

work to be done by public servants and practically at the expense of the country. I am not going to become violent about it, but I am endeavouring to get at the facts, and to criticise, in a moderate way, what I think is wrong. Will the Minister of Customs deny that the view I have taken of the situation is correct?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not intend to prolong this discussion. I think I have made myself perfectly plain. What I have said is on record, and there is no use of going over it again. The leader of the opposition now absolves Mr. Bain and says I am to blame. Then why did the hon. member for East Elgin move to strike out the salary of \$2,800 for Mr. Bain instead of moving that my salary be reduced?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is perfectly plain, and I thought it would occur to the hon. gentleman at once. My hon. friend from East Elgin simply desired to transfer the liability from the country to the Minister of Customs. I would not suppose that Mr. Bain would lose his salary, but the Minister of Customs would see that it was paid from the source to which Mr. Bain should have looked in the first instance.

Mr. PATERSON. I am sorry to find that an hon. gentleman who leads one of the great parties of this country does not understand parliamentary government better than to know that when an officer's salary is struck out of the estimates he does not get it.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to say that the reason I moved the motion was this, that if the Liberal party have a civil servant who is preparing campaign literature for them, the least they can do is to pay for it themselves. I am here to represent a portion of the Conservative party, and I know that they decline to pay any civil servant for issuing campaign literature in the interest of the Liberal party.

Mr. CLANCY. It is worthy of note how much the compilers of this literature, if it was not Mr. Bain, are indebted to him for. There are some thirty pages of this literature, of which less than one page is devoted to the hon. gentleman's department, and what is that? First, the total expenditure for 1903. Did they have to go to Mr. Bain for that, or did the hon. gentleman use it in his speech? There was not a word of it in his speech. Then there is stated the total expenditure for 1895—did they need to go to Mr. Bain for that?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know that they did.

Mr. CLANCY. But the gentlemen who are making the apologies to-night said they did go to Mr. Bain for the information. The hon. member for Cape Breton said so.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I did not say that the gentlemen who compiled this literature

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

went to Mr. Bain. What I did say was that the committee having it in charge availed themselves of some material prepared by Mr. Bain and to be found in the minister's speech.

Mr. CLANCY. This is not found in the minister's speech at all; I defy the hon. gentleman to find it in any speech of the minister available to members of this House. The hon. gentleman says they availed themselves of material prepared by Mr. Bain. Did Mr. Bain prepare the figures relating to the public debt or the surpluses? That is not in his department. Did he prepare the material in regard to how the money was spent, or the Yukon matter, or the Inter-colonial Railway matter?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Did these gentlemen avail themselves of information prepared by Mr. Bain in regard to the Department of Agriculture, or in regard to a number of items of public works, or with regard to the Marine and Fisheries Department, and so on? On page 12 of this pamphlet there are only two or three items referred to. I have mentioned two of them, namely, the expenditure of the Customs Department in 1903 and the same in 1895, and the revenues for the same years compared. Did these gentlemen avail themselves of Mr. Bain's work for the purpose of finding that out?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Then what did they get that came from Mr. Bain? Because all the other statements belong to other departments. How did they come in possession of Mr. Bain's figures in regard to these other matters if they were not prepared by Mr. Bain? The hon. gentleman has unwittingly become a good witness.

I expected my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to extricate himself from this position because he has it in his power to do so. I was sorry to have to believe that the hon. gentleman had a knowledge of Mr. Bain having been employed at work of that kind, and did so because that hon. gentleman left that impression by his silence and his refusal to answer. The hon. gentleman was asked a straight question if he had any personal knowledge, directly or indirectly, that Mr. Bain had been engaged in preparing literature for use or distribution by the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman has not said up to this moment that he had absolutely no knowledge of this. He admits that Mr. Bain prepared the tables for him but that is not an answer, with all due deference to the minister that is a very equivocal defence. He should say that he has no knowledge that Mr. Bain was in any sense connected with it. We have here the pamphlet and we have the statement that the compilers used the material furnished by Mr. Bain and this pamphlet shows that Mr. Bain has been providing for all the