

during the incoming year as you did last year or you may not. It is not for me to give the answer to that question. That is what the hon. minister is here for, it is what we want to know and it is what we will know before he gets this item through.

Mr. PATERSON. We are asking for this amount. It is based on the expenditure under a similar head last year and it runs about the same thing.

Mr. INGRAM. Why don't you tell us what the expenditure is?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has it in his hand. It amounts to \$37,500. He seeks to know what transpires in council. I am not at liberty to tell him what transpires in council, but the fact that the amount is in the estimates will be taken as an evidence that it has received the approval of council and I do not know that the hon. gentleman would be any wiser. I may say that I consider his questions are captious, without any public benefit, that they are of no use and that no good purpose will be served. He may delay the proceedings but he is certainly not accomplishing anything more, and cannot hope to accomplish anything more.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the minister to say that the expenditure is included in this report which is brought down to the 30th June last year. The hon. gentleman is asking for money to be expended from the 30th of June next until the 30th June, 1905, he wants to lead the House and the country to believe that because we have a document before us that will soon be a year old, we should be in a position to judge from that what he is going to expend next year. The hon. gentleman talks about me wanting to know what he does in council. Was the hon. gentleman joking?

Mr. PATERSON. No, the hon. gentleman asked if I went to council and did so and so.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman must be joking when he talks like that. Nobody wants to know what the hon. gentleman does in council. I have never asked him such a question. I have been too long here to ask any such question because I know better. I would be quite satisfied to get from the hon. gentleman an explanation of his estimates in this House, without endeavouring to ascertain what he does in council. If he is as particular in withholding information from council as he is in this House the hon. gentleman will never divulge what took place in council. I am perfectly reasonable in the question I am asking.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman wants to know how much I am going to expend on padlocks this year?

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, is there anything unreasonable in that?

Mr. SPROULE. Here is an item for printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, instruments, &c., for various ports of entry, legal expenses and uniforms for customs officers. Let us suppose that he took this whole vote and expended it upon two of these items. It is the duty of the minister to give explanations as to the various items, and when he tells the House how he spent the money last year, the House decides whether it is wise to vote it or not. We are asking for no more information than we have a right to ask, and the minister is giving us less information than he should give us. I cannot conceive how any minister could ask council to pass these items on such limited information as is presented to the House.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation about the legal expenses. Mr. T. Woodyatt of Brantford was paid \$264 for investigating charges against officials. What was the outcome of the investigation?

Mr. PATERSON. That was for an investigation in 1897. Mr. Woodyatt was a long time in rendering his account, but he had not been paid before.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the department not ask for the account?

Mr. PATERSON. He was asked repeatedly for it.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the trouble?

Mr. PATERSON. There was no trouble. He was asked time and again for his account, but he did not send it in. I grant you it looks strange, but it is a fact.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister would bring down the correspondence.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know that there is any, except that there may be letters asking him to send in his account.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the outcome of the investigation?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not remember the facts as it is so long ago, but the accountant's memory is that the services of one officer at Parry Sound were dispensed with, and the charges against a man named Campbell at Meaford were not sustained.

Mr. BLAIN. It would save time if the minister would give a full explanation.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot be expected to remember the details of an investigation that took place several years ago. Mr. Woodyatt is the police magistrate of Brantford, who occupies a very good judicial position, and I think it will be generally admitted that whatever his findings were, they were correct. It looks strange that he did not send in his account before, but that is