

detention of the whole of the goods is justifiable is provided for in the next clause. If there be any evidence, by way of correspondence or otherwise, or by the invoice, which would lead to the supposition that fraud was intended by the importer, then the whole of the package is to be seized and confiscated. The law is equally clear as to the principle on which a collector can levy duties on goods imported. If a capitalist, with a large amount of money, can buy 5 or 10 per cent. cheaper than another man, the law provides, so far as the Customs duties are concerned that he shall not have any advantage beyond that which his wealth gives him in the purchase of the goods. The law is clear, and those who administer it have no option in the matter. The difficulty that has arisen is in connection with the system of selling in the United States to merchants in this country in giving them additional discounts, provided they purchase a certain amount of goods, that discount not being made up until the end of the year. For instance, a man gets a certain discount if he buys to the extent of \$100,000 during the year, and a different discount if he buys to the extent of \$50,000. I should like to know how any law could be framed to meet cases of that kind. The goods should be entered at the price at which they are sold at the time of exportation, and on that the duty is paid.

Mr. WELDON. What I want to understand is, why a man who pays only \$3,000, at the rate he has agreed upon with the manufacturer, has to pay duty on, say \$4,500, 50 per cent. more than he pays. He does not pay on the value of the goods, but on a larger amount than he has paid for them. It is an act of injustice, and is, I believe, an inducing cause for the smuggling in New Brunswick that is so much complained of.

Excise \$322,125

Mr. COSTIGAN. The increase over last year is \$8,830. There is an increase of \$1,670, resulting from changes which have taken place in consequence of resignations and deaths, and new appointments. They have resulted in an addition of five officers to the staff, or rather four, because one of those officers belong to the Weights and Measures branch, but he is paid \$300 as an Excise preventive officer. Then, there are \$1,336 for promotions. These have taken place in accordance with the Civil Service Act. Then there are \$300 for increases, as the result of examinations. The annual increase of 5 per cent. upon the minimum of each class makes up \$6,000 of that increase. The House will understand that when our officers get 5 per cent. increase, they were appointed at the minimum salary on all occasions, and that increase continues until their salary reaches the maximum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot say that the general result is very satisfactory. I find, although there has been a comparatively small increase in the amount of receipts of Excise, an increase not over 10 or 12 per cent., within the last half-dozen years, the expenses have increased nearly 50 per cent. In 1879 the expenses were \$211,000; in 1884, \$300,000; and in 1886, \$322,000. It appears to me there is nothing to justify this enormous relative increase in the management of the Department. With regard to the \$3,000 allowance to Excise officers in Manitoba, to compensate for increased cost of living, I must say that the state of things in Manitoba is not that which formerly prevailed. I do not object to Excise officers or other servants being paid a fair salary, but I must say that the argument which might hold good in 1881 and 1882 no longer applies at all in many, probably in all parts of Manitoba.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is intended to reduce that as rapidly as possible.

Culling Timber..... \$71,600

Mr. VAIL. Why this increase of \$200 to the supervisor?

Mr. COSTIGAN. With reference to the increase of \$200 to the supervisor, that will still leave his salary under what it formerly was. It formerly was \$2,600; it is not intended that his salary should be increased further.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It must be recollected that the whole of this business means a cost of \$28,000 or \$30,000 over and above what we get out of the timber. If the receipts at all equalled expenditure, there would not be much objection to an occasional increase of salaries, but there is a decided objection, as things stand. I would ask what the \$8,000 contingencies is for?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That must have been for rent of office, fuel, gas, stationery and repairs, and other running expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In running a small place holding a dozen clerks, \$8,000 is a big item for contingencies. I hardly think the fuel and water, and light and stationery will amount to that. What did the hon. gentleman spend for that last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will give that information to the hon. gentleman on concurrence.

Weights and Measures and Gas..... \$84,650.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is an increase of \$1,900 in the salaries of inspectors of Weights and Measures.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We appointed an additional officer in Manitoba, and an additional inspector in British Columbia. That involves an expenditure of \$800 and \$600, and the increase through the whole staff only amounts to \$500.

Mr. VAIL. There is an increase of \$50 in the salaries of inspectors of gas.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This service is growing. I think any one will admit, when we have extended the inspection of gas to several cities in the Dominion, the increase of \$50 is very little.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the case of a great many other companies, such as insurance companies, where we have inspectors, we charge them to the companies, by way of a special tax. Is anything of that kind done with the gas companies?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; they have to pay certain fees for inspection when the gas is inspected, to test its purity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The salary of \$800 for commissioner of standards is paid to the deputy head, is it not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; he is the commissioner of standards, just the same as the former commissioner under the hon. gentleman. This office was created by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was created in 1873. It strikes me that this item belongs more properly to the head of Civil Government.

Mr. VAIL. I do not see why it should be paid for at all; it should be the duty of the deputy to perform what is required of his office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been allowed for some time.

Inspection of Staples \$2,700

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is a decrease of \$500, in the amount for the purchase and distribution of standards of flour, etc.