

departments. Out of 30 pages less than one is devoted to this department.

Mr. PATERSON. What number is that?

Mr. CLANCY. This is pointer No. 3.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, number 3.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman acquitting Mr. Bain of the others and not of No. 3.

Mr. PATERSON. I quoted from No. 1, I think.

Mr. CLANCY. Then the hon. gentleman does not deny that Mr. Bain prepared No. 3? The hon. gentleman by his refusal to answer made it perfectly clear that he had knowledge of the facts and he cannot blame any one if an impression goes to the country which he could prevent going to the country by a point blank denial that Mr. Bain is connected with this pamphlet. He says that Mr. Bain is connected with the tables. I defy the hon. gentleman to give one table in connection with his own department in political pointer No. 3 that has ever been used by him in a speech in this House. If the hon. gentleman cannot do that he stands in the position of admitting that Mr. Bain prepared this pamphlet and of defending Mr. Bain's conduct.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not intend to continue the discussion. If I am to blame, I have said all I shall say and will have to accept the hon. gentleman's blame. I merely wish to state that when Mr. Clancy said no increase had been granted to Mr. Bristol for five years I thought it was only one year. I have had the accountant look it up and find there were three years Mr. Bristol did not get the increase. I asked the reason and found that in one year none of the officers got it, and in two other years the officers who were receiving lower salaries than Mr. Bristol had received their shares. This the hon. gentleman is correct in reference to three years. I am glad to say however, that through changes that have taken place in the department, unfortunately some of them by death, Mr. Bristol, whom I before said I consider a good officer—can now be raised from \$1,300 to \$1,500 this year.

Mr. CLANCY. And in the meantime for these three years the hon. gentleman deprived him of those \$500.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman knows the policy with reference to statutory increases that was adopted when the government first came into power, and the difference of opinion as to whether it was obligatory or not. I suppose if we were wrong in this I shall have to take my share of the blame along with the other members of the government.

Mr. CLANCY. The trouble was that Mr. Bain was given a statutory increase at the

very moment it was withheld from Mr. Bristol. I should like to know why when a statutory increase was given to Mr. Bain it was not also given to Mr. Bristol.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman evidently has not the highest appreciation of my doing what is right and fair in my department. I shall have to remain under his censure; it will be rather grievous to bear but I shall have to suffer under it.

Mr. CLANCY. It would be much more pleasant if the hon. gentleman would candidly admit he had done wrong. He has not given us as dignified an answer as one would expect. I think the country would expect a better defence than that. Two courses are open—and I am not going to lecture the hon. gentleman on political ethics or morality—but there are just two things which he could do, either give a defence that is worthy or to make a confession that is equally worthy. The hon. gentleman I am sorry to say, has done neither. He has given an equivocal answer. It is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman can be placed in the category neither of very honest men, politically speaking,—nor on the other hand of those who will brave out a matter that has no defence. The hon. gentleman has chosen a middle course and is I fear in a very awkward position. I hope this discussion, as far as it has gone, will bear some fruit. The hon. gentleman in his cooler moments will see that the doctrine he laid down here this evening is a wholesale doctrine of abuse and one that can be applied throughout his department, so that by merely calling a gentleman in the department a private secretary he can be engaged in writing campaign literature or what would be no worse going out and canvassing for the hon. gentleman in his own riding. I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) to compare this with a case that came under my notice in which a collector of customs receiving \$400 a year was found riding with a man putting up bills. A conspiracy was formed against him. He was given no trial, and no opportunity to deny the charge against him or to prove that he was not guilty. He was given no opportunity for that, but was dragged to the block, the political axe was brought down and that gentleman was dismissed. I challenge the hon. gentleman to deny the statement I now make. If he denies it, I will give him the case and I will undertake to say that the gentleman was dismissed for no better reason than that he was found driving in a rig with a man who was putting up bills. Yet the hon. gentleman sees no impropriety now in allowing one of his chief officers to engage in writing political literature for his party.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope the hon. minister has brought the information we asked for before six o'clock, and is ready to tell us