That is the sort of thing that people question. An incident like that is told all over the country and brings the practice of the office into disrepute.

I am quite willing to waive the demand for individual travelling expenses, on account of the difficulty mentioned by the minister. I think we ought to have the names of those with salaries of \$3,000 and over.

Then I have the curiosity to know how many lawyers are in the employ of the wartime prices and trade board and how much they are getting out of it.

Mr. MacNICOL: They will not get much, surely!

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They do. The board has an army of young lawyers, a good many of whom ought to be in uniform. How are they selected? Are they selected by the civil service commission, or is the civil service commission a rubber stamp as far as the employment of these young lawyers is concerned? There is an avenue there for investigation on the part of hon. members. I do not want to be the chief critic of this set-up, but I know a very large amount of money is spent, and I am not sure that we are getting a dollar's value for every dollar that is spent; in fact, I feel quite satisfied that we are not. I wonder if we are getting a dollar's value for every five dollars that are spent? I should like to have an expression of opinion by hon. members who know about the operations of this board.

I will give the committee another example of the ineptitude of this board. In New