

Jones, or any one else, hon. gentlemen opposite would not know the merits of these men. But it is possible they might have personal knowledge of cases that were not receiving proper remuneration and that were entitled to an increase. They would express their views, and I would be glad to avail myself of the information they might give me with reference to the duties performed within their own knowledge, and these cases would be taken into consideration, as I trust will be found to be the case with many of the officers whom they have brought to my attention. But hon. gentlemen must understand that it is impossible for me to mention every man whose salary we propose to increase. There may be some men whose salary we could not increase because they are stationed at ports where the amount of revenue is decreasing, as is the case in one or two of the western ports. Of course hon. gentlemen will not ask me to mention the names of those ports where, from changing conditions, the revenue is falling, it would not be in the public interest that I should do so, and hon. gentlemen would not wish the world to know that the revenue was diminishing at those ports.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the city of Montreal as one instance where the increased expenditure is necessary. If my memory serves me right, I think Montreal showed a diminished revenue during the last month as compared with the previous year.

Mr. PATERSON. That is only for one month.

Mr. CLANCY. However, I am not urging that. No doubt the hon. gentleman has some information as to the necessity of the increased expenditure in Montreal.

Mr. PATERSON. The expenditure there would be between \$3,000 and \$4,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Then in the city of Toronto the hon. gentleman contemplates the possibility of some change that might require one or two men extra. No doubt he has also information with regard to the number of new outports that will be opened during the present year. Surely he could say about how much he intends to devote to cases of that kind without giving the names of every officer he intends to appoint. He is asking us for \$25,000 to apply in salaries, and he has only told us of one case where he expects to apply \$3,000 or \$4,000. The balance he has left a complete blank.

Mr. PATERSON. The department have not yet arrived at a determination. I have pointed out that by the time this money will be available we will be in a position to know what the business of the current year has been. The department desire to get along with as few new ports as possible. We have a great many new ports in Canada.

we are trying to give all the facilities we can to trade and commerce. People are often asking us for the establishment of a new port, pointing out that at present they have to go too far to make their entries. Many such cases are made out that we cannot hope to fulfil at present. The hon. gentleman has brought to my attention the necessity for an outport in his own riding. If we do not see our way to meeting his views at present that is not saying that it may not be necessary, or that it may not be done in the future. But there are many other ports situated just as disadvantageously.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman hold out any hope now that justice will be done to the locality I mentioned, the town of Dresden? It is a very deserving town. Can he told out any hope that any portion of this large sum will be devoted to the purpose of an outport there?

Mr. PATERSON. It is on the list and will be considered with others but I cannot promise further. I know it will be considered on its merits.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to remind the hon. gentleman that it has been on the list for a long time.

Mr. PATERSON. There are a lot more.

Mr. CLANCY. Although it is on the list there is no attention paid to it. The hon. gentleman asked \$10,000 last year for this same purpose. He is asking an increase of \$15,000 this year over last. I am not going to quarrel with the hon. gentleman as to where he spent the money. I am not prepared even to say that the hon. gentleman has wasted any money in opening any new ports, because I think the public ought to be served, but the hon. gentleman will not conclude that because that is the case the committee has no right to know where the money is going. The hon. minister, with the money that was voted in bulk last year has made a distribution of it which some hon. members of this House don't believe to be fair. I will take the case of the sub-collector at Walpole Island. His home is at Port Lambton. He resides there during the winter months and during the summer months he resides on the island. The sub-collector at Port Lambton gets \$400. The collector at Walpole Island gets \$50 more than the collector at Port Lambton. I desire to ask the hon. minister what the revenue from Walpole Island amounted to during the past year and why an extra \$50 has been given in that case. I refer to this because the increase has been taken out of a fund somewhat similar to that which the hon. gentleman is asking for now.

Mr. PATERSON. The officer at Port Lambton, I am told, gets \$450 and there is \$50 allowed for house rent while the officer at Walpole Island gets \$500 and no house