

industry and other activities, thus rendering the position of our own workmen more difficult. That is the main reason why very little decrease is shown in civil government this year.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I should like to ask rather a general question: When the Minister of Finance introduced his budget, he indicated that there would be a further cut in all the estimates averaging about ten per cent in each department. These estimates of course, do not indicate that cut. Are we to understand that each of these estimates will be cut by ten per cent, or are we voting the full amount without that deduction, the government, while having that full amount voted, in the budget pledging themselves to spend only ninety per cent of the money voted?

Mr. GORDON: The decrease that is indicated in item 18 is by reason of a reduction in salaries and of not filling positions that have become vacant.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is not my question.

Mr. GORDON: There is a ten per cent deduction from the vote as indicated, the details of which are found on page 74.

Mr. SPENCER: With regard to the Canadian doctors who were sent to Great Britain and Europe when immigration was coming to this country in good volume, has it been found possible, now that immigration has been reduced considerably, to cut down that staff of doctors?

Mr. GORDON: Yes, the staff has been reduced very materially. Right now we have about six doctors, while prior to, say, three years ago, we had something like fifteen or sixteen.

Mr. SPENCER: Where are they stationed?

Mr. GORDON: Three are stationed in Great Britain and three on the continent, one at Paris, one at Antwerp, and one I think at Rotterdam.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I do not think the minister quite caught the gist of my question; I may not have put it clearly. It was this: When the budget was presented, the Minister of Finance made the statement that in addition to the reduction in expenditures as shown in the estimates as they now appear, a ten per cent flat deduction would be made in the interests of economy. That deduction does not, of course, appear in the estimates because they were prepared and presented to the house before the Minister of Finance made his statement. Are these estimates to be considered

[Mr. Gordon.]

as being voted less ten per cent, or are we voting the original amount and does the government then in effect pledge itself to expend only ninety per cent of the money now voted, in order to comply with the statement of the Minister of Finance that an additional cut would be made in the estimates of ten per cent in the interests of economy?

Mr. GORDON: With respect to at least the item at present under discussion the decrease as shown, plus the ten per cent statutory deduction, is all that the government has in contemplation unless during the course of the year some further reductions can be made. This vote, as I have indicated, covers salaries for officers on the boundary and in Europe, and there will be no further ten per cent cut.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The further ten per cent reduction as intimated by the Minister of Finance will not apply to the salary votes but only to the other votes?

Mr. GORDON: That is the way I understand it.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was wondering just where it did apply.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is hard to determine exactly what the salaries are under the Department of Immigration and Colonization, as they are spread over so many votes; for instance, under vote 18, the details of which are shown on page 74, and then under vote 63 we have immigration, salaries and contingencies, \$1,417,000. Can the minister tell us what salaries would be included under vote 63 in addition to those detailed on page 74?

Mr. GORDON: The item we are now discussing is for salaries at Ottawa generally speaking—

Mr. MALCOLM: The permanent staff?

Mr. GORDON: Generally speaking, and the others are outside of Ottawa, in Europe and on the boundary.

Mr. MALCOLM: Under item 18, according to the details set out on page 74, the total staff cost \$228,380, from which is deducted the statutory ten per cent, leaving a balance of \$205,542. I undertook the minister to say a moment ago that the promised economy of the Minister of Finance in his budget speech of a few days ago will not have any effect on this vote. Might I ask the minister, in view of the desire of the Minister of Finance to effect economies, why he needs to retain at this time, when he is not encouraging immigration, a director of publicity at \$4,320, and