

table, having at his right Bishop Dunn, and at his left Judge Langelier, and then next to Bishop Dunn was Judge Routhier, who was thus occupying the third place of honour, though as an ex-Chief Justice he should have taken precedence over Judge Langelier. The A.D.C. told me: 'We will take Judge Routhier and put him on the other side, and you take Judge Routhier's place, because I understand you have an objection to sit beside Judge Langelier.' I said, 'I have not the least objection to sit beside Judge Langelier, I have no personal matter with him, but I want to know on what side I sit. It is not the fact of being at his side, but the question is as to being on the right side. He said, 'You take Judge Routhier's place.' I said, 'That does not solve the difficulty. You are giving me a wrong place. I should have the third one and Judge Routhier the second one because Judge Routhier passes before me, and Judge Routhier also passes before Judge Langelier.' Anticipating what arose, I had prepared a letter, and without any fuss at all, I said, 'I cannot remain,' please hand this to the Lieutenant Governor, and this letter which I give him reads as follows:

(Translation.)

Spencerwood, 9th Nov., 1909.

Captain Victor Pelletier,  
A.D.C. in Waiting upon His Honour the  
Lieutenant Governor of the province of  
Quebec.

Sir,

In accepting the invitation of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Quebec to a state dinner given this evening on the occasion of His Majesty's birthday, I had reason to believe, especially after my last two letters, that the order of precedence established in this country would be respected and that senators would have the place to which they have a right.

I have just assured myself to the contrary. I see, in fact, by looking at the places assigned, on the plan of the dining room, to each of the guests that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has given Sir Francois Langelier precedence over senators, although this gentleman is not Chief Justice, because Judge Tait occupies that position.

Foreseeing what is happening to-day, but wishing to avoid in public the scene of a protest, which is always disagreeable, I did, in my last letter, ask His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to excuse me from being present at his dinner in case it had really been decided to change the order of precedence in the manner which I find it has been this evening.

It has not been desired to grant my request. Still more, it is wished to force me to accept this evening an arrangement which would make me a party to an error voluntarily committed.

I refuse to do this.

And it is in order to protest against this injustice that I find myself forced to decline respectfully the invitation which has been given me. My protest comes at the last hour, but all the same in time, since I formulated it before ratifying by my acceptance the error of which it is sought to make me a victim.

Be kind enough to transmit to his Honour the reasoned refusal which I give you, and believe me, Sir,

Your humble servant,

(Signed) P. LANDRY.

That is all that took place. There was no fuss, no discussion, nothing to amuse the public. I see before me some of my hon. friends who were at the dinner, and they never knew what took place, because there was no fuss at all. I assure hon. gentlemen that in this particular instance it is not because my name is Phillippe Landry, it is because I am one of the members of this House, that I followed that course. It was my bounden duty, out of respect to the position I occupy, and in accordance with the views of all those who know something about precedence, to do what a gentleman should do, and in that respect I think I shall have the approval of all the senators of this House.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—

I suppose my hon. friend opposite would like some expression of opinion as to the very grave constitutional question which he has raised. As it is one of gravity, and importance, and I believe he has placed a notice on the Order Paper which will require a formal answer, I will only say a few words, and reserve the matter until I have had an opportunity of consulting with my colleagues on the important question of precedence. I am sure the whole House will join with me in regretting that, under any circumstances, the hon. gentleman would have lost his dinner. My recollections of the hospitality of Spencerwood are of so agreeable a character and the excellence of the dinners during the time that I had a more intimate acquaintance with them, was so great, that I feel a good deal of sympathy for him on that score. As to the question how far our