

proval of the Liberals and Conservatives in the Quebec legislature ?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—No, I did not say unanimous. I said I understood it was passed with the concurrence of the majority on both sides of the House.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—I voted against it, and proposed the six month's hoist, so that it did not receive unanimous approval.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I take issue with the hon. minister. As far as number is concerned, what is the position of the Conservative party in the Quebec House ? There are six or seven, and all except one, who was interested, voted against the measure, and that one gentleman retired, and did not vote at all.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Which one ?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The one the hon. minister named the other day.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—Which hon. minister ?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The other minister, the Secretary of State. If the hon. minister wants to be well informed, he should not obtain his information from a bad source, because he may be misled.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I must not get any information from the hon. gentleman from Stadacona.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Why not ?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Because the source is not very good.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Why ? The minister cannot say why. All the members of the Conservative party in the legislative assembly except one, voted against that measure, and I defy the minister to find me one single member belonging to the Conservative party who voted for that measure. If his information is good, he will rise in his place and answer me. Will he ? No, he does not answer.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN (DeLanaudière)—Did the leader of the opposition vote against it or for it, or did he vote at all ?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Does the hon. gentleman himself know ? I asked him the other day. Does he know better now ? I think

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE.

not, because he is seeking additional information. I will call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to an extract—he may say it is bad information—which may help him. Yesterday he said a Bill was only disallowed where it was against the Dominion interest. Here is a precedent, which will be found in Hodgins's Dominion and Provincial Legislation, on page 178, which reads as follows :

Report of the Minister of Justice, James McDonald.

In reporting upon a reserved Bill of the Prince Edward Island legislature in 1876, the then acting Minister of Justice reported to Council, and His Excellency was advised, to withhold his assent from the Bill, one of the grounds being that the Bill was retrospective in its effect ; that it dealt with the rights of the parties then in litigation, and that there was no provision saving the rights of private parties.

Is that bad information ? I give that for the information of the Minister of Justice. I might give something now for the information of his colleague, the hon. Secretary of State. At page 1178 of the same volume we find the following :

That many of the proceedings taken in the Commissioners' Court, and which are pending and undetermined, are manifestly irregular, informal and invalid; and that it is contrary to British legislation to remove doubts in contested proceedings by retrospective legislation, as sought to be effected by this Act.

The undersigned has the honour further to report :—

That without giving weight or consideration to any great extent to the allegations in the petitions, which are unsupported by any actual proof, he is of opinion that the reserved Bill is retrospective in its effects; that it deals with rights of parties now in litigation under the Act which it is proposed to amend, or which may yet fairly form the subject of litigation; and that there is an absence of any provision saving the rights and proceedings of persons whose properties have been dealt with under the Act of 1875.

He therefore recommends that the Bill, intitled : An Act to amend the Land Purchase Act, 1875, do not receive the assent of the Governor General in Council.

What does the Secretary of State think of that ? Is that bad information ? What does the hon. Minister of Justice think of that ? Is that bad information ? It is signed by R. W. Scott, acting Minister of Justice.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Then it must be bad.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I submit those two precedents directly apply to the case that is now before the hon. Minister of Justice.