

abolish it in Canada would be to do away with the incentive now existing, and to lessen the anxiety of officials to discover and follow up frauds, as they would not incur odium and ill-will in a discharge of their ordinary routine duty, without being rewarded for it. Consequently, unchecked frauds would increase, and honest business men would suffer all the more. Instead of energetic and capable Customs officers paid by the dishonest portion of the community, as at present, for their successful efforts in discovering and punishing irregularities, the public Treasury would be depleted by the loss of revenue which the proposed system would undoubtedly entail. It is, therefore, manifest that a continuance of the present system is calculated in every way to conserve the interests both of honest business houses and of the revenue of the country. It is beyond doubt the system which experience has proved to be the best, and it should be maintained. Mr. Speaker, I shall leave this question with the House, asking hon. members if, with these facts before them, they deem it advisable to vote for the motion which has been placed in your hands, the most absurd portion of which, with all respect to my hon. friend (Mr. Holton), is that which declares that no condemnation of goods shall take place until there has been a public trial. If that were to be adopted, we would have to appoint an extra judge or two—one probably in each Province—to look after the seizures, unless you decide to abolish the moiety system, and allow everyone to bring into the country what goods he pleases; because a judge would have to adjudicate upon 600 or 700 seizures per annum. That is about the number we have to deal with, and many of them are of the most trivial character possible. For instance, a five-gallon can of coal oil is brought across the border, and, according to the proposition now made, that must be held in durance vile, and I suppose we would have to put a Special Officer in charge of it to prevent evaporation taking place, or to prevent the oil being extracted and water put in, until a judge could adjudicate upon it. That is the proposition which hon. members will be asked to vote for. However, this motion being one condemning the Government, I expect that hon. gentlemen opposite will vote for it, irrespective of the principles which it involves.

---

A. SENECAI, Superintendent of Printing.