

also engaged in insurance, I believe, and in several other branches of business, and is besides a municipal officer. Complaint has been made on that ground. The question was submitted to our inspector, and he reported that there is nothing to prevent the officer from engaging in other business, so long as it does not interfere with the duties he is paid by the Department to discharge, and we have taken no step one way or the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be; but it seems to me that the precedent is likely to lead to mischief, if Excise officers engaged in other occupations, or become even municipal officers. The hon. gentleman may be correct in stating that it is not expressly prohibited by law; but it strikes me, and I think I have heard the hon. First Minister express a similar opinion, that it is not advisable that Excise officers should be allowed to engage in other businesses, and on that ground we pay them larger salaries than we otherwise would.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may say that, in this particular case, I felt some delicacy in taking rigorous action, because the gentleman to whom I refer is supposed to sometimes take an active part in politics, and against the present Government, and I thought any interference might look like retaliation. I agree with the hon. gentleman, however, that it would be advisable if the officers should confine themselves to the work of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I speak without knowledge or concern whether the parties in question employ their political influence either *pro* or *con*. I am speaking simply in the general interest of the service. Of course, if the matter has been acquiesced in by the hon. gentleman or his inspector for some time, it might be harsh to put a stop to it at an hour's notice. But I think it should be put a stop to within a reasonable time.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The vote of \$50,000 for travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., shows an increase of \$6,000, which will be easily understood when I say that we are increasing the number of meters and extending the operation of gas inspection every year, and for this purpose we must rent offices and increase the staff; but I think I shall be able to give the House a statement which will show that the increase which has taken place since 1878, in the number of officers and in the expenditure, has not been out of proportion to the increased duties imposed on the Department by the new industries under the regulation of the Department, which have been established in the country. The vote for stamps shows, apparently, an increase of \$8,000. Last year \$12,000 was voted in the ordinary Estimates, and \$13,000 in the Supplementary Estimates, which brought the vote up to \$25,000. The year previous there was \$37,000 expended for the same purpose. So that this vote has really been reduced in two years by \$17,000.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue what became of the \$500 voted last year in the Estimates as an allowance to the Excise officers in British Columbia, to compensate for the increased cost of living as compared with the older Provinces. There has been no distribution of that amount, and I believe there is an Order in Council which precludes the possibility of its distribution in the direction in which it was put in the Estimates. What does the hon. gentleman intend to do, both with respect to this amount and the amount now in the Estimates?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that I was unable to expend that last year, on account of an Order in Council, which, I must say, appears to be a very reasonable one. That allowance is based upon the claim of increased cost of living, but an order was passed some two years ago declaring that when a salary of a

person in Quebec, Manitoba, the North-West or British Columbia, was based on the scale of salaries applicable to the whole of the Provinces, he would be entitled to this allowance, but if fixed at a higher rate to meet this increased cost of living, it would be unreasonable to expect a further sum for that purpose.

Mr. BAKER. The hon. Minister, although nearly accurate, is not strictly so. When these salaries were arranged for the officers of the Department in British Columbia, 15 per cent. was allowed, not 25 as allowed to Manitoba. I know that the additional amount was not given to the Inspector of Inland Revenue; it may have been given to the Collector, but certainly not to the Inspector, and that officer is at present receiving less than any officer in the same position in the other Provinces. I would like to impress this on the hon. Minister.

CULLING TIMBER.

Montreal.

Deputy Supervisor	\$ 900 00
Book-keeper and Clerk	600 00

Quebec.

Supervisor	2,000 00
Deputy Supervisor	1,600 00
Cashier	1,400 00
Specification Clerks	1,950 00
191 Messengers	350 00
Specification Clerks, &c., 8 months—	
1 at \$1,000	5,300 00
2 at 700	
3 at 600	
2 at 550	
Assistant Book-keeper	1,100 00
Total salaries	15,200 00
Pay of Cullers	43,000 00
Contingencies	8,000 00
Annuities to superannuated Cullers	5,600 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to see this sum increased and the receipts diminished. Last year, apparently, we only had \$41,162 deposited to the credit of the Receiver-General; and, under the circumstances, being out of pocket every year some \$30,000, we are asked to increase this vote. It does appear to me that this is really a very considerable abuse in practice, and that we ought not to be paying two dollars for every one we get, for the purpose of culling timber which really does not belong to us at all.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman explain as to these superannuated cullers? I know it has been paid in former years.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is to make up for the decrease we propose in the pay of cullers. The decrease having been made in that item, an increase appears in the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still the increase is larger than the decrease. The increase is \$5,600 and the decrease is \$4,500, and the increased contingencies \$3,700. The result is, as I stated, that we got last year \$40,100, and on this we are called upon to pay \$4,500 more. We are paying \$31,800 more than we received in 1883. It does look like an abuse.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS.

Salaries of Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors of Weights and Measures	\$43,950 00
Salaries of Inspectors of Gas	11,450 00
Salary of Commissioner of Standards	800 00
192 Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postages, stationery, &c., for Weights and Measures	17,200 00
Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, &c., for Gas	6,500 00
Salary of the Chief Inspector of Standards, to be transferred from the Inside Service	1,800 00