

gentleman is guilty of having introduced into the service for the first time the defence of a man holding a high position and drawing a large salary, on the plea that he was a good officer, and that what he had said was true. The present Commissioner of Customs (Mr. McDougal), could just as consistently go out on the stump to-morrow and advocate the principles of the Liberal party, if they had any, and he would be no more censurable than Mr. Bain. But the hon. gentleman has shown to the country that the service is permeated with corruption. I do not know of a more corrupt thing than to take the people's money and prostitute the service as the hon. gentleman has prostituted it. He did not do it unwittingly, and he unblushingly defends it now. We have never witnessed a spectacle like this since we have been privileged to have a parliament in Canada, and I hope we will never witness it again. What is the paltry, miserable excuse that the hon. gentleman gives? It is that this gentleman has done good service. A collector of customs who is a good officer might as well go on the stump and say what he likes, or write campaign literature and then come back and render the excuse which the hon. gentleman has given by saying that he was a good officer. That has nothing to do with it. The hon. minister has not done himself justice and he certainly has not done his department justice. The hon. gentleman did elevate himself somewhat the other evening when he refused to get up and make a point blank denial of what he knew to be a fact. The hon. gentleman chose on that occasion to be silent. But, the hon. gentleman has not improved with the lapse of time. He comes back with the defence that the officer is a good one, and the literature he prepared is true. We might just as well take one of the hon. gentleman's officers to-morrow and allow him to go out on the stump, telling the people that the hon. Minister of Customs in the House of Commons had defended that course of conduct, that he was perfectly at liberty to pursue that course and that the minister would justify him. There is no single officer in his department who could not to-morrow go on stump after what the hon. gentleman has said, discuss politics and take any active part in politics he chose. He could say: Have I not done my part well in my department? Is all I have said and written perfectly true? Is that not a perfect justification? I would like the hon. gentleman just to see how it would appear in his eyes if any hon. gentleman on this side of the House should take the position he has taken to-night. No one would more readily rebuke a course of conduct like that than the hon. gentleman himself. I want to say that the hon. Minister of Customs has laid down the most vicious rule that was ever laid down in this House. He has told the people plainly that you may spend public money for any purpose you like, that you may employ

political hacks, and employ them with the public money, although, I say that the man who has been writing this literature is not the hack. If you were to ask who the hack was, I would be forced to name the hon. gentleman who defends this conduct in this House to-night. I do not believe that in the whole history of the parliament of Canada, a minister has ever made such an exhibition as that which the hon. gentleman has made here to-night. I do not know one who has ever laid down so vicious a principle. I do not know one who has ever so unblushingly defended it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Customs read us several pages from 'Political Pointers No. 1,' which he admits was prepared by the Assistant Commissioner of Customs. The Minister of Customs not only read the tables, but he read a great many of the remarks in connection with them, and he asked us if we could prove that these statements are not correct. I hold in my hand 'Political Pointers No. 3' prepared by the same gentleman and if the minister will grant me a commission, I am satisfied that I can prove that this gentleman prepared every word of this document. This is what he says here, on page 12, Customs Department. He shows the gross revenue, 1903, \$37,110,354; gross revenue, 1895, \$17,887,269; increase, \$19,223,085.

Then on page 5. He says:

Under the head of capital the Liberals spent in the last seven years \$64,885,608, as compared with \$37,082,642 expended during the last seven year term of office of the Conservatives.

Now, if it could be shown that this increased expenditure had been met by imposing additional burdens in the shape of taxation on the people, or by unduly increasing the public debt, the government might be fairly criticised.

Then he follows it up by saying:

But the fact is, and it is worthy of very special consideration, that the increased expenditure, necessitated by the great development and progress of the country, has been met without increasing the rate of taxation, without imposing additional burdens on the people, and without unduly increasing the public debt.

On one page he says that the taxation has been increased by \$19,000,000, and on another page he says that this vast increase of revenue has taken place without increasing the taxation a single cent. Is that statement correct that has been written by this political hack, or by the instructions of the political hack who instructed him to prepare this campaign document? Then he makes another statement which I am sure every farmer in this country will repudiate. Dealing with the Department of Agriculture he says:

Of the increase stated \$150,000 represents increased expenditure for the promotion of agricultural and dairying interests, including experimental farm expense. The amount spent for such purposes in 1903 being \$300,000 as against only \$150,000 in 1895. Under the Conser-