

selves by making those statements. The hon. member for West Assiniboia charges us with harbouring monstrous and erratic propositions in our heads and making buncombe speeches. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman is a good judge of erratic speeches and he should be a good judge of buncombe, and I think that on this occasion he was only exerting himself to display his own superiority in these respects. In criticising what was said on this side of the House, he assumes that the resolution in question made by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island was a buncombe resolution. It is as buncombe an assertion as can be to state that a resolution presented by another member is a buncombe one, though alleging no facts to prove its buncombe nature. But I think the country at large will be satisfied on reading the two motions, which was buncombe and which was moved in earnest. My hon. friend from Assiniboia also said that the motion of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island was passed over with slight notice by the *Times*, and that that paper referred entirely to the significance of the motion passed by the House. The significance of the action of the House depended entirely on the significance of the motion it voted down. If the motion voted down by the House was misrepresented, then the action of the House was misrepresented, and the action of hon. gentlemen who voted for one motion and against the other was misrepresented. So that the whole House has been put in a false position by this incorrect report. As to the conduct of the correspondent, I shall leave that as it is. It has been sufficiently discussed, I think. But, Sir, what I rose more particularly to do was to call the attention of the House to a series of double payments made to members of the Civil Service which, I think, can be more conveniently discussed on the motion to go into Supply, than on any particular item in Committee of Supply, although it may be necessary to give some further attention to some of these items when we are in committee. We find in the early part of the Auditor General's Report a list of persons to whom double payments have been made for different services. I do not propose by any means to go into them all, but I propose to quote a few examples in order to show how I think public money has been misapplied. One of the first notable instances is that of Dr. Allen, of Fort Macleod, who is paid \$1,200 a year as collector of customs and \$600 a year as inspector of ranches. Now, it seems to me extraordinary that the same person can be at two places at once, unless, as the memorable Sir Boyle Roche said, he is a bird. How a man can be at his post as collector of customs, and can also be going around the country inspecting ranches, is something which only the imagination of my hon. friend from Assiniboia can possibly compass. Perhaps he will be able to explain how this double individual gets his duties performed. Then, I find that an official in Halifax of the name of Balcum is paid \$900 as receiving teller in the Assistant Receiver General's office, and is paid \$201 for 201 nights of guard duty. Now, this man is certainly an overworked civil servant if he is on duty all day as a receiving teller and on duty all night as a watchman. The duties of a night watchman seem to be hardly adapted to the dignified person who performs them in this instance.

Then, Sir, I find here a case which I have referred to before, and which I may have to refer to again, the case of Lieutenant-Colonel D'Orsonnens at St. Johns, Quebec, Infantry School. I find that he is paid \$1,400 a year as commandant of the school, \$456.25 as a commander's pay for 365 days at \$1.25 per day, and in addition \$365 as Deputy Adjutant-General. Now, Sir, those who know anything about the volunteer system know that the duties of Deputy Adjutant-General and those of the commander of an infantry school are quite distinct, and cannot be properly performed by the same person. As to the pay for command, it does not seem to be the rule in the service to give the commanding officer of a school extra pay for being in command. I do not find the commander of any other school receiving double pay, and some explanation will be required of that. Then, I find in the Halifax office, a gentleman of the name of Howe, who is paid \$1,216 as a superannuated auditor, and is employed as a clerk in the post office inspector's office at a salary of \$600. Now, I have always thought it was the rule of the service, as it is the law, that a superannuated official could not again receive pay in actual service, a superannuation grant being made on the assumption that he is not fit for actual service. I believe this payment is contrary to the law as well as to common sense, and a waste of public money. Then, I find the name of a gentleman in the service at Ottawa, Mr. Marceau, who receives \$1,440 as assistant engineer in the Trent Canal office and a further sum of \$1,250 for translating the report of the Geological Survey—\$2,490 in all. Now, it stands to reason that he can hardly give his full attention to his duties as assistant engineer of the Trent Canal if he is able to earn \$1,250 besides in his odd moments. There are several instances of that kind, but I mention that as one of the larger. Now I come to a very large class of cases, those in which civil servants are allowed to derive large incidental payments of money from the public treasury in addition to their pay in their nominal occupations. I refer to the cases of customs and excise officers who receive a share of the seizures made through their information. Bad as the system is of giving extra pay to civil servants in any capacity, I think this is the worst of all. In the first place, the assumption is that a customs or excise officer is bound to give his whole time for the salary which is paid to him. In the second place, it is assumed that while giving his time to that business he will do his duty. He is paid for doing his duty, and his duty is to catch those who are attempting to infringe the customs or revenue law. There is no reason why he should be paid extra for doing his duty any more than a policeman should every time he arrests a criminal. It is said this is done to stimulate zeal, but instead of stimulating zeal it stimulates cupidity. It gives an opportunity to officials to levy blackmail upon importers. We should not proceed upon the assumption that every importer is a scoundrel and is trying to cheat the revenue, but we do proceed upon that assumption; and we give to the customs officials unlimited power to value any article presented for entry duty at the customs, according to their own opinion of its value and without any regard whatever to its actual cost. This is a tremendous engine of power