

on his position, that he used and abused his position as a member of this House, in order to put money into his own pocket. Now, let us glance for a moment at the defence that has been put forward. The hon. gentleman has made a statement in his place in Parliament, and has published and caused to be put on record, a long letter in which he deals with these transactions. He admits the facts. I render him no thanks for that. Those facts were established in a court of law and could not be denied. But he pleads three things. First he pleads that he has successfully evaded the law. He tells us that he is not brought within the provisions of the Independence of Parliament Act. That may be or may not be. That is a matter for the courts and for lawyers to decide. But what on earth does this House, what on earth does this country believe to be the object of any Independence of Parliament Act? That Act in its terms explains what it is. It is an Act for the better securing of the Independence of Parliament, and for that purpose it prohibits absolutely the dealings of members of Parliament with certain things which might in some cases be innocent; but that law does not abrogate the right of Parliament to protect its own independence or with the jurisdiction of the House in such matters; nor is it just, or right, or proper to imply that the meaning of the Independence of Parliament Act is that, if any skilful lawyer or jurist can evade the exact terms of the Act, its letter and its spirit, he is, therefore, to go harmless and not to be dealt with by Parliament. I say that the terms of the Act do not bar the jurisdiction of this House. I say this House has a perfect right to deal with offenders who have committed discreditable or scandalous acts, and though I shall not detain you now by reading all the authorities that might be cited, I shall refer to the "Parliamentary Procedure" of our clerk, Dr. Bourinot, in reference to the disqualification and expulsion of members. He says:

"The power of Parliament to expel a member is undoubted. This power has been repeatedly exercised by the English and Colonial Parliaments, either when members have been guilty of a positive crime, or have offended against the laws and regulations of the House, or have been guilty of fraudulent or other discreditable acts, which proved that they were unfit to exercise the trust which their constituents had reposed in them, and that they ought not to continue to associate with the other members of the Legislature."

Such is the language of Dr. Bourinot, of the late Mr. Todd, and of Sir Erskine May. That view will commend itself to every lover of representative government in this country or elsewhere. There is one other thing to which I will call the attention of the House. Whenever we meet together for the first time in any Parliament, it is the habit of the Premier to read over to the House the following declaration:—

"That the offer of any money or other advantage to any member of this House for the promoting of any matter whatsoever, or pending, or to be transacted in Parliament, is a high crime and misdemeanor, and tends to the subversion of the Constitution."

Sir, is it the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to move, when this motion is put, that a rider be added to this declaration to run as follows:—

"But that any member of Parliament may take all and everything that he can lay his hands on, by the use of his influence with the existing Government, whether in the way of land grants, timber limits, railway subsidies or

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

otherwise, either as a provision for his old age, or for other purposes."

Now, Sir, I apply the principle. Had the hon. gentleman taken \$100 for his vote in this House, and had that been proved, no man would say but that the hon. gentleman must have been instantly and unceremoniously expelled. I would like to know in what respect taking \$100 for his vote is worse than what has occurred? Let any hon. gentleman show me, if he can, the moral difference between a member of Parliament exacting money from a suitor who is applying for an Act of Parliament, in return for his vote or influence, and a member of Parliament exacting money from a suitor for the purpose of obtaining an Order in Council? Show the moral difference, if you can. I say that it is in reality a far higher crime and misdemeanor, that it tends far more to the subversion of the Constitution, for a member of Parliament secretly to use his influence with the Government of the day for such purposes as the hon. member for Lincoln declares he has used his to obtain the grant of a very valuable tract of public land for an utterly nominal consideration; I say that it is ten times a greater crime and misdemeanor, and ten times more dangerous to the liberty of the subject, to do this than to take a few hundred dollars directly for his vote in Parliament. In one case we have some chance of knowing what is done, in the other it is almost impossible for us to know, except by some accident, or to find out what the hon. gentleman has been about. The hon. gentleman relies upon another plea. He maintains that although it is quite clear that the timber limit was extraordinarily valuable, its value at that time was moderate, that it was a mere lucky accident by which he was enabled to realise a profit of \$200,000 for what he had paid \$500. Now, the letters which I have read from the hon. gentleman, under the dates he has given, show conclusively, that before he obtained that Order in Council he knew right well that it was a very valuable property. The letter of the 10th April contains a statement that he estimated the property at \$40,000, a week before the Order was passed; but he has expressly stated in his defence that the great value was caused by the deviation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, he says, was known to be likely to take place in May. Now, I have taken the trouble to look up the records; I remember something of that same deviation. It was perfectly well known in the House to many members on both sides, long before the 17th April, that the Canadian Pacific Railway contemplated diverting their line; it was particularly well known to members of the Government. On the 13th April, four days before the Order in Council was passed, Sir Charles Tupper introduced an Act into this House, providing for a deviation to the south, and allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to find a pass, if they could, within 100 miles of the boundary; so that the statement, that the value of this land was caused by an unforeseen deviation of the railway, has, also, no foundation in fact. It was perfectly well known that the company was going to apply, and both the Government of Canada and the hon. member for Lincoln knew perfectly well, that there was a strong probability, to say the least of it, that the company's line would go close to these limits and make them enormously more