

woman according to their lights are doing the work for which they are paid, but I am saying that on the principle of economy and efficiency the whole office at Vancouver could be wiped out.

Let me give an illustration, a precedent, a Dominion government precedent for the minister if he likes. Many years ago I was an Indian agent out there on that same coast with the same geographical conditions, only they were worse then than they are now, and when I wanted to buy five dollars' worth of stamps at government expense, I had to make out elaborate vouchers in quadruplicate, and send them to the head office, which was very much like this Vancouver one, although it was situated in Victoria. Then the head office man wrote back to Indian Agent Neill and said that he had received his letter enclosing vouchers, which he had forwarded to Ottawa. That took some time. Later on the Ottawa office wrote to the man in Victoria, "You can instruct Indian Agent Neill to buy five dollars' worth of stamps." There was more correspondence. The cheque followed the same devious course. As Indian agent I was familiar with the ground and knew the circumstances, and nine times out of ten my advice was taken and had to be taken. I forwarded my recommendations to Victoria and they went the usual rounds again. Finally I cut out those formalities and did what I thought ought to be done, and by the time I was due for a vote of censure, the incident was too far back for anything to be done about it. But suddenly some man with some idea of efficiency said "All this is unnecessary. What is the sense of it?" The office in Victoria was closed and the agents communicated direct with Ottawa. I would suggest to the minister that the whole head office in British Columbia could be dispensed with at a great saving of expense and with no loss of efficiency on the grounds I have mentioned.

Then I buttressed it with the fact that in Nova Scotia, where, I may say, they are wholly alive to their opportunities with respect to spending money—the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Veniot) will allow me to say that?

Mr. VENIOT: That is fair.

Mr. NEILL: I do not blame them; I would do the same. But when they can do it so cheaply, there is no reason why it should not be done in British Columbia. I would wipe the whole thing out. Pay the inspectors better money and they will rise to their

responsibilities. Give them more work and pay them—that is a good business principle—and save from thirty to thirty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. VENIOT: When we were dealing with oyster culture I brought up a question which I think I am in order in bringing up again under item 171.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 176 covers oyster culture.

Mr. VENIOT: I know, but 171 also covers it to some extent because it has to do with the salaries of guardians who are employed in this line of industry. On that occasion I brought up the question of containers or barrels for oysters. Under its new regulations the department has specified that oysters shall be packed in a certain way. Designs for the container or barrel have been submitted to the department. Under the ways and means bill before the house the sales tax has been increased from four to six cents, and if the department is going to insist upon a costly container being adopted it will be an injustice to the fishermen. Has the department made up its mind with respect to what design of container it will impose upon the oyster fishermen?

Mr. DURANLEAU: A regulation was adopted in 1931 as to the dimensions of oyster containers. This was done, I am told, after consultation between the officials of the department and the fishermen and others engaged in the industry in the east. But since then representations have been made against the cost of those containers, and my deputy tells me that at the present time he is communicating with the interested parties in order to come to some agreement on the matter.

Mr. VENIOT: I thank the minister for the information. Let me now draw this to his attention. When deciding on the design of the container, in the name of conscience do not leave it to those interested in the manufacture of containers to say what shall be adopted; and be careful that the price does not exceed, to any great extent at least, the price at which our oystermen have been buying their containers in the past. Why should there be a special design of container for the shipment of oysters any more than for the shipment of anything else? Why should regulations be adopted which impose that extra duty upon the oyster fishermen as well as upon the oyster exporters? An oyster