

There are several of them that amount to 50 per cent more or less of the amount involved. But it is in the case of the special branch more particularly that the amount is put up very rapidly. I have a few samples on page 45 of this return. One party deposited forfeit for undervaluation, \$1,642.20. The officer seizing got \$410.50 and the officer giving the information the same amount, or \$821 out of \$1,642, being exactly 50 per cent. The average salary of these men who make the seizures is about \$3,000, and some are getting as high as \$6,000 or \$8,000 and in addition this vast amount of fees. Some of them are getting more than the salary of the Prime Minister. The hon. minister will correct me if I am wrong. Out of the fines, some are making upwards of \$12,000 per annum. There is one item of a deposit retained, \$11,411.40. The officer making the seizure got \$1,426.43 and the informer \$1,426.43 or a total of \$2,852 was paid for making one seizure that would probably take a few hours. These men can step into a warehouse and make a seizure and make all this money out of it. This may lead to a great abuse in this very respect, that it may lead to compromises in order to liberate the goods seized. The system is open to all kinds of fraud the way it is handled to-day. A man who may be fighting the government bitterly may be held up for the very last dollar, and a party friend or a subscriber to the party fund may have the seizure of his goods hushed up. I have had cases brought to my attention in Montreal at present which are being hushed up. Why and how we want to know. It is a serious matter if our Customs Department may be administered for the favour of some parties and to the detriment of others.

Mr. PATERSON. Would you say it is?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I say that in some cases the names are given out and in others they are not.

Mr. PATERSON. Will the hon. gentleman endorse a statement of that kind, namely, that the Customs Department is influenced in its decisions by political reasons, favouring the one party and not the other? Can he point out any cases of that kind?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have pointed out the very case a few minutes ago where the charge is made.

Mr. PATERSON. What charge?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The charge made by the leader of the opposition that the party machine stepped in and shielded the man.

Mr. PATERSON. That was no seizure.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It was a case in which the department is concerned.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not admit that, but you are talking about seizures. I know

nothing about the machine stepping in or anything of that kind. That is a different matter. But the hon. gentleman talks as if the seizures in the Customs Department are dealt with on different lines according to the politics of the men who make infractions of the law. Will the hon. gentleman say that and let it go to Brantford?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. My hon. friend is getting unduly warm.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not want insinuations of that kind.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There will be no insinuations. I will give the hon. minister all he wants before I get through. I have a statement here now, and I have mentioned where the city is. When the hon. minister mentioned names the other night, he went up to 1896, but would not go beyond that, and he wanted the names not inserted in 'Hansard.' He knows the names.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I can show him the name of a very prominent party who is at present concerned. The minister himself gave names the other night and they were all names of Conservatives before 1896, but he would not go beyond that. He was thus trying to lead the country to suppose that no infractions of the customs had been committed since the present government got into power. He read many names and then asked that they would be withdrawn as he did not want them to be published. I am not going to make any statement and ask that it be withdrawn from 'Hansard.' I am taking caution from the example of the hon. gentleman who did not want to give names and thus do injustice to any particular firm. But the names are known to the department. Can all these seizures be made without the hon. gentleman knowing the names?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly I know the names.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There are fifty pages of them here and he asks me to give the names.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. He has not furnished the names and he said I did wisely in not asking for them. The names are known to him, and the system he follows in making seizures lends itself to a settlement privately between the inspector, or the man who makes the seizure, and the man who gives the information and the government and that system might be worked to the detriment of a man on the one side of politics and to the advantage of a man on the other.

Mr. PATERSON. Give an instance.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am dealing with the general principle on which the seizures were made, and I say that the system followed