

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is known as Sarnia. I do not know what its limits are. The hon. gentleman knows the extent of Sarnia.

Mr. PATERSON. It is the town of Sarnia, that is all.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The manufactories at the outskirts of the town may be included in this report. It is stated in the return that there are seven manufacturing establishments within the limits of that officer's jurisdiction. To enable him to discharge the duties, another officer has been sent from London there. That will be the effect of it. If the work became less he could be removed to some other place where his services would be more required; but at the present he is required there, as has been shown by the report of that officer.

Mr. LISTER. One word of explanation. The hon. gentleman has said that the expenses up to the time of the death of the late collector amounted to \$2,150, and that on his death an officer was appointed at a salary of \$800. Now, at the time it was a division, the hon. gentleman must remember that he had the officer at Sarnia to do the work at Petrolia and other places in that division. Petrolia is as large as Sarnia, and has more manufactories than Sarnia, so that the work done in that office was more than twice—I may say three times—as much as it was from the time it ceased to be a division; and Mr. Wood, when he went into the office at \$800 a year, had not more than one-third the work the old collector had to do, so that in point of fact there has been no saving at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was understood that on this matter we should have more latitude, that we were to have a full understanding of the question when it came up. Could the hon. Minister tell us the number of manufactories subject to supervision at Sarnia in January, 1883?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Seven.

Mr. PATERSON. Then at that time there was precisely the same number. The officer runs it along, and is apparently able to run it along, until this gentleman is appointed some months after the election. He had run it for a considerable time, from June up to January, with the same number of establishments, before it was found out that he required assistance. Now, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the officers do report that two extra men are required for the London division, but the London division comprises a large extent of territory, and when those men are appointed one is detailed to go to Sarnia to assist the officer there—I think one of his officers does mention Sarnia separately. But the hon. Minister himself has told us that Mr. Slattery has been appointed there temporarily. Now, if that is the case—and the hon. Minister gave us to understand that it was—he admits that there is no necessity for placing him there permanently; there may have been for a short time a pressure upon the officer there who was entitled to get relief from the head office at London. But we understood before from the hon. Minister that this officer was appointed permanently, that his services were requisite. With all deference to the hon. Minister I think he has failed to make out just as strong a case as he desired to. Further than that, I may say, though I do not wish to find too much fault with him, that he was not sufficiently explicit in making his statements, as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—myself among the number—were rather led to a conclusion different from what we have just found to be the actual condition of affairs.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps I have not been explicit enough; perhaps I have left unsaid a great many things I might have said; perhaps I might have paid the hon. gentleman in his own coin; perhaps I might have wounded them as they would endeavor to wound me; but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I care little for the insinuations the hon.

gentleman has let fall. He has entirely misrepresented the statement I made so frankly before the House, he has tried to mislead the House, and I am not disposed to allow the hon. gentleman to do so.

Mr. PATERSON, Say how.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says that because this man continued to do the work a certain time without an officer, that was proof that he had no necessity for an officer. Did I not state clearly to the House that in consequence of the passing of the Civil Service Act we were unable to make any appointments until examinations took place, and until we had a list from which to choose our men? But he says that the officer reported that two men were required for the London division, but said nothing about Sarnia. The hon. gentleman drew his conclusion from a hint given by the hon. member for Lambton who, I am glad to say, retracted the accusation he made the other night, when he accused me of having made the appointment from a political point of view, and in order to reward this gentleman for carrying certain circulars. I told him I knew nothing about who carried the circulars. He would not accept that; but to-day he has acknowledged that he did make a mistake at the time. Now, let us see what the officer at London did say. I have a letter from Mr. Gerald, collector at London, who says:

"I beg to inform you that two additional officers are required in this division, viz., one to take charge of Slater's malt house, recently supervised by Mr. Officer Cameron, and one at Sarnia to assist Officer Elwood, who will now have more work than he can attend to."

Is that plain enough for the hon. gentleman? This was on November 10th.

Mr. PATERSON. I said that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This document proves an additional officer was required for that place, and because we could not send one in time, we appointed Mr. Slattery temporarily, before he entered the London division. But Mr. Slattery is not there now, and I gave the hon. gentleman the figures to show that the statement he made, that he had saddled the country with \$600 additional, is not true, because the expense of that office has not been increased, and is nothing compared to what it was before.

Mr. LISTER. Nor the work either.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Who was the occupant of the office in 1878? I suppose the hon. gentleman would have had a grievance if he found that, because the receipts of that office at that time did not justify the expenditure, we had removed the officer. But he was allowed to remain in the office, though a strong opponent of the present Government politically. Hon. gentlemen were fond of appointing their friends and finding places for them, and there was a good opportunity of filling that place by a political supporter at \$1,400 a year. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot complain because we allowed one of his friends to remain in office and draw that salary. But we did not fill that place by putting in a political supporter, but we brought Sarnia into the London division, and reduced the expenses of that office down to \$800. Now, on account of the increase of work, on account of the report of our own officer, and acting in perfect good faith, we have made this change, the hon. gentleman complains of it. The hon. gentleman says, or insinuates, that I ought to send a man there as a probationary clerk; he says I say that this is not a permanent employment. I say that no probationary officer is a permanent officer; every man appointed in our service is changed from one place to another wherever he is most required. If he is required at Sarnia to-day, he goes to Sarnia; if he is required at London to-morrow, he goes to London, but he is not continued there any longer than he is required.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to say—