

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—As the hon. gentleman seems to know a good deal about what took place in Quebec, and has referred to me two or three times, I think it is but just that we should saddle upon the proper parties the responsibility for the legislation complained of. First, I think we owe it to the provincial government to say that it was not a government measure. It was a public Bill, introduced by a private member. Now, I have obtained information that that Bill was brought before the House with the absolute consent of the leader of the opposition, the Hon. Mr. Flynn, who was himself to benefit by that legislation, his seat being contested in Nicolet county. There were five or six contestations. The Bill was passed through its first and second readings, and went to committee without opposition, if I am well informed, (the hon. gentleman from Montarville can correct me if I am wrong, for he was present), and it was only on the third reading that a member of the opposition, called for a vote. There was not a word of protest from the lips of the leader of the opposition, and four or five members of the opposition voted against the Bill, the leader of the opposition eclipsing himself when the division was taken. In the legislative council, I congratulate the hon. gentleman from Montarville on the fact that he moved the six months' hoist, but his party held practically the control of the Upper Chamber, and could have defeated the Bill had they been so inclined. Twelve out of twenty-four could have negatived the measure, but it was passed by, I think, a vote of two to one, so this private legislation, which I will not discuss nor pass judgment upon, except to say that I could have wished it had been defeated on the motion of my hon. friend from Montarville, was passed with the express consent of the leader of the opposition. His position was still worse than that of the member whose case has been mentioned here. The provincial law enacts that when a member's seat is contested, he must, before taking his seat, take an oath before the clerk of the House that to his knowledge no illegal act was committed in his election. The hon. leader of the opposition neglected, during that session, to take the oath, and the Act which is complained of covers that illegality on his part. I simply rise to show where the responsibility lay.

It was a measure initiated by a private member, with the consent and concurrence of the leader of the opposition. It met with some opposition in the legislative council, but was carried. The Minister of Justice correctly stated that there had been no practical opposition to the measure in the Lower House, for there was no protest heard from any one except at the last moment, when a snatched vote was called, in order that political capital might be made from it at a future time.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—If the House will permit me, I shall answer the new information brought into the discussion, because the hon. gentleman says a good deal and knows very little.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The hon. gentleman from Montarville can correct me if I am wrong.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I can correct the hon. gentleman myself. The Minister of Justice stated that the Bill had been passed through the legislature, with the concurrence of both parties. Was that said or was it not said? It was said. What does the future, undetermined minister say? He says that all the party, except one, voted against it. Who is right? The hon. pseudo-minister comes forward and denies the statement of the actual minister. He confirms what I said. He got up to correct me; where is the correction? He imputes motives. What does that amount to? He judges others according to his own sentiments. He may think it a fair way to judge people, but it is sometimes unsound, and in this case it is unsound. The minister—I am always saying 'minister,' he will excuse me for styling him so—but the hon. member says Mr. Flynn eclipsed himself. That may have been a partial eclipse, but the total eclipse is for the government, and can be seen without smoked glasses. Mr. Flynn withdrew because he had no right to vote on that question. When a member is personally affected in such a case, he must withdraw. He complied with the law. The hon. member says the vote was taken to make political capital. The Dominion government to-day is in a position to make political capital by honestly doing its duty. That is the position of the matter now. The Minister of Justice has all the facts before him. He has had no time to read