

an assistant director of publicity at \$3,000? What publicity are we engaging in to secure immigration at the moment, when it has been intimated we are trying to discourage it?

Mr. GORDON: The publicity branch, when I took charge of the department, was quite a large one. Now it consists of the officers as indicated, a director of publicity, with an assistant and, I think, one or two stenographers. Their work consists of answering communications from the United States, because it will be recalled that up until two years ago we had some sixteen officers, if I remember correctly, in various parts of the United States, and we had many forms of advertising in Great Britain and on the continent, showing the opportunities and attractiveness of Canada to people who might come to this country and colonize. That staff was entirely done away with following the policy inaugurated in the fall of 1930. The designation of the position, director of publicity, is hardly a correct one, but it was the designation given by the Civil Service Commission when the office was created, and it has been retained. The activities of these four officers are in assisting the attempt that we are making to do some colonizing at home, a matter which has been discussed very often in this house, and I can assure the committee that these men are working and earning their money. It is, comparatively speaking, a very small staff.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): In regard to the ten per cent deduction of \$22,838, as shown on page 74 of the details, I presume that that cut applies to certain ex-service men on the staff. Will the proposed pensions deductions referred to in the budget the other day apply to these men, plus the ten per cent reduction referred to in the item, amounting to \$22,838?

Mr. GORDON: I prefer to let the Minister of Finance answer the question, but if my information is helpful I would suggest that it would apply.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): So that we may have the ten per cent reduction applying to all, and the special pension reduction under the terms of the budget?

Mr. GORDON: I should think so, yes.

Mr. LUCAS: Have we any immigration officials in the United States at the present time?

Mr. GORDON: No.

Mr. POULIOT: As the Department of Immigration is a minor department, and as the Department of Labour is one of the

important departments, would it not be more appropriate for the minister to be called the Minister of Labour and acting Minister of Immigration, instead of Minister of Immigration and acting Minister of Labour?

Mr. GORDON: I do not know that it would make much difference—"A rose by any other name..."—but the fact is that I have been appointed Minister of Labour and am acting Minister of Immigration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: How many immigrants have come into Canada during the last year, and from where?

Mr. GORDON: I shall have that information in a minute, if the right hon. gentleman would let the matter stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are there as many immigrants as there are members of the staff?

Mr. GORDON: In 1931 there were 27,530 immigrants admitted, and in 1932, there were 20,591.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What countries were they from, chiefly?

Mr. GORDON: In 1931: British, 7,678; United States, 15,195; all other countries, 4,657. In 1932: British, 3,327; United States, 13,709; all other countries, 3,555.

Mr. BENNETT: Canadians coming home.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has the minister any way of telling whether any of these immigrants have received relief since coming to Canada, or whether they have been self-supporting?

Mr. GORDON: I think I am safe in saying that the great majority of these immigrants are the wives and children of men who have been legally admitted. In each case before the wives and children are admitted investigations are made to see that the heads of the families here are established ready and willing to support the people coming in. I have heard of no case where any immigrant admitted since 1930 has had to accept relief in any way.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Of the total sum of over \$1,641,000 for the Department of Immigration, what is the estimate of the amount that can be saved by the suggested pension legislation contained in the budget address? Has any estimate been made?

Mr. GORDON: I presume the hon. member is speaking of the vote contained under civil government?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Yes, vote 63 plus the civil government vote.