

Then, there is an oath, a part of which material to this question is as follows:—

I will not ask or receive any sum of money, services, recompense or matter or thing whatsoever, directly or indirectly in return for what I have done or may do in the discharge of any of the duties of my said office, except my salary or what may be allowed me by law or by an order of the Governor in Council.

I do not understand that these allowances have been made under an Order in Council.

Mr. FIELDING. I think so; they are in my case, I know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are they in the case of the hon. Minister of Customs? I do not so understand it.

Mr. PATERSON. The commissioner assures me that they are. I cannot state from my own memory, but the commissioner says they are.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say the other night that they were not.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think I said so. I was trying to say nothing that I did not know to be perfectly correct, and I would not be positive of it. However, the commissioner tells me now that these payments are made under Order in Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That disposes of the matter as far as the oath is concerned, because there is a direct reference to an Order in Council. But, I do not know how you deal with section 51. The position of the hon. Minister of Customs is somewhat peculiar because he has an officer who is called the assistant commissioner of customs, and who, he says, is not his private secretary.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He is his private secretary?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well then he is entitled under the law to this allowance and the hon. gentleman has no right to give it to any one else. There is a sum of money voted by parliament for the private secretary of the minister, and if this gentleman is his private secretary, he is entitled to it and no one else is entitled to it. That follows logically and conclusively. But I understood him in one portion of his remarks to say that he was not private secretary, but sometimes performed the duties of private secretary. Then he said there were two ladies in the office who were on salary, and that he had distributed a portion of the salary of his private secretary to these ladies. I understood him to say that he had not done that by order in council, but that it was merely a departmental proceeding. I consider that an irregular proceeding and I do not know

how you can get over the provisions of section 51. We vote the salaries for all these officers, and if the statute says that you shall not give them any extra allowance, I suppose it means what it says, and that the government is bound to carry out the terms of the statute. Then, in regard to the other point which has been dealt with very fully to-night, I have only to say a very few words. I certainly gathered as distinctly as could be from what the hon. Minister of Customs said that Mr. Bain had practically written the whole pamphlet known as 'Political Pointers No. 1.' If the hon. minister did not mean that he certainly did not express himself with the clearness which usually characterizes his utterances. Indeed, I understood him not only to admit it but to quote from the pamphlet then in his hands and to justify the work of this gentleman because he said you could not find any fault with the accuracy of the statements made. He said that it was a good thing that this gentleman had been employed to do this work, because it was right that the people should know the facts set forth in this pamphlet. He said further that he was perfectly justified in doing it because that was naturally the work of a private secretary. He said that a private secretary might prepare figures of that kind for a minister, and having prepared figures of that kind it necessarily followed that it was no harm for him to prepare them for a campaign sheet such as that which the hon. minister quoted. Well, I think that opens up a pretty wide question regarding the operations of any department in this country. What would it lead to? It would lead to this that the minister could take \$600 voted by parliament for his private secretary, and divide it amongst six or twelve men in his department calling them private secretaries, then set every one of them at work to prepare campaign literature for the political party of which he is a member, and distribute that through the country and no one would be entitled to find one item of fault with such a proceeding, provided the statements contained in that literature were true. In other words words, the only qualification necessary to the employment of a civil servant in the preparation of campaign literature is that he must not insert any falsehoods in any document that he may prepare. That is the argument of the hon. gentleman. You can take a dozen men, give them \$50 each out of the salary of the private secretary, call every one of them a private secretary and set every one of them at work preparing campaign literature for the Liberal party. Does not the hon. member think it would be fairer after all to put his hand in his pocket and for other members of the government to put their hands in their pockets for the purpose of paying men to do this work just as we have to do on this side of the House? Is it the fair or proper