

to the order of Mrs. N. M. Rykert, and in full of the moneys payable to her under agreement.

"J. C. RYKERT,
"Her Attorney."

Now, the last point to which I want to call your attention, Sir, is the opinion which the hon. gentleman himself, all things considered, seems to have entertained of this transaction. I find on the 25th December, 1882, under date from St. Catharines, the hon. gentleman writes as follows:—

"ST. CATHARINES, 25th December, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—What is the reason that some person writes the full particulars of our business to some parties here? Mercer or some member of the family has written all the facts to Seymour, and he is telling them all about the city. This is very injudicious and contrary to what I asked you to do. It is of the utmost importance to keep the sale out of the papers, or we may be injured at Ottawa. Already they are threatening the Government to bring the matter before the House, and, if they do, it will perhaps hurt us very much. If Sir John knows the facts, he may prevent the transfer being recognised."

He did not do it.—

"Now let me again urge you to see that this is kept quiet. Why does Mercer want to tell all the Seymour family? You might as well publish it in the *Globe* at once, as they tell all they know on the streets. Let me know as early as possible the day Sands will go up, so that I can be prepared."

On 28th January—and I may observe that the hon. gentleman, in some of the statements on the Table, declares there was no impropriety whatever in these proceedings—he proceeds to write:

"I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I seem to have all the hardest part of it to do. I have Bowell working for me. And if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were at the Queen's Hotel. I have not slept any for a week on account of this. We must keep perfectly quiet."

And on the 23rd of January the hon. gentleman, in another remarkable letter, expresses the opinion that if these particulars come out there will be the devil to pay in the House.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quoting from matters on record in our proceedings, and I presume I am perfectly in order. However, as the hon. gentleman doubts whether I am, I shall read the statement:

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, 23rd January, 1884.

"DEAR MERCER,—I wrote you yesterday at the Hotel Baltimore as requested. I mentioned the fact that Sands had been to see me, and tried very hard to have the notes renewed. I told him they were in the hands of the bank, and he finally agreed to pay them, which he did five days before they were due.

"I fully satisfied him as to the whole matter, otherwise I am afraid he would have repudiated. So you will find that you have been paid the notes. This is really a grand thing for us. There is the devil to pay in the House about the whole affair, and it is really too bad that I am compelled to bear all the brunt of it."

Now, here arises an interesting psychological problem. When the hon. gentleman spoke of there being the devil to pay, was it second sight on his part, was it a guilty conscience, or was it simply that the fiend had been bought off for a season? I think, Sir, that I have established tolerably clearly from the evidence of the hon. gentleman's own written statement, and by agreements signed by his own hand, all the facts in this transaction upon which I intend to invite the judgment of the House. It now remains for me to deduce certain inferences from these facts. The House has estab-

lished before it, from the hon. gentleman's own written statements, what he has done. This hon. member, a representative of the people, a trustee of the people, under pay by the people, or, at any rate, indemnified for all charges in attending to his duties here, thinks it consistent with his duty to devote his whole time, during two whole Sessions, to engineering an Order in Council through the House, by which a very valuable property, a property belonging to Canada, the property and inheritance of the whole people of Canada, is bartered away for nothing after an agreement had been made by him with Mr. John Adams, in accordance with which he was to receive half of all the proceeds. Looking on the hon. member as a trustee, I say it is a deliberate fraud on the *cestui que trusts*, and I say here—and I think no one will contradict me when I make the statement—that, if this had been a transaction between an ordinary trustee and his wards, there is no court of equity that would not have compelled the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) to refund to his wards the whole \$200,000, with compound interest. Now, there is another, and a vastly more important side to this matter. I propose to ask your attention, and the attention of the House, to certain propositions which appear to me to underlie the whole theory of representative government. I will lay down the propositions by which I am willing to be judged, and by which I propose to judge the hon. gentleman. I say, in the first place, that every member of Parliament—whether he may admit it or not—is a trustee in the strictest sense of the term. I say he has no right to use his position as a member of Parliament for his own private gain or advantage. I say that, if he does use his position for his private gain, he cannot possibly discharge his duties as a representative of the people, and as a trustee of the people. And I say that, unless those principles are clearly understood and fully recognised, first, by this House, and then by the people who send us here, parliamentary government here or elsewhere is a farce and a fraud. I challenge contradiction of these statements. I do not think I have gone one bit too far, and, if any hon. gentlemen feel disposed to contradict those propositions, I hope they will do so here and now before this debate is over. Now, what is the corollary to be drawn from this? The corollary is, that if any member of Parliament has a transaction of any kind with the Government, the onus lies upon him to show that he made no attempt to use his position as a member of Parliament for his private gain or advantage. This is the case even where the dealings would otherwise be legal. That is the position which I take. Many things have been absolutely prohibited, and wisely prohibited, to members of Parliament. There are many things with which they are not allowed to meddle in any shape or way, but, beyond that, there lies the unwritten law of England providing that no trustee is justified in using his position to the detriment of the *cestui que trusts*. I apply that in the case of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) as I am willing to have it applied in my own case. If you admit—and I defy any hon. gentleman to deny it—that this proposition is sound, then the hon. gentleman is condemned from start to finish of his whole correspondence, for his whole correspondence shows that from first to last he traded