

age, and now the minister says that only \$3,000 was expended in postage and the balance in some other way.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAIN. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. Does he say the \$3,000 was expended or not expended?

Mr. PATERSON. \$3,000 was expended under this appropriation on postage during six months.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the other six months have not expired yet.

Mr. PATERSON. No, the other six months have not expired yet. This was a general contingencies item, and the statement to which my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has referred would be given in the course of a rough statement of how the contingencies estimate was made up. And it was estimated that \$6,000 would be required for postage. It is voted as one item for contingencies, which is perfectly right. We could not expect to estimate to a cent the postage account for the whole Dominion government. The actual expenditure for six months was \$3,000, and you naturally assume, unless conditions change, unless there is a larger business or some thing of that kind, that the yearly postage for a year will cost \$6,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. The trouble is that we have not the details of money expended. The details that we have are for money spent up to 1st July, 1903. Last year, the hon. minister asked us to vote \$1,159,865. That was an increase over the preceding year. He was asked what he was going to do with the money and he instanced this item of \$6,000 postage. But now we ask what is he going to do with \$25,000 more than last year that he asks for. He tells us that he wants something for Montreal, something for Toronto, and something for Winnipeg, and something for new ports that he may open, and tells us that we must trust him for all this. We have not the details of the latest expenditures, but we have the plain fact staring us in the face that, since he became Minister of Customs, the expenditure has increased by about half a million. Of course the hon. gentleman has collected more money. But, in many ports that I could name the same officers as before, and paid no higher salaries, have collected much larger sums than before. But, simply because he gets more money the hon. gentleman says he is justified in asking an increase. He does not give the explanations that the committee are entitled to. Before he arrived at these estimates, he must have had some details of what he intended to do with this \$25,000, and he should give us details as the Minister of Public Works or any other minister is accustomed to do.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the Minister of Customs to state that he had under his hand a list showing the increases in salaries last year. The list is a long one, I believe, and the hon. gentleman did not care to read it unless the committee insisted upon it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) would have no objection to handing it to the 'Hansard' reporter, and we could agree to take it as read. That course would save the hon. gentleman trouble and we should all be able to have a copy.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman will see there have not been very extravagant advances in many cases. I think some 400 officers had their salaries augmented. If they were augmented by only \$50 each, that would make a considerable total. In the port of Toronto, I think all the men were brought up to a minimum of \$550, and those who had been receiving \$550 were put up to \$600.

Mr. BLAIN. All?

Mr. PATERSON. I believe there was no distinction. While some officers might be more valuable and more active than others, yet they were all engaged in about the same work, and we thought that those in the same class should draw equal pay. In Montreal we follow a similar rule, except that the minimum is \$500, instead of \$550. A good many were working at \$1.50 per working day, and these were brought up to \$500. The reason why they were not brought up as high as the Toronto men, was not that they were not as faithful officers, but because in Toronto there is little or no extra work. Montreal being a large seaport, with ships arriving day and night, the salaries of the lower paid men are supplemented by their earnings for extra services. I believe it was the sense of the committee last year that these increases should be made. I believe that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) expressed the opinion that \$600 a year was only a fair amount for men living in cities like Toronto or Montreal. We did not bring it up that high, but made an advance towards it. There were sixty in Toronto that were increased.

Mr. CLANCY. I mentioned this matter because the hon. gentleman said that he had a statement of the changes that had been made. Hon. gentlemen on this side, I am sure, are not disposed to insist on the minister reading that statement. I would suggest that, in order that we may all have the information, we should consider the statement read and the hon. gentleman should hand it to 'Hansard.' Perhaps the hon. gentleman will assent to that, especially as he said he was prepared to read it if the committee insisted upon it.

Mr. PATERSON. It will be the proper way, I suppose, if hon. gentlemen want the information, for me to read—