

charging Mr. McNab with having done anything out of the way because personally I have no knowledge and have no charge to make against him. He may have been distributing religious tracts or prayer books, for aught I know.

Mr. COWAN. It is not likely.

Mr. SINCLAIR. But I find the explanation of the 'Sun' rather peculiar that he remained there a whole week getting up imaginary revelations, and revelations which were not given to the public for something like six weeks after the election was over and therefore could have no part in the result. That, however, was the explanation given by the 'Sun.' We were told that the climax would be reached when this matter would be brought up in the House of Commons. I suppose it is the climax we are having to-day. There is certainly a great deal of noise over a very small matter, but that is becoming characteristic of hon. gentlemen opposite. To quote the language indulged in by the great D. V. Johnson's ghost in the 'Rejected Addresses,' it is not the first time this session, Mr. Speaker, that the parturient mountain to your left has been in labour and has brought forth a muscipular abortion. These hon. gentlemen opposite attacked the Prime Minister over the non-production of the memorandum of the Grand Trunk Pacific and later on attacked the Minister of Railways because he would not make a speech, but when he did, there was not a single man on that side who undertook to answer it. Their recent attack on the Minister of Agriculture also was another evidence of a great deal of ado about nothing, and to-day it seems we are reaching the climax. I do not wish to be understood as advocating a policy of employing Dominion officials to do campaign work, but when one is discovered doing work of this kind, he ought to have the sympathy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They themselves furnished us with an illustrious example in the case of Sir Charles Tupper. It will be remembered that in 1891 or 1892, when Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., was High Commissioner of Canada, drawing a large salary from the people, he came across the Atlantic, and while his salary was still running, stumped Nova Scotia in the interests of the Conservative party. The Liberals in this House then protested. They said it was not fair that a man at the very head of the civil service, drawing a very large salary, should be allowed to conduct himself in that way, but I have yet to hear that any hon. gentleman opposite ever protested against his conduct.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. member say that Sir Charles Tupper was drawing his salary while he was here in Canada?

Mr. SINCLAIR. He was still in office and High Commissioner and I presume he was.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

Mr. SPROULE. My recollection is that he made the statement that he was not.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If the hon. gentleman would say that Sir Charles Tupper did not draw his salary during the month or two he was stumping Nova Scotia, I will take his word.

Mr. SPROULE. Sir Charles Tupper himself denied that. Surely his denial ought to be accepted.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Would it be considered proper for a civil servant, by simply refusing to accept his salary for the time he was transgressing, to act in the manner referred to?

Mr. SPROULE. That has nothing to do with it. It is a question of fact.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If that happens to be the case, it is like the case of the men we have been discussing. Mr. LeBlanc who was off duty for a few months on furlough. If that is an excuse for Sir Charles, a similar excuse should not be denied to Mr. LeBlanc. It is only a few weeks ago that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) brought to the attention of the House a very glaring case that happened prior to 1896, that of a Mr. McKay who drew \$20 a day from the treasury during a certain period while he was engaged in stumping and organizing the west in the interest of the Conservative party. Now, under the system that was carried on during that period nearly every official was an election agent of the Conservative party. I do not say that was right, but I say as I said before, that when an official now is discovered in an indiscretion of this kind he should have the sincere sympathy of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Reference has been made during this debate to my friend Mr. John A. Kirk, of Dorchester. For many years Mr. Kirk occupied a prominent and honourable position in this House. I have no doubt that his word will be taken by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and that when he makes a statement that he did not take an active part in the election, he will be believed. I am certain he will be believed by the people who know him best in the county he formerly represented. It will be remembered that a few weeks ago reference was made to a visit made by Mr. Kirk to St. Mary's, by the Halifax 'Herald'; and Mr. Kirk wrote a letter to the 'Herald' which I will take the liberty to read:

To the editor of the Halifax 'Herald.'

Sir,—I am sure you will be fair enough to permit me to correct a statement you were induced to make by some one who 'told you,' as you say in your comment, on the extract taken from the Sydney 'Post' in the 'Herald' of the 26th inst., under the heading of 'Officials,' to the effect that I was 'ordered by the government to take part in the campaign' on the occasion of the election recently held in Guysborough. I beg to say that I was not