

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Leeds had been shown the letter according to my friend's statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I prefer my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would be very sorry indeed to say anything offensive to any hon. gentleman in this House, on either one side or the other. But I think I was justified in feeling hurt, as I was, when I made the statement that the entry in the pair book of the hon. member for Leeds was a fraudulent entry. I have always understood that it took two to make a pair. I never stated to the whips on this side of the House that I was paired. The statement of the member for Selkirk seemed to be accepted on the other side, and when my statement was made to-night it was not accepted. The member for Leeds got up, and in a very offensive way denied my statement. I will just say that the member for Leeds is mistaken. He came over to my desk, and I told him exactly what the pair was, and I held out the letter to him, and he said: "Oh, that is all right," and walked away. Now, being cognizant as I was of this fact, hon. gentlemen will understand why I felt very much offended at the hon. gentleman's language.

Mr. TAYLOR. I never read the letter the hon. gentleman mentioned. I did not change my mind further than to remember that the pair was recorded, and it was recorded on the other whip's desk that the pair was for ten days, until the 13th. Members on both sides like to have their names appear as being paired, if they are absent, and we have tried to meet their views. As my hon. friend and the member for Lisgar made this private arrangement, and the time was given in writing the whips are not to blame for the mistake. It was given in by the hon. member for Selkirk, and in order to be sure that no mistake would happen a copy was put on the desk of the Opposition whip. If hon. gentlemen will look on Mr. Trow's desk they will see it is there, and it has been there for several days, and they will further see that the pair expires on the 13th. That is enough to justify my course in the matter. I have nothing further to do, and I simply drew the attention of the House to the matter. But the hon. member refused to accept my statement, and offensively suggested a fraudulent entry.

Mr. FORBES. It is the usual practice for the two members both to sign a paper, which is handed to the whip of either party. Then it is recorded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not done once in twenty times.

Mr. FORBES. We are endeavouring to carry out the practice. In this case no signature was obtained from the hon. member for Russell; he signed no paper. How the entry came in the book of the hon. member for Leeds I do not understand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. How is it in Mr. Trow's book?

Mr. FORBES. It is not in his book.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you seen the book?

Mr. FORBES. The only thing is the paper furnished by the hon. member for Leeds.

Mr. TAYLOR. He has a book like this one, and I expect it is entered up by the clerk every night.

Mr. FORBES. No, it is not. It makes no difference, because the pair appears in the book kept by the clerk: it was entered by the authority of the member for Lisgar but without the authority of the hon. member for Russell.

Mr. BOWELL. What the hon. member for Leeds said was that the information was given by the hon. member for Selkirk, and not by the hon. member for Lisgar, and supposing he had made a pair between those two gentlemen, he entered it in the book.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Justice seemed to think that the member for Russell was to blame for using the language he used. He overlooked one important point, namely, that when his explanation was given, it was not accepted by the Government whip.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The language used by the member for Russell with respect to a fraudulent entry in the book was used in the same breath as the statement of the hon. member for Leeds, and the latter hon. member had no opportunity of saying whether he accepted it or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even so; after the letter had been shown him, he was perfectly justified.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He was perfectly justified.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The feeling prevails on this side of the House, whether rightly or wrongly, that a great many members have been unfairly and unjustly dealt with through the action of the head whip on the other side. There have been, on the other hand, no complaints made by hon. members opposite of the Liberal whip. How do mistakes occur, and how is it that the head whip is so offensive? Not long ago two hon. gentlemen on this side, whose characters are beyond suspicion, found themselves in the same position as did the hon. member for Russell. It is not a matter to be passed over as lightly as the Minister of Justice treats it. It is true that the newspaper reporters will probably, in a spirit of fairness and after this full explanation, showing how utterly wrong the member for Leeds was and how correct the member for Russell was, do justice to my hon. friend; but except for that fact, the statement might have been read by tens of thousands that the member for Russell had violated what is equivalent to his word of honour. The House cannot but feel how unfair and unjust was the charge made against him. It is due to this feeling to which I have referred more than any other for which hon. gentlemen opposite have to thank themselves if they find difficulty sometimes in securing pairs.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a feeling of insecurity of being unfairly dealt with; not induced by the instance to-night but by other instances, and this will accentuate the feeling very much.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to have the names of the two members to whom the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Langelier and Mr. Lavergne.