

nected with matters political and matters financial that engage the attention of the minister. That fact is so apparent that it must be realized by every one.

Coming to the statements he has prepared for me which I have used in the House and which have been used by the compiler and publisher of this document which has been alluded to, if they are wrong, if there are falsifications of the public accounts, if there are errors even in them, I should be glad to have the errors pointed out, but if not, I am unable to see that he has done anything which deserves censure much less the punishment proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that because of what he has done, his salary should be summarily cut off, that in fact he should at once be dismissed from the public service. Let me tell the hon. gentleman opposite who speaks of him as a public hack, that if they should both go into the world to-day and seek positions at what they are worth, I venture to say that man will command a higher remuneration than the hon. gentleman. I may be wrong—

Mr. FOWLER. You are.

Mr. PATERSON. But that is my estimate of the two men. I know one intimately, and I have formed an estimate of the abilities of the other gentleman by the efforts he has made in this House. I can tell him more; my belief is that Mr. Bain could leave the public service and in a very short time could command a larger remuneration as a reward for his labours than he gets in the civil service at the present time, and it was not so long ago that I was somewhat afraid I was going to lose his services.

An hon. MEMBER. Do not fear.

Mr. PATERSON. They are not accustomed to having men like that in days gone by, but I tell them that it is a fact, and that his services are known and appreciated by me—and I think I am some judge, and have some reason to be a judge of the merits of the men who are engaged in the public service. If I was a little warm, if I did speak a little loudly, all I can say is that sometimes I feel a little touched when reflections are cast upon a gentleman who, I think, does not deserve them. To hear a man who is as faithful a public servant as Mr. Bain, a man who, like many others in the public service, gives good return for the salary he receives, described as a political hack, and the inference sought to be drawn that all he does—for that seems to me to be the impression that hon. gentlemen opposite desire to leave—is to write partisan literature for distribution, makes me feel that hon. gentlemen are doing a monstrous injustice. I know that to be a fact and when it was done I got a little warm and spoke as I felt. Do not consider this as an apology by any means; it is only an explanation of

my use of a tone a little louder than my ordinary complaisant tone of speech.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) says that he felt a little touched. It seems to me that the treasury is the thing that has been touched. The minister has done me the honour to compare my abilities with those of the officer under discussion, and he says that if we were turned out into the world together I would not be able to achieve one half as good a position as would that gentleman, nor would I be worthy of filling so good a position. The hon. gentleman I suppose sizes up the advantage of the position by the amount of salary connected with it. I think it would be perhaps as well if the hon. gentleman had compared himself with that officer. My judgment of that would be as follows. I do not know what position, outside of the cabinet, the hon. gentleman could fill, in which he would get anything like the salary he gets to-day. There is one position I believe which the hon. gentleman could fill with a very great deal of ability—just one position. While he was speaking I was thinking over all the various walks of life open to men of this country and trying to fit the hon. gentleman into some position for which he would be eminently qualified. Then I remembered that on occasions I had attended the circus and I had heard persons outside the circus tent where the curiosities were, describing the wonders to be found therein.

It struck me that the hon. minister would be eminently qualified to fill such a position. I do not know what the salary ought to be, but I should judge it would not be so large as that he pays his assistant commissioner whom he lauds so highly in this House. I have not made it a practice in this House since I entered it to refer to hon. gentlemen opposite as I have to the Minister of Customs. But I want to let that hon. gentleman know, and to let every supporter of his know, that when I am attacked in this House, when insulting references, gratuitously insulting references, are made to me, I shall protect myself; I shall take very good care to treat hon. gentlemen opposite just as they treat me. I do not know that it tends to improve the tone of debate to have the minister indulge in this sort of banter, or badinage, or repartee across the floor. However, that is a matter for the hon. minister to settle with his own conscience. He is assuming to set up as a moral censor. He says his moral principles are wonderfully good, and assumes to reproach me for having moral principles not so good as his own. Well, I am not here to belaud myself, but I am prepared to leave it to those who know us both to say which is the more entitled to credit on this ground.

Now, to come to the question. The hon. gentleman set out, as I supposed, to repel a certain allegation made against an official, in his department. And how has he at-