

The honourable Postmaster General was referring to the blowing up of the country residence of Lord Atholstan.

Hon. Mr. Belcourt: Will my honourable friend allow me to say—?

Hon. Mr. Blondin: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. Belcourt:—and I think my honourable friend must know, that it was proven in court that a Government detective by the name of Desjardins, employed by the Government in Montreal, paid \$25 to the people who used the dynamite to which my honourable friend refers.

Hon. Mr. Blondin: Well, I understand—

Hon. Mr. Belcourt: It is a fair question.

Hon. Mr. Blondin: Oh, yes, I understand my honourable friend now. He is absolutely right. I should not like to convey the impression that during those troublous times people of all kinds did not often act in the name of one party or the other. But what my honourable friend cannot deny is that this sort of thing was general in the whole province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. Belcourt: Oh, no, no, no. I certainly deny that absolutely, and everybody will deny it. Dynamite general throughout the province of Quebec? Does the honourable gentleman know what he is saying?

Hon. Mr. Blondin: Yes, I do. How many barns were burned, and how many times was dynamite used in the district of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Belcourt: I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Casgrain: Only when the Government paid for it.

Hon. Mr. Blondin: They were very convincing arguments anyway.

The honourable Postmaster General may well be thankful to the honourable gentleman from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) in having assisted him in inaugurating his recruiting campaign. I was on the platform at the Monument National on the occasion referred to in the address of the honourable gentleman, and I heard both his address and that of the honourable gentleman for De Lorimier, and both of them were patiently listened to throughout their remarks. I regret to say that the honourable gentleman does not give a correct account of that meeting. It is true that there was some noise during part of the meeting, but it did not last long, and it was not during either of the addresses I have mentioned, but when a young man who followed spoke in a very indiscreet and offensive way. If it had not been for that I am perfectly sure the meeting would have been perfectly quiet. But at all events, the honourable gentleman was given a good hearing, and I do not think it is with a very good grace that he comes now to throw mud on his own people because of the interruption to which he has referred.

Hon. Mr. BLONDIN: Will my honourable friend permit me? I do not think he

is stating exactly what happened. I was practically prevented from speaking. I was interrupted after I had been permitted to say only a few sentences. I do not consider that I was allowed to speak, because I do not think I spoke for more than seven or eight minutes, and as I was to be one of the main speakers I suppose that I should have spoken longer than that.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: It is a matter of appreciation. The honourable gentleman, of course, was present; I was present. My recollection may be faulty, but I am speaking to the best of my recollection, and I must say that I have a good memory and I was near the honourable gentleman, and I have consulted other persons who were present, and my memory is to the effect I have mentioned. I could give the name of the young man who followed the honourable gentleman from De Lorimier and who was speaking when the noise took place. I do not deny that during the speech of the Postmaster General there were some interruptions, that questions were put to him; but my recollection is that the interruptions were of an orderly kind, and that there was no indication of any desire on the part of the audience to prevent the honourable gentleman speaking. The honourable gentleman of course should bear in mind the position that he occupied at that time. In his address the other day he confessed errors in the past.

Hon. Mr. BLONDIN: Will you do the same?

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: We are all subject to errors. They may be more or less important, but we are all subject to errors; and when a public man commits an error, which he has to confess later, I think it is bad grace on his part if he takes the occasion of such errors on his part to make reflections upon his own province.

Now, how does the honourable gentleman reconcile the admission which he made in his address the other day, that he was supported by both the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier as the leader of the Liberal party and by the honourable member for De Lorimier, who was at that time, as he is to-day, a leading member of the Liberal party, with the charge that he has made in his speech that the Liberal party was responsible for the manner in which he was received at the meeting at the Monument National? I think it is altogether ungenerous on his part to throw out such accusations when he was not interrupted by Liberals, but by people with whom he had been associated