

Mr. BLAKE. It appears as if the increase is made more for the purpose of enabling the Intercolonial Railway to show a balance.

314. Charges on Revenue—To provide for amount required to complete Customs service in the Province of Manitoba.....\$25,000.00

Mr. BOWELL. This is to provide for the extra amount of work devolving upon the Customs Department in Winnipeg, as well as Emerson. In 1871-72 the amount collected was \$433,500. The revenue already paid up to March this year is \$1,236,770, and from information I have received it will reach at least \$1,750,000 for the present year. When it is considered that there have been from \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000 worth of goods imported, on which no duty is paid, but which pass through the United States, and consequently have to be entered and bonds cancelled in the same way as if they were dutiable goods, with the exception of not collecting duty on them, the Committee will see the amount of extra work devolving on the staff. When in Winnipeg last year I learned that over 600 cars entered the city in one day, and this will give some idea of the work devolving on the officers.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman able to inform us whether the indications are that the importations will continue to be concentrated at Winnipeg?

Mr. BOWELL. As soon as the spring trade opens and we establish offices at Portage, Brandon and Regina a large proportion of the trade will go to those different points, and a large proportion of the business will go direct from old Canada to Thunder Bay, and by the Pacific road to Winnipeg.

315. To provide for the cost of obtaining stamps and for the stamping of imported and Canadian Tobacco, under the provisions of 43 Vic., c. 19 \$13,000.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is required to make up an actual deficiency in the estimate of last year, when \$12,000 were voted; but it seems that this year, the actual cost will be in the neighborhood of \$25,000. During the first two months of the year, the expenditure was \$10,540.23, but this year 1882-83 is not properly chargeable with the whole amount, because some payments of 1881-82 ran into last year. One reason I have for only asking the usual vote this year, is, that we expect it to cost very much less. The denominations of stamps—which, of course, we propose to change—used up to the present, were over 250 or nearly 300, and it is now proposed to reduce them at the outside to thirty-six. The House will see that there will be a very large reduction in the cost; and I think it is quite certain, that the estimate for the present year will be quite sufficient under this head.

317. To pay F. G. Wainwright for extra services in Halifax Office, from 14th October to 20th December, 1881. \$40.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. These extra services were rendered while the Committee was at Halifax. He engaged Mr. Wright to do the work at night and certified that it ought to be paid.

318. To pay H. H. Grant, difference between his salary and salary of his predecessor, as Collector of Inland Revenue, at Halifax, from 1st January, 1882, to 30th June, 1883..... \$300.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Grant was appointed to take the place of an officer named Mr. McLeod, a defaulter, I think, and on a lower salary, with a promise that if he proved capable, he would get the salary of Mr. McLeod. He proved to be a thorough officer, and this \$300 is to make up the salary. Mr. McLeod received \$1,400, I think, and Grant was receiving \$1,200.

Mr. BLAKE. If competent, he should have got his predecessor's salary, and if incompetent he should not have been appointed at all.

Mr. CARLING.

Mr. DALY. I think he was in the office previously, and it was merely a matter of promotion, and of his qualifications to fill the office. I am glad to see that he has done so to very great satisfaction.

319. To pay J. Griffith, Collector of Inland Revenue, Sherbrooke, difference required to increase his salary to \$1,000 per annum, from 1st July, 1881, to 30th June, 1883..... \$1,000.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Griffith has been Collector at Sherbrooke since 1871. He was appointed at a salary of \$400, which, of course, was low then, but the collections of the office at the time were \$1,932. There has been since a steady increase in the collections, and the business of the office, from \$1,900, in 1871, to \$58,416, at the present time. No increase was made in his salary until a year ago, when \$200 more were given him. Of course we recognize the principle in the Civil Service Act, and, by the policy we have pursued, the salaries should be based, to a certain extent, at any rate, on receipts, and volume of business done; and this division seems long ago to have reached the point where this man's salary should have been raised. I dare say that, if the matter had been brought to the attention of the Department, this would have been recommended. This \$1,000 is to bring his salary up to \$1,000 for the last two years, making up the difference between that figure and \$600—to which, I think, he is justly entitled.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to be a very mysterious way of acting. In the first place, the attention of the Department was not called to it, and therefore the Department did not call for more money. In 1882-83 the salary was increased from \$400 to \$600, so either an application was sent in or the Department took the case into consideration, and it was decided that he was entitled to \$600, and to ask Parliament to vote it. But now it is not merely an increase to \$1,000 a year in the future, but to make it up for the past two years to \$1,000 a year. Well, it seems to be a very extraordinary proposal. If no application was made by or on behalf of this officer until last year, and if last year the Department considered the case, and themselves thought that to \$600 he was entitled, how is the salary now raised to \$1,000, and even for two years previous? Besides this is a very inconvenient precedent to increase a salary for two years gone by. Once again you open the door which you will find is very difficult to shut, and by agreeing to this proposal, when we were asked last year to increase this man's salary to \$600, we are now to be told that we were wrong last year, that then a wrong proposal was made. What we ought to have done was to increase the salary to \$1,000, and more, to increase it to \$1,000 a year for two years gone by, and therefore, we are just in the same position as if we had done him what is now deemed an injustice in the earlier years. Under what misapprehension was the hon. gentleman? Under what circumstance did the hon. gentleman or his predecessor propose what is now said to be wholly inadequate, the increase of 1882-83? Who misinformed him? Did the officer make that proposal, or somebody else on his behalf? How does the hon. gentleman now come to increase this salary in the future, which may be all right; I have not analyzed the accounts. I say nothing adverse to it—but judging the Department and the Government by its own proposals, and the salary assigned, I think a little more explanation is required before we should be called upon to adopt a very inconvenient precedent, of a lump increase to an officer's salary for two years back.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not quite two years—last year and this year.

Mr. BLAKE. From the 1st of July, 1881, to the 1st of June, 1883, appears to be somewhere about two years. Of course, the individual case may be all right, and I do not condemn it, but I say you could not set a more dangerous precedent than to say to the Civil Service that you can