MR. BENNETT. In view of the fact that this province has been cursed with a liberal government for thirty years, perhaps I should withdraw the statement. I am forced to admit, and I regret it as an Ontario man that political degradation is at a low point in the province of Ontario. Nor has this government tended to raise the tone, for to-day political life in this Dominion is lower than it has ever been before, and every man knows it. A Bill was introduced into this House last year to amend the Criminal Code; but powers behind the Throne interfered, and prevented it going into force. That Bill had in it a clause that would have prevented the combination of certain businesses to deal and traffic illicitly. There was a vast combine in the city of Montreal last year, the American Tobacco Co., that would have been badly hit by that measure, and what happened? A prominent senator, a supporter of this government, appeared before the government, and the result was the withdrawal of that clause; so that it is permitted and allowed to this American trust and any other trust to go on and traffic in businesses as they chose. Where are the liberals of the old school who used to invoke the Independence of Parliament Act? They are all silenced; there is not a word from them. What have the American newspapers said in reference to what is known as the Gaynor-Greene extradition case in the city of Quebec? What happened there? Here were two well-known thieves, or persons accused of theft and embezzlement in the United States, who came to the city of Quebec. Who appeared on their behalf? There was a time in this country when the old liberals used to rise up and condemn any member of parliament who held a brief for any interest which would clash with the political interests of the country; and yet we find that the Minister of Justice's own firm was concerned in shielding these men and keeping them in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that I had anything to do with the defence?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman's firm had.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK. No firm that I am connected with had to do with that case. My name does not appear in connection with it in any way.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman denies that his firm had anything to do with that case, I will withdraw the statement.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK. I say that no firm that I am connected with acted in that case. My name does not appear in the proceedings.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not make the statement that the Minister of Justice's name appeared in the proceedings. I say that the firm with which he is connected acted for Gaynor and Green. Do I understand him to deny that?

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK Yes, I do. Some members of the firm may have acted. The firm I am connected with did not act.

Mr. BENNETT. That is rather gauzy. I suppose that when the division of the profits of the firm was made, the Minister of Justice carefully asked that no part of the profits from the Gaynor and Greene case should be included in his share?

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, I am prepared to make such a statement, and if the hon. gentleman had any professional etiquette, he would know that no such statement should be required from a lawyer.

Mr. BENNETT. In answer to the Minister of Justice, I will say that he is hitting some of his friends pretty hard. I recall the case of the St. Catharines Milling Company, in which the firm of McCarthy, Osler & Co. appeared on behalf of the Dominion government, and hon. gentlemen opposite denounced Dalton McCarthy for permitting his firm to have anything to do with that case, and the 'Globe' newspaper assailed him with the vilest vituperation. And yet we have it stated in the public press that the firm with which is associated the name of the Minister of Justice, the man who has the appointment of the judges of the country, acted on behalf of these accused men in the city of Quebec. The Minister of Justice should have seen that his firm did not act at all in that regard. But the Minister of Justice does not stand alone as a sinner in this respect. What have we heard on the floor of this House? I can recall a case of a few years ago when a man of this House stood up and said that he was entitled as a lawyer to take all the cases he could get against the government. What does that mean? It means that members of this House can advertise: 'I am a supporter of the government, and if you have a case against the government, bring it along, and all the power I have as a member of the House I will exert on your behalf in order to advance your interest.' What has that to do with the Independence of Parliament Act? I say it is most flagrant. This thing is spreading in this country. I will give the House another instance of it. A dock was to be purchased for the government in the town of Midland. The gentlemen who owned that dock were very anxious to effect a sale to the government. My opponent in the last campaign, Mr. George Chew, made an open bargain with the men who owned the dock that if he effected a sale, he should receive a commission of $400. That is the state to which political morality has got in this country. When the deal was made, the gentleman did not receive his money, and he brought his signed paper into the office of the firm of which I am a member as a law partner; and we issued a writ for the $400,