year. If he did not do that, I am afraid the House would be very reluctant to give him the money he asked. Take the Department of Railways and Canals. Suppose the minister of that department used the same reasoning as the hon. Minister of Customs, saying: We spent the money wisely last year, and I think you should trust me for the next year with so much more money. These are parallel cases, and I mention them only to show the absurdity of the position the Minister of Customs takes in asking us to vote this lump sum without giving us detailed information. He asks us to take him on trust. That is not businesslike, and it leads to the impression that he has not a very intelligent knowledge of his own department. We do not want to be unreasonable with the hon. gentleman; but the very way he started created a bad impression on our minds. The very fact that some of the money voted last year was used in getting campaign pamphlets written made us feel that, although he desires to do what is right, he is not handling his department in a businesslike way. Nor is he giving the people's representatives the detailed information which they are entitled to have before they grant him $25,000 more for the service next year than he had last year.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended last year for postage?

Mr. PATERSON. The accountant tells me we have it for each port, but not the totals. Does the hon. gentleman want it totalled up.

Mr. BLAIN. The total amount yes. My reason is that last year the hon. gentleman asked an increased item of $6,000 for postage.

Mr. PATERSON. That was accounted for. There was a change in the postal arrangement by which the amount of postage on the great number of manifests and documents that we have sent out was enhanced, but we have now gone back to the rule that previously prevailed.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister seems to be unable to give the items on which he proposes to spend the money next year. Was the $6,000 additional voted for postage last year used for that purpose, and if not what portion of it was expended?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot give the information in detail. It has been spent in the general expenditure, but I cannot give the exact amount spent in postage alone.

Mr. BLAIN. Could not the minister give some little explanation? He said last year:—

> There is also an increase in postage of some $6,000, owing to increased business.

It seems to me to be rather a reasonable request to ask the minister if the $6,000 was expended for postage last year and if not, what became of the balance of the money?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. PATERSON. That estimate was based on our expenditure for six months, and whether it worked out just exactly to the amount we asked, I am unable to say.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. minister cannot give us this information, it is rather difficult for the committee to tell what becomes of the money which we vote.

Mr. PATERSON. The postage was included in the general vote for contingent expenses; it was not confined to postage but in making up the estimates, it was estimated that $6,000 was required for postage. If it was not all used for that, the balance of the $6,000 may have been expended in other contingencies.

Mr. BLAIN. Was any of the $6,000 spent in postage?

Mr. PATERSON. The accountant states that $3,000 was expended in six months, whether the whole $6,000 was expended in the 12 months he is not able to say.

Mr. BLAIN. How long was the changed postal regulation in operation?

Mr. PATERSON. I think about six months.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister then states that in the six months $3,000 was expended. Will he tell us what the other $3,000 was expended for?

Mr. PATERSON. It would be in general contingencies.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that the policy of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. PATERSON. That is the way it was always done.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman stated last year that he was asking the committee for $6,000 for increased expenditure for postage. Then he says that only $3,000 was expended for postage and the rest was distributed around in other departments.

Mr. PATERSON. The $3,000 was expended in six months.

Mr. BLAIN. He says the postage regulation was only in operation six months and the balance was expended in some other way? In what other way?

Mr. PATERSON. There is still postage to be paid, but the change back to the old rate reduces the amount of postage.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that the balance of this unexpended money can be expended for anything else?

Mr. PATERSON. It was a vote for general contingencies.

Mr. BLAIN. It was a specific amount.

Mr. PATERSON. No, no.

Mr. BLAIN. I have quoted his words; it was a specific amount for increased post-