

lends itself to that kind of thing. Surely he can understand that. I have pointed out that the department has been paying altogether too much to the informers and the men who made the seizures. Will the hon. minister deny that? I understand that he is talking of increasing the salaries of these men and not allowing the thing I complain of, namely, the holding up of any man. A respectable and responsible business man might prefer to pay \$5,000 in the case of an infraction of the customs laws, which would involve only a fine of \$500, rather than have his name branded as defrauding the customs. There were about \$250,000 of fines imposed according to this report and on that amount no less than \$105,305 has gone to the men making the seizures and the informers. Will the minister dispute that?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is not that an immense amount to pay for making seizures, not one of which would take more than a few hours? Fancy a man getting \$2,000 or \$3,000 for a couple of hours' work. In the special branch alone nearly \$44,000 were paid to the men making the seizures and the informers. In the preventive branch \$13,595 were paid to the officers making the seizure and \$11,094 to the informants, or in all \$56,017 were paid to the officers making the seizures and \$48,674 to the men giving the information, being a total of \$105,391 paid out of these fines to men who are supposed to be getting their salaries out of this government.

The minister in his statement the other night said nothing about these men receiving this large amount for fines. The amount they realized from fines would appear to be much greater than the amount they realized from salaries. This has been going on for many years until this work has become a science and we have to-day more than 50 pages of these seizures up and down the country, showing fines all the way up to \$25,000 and the amounts of these fines have been divided largely between the informants and the men making the seizures. In some instances \$2,000 or \$3,000 have gone to a single officer for a single attachment of goods. Surely that is out of all reason, and if this is to be on a percentage basis it should be on a graded basis. When the seizure is for thousands of dollars surely the minister should not pay the same proportion as if it was only \$5 or \$10. It would not be unreasonable in the case of a \$10 seizure to pay 50 per cent but that seems an unreasonable proportion when the seizure runs up into hundreds of thousands of dollars. The time occupied in working up one case might be as great as in the other. The present method leads to a system of spying around, it is a kind of informer business and it is a question whether the department are pursuing the right

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

course in going into warehouses and prying into matters in that way. In cases of undervaluation, seizures might be made where the merchants were not guilty at all. The invoices are made out in foreign countries, the importer may not be aware that there is undervaluation, he may have bought the goods in good faith, thinking he was paying the full price, and the customs officer may make a seizure for thousands of dollars before the importer knows there is anything wrong, and in order to prevent the story going abroad, he has to put up a certain amount of money. I am told that in Montreal there are some of these cases now in progress. The Minister of Customs knows of them. I think that Mr. Ames the other night mentioned to the minister one or two cases and gave him names as well, so he cannot say he is not aware that any of these infractions have taken place, or by whom they have been committed. The manner in which the seizures are made and the cases settled will not commend itself to the judgment of good business men, and the fact that such large amounts of fines are paid to the men who get the information and make the seizures does not commend itself to me upon the face of it. I would like to see simply the salary paid to the man who does his work and expect him to do his duty, the same as any other official, whatever amount is realized from fines going to the government, as I think it should. There are scores of cases where the fines are from \$100 to \$500 for what must have been a very small amount of work. The basis of remuneration should be value received. I do not believe that in the past the minister has taken the best course, and I believe he would do well to revise that course in the near future.

I wish also to refer to the manner in which the statistics of the exports and imports of the country are given in the reports. Let it be understood that the present Minister of Customs has inaugurated a new system of statistics. My contention, as I have pointed out on previous occasions, is that the change is not to the advantage of the country; whether it is to the advantage of the department or not, the minister is the best judge. The present system is not fair. The town or city in which goods are manufactured, that is the real port of origin, does not receive credit for its exports but the credit is given to the little border town through which these goods pass to a foreign country. Let me refer the minister to the Trade and Navigation returns at page 18. Let us there take my own city of Brantford, which is also the home of the Minister of Customs. You will find in column 1, for the year ending June 30, 1905, that the exports are put down as absolutely nil, not a dollar. The minister knows that this is misleading, that it is not a correct statement, that it is not doing