

was in the bed-room with her. They both admit hearing a man's voice in her room. Early next morning they saw Pingle coming down stairs.

HON. MR. MACINNES—Allow me to ask the hon. gentleman if this is his own speech he is reading.

HON. MR. CLEMOW—No, it is the opinion of the Counsel for the petitioner.

HON. MR. MACINNES (B.C.)—I submit that the House should not be prejudiced by the opinions of Counsel for either petitioner or defendant. Every hon. gentleman has been supplied with a copy of the evidence and doubtless has read it, and it is for them to come to an opinion without being influenced with what the Counsel have stated at the trial or have since written.

HON. MR. POWER—I understand the hon. gentleman has raised a question of order?

HON. MR. MACINNES—Certainly.

HON. MR. POWER—As one member of the House, I do not think the point of order is well taken. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa is the promoter of the Bill and if he chooses to submit to the House the arguments of Counsel for the Bill, I do not know but it is within his right. He can make those arguments his own if he chooses to do so, and will be within his right.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The trouble is he is not making it his own; he is troubling the House with a brief or factum of one of the parties to this cause.

HON. MR. CLEMOW—I have told the House that inasmuch as I have not made up my mind on this case I desired to hear the opinion of both parties.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I think my hon. friend from British Columbia is somewhat hypercritical. It is a common thing for members of this House to make a speech on a subject, and in that speech to cite the opinions of others in support of their views. My hon. friend from British Columbia has on a recent occasion stated the opinions of a large number of statesmen in the United States as to what we shall do in this country, and I do not see, if the hon. gentleman from Ottawa chooses to interpolate in his speech a citation from

the opinion or speech of anybody else, that he is not perfectly within the rule.

HON. MR. MACINNES—Can the hon. gentleman name one case in which I did it?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I have named one case in which my hon. friend in support of his views cited a large number of quotations from the opinions of gentlemen on the other side of the line about the affairs of this country, and I see no reason why my hon. friend from Ottawa should not cite the opinions of anybody he pleases if they are pertinent to the particular case, and if he chooses to make an argument in that form.

HON. MR. MACINNES (B.C.)—The hon. gentleman will see the difference. The hon. member from Ottawa rises in his place and says he has no opinion of his own on this case, and that he is not supporting the Bill. If he had made a speech in support of the Bill, and then quoted the argument of counsel, I could see the force of it. But he is merely moving the adoption of the report of the committee, and proceeds, without saying whether he endorses it or not, to give an opinion of the counsel for the petitioner. There is all the difference in the world between that and the instance that the hon. gentleman cites of my reading extracts from American newspapers, in support of his case.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—There is no question at all that in the freedom of a debate any gentleman in the House can adduce whatever opinions he may think fit pro or con. If not we would be tied up altogether to our own particular views. It is not to be supposed that my hon. friend who is not a lawyer, can himself give us a legal opinion; therefore he gives the opinion of a lawyer, and he may give it for or against the case, as he thinks fit.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Each member of the House, very likely, had the opinion of that lawyer before the Senate met to-day.

HON. MR. FLINT—I think it is only fair, if this opinion is to be laid before the Senate, that the opposite party should also have an opportunity of having the opinion of their attorney laid before us, so that we shall have both sides of the question. It is well known that lawyers differ in their