

the conclusion of the trial and he returned to the province of Nova Scotia and engaged once more in his customary avocation of editing a Liberal newspaper in the county of Queen's. But the Minister of Finance in his speech at Montreal did not allude to another matter which I think might very well have engaged his attention. In the session of 1905 there was a resolution moved in this House by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) forbidding active interference of public officials in elections; a resolution couched so exactly in the language which the Prime Minister had used over and over again in this House that the government for very shame's sake were compelled to accept it and did accept it. After that resolution had been passed un-animously it was shamelessly disregarded by the Minister of the Interior, but we did expect better things from the Minister of Finance. Nevertheless, in the recent election in Shelburne and Queen's we find that many federal government officials have been working for the Minister of Finance; and working openly and boldly and unblushingly, and so far as we are able to judge with the minister's full consent and approval. Am I going too far in saying that? I think not. I do not desire to be unjust to the hon. gentleman, but let me say that a Mr. Bain who in the last fiscal year drew as salary and allowance from this government as fishery inspector a sum of \$971.10, and Mr. Oscar Campbell, who drew a somewhat smaller salary, were appointed by the Minister of Finance to be his agents at two polls.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, they were appointed by the Minister of Finance by writing under his own hand to be his agents at two polls in the recent election in Shelburne and Queen's. Well, we have the language of the Prime Minister in regard to that conduct. This very practice was brought to the attention of the government during the session of 1905, and the Prime Minister had no hesitation in condemning it in these words:

If he (referring to the official charged), if he was acting as a scrutineer he was going further than I would permit him to go. I do not think that an officer of the government should act as a scrutineer or as an agent.

Yet in face of the unanimous resolution of this House, in face of the declaration of the leader of this House, the Minister of Finance not only had officials of this government working openly for him in that election, but we find him approving and confirming their acts by appointing two men who are paid by the public money of this country to be his agents at the polls. Now, Mr. Chairman, ladies and—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for thus unwittingly breaking the rule of the House which requires me to address the Chair, but I trust, Sir, you will excuse me if I decline to apologize for addressing the ladies on any occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, her.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, a year and a half ago we heard echoes of the London election. It has been alluded to to-day by the hon. gentleman who moved the address. It is a matter to which I did not intend to refer in this House until the proceedings in the courts had been closed and it is a matter to which I shall make but slight allusion now notwithstanding that there is a resignation or an attempted resignation in the hands of Mr. Speaker, and notwithstanding that my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) has seen fit to draw the attention of Parliament to it. There were shouts of victory on a memorable evening in this House last year, and certain hon. gentlemen—gentlemen on the other side of the House I presume—were good enough on that occasion to fasten upon the door of my room in this building and upon the door of the room occupied by the chief whip of the Conservative party and upon the door of room No. 6 a very ribald inscription with a piece of crape attached to it. Mr. Speaker, who is wearing the crape to-day? I shall make no further allusion to that except to say that I believe that crape has been preserved and it is now at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite.

And it was in connection with this very election that the mere appearance of the Hon. Mr. Haultain upon the public platform was thought sufficient to cause him to be put to one side although he had been Prime Minister of the Territories, now constituting the two new provinces, for a period of about thirteen years. I made a brief reference to this matter last year. I did not then know the inner history of it. It had been disclosed, but I was not aware of it, by the present Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, and it had been disclosed in this way. In a letter quoted in this House last year—quoted after I had spoken and after the Prime Minister had spoken—by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle, it appears that Mr. Walter Scott gave this version of the transaction:

I may say that Laurier all along has seemed to be of opinion that Haultain ought to be called as premier in one of the provinces. Had Haultain acted with any approach to propriety under the circumstances I believe that Laurier would have absolutely refused to pass him over.

What has the Prime Minister of Canada to do with passing over Mr. Haultain? Is that not the business of the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan? Have we not a constitution in this country under which we are supposed to have lieutenant governors