

rent. The revenue at Walpole Island is only \$121. The salary is more than the revenue received but as the hon. gentleman knows it is a preventive service that is maintained there. There is an Indian settlement and parties were in the habit of smuggling liquor which was demoralizing to the people using it. It was reported to us that it was desirable in the interests of the Indian population that an officer should be stationed there so that naturally we could more effectively counteract the illicit trade that was going on.

Mr. CLANCY. The officer does not reside there during the winter months. I was unaware that the officer at Port Lambton received \$450. That must have been paid during the present year, 1903-4.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, the accountant says that he was given an increase, perhaps on representations made by the hon. gentleman, of \$50 on the 1st of January, 1903.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. I am afraid that any interference on my part will not be very much welcomed. It was not on my recommendation at all.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I do not know. I do not affirm that.

Mr. CLANCY. These gentlemen live in their own houses. Has there been an increase at Sombra, which is another out port?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, the sub-collector there was amongst the increases granted last year. He gets \$50 more.

Mr. CLANCY. Now, we have pretty good evidence of how the hon. gentleman will make use of this \$25,000. Here are three cases where there is no additional work, and where I doubt if there is any increase of revenue; yet, the hon. gentleman gets us to vote him a bulk sum which he hands out in this manner. I am not going to offer any criticism as to whether these officers are too well paid or not. I have nothing to say in regard to that, but I do say that the hon. gentleman should give the members of this House who reside in the localities where these increases are granted an opportunity of expressing an opinion as to whether they are meritorious or not. I do not know anything that will more fairly illustrate the position that the hon. gentleman is taking now than the three cases that I have mentioned. Does the hon. gentleman say that there has been any increase in the duties performed by these officers because that is the only explanation he can offer for having increased their salaries?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, there has been an increase but it has been slight. A salary of \$400 is a very small salary for a collector of customs. The receipts are not large but

Mr. PATERSON.

still all these ports are important where there has to be prevention of the illicit introduction of goods into the country. We have ports where the revenue is not very large in which we have to maintain officers although the receipts would not seem to justify their maintenance. But if they devote their whole time to the duties of the office four or five hundred dollars is not a very large sum. If that gentleman wants to know what was done, instead of giving in advance what we anticipate doing, I can give him a statement of what we did with the money last year so that he will be in a position to judge whether or not it was properly expended, and so that he may be able to censure those who are responsible if he thinks that any mistake on the part of the department has been made. I have the list which is long and I am a little tired but I have no objection to going through it and giving the hon. gentleman the information as to how this money was expended last year. Next year after this money is voted if the hon. gentleman asks for an explanation I can give him the information although he may say that it is locking the door after the money is stolen. But, I cannot give him all the information now. I think it is unreasonable for him to ask it. I have given him all the information that I could fairly be expected to furnish at the present time. Considering the growing trade of the country and the importance of the work that the Department of Customs is performing, I think that the head of the department and the officers of the department can be trusted to exercise their judgment in regard to the expenditure of an increase of \$25,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman must have known last year that he intended to give an increase to each of these officers that I have referred to. It is not necessary to say one word by way of criticism as to whether these salaries are too large or too small? The hon. gentleman says that the growing trade of the country is the reason for this increase. The growing trade of the country was not the reason for these cases. If the hon. gentleman has entered upon a general rearrangement of an advance in the salaries of his officers throughout the country that is a question that may be fairly considered. I have never taken the ground that any public servant shall be put on starvation salaries, nor shall I ever take such a position. But, when the minister proposes to increase salaries he should tell the House what are his reasons for so doing. I would be the last to insist on the minister giving specific details, but I do say that he ought be able to tell us whether he intends to increase the salaries of officers at certain places, where the increase of revenue would not justify it. I do not mean to say that these cases are devoid of merit; in fact I think that very