

a continually growing evil. There are no people more anxious, I believe, to have vigorous steps taken to put down this smuggling than the clergy of the province of Quebec, and I am glad that the hon. gentleman bears testimony to the help they have afforded in that direction. My testimony from my experience with the department has been to the same effect. As to this being a fund that may be used to oppress people and so on, there is nothing in that at all. This is a fund to be put into the hands of the Department of Justice to be expended in such a way as will command the confidence of the House. This is not for the purpose of harassing importers, but to give additional strength to the Government to put down this great and growing evil.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not rise to criticise the vote, but, so far as it brings up the question of smuggling, I have a word to say. Smuggling of late years has assumed enormous proportions, and I am confident that hon. gentlemen opposite will find, as the late Government found, that it is no easy task to put it down. I am sure, however, that the whole House will wish the Government success, and members on both sides, I believe, would be willing to afford the Government every reasonable facility in dealing with this evil. But I wish to call the attention of the Government to one point, to a weak point in our administration, according to my view. The division of the proceeds of seizures are so made that they are themselves an inducement to smuggling. Therefore, it will not do merely to get a vote of Parliament such as this or ask further assistance in rewarding informers; you must begin nearer home. There is no use in leaving the law in such a way that it offers inducements to smuggling and then seek to counteract that by legislation and the expenditure of money. I have in the past looked into this case very carefully, because the department of which I was the head, the Inland Revenue Department, in co-operation with the Customs Department, had officers to enforce both the inland revenue and the customs laws. With the assistance of my officers I prepared a calculation which showed this condition of things, and one which exists to-day, and I ask the Government to take it into consideration. I found that a smuggler may go to the United States and buy a cargo of these strong wines or alcohols, and bring it in with the view of landing it at a Canadian port, or smuggling it in in some way. If he finds that he cannot escape one of our revenue cutters, and that he is exposed to the danger of seizure and confiscation, by some one stepping in and making a seizure, the whole cargo and the vessel may be seized and confiscated, and he still gets out with a profit.

If he escapes he makes an enormous profit, but if he is seized, under the present law, he makes some profit. Now, does not the House see that if I am right in that statement, there is an enormous inducement to the smuggler. If he is successful he makes an enormous profit; and if he fails in smuggling, he does not lose anything, but he actually makes a small profit. That is the point to get at. I strongly advise the Government to give this question their most earnest consideration.

Mr. QUINN. I must oppose this vote for two reasons. In the first place, I oppose it on the ground of its being called a secret service vote; and secondly, because I think it indicates a desire to move further in the wrong direction which has already been pursued by our customs authorities. It is an acknowledgment, too, that the moiety system to which reference has been made by the ex-Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan), has been a failure. The moiety system has been the greatest curse which I think has ever been seen in this country, and has caused the perpetration of numerous frauds, and has brought into activity the worst characters that could have been found in the country. Yet by this vote the moiety system is not abandoned. If there was any hope that it would be abandoned, that would probably be a reason to make a trial of the secret service system. But we tack on to the moiety system a thing which I look upon with greater dread, and which I think will turn out to be a greater evil, than the moiety system, and that is the secret service system. Now, the Minister of Finance said that it is not in the true sense a secret service vote, that it is really a police vote. If it is a police vote why not put it in the form of a police vote? This House and the people of this country do not oppose giving to the Government all the powers necessary for the purpose of managing the police and detecting crime, either crime against the customs and excise laws, or the criminal laws. But the people of this country do object to giving any Minister the expenditure of a large sum of money without his being obliged to account for it to any one. That is what the people object to. Here is a sum of \$5,000 going into the hands of the Minister of Justice to be used by him as he thinks fit. After it passes this House he is not bound to account to this House to show how he has used it, even for customs purposes. He is supposed to use it for customs purposes, but as far as the people are concerned, the moment this vote is concurred in, all control over it is lost, and the Minister is not bound to account to anybody. It is secret service money, and its very nature precludes the possibility of accounting for it. On this ground I must object to it. I think the Government would have done much better if, instead of asking for it as secret service money, they were to provide