

the radio, advertising, and so forth, and last year we tried another mode of collection. We began organizing in July and continued up to September, because it was a new organization and it took some time. Under that new system of canvassing from house to house, instead of taking legal proceedings, as we did previously, against those who had not complied with the law in the first three months of the fiscal year, we collected 84,000 licence fees more than we had collected the previous year. Those supervisors finished their work to-day, February 28.

My hon. friend from South Perth asked how many vendors there were under the department. To-morrow we shall have none. We have not yet decided whether this new system will be in force for another year or whether another mode of collection will be tried, but the aim of the department is that every owner of a radio set shall pay for a licence.

A question was asked by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni, whether we intended to increase the licence fee this year. I do not think there will be any question as to that this year. I think the licence fee will remain at \$2, but I repeat that it is the intention of the department to see that every radio owner pays his licence fee.

Mr. COOTE: I seems to me that the minister has shown great diligence in collecting the licence fees. I think the committee would be interested in learning just what use has been made of the fees paid by the licence holders. What service has been rendered by the department? How many engineers are working in the field to see that radio reception is just what it should be? I wish the minister would also tell the committee what the commission is now doing. I understand that it has been operating for some time. Is the commission exercising a censorship, and if so, on what grounds do they decide who shall not be allowed to use the air? Has the radio commission yet broadcast any national programs, and if so, what telephone or telegraph lines are they using for these national broadcasts?

Mr. MALCOLM: The discussion is on the item of fees for radio licences. I quite appreciate the difficulties which the minister has in collecting the fees, but I doubt very much if the system under which radios are licensed is productive of the revenue which should be produced. The collection is a very laborious process for the amount of money derived. I do not think any new invention of modern times has presented just the same

difficulties that radio has in the way of collection of fees. I would suggest to the minister, if he wants to get a reasonable return from the users of radio receiving sets, and if he wants to avoid the present difficulties of collection, he could go about it in a very simple way by wiping out entirely the licence fee for the use of a radio set, and instead ask his Minister of Finance when he brings down his budget in a few days to put a direct tax of twenty-five cents each on all tubes used in radio receiving sets. There is no logical reason why the man with a crystal set or a one tube set should pay a licence fee of \$2, but the owner of an eight tube set might very well be asked to pay a tax of twenty-five cents apiece on radio tubes. The minister would then have no difficulties in collection. The manufacturers would pay the tax just the same as they do the sales tax, and every cent of the revenue would come into the treasury. The cost of collection would be nil, and the tax would be distributed more evenly among those who use radio receiving sets with tubes.

Mr. SANDERSON: If I heard the minister aright, he said that there were 47 supervisors in Ontario, but he did not know how many vendors or inspectors there were. There might be one or five or ten thousand—any number. Surely the minister has some knowledge or information concerning the number of inspectors in Ontario under the control of his department. They draw revenues from the public exchequer; they are public servants. Surely the minister knows how many there are.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I think I answered the hon. member's question. These vendors or inspectors were the employees not of the department but of the supervisors. We did not pay one cent to the vendors, but paid a commission to the supervisor. It is very easy to understand that since we had nothing to do with the vendors and dealt only with the supervisors, we cannot tell how many vendors there might be in each constituency. I should imagine the supervisor was a reasonable man—

Mr. SANDERSON: And a good supporter of the government.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I cannot say that; if they are reliable men we are satisfied. I should imagine the supervisor would give the jobs to three or four men; those men could not earn their living if there were too many in the constituency. The number of men required would of course depend on the size and importance of the constituency. I do