

former minister, but I say that he should have been well treated at least. Mr. Bain had an allowance in addition to his salary of private secretary, he had \$600 for the balance of that year. The next year he came in as private secretary at \$600, and was paid \$600 more as an extra clerk in contingencies. The next year he had a private secretary's salary of \$400, and an additional salary for 1897-8 of \$300. In the same year 1898-9 he was elevated to the position of second-class clerk at \$1,100, making in all \$1,800. The hon. gentleman was careful to go back to pay Mr. Bain a sum of \$300, hidden by some means, I cannot imagine in what service it was, but he increased his salary in 1897-8 by \$300 in order to give Mr. Bain a salary to which he was not entitled. Then in 1900 Mr. Bain got the salary of a private secretary, \$600, and he got \$1,150, including no doubt his statutory increase. In 1901, he was made a first-class clerk and put over the heads of other clerks in the hon. gentleman's department. He got his salary of \$1,400 along with \$400 as private secretary. In 1902, he got the salary of a first-class clerk and he got the statutory increase. He did not have to wait one year, he got the statutory increase of \$50, and the secretary's salary of \$400, which made \$1,850. In 1903, he got the salary of a first-class clerk, \$1,500, and his statutory increase of course and \$400, making \$1,900. the accounts for 1904 are not down yet, but the sum for the last year is, \$2,800 for Mr. Bain, then assistant commissioner, not as private secretary to the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman comes down with the same item this year. Now let us see how Mr. Bristol was treated. the gentleman who occupied the position of second-class clerk and private secretary to the former Minister of Customs or rather the Controller of Customs for some years. For some years after the hon. gentleman came in Mr. Bristol got \$1,100. He was entitled to his statutory increases, but I want the hon. gentleman to attend to what I am saying now, the hon. gentleman deliberately, unfairly, and I say cowardly, on the part of a minister, refused to Mr. Bristol even his statutory allowance. He refused Mr. Bristol even his statutory allowance and Mr. Bristol did not get his statutory increase until 1901. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, if I could get the hon. gentleman's attention—of course, the hon. gentleman says that he does not want to listen, but I want to tell him the country is listening—I want to ask the hon. gentleman why Mr. Bristol, who occupied a position with the former minister similar to that occupied by Mr. Bain, with the present minister, was deprived of his statutory increase from 1896 to 1901. The hon. gentleman refuses to answer. The hon. gentleman knows there is no explanation of it except that he wilfully deprived a civil servant, who was under his control and who had no

Mr. CLANCY.

option but to leave the service or submit to what the hon. gentleman was disposed to impose upon him.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman right off, but it strikes me from what he says that it would look as if Mr. Bristol had gone five years without any statutory increase. I think it will be found if that be so that it was because he had been at the maximum of his salary just as it happens this year. I am asking for increases for all that I have in my department except two, and if these two were not at the maximum of their class, I would ask for them also. I am not asking for increases for them because they are at the maximum of their class. I do not know that this is the fact in regard to Mr. Bristol, but I think that it is the explanation. The accountant tells me that there was one year that he did not get his increase, but nothing like five years. Now, Mr. Bristol is being promoted from \$1,300 to \$1,500, and I want to say that Mr. Bristol is a very good officer.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman dealt out very tardy justice to Mr. Bristol. The hon. gentleman ought to know, and if he does not, his officer is beside him and can tell him, that Mr. Bristol had \$1,100 in 1896, and that in 1903 he only got \$1,250.

Mr. PATERSON. I am sure the hon. gentleman is wrong.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not at all depending upon hearsay. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Auditor General's Report for 1903, he will see that Mr. Bristol only got \$1,250, or three statutory increases since 1896. Therefore, Mr. Bristol has been deprived of \$500. That is equal to four years' statutory increase. Had he received the statutory increases from year to year, Mr. Bristol would have received \$1,450 in 1903. The hon. gentleman spoke about morals a moment ago. Has the hon. gentleman two codes, one a set of political morals and the other the morals of a private citizen? I would like to ask which set of morals is applied to the case of Mr. Bristol. If he applied his political conscience to Mr. Bristol we can understand that when he speaks of conscience and morals he does not mean political conscience or morals. Mr. Bain has been brought into the department and put over the heads of others, when, if experience is worth anything, he was not entitled to be put over their heads. However, that is a choice that the minister may be permitted to make. Now, we will come to the grave charge of the hon. gentleman. That hon. gentleman was asked if he had any knowledge directly or indirectly that Mr. Bain had been writing literature for the Liberal party, and he sat dumb as if there was no life in his body. The hon. gentleman refused to answer. He did not need to ask Mr. Bain. He knew what Mr. Bain was doing. Mr. Bain is not the guilty party. The hon.