

Mr. BOWELL. The increase of \$6,225 in Ontario is largely caused by the additional officers who had been found necessary at Suspension Bridge and Windsor. On the completion of the cantilever bridge the Canada Southern Railway required a full staff of officers at the port, the same as we have at Suspension Bridge. We had accordingly to increase the staff by six or seven officers. When the Canada Southern made its crossing opposite Windsor, instead of at Amherstburg, we had to put additional officers there. Their salaries, with small increases at different ports, explain the increase of \$6,225. That amount is, however, larger than the actual charge upon the revenue, because at the cantilever bridge at Clifton, I have adopted a new plan of payments, than were formerly made by the railway companies to different officers for extra services, and placed the amount to the credit of the Receiver General, and had therefore to add one or two additional officers at such points, and pay them out of the general fund. My reason for doing this is that I found that officers receiving extra pay were liable to become more the servants of the railway company, or steamboat company, than of the Department. The adoption of this plan involves the placing of a larger number of men at the points I have mentioned; but that is more than compensated for by the amount paid by the railway companies for what are termed extra services. The railways pay \$1,500 a year at the cantilever bridge, which amount now goes into the general fund. There is a decrease of \$325 in Quebec. In New Brunswick there is a decrease of \$2,205. In some of the outer ports I have found there are more men than are really needed, and as they are superannuated or die, I do not fill up the positions, except where officers are absolutely required.

Mr. WELDON. Where is the reduction in St. John?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a saving at St. John. The hon. gentleman will see that there has been a saving of \$450 at St. John. Macadam Junction, which was formerly a port, is now made an outport of St. John and the expenses transferred to St. John. The object in doing that was to bring that junction of the railway under the surveillance of the officers at St. John, they reporting to St. John instead of the office here. The gross reductions in the St. John office have been \$5,000; the increases amount to \$1,550, showing a net decrease of \$450, though much larger if the expenses of the Macadam Junction port of \$1,400 be deducted, as it should be for comparison.

Mr. WELDON. I notice that Grand Falls has been reduced \$2,185, and Woodstock increased \$2,335.

Mr. BOWELL. That is for the same reason, precisely, as in the case of Macadam Junction, so that the preventive officers along that line of railway report to Woodstock now instead of Grand Falls.

Mr. IRVINE. Are there any other changes in that district—shifting officers from one place to another?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of. I have no recollection of changing the officer from one place to another.

Mr. IRVINE. Does Mr. Beadle occupy the same place as he did last year?

Mr. BOWELL. He was moved up to the junction, nearer to the American boundary.

Mr. IRVINE. That is five miles nearer to the American boundary. Then the hon. gentleman says he shifted Mr. Kilburn, the preventive officer. What object was there in doing that?

Mr. BOWELL. The object was to prevent the hon. gentleman's friends carrying on their avocation, as far as

possible. In all these changes I acted on the recommendation of the special inspector, who made an inspection of all the ports along the line of the railway.

Mr. IRVINE. I do not say the hon. Minister has acted improperly; no doubt the inspector gave him good counsel. Nor do I find any fault with him for increasing Mr. Kilburn's salary, because he is a good officer, and he is on the road that leads to Woodstock, where most of the business is done. Nor do I find any fault with him for removing Mr. Beadle from Andover village, which is five miles from the American boundary, and placing him nearer the boundary. But living, as I do, within four miles of the American boundary, and knowing the geography and topography of the country, I ought to be able to give some valuable information. I know every road that crosses the international boundary; the whole frontier is settled, from the lower end of my county to the upper end; the roads lead in every direction, and smugglers are just as liable to go by one road as by another. Now, Mr. Schooley is sub-collector at Centreville, four miles from the American boundary, at \$300 a year, and on that road, where there are only a few houses, the Minister of Customs has appointed Mr. Kearney at \$200. I have pointed out before that this is wrong, and I point it out again, that these officers should not be on that road, as there is no necessity for them. It is a sheer waste of money. If the hon. gentleman looks at the returns he will find that last year only \$335, I think, was collected at that port of entry. It was not for preventing smuggling that Mr. Kearney was appointed.

Mr. BOWELL. If I remember, Mr. Kearney is situated at Florenceville. After the death of the officer at that point, Mr. Kearney was appointed in his place. I did not personally investigate the matter; I took it for granted that the inspectors knew where the officers should be placed, and when that vacancy occurred it was filled. It is not always best to place the officers exactly on the boundary line to detect smugglers.

Mr. IRVINE. Mr. Appleby's father was appointed there before New Brunswick entered the Union, and he was the only man appointed on that side of the river, outside of the town of Woodstock. And Mr. Schooley was appointed in his place, and instead of appointing an officer at Centreville it was thought by the Government that Florenceville was a better place. I think it is simply a wilful waste of money. Mr. Kearney was not appointed to prevent people from smuggling, as any person who understands the country knows.

Mr. BOWELL. I am very glad the only charge the hon. gentleman has against my Department of wilful, wasteful expenditure, resolves itself into the enormous sum of \$200, and that is for a preventive officer along one of the New Brunswick roads, not many miles from the Maine frontier. If I have never any greater sin to answer for, I will go out of office with a very clean record.

Mr. VAIL. The strongest charge is that a merchant doing business in the country fills the position of preventive officer and collector of Customs.

Mr. MITCHELL. One of the great difficulties I have had to experience is that the Minister of Customs has always been a little too stringent in relation to the officers in New Brunswick. He does not give salaries high enough, and in several instances, when I have applied for increases, I could not get them.

Mr. WELDON. A man who is an importer should not be a preventive officer.

Mr. BOWELL. The information is, that Mr. Kearney is not an importer. It is utterly impossible to prevent officers