

ney), and to Mr. Farrar of the *Mail*, then residing in the North-West Territories, were sales to men who were not lumbermen, who had no intention of working the limits themselves, and who acquired them for the purpose of transferring them to someone else. As the hon. gentleman will see, instead of limiting the limit to 200 square miles, there was nothing to prevent 500 square miles passing into the hands of any one party under the regulations adopted. But all this, Mr. Speaker, is beside the motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "hear hear," and I am glad he agrees with me. But, of course, he will understand that when the Minister of Justice insinuated that we had acted most improperly in granting this limit, and when the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), undertook to make the granting of this limit a defence of his action, then it was necessary that I should say something in defence of the Government of which I was a member, and the one chiefly responsible for that particular act. Now, with respect to the motion of the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Minister of Justice has proposed an adjournment of the debate. To what end, to what purpose? What is the object of the adjournment of the debate? I listened very attentively to the explanation made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and that hon. gentleman did not controvert anything that was said. Why, if the hon. gentleman intended to controvert anything contained in the letters, and intended to repudiate any of them as being spurious, the opportunity occurred when the hon. member for South Oxford first proposed to place them on the Votes and Proceedings. If the hon. gentleman had said that these letters are not genuine, or that some of them were spurious, then an enquiry would have been proper for the purpose of ascertaining which were genuine and which were spurious. An enquiry would have been necessary under those circumstances; but the hon. gentleman admitted that they are all genuine publications. For what purpose does the hon. gentleman ask a committee? Is it for the purpose of disproving anything the hon. gentleman himself has said over his signature? Is it for the purpose of showing that he did not tell the truth in regard to his own conduct in the matter? Surely not. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Sands is satisfied with the transaction, and that he is not disposed to charge him with fraud and misconduct in the matter. That question is not before the House. It is not a matter of any consequence what Mr. Sands' views are on the subject; it is not a question whether the hon. gentleman acted properly or improperly in dealing with Mr. Sands. That is not the question at all. One question is, whether an hon. member of this House should, for the purpose of his own profit and advantage, undertake to act as agent or intermediary between the Government and any outside party. I can well understand how a member of this House may be applied to by his constituents to make application for this or the other thing; but I do not understand how an hon. member may undertake to make professional charges for such service. That is a wholly different matter, and that is an important

point involved here; it is, at all events, one of the important points involved in this case. There are a number of cases to show that a member is not allowed to promote business in Parliament in his professional capacity. This has been ruled over and over again. It is true that among English precedents we have nothing which says that a lawyer may not act professionally before any Department of the Government. But look at the principle, and you will find that exactly the same reasons which would prevent a member acting professionally before any committee of the House, or in the House itself, applies to a member acting professionally before any Department of the Government for hire or for fee, as he would before a court of law operate here. The reasons for the rule are the same in both cases, and the reasons which influence the action of a member in the one case should influence his action in the other. Take the case of Mr. Isaac Butt, the case of Mr. Bird, discussed by Lord Brougham and Sir Robert Peel, when both were members of the House of Commons, and take other cases which I might mention. In the case of Sir Isaac Butt, Sir Hugh Cairns, who was then Solicitor General, spoke in vindication of his legal brethren in the House, and said:

"That every member of the profession who entertains that feeling of honor, which he believes was common to the whole body, would at once declare that he could not advocate or even vote for any question in the House in which he had been professionally engaged, lest he might unconsciously, perhaps, be biased by the opinion which he had, as an advocate, expressed outside the House."

That is the rule laid down. If you wish to ascertain how far a member should be precluded from acting before any Department of the Government with a view to influencing the Administration for pay, you have just to look at the reasons which prevent a member from acting in Parliament, and you will see they are exactly the same in the one case as in the other. It is true the member has not to vote when he is before a Department. But he may go before a committee of the House of which he is not a member, and undertake to advocate any measure, but if he does it for hire or fee he comes within the rule laid down by Lord Cairns. In this respect the hon. member for Lincoln is within the reason of the rule. Then the hon. gentleman has shown that he himself felt that he was not acting in accordance with what he considered defensible or he would never have substituted his wife's name for his own as the party who was to receive the pecuniary advantage. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the question, but I think it is not in the public interest that the Government should ask for an adjournment of the debate and that they should propose to refer the question to a committee. The facts are before us. The hon. gentleman in his explanation has not proposed to introduce anything to controvert what we have here. This is not in the position of an ordinary case in this respect: if he proposed to produce evidence by way of rebuttal it would be to refute evidence given by some other party than himself. But the charge made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is based on the testimony of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert); it is based on what the hon. gentleman himself has said. It is not based on what has been said by some one else. There is no other party giving testimony except the hon. gentleman, whose testimony he may seek to con-