

on a money Bill, he voted against the decision of the Speaker. He intervened and amended a money Bill. What has he to say to that accusation? I suppose he is converted to-day. He has better feelings and more knowledge to-day. He has acquired knowledge since the days when he voted against a money Bill, and, at that time, he did not feel so indignant. I do not think he is a symbol of consistency. The hon. gentleman took upon himself to say that I was more in sympathy with my friends the beneficiaries of this Pension Act and perhaps on that account I took this position. The hon. gentleman is not serious. I never saw Mr. Sifton, I never saw Mr. Mulock, I never saw the other parties who are beneficiaries of this Pension Act. I may tell my hon. friend I was never approached by any beneficiary under this Act. What I do in this House I am able to do of my own accord, and I do not want any suggestion or imputation coming from the power room. I am not against the repeal of the law if the government desires it.

Hon. Mr. GIBSON—You want it to be amended.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I still want it to be amended.

Hon. Mr. GIBSON—The hon. gentleman will not succeed.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—No, because I am not going to address myself to the reason nor the justice of the hon. gentleman. If I addressed myself to the justice of the hon. gentleman, I would not get anything at all. I will tell hon. gentlemen why I want it amended. This law says that it shall take effect on July 1. That is enacting a law with a retroactive effect. On what principle is such legislation introduced? making a law to-day or to-morrow that is to take effect from fifteen days ago? What does the hon. gentleman call that if it is not retroactive in its effect. I think the principle is a vicious one.

Hon. Mr. GIBSON—I may tell my hon. friend that there is no provision being made in the estimates passed by parliament for the continuation of these pensions beyond June 30. They expire on that date.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is that a sufficient answer? Is that all the hon. gentleman can say? Because he does not see the money, he says it has not a retroactive effect. Is money the supreme argument in his eyes?

Hon. Mr. GIBSON—That is the trouble in this Bill.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—This Bill has a retroactive effect, and I defy the hon. gentleman to say it has not. It provides that it will be in force on the 1st July, and the first July is past. The Bill must take effect on the 1st July. Is that not retroactive? I am ashamed of the hon. gentleman from Beamsville. For the reasons I have given, I ask that the Bill should be amended. What does the government say? They did not acquiesce when I made the request, but they acquiesced when the hon. gentleman from Montarville made the suggestion. The government in this House is not the government. The government of this House is the power room, and they decided that we would not go into committee and would not amend the Bill. So that the government has acquiesced in one thing to-day, and that is to yield to the desires and decisions of my hon. friend. They do that nicely, and my hon. friend will feel satisfied when he goes home with the grand victory, not over us, but over his own friend and over the government of the day. These are the reasons I wish to advance to justify the position I took, because I had a right to take it, and I think from the observations I have made that my hon. friend from Beamsville is convinced that I was correct—at all events he has yielded, and he is doing what I suggested—following the rules of this House.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—It seems to me that under the legislation of last year the government has contracted an obligation, and, whatever the result, I think the beneficiaries under this Act should be paid up to the time the Act expires. The country cannot repudiate that. The fact that no provision is made in the estimates does not relieve the country from the obligation it undoubtedly owes to these gentlemen. I hope the government will consider that matter. While not agreeing with the hon. Secretary of State in regard to the principles of pensions,