number of ports, many of whom had been induced to accept situations at a small remuneration in the hope that they would receive promotion under the Civil Service Act. The only complaint he had to make against the \$10,000, was that it was not sufficient—a larger sum should be asked for.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he quite agreed that it was a very improper thing to ask for a vote of this kind if it could be avoided, or unless the Government are prepared to point out the specific uses to which it will be applied. They would look into the matter before concurrence, and if the sum should be considered necessary, the use to which it was intended to be applied would be explained to the House. If they could manage without it they would.

Hon. Mr. BURPEE said in reply to the question of the hon. member for Hastings that the sum of \$15,000 that gentleman had alluded to was for the inside service, and not for the outside service. In reference to the remarks of the hon. member for South Leeds, there were cases in which the salaries might be increased, and increased with great justice.

Hon. Mr. TÜPPER said he thought the Finance Minister could scarcely have been serious when he suggested on a former occasion that a large increase made in the Customs Department by the late Government warranted a large increase by the present Government. He did not, however, intend to take any exception to the increase because he had found from experience that it was in the interest of the public revenue to pay those liberally who were engaged in its collection. With reference to the item for promotions it was well-known that under the regulations of the Department when a port reached a certain amount of revenue, the collector there was entitled to an increase of salary, and besides this, new officers were occasionally needed, and therefore the Government would require this vote. It was also remembered that the \$70,000 voted by the House two years ago for the re-adjustment of salaries was at that time applied to both the inside and outside Civil Service.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—The hon. member must remember that he distributed himself to the inside service only.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said they distributed some \$55,000 to the inside service,

and then distributed the balance in the outside service, but it fell far short of what was required.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL observed that the Premier having stated that on concurrence he would be prepared to give information as to how this sum was likely to be expended, the item should be allowed to pass.

Item passed.

On item 170, under the head of Excise.

Mr. Decosmos desired to call the attention of the Government to the state of the Inland Revenue Department in British Columbia. The total revenue from this source in that Province in the year 1873-4 was \$10,878, and the expenditure \$6,065, leaving a net revenue of This revenue was almost wholly derived from five breweries and one distillery in the Town of Victoria, and to collect it surely three officers were not required. These parties did not object to paying the tax, but they would prefer to pay a fixed license and be relieved from the inquisitorial system of the Excise Department. If this plan were adopted the Government would get more revenue, and the brewers would be relieved from a great deal of annoyance.

Hon. Mr. GEOFFRION said the same system was applied to British Columbia as was in force in the rest of the Dominion. An exception could not be made in favor of any one Province. If the hon. gentleman had any better system to propose, he would be glad to give it his consideration.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL called attention to the fact that at the port of Newcastle the predecessor of the present collector received five per cent. on all excise duties he collected. Since the appointment of the present collector he had continued to perform the same duties, but was not allowed the commission of five per cent.

Hon. Mr. GEOFFRION said he would make inquiry into that case. The rule of the Department was that where there was no excise officer, the officer of customs collected the excise and received a commission of five per cent.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said all he asked was that that rule be applied in the case he had instanced. Item passed, also Item 171.