

what he proposes to do with this extra \$25,000 that he is asking for.

Mr. PATERSON. I explained that once or twice. I intend to use part of it in strengthening the force at some of the ports; part to provide for the contingency of other ports that need to be opened before this money is all expended; and part of it in augmenting the salaries of officers in those cases in which that increase seems warranted.

Mr. TAYLOR. I submit that this is no answer to the question. When the minister made up these estimates he must have made it up on the basis of certain items—so much for opening this new port, and so much for salaries in the other, and so on. We should have this in detail so that when the record of expenditure is given we may see whether the minister's estimate is verified or not. The hon. gentleman takes great credit to himself for running this department economically. I find that, in 1904-5, he is asking, for the first item of salaries and contingent expenses, \$1,159,865. In 1895, the same service was rendered for \$836,631, so there is an increase of that item of \$348,000. In the next item, salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors, he is asking for \$139,200. In 1895, this service cost only \$70,506—an increase of \$68,694. So, altogether he is asking for \$1,430,565, whereas in 1895 these services were carried on as efficiently as they are to-day for \$921,530. There has been an increase of \$515,035. Where has all this money been expended? And the hon. minister asks \$25,000 more this year than last. Yet he refuses to give a single detail as to where he intends to spend even \$100 of it. He gives only a general statement that he wants it to use at his discretion. I have never seen money voted in that way for any department. The practice is, when a minister asks for an increase, he tells us in detail what he intends to do with it. That is all we want, and we must have some detail of how he intends to spend this extra \$25,000 on the first item and \$10,000 on the second.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister give a statement of the number of ports and outports opened last year?

Mr. PATERSON. Six new officers were employed in Ontario since 1st June 1903:—Mr. Richardson, Chatham; Mr. Deacon, Fort William; Mr. George E. Buckley, Niagara Falls; A. E. Guerard, Port Arthur; J. B. Watson, Sarnia; Thos. Fournier, Sturgeon Falls.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the number of outports?

Mr. PATERSON. Four. There was one in Ontario, one in Quebec, one in Nova Scotia, and one in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BLAIN. At what towns?

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. PATERSON. Sturgeon Falls, Ontario; Marieville, Quebec; Oxford, Nova Scotia, and Saskatoon, Northwest Territory.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. minister in mind at this moment any officers to whom he intends to give increases for the year for that which this money is voted?

Mr. PATERSON. I explained that there is to be an advance to a number of clerks in the Long Room at Montreal. We intend to bring them up to a minimum of \$900. I explained the reason: that these men receive the entries; that their work must be done very quickly and very correctly; that we thought that if they worked from nine to four they would sufficiently tax their mental energies, and they should not be allowed to share with the landing waiters and preventive officers in performing extra services and receiving extra pay; therefore, we intend to augment their salaries. We are not able to carry out the same system in Toronto as in Montreal owing to the nature of the building. But we are having changes made which, we hope, will enable us to inaugurate the same system. That may necessitate, if we are to do the business as quickly, another man or two there. We expect that we shall require to open some outports. As I said before, we have a score or more of applications all making out as good a case as they can, and none without merit. We do not feel justified, however, in granting them all, but it is difficult to make a selection, and we are deferring it as long as we can. But we anticipate that, in the Northwest at least, it may become imperative that we should create new ports before the time for which this money is voted elapses. Of course, hon. gentlemen can understand that in that section of the country the towns are a long way apart, and that with rapid immigration and large importations it may be found only just and right that additional facilities should be given. As to the officers whose salaries we hope to augment, does it not, in the last analysis, come down to this—that the department must determine. If I were to say that the department proposed to increase the salary of such and such a one in Toronto, that would be no information to the members of the House, because they do not know the individuals, nor do they know whether they are deserving of higher remuneration or not. Surely hon. gentlemen will admit that that much confidence must be reposed in the department. Even the officers of the inside department here cannot know these cases themselves. But we avail ourselves of the reports of our inspectors and others who visit the ports, and also of any other information which we may gather bearing on these points. And, necessarily the department must be trusted to exercise its discretion.

If I said that we proposed to increase the salary of Mr. Smith, or Mr. Brown, or Mr.