

tleman to whom I have referred. They had their little wrestle last session, they fought each other like Turks, but to-day, forsooth, they pretend to represent a popular feeling in this country. I admit the ability of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I admit that he could do much if he had the power, and if he were not trammelled as he is trammelled, according to the traditions of this Parliament, by the extraordinary and unique position which he has occupied in connection with this question. I have never hesitated, I did not hesitate last session to dwell on this question. I propose to dwell on it again, not merely for the purpose of asking the attention of hon. gentlemen here to it, but of taking that advantage which I claim I can take at the hands of my fellow-countrymen, when I point to the fact that the excitement, whatever excitement there may be against the policy of justice adopted by this Government, has been fanned, has been aroused, and has been led by the paid advocate of the Manitoba government. It has been an ephemeral, a spasmodic, a pumped-up excitement, pumped up by arguments for every one of which there has been cash paid down in advance, cash paid over the counter. There cannot be an argument advanced by the hon. member for Simcoe which has not already been given in return for the gold of Manitoba, which he has in his pocket. Am I to be influenced by arguments of that kind; and to be, in the slightest degree disturbed in my opinion as a free and independent member of Parliament? I scout that, and I deride that, and I believe that the people of this country will take the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) at his true and his proper worth. But, if hon. gentlemen think that my position is extreme, I call to my aid in denouncing the advocacy in this independent legislature of the policy of the Manitoba government by the member for Simcoe—I call to my aid the arguments which that hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) has already advanced in this House. He knows, that his position contravenes the traditions and the teachings of Parliament. He knows that his position is inconsistent with the position of an independent member of this House, or of any British parliament, and his own opinions are on record upon that question. I will not call your attention again, Mr. Speaker, to the rules of this House, nor to the resolutions of the English Parliament, by which no member is entitled to vote upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest; but I will refer to the fact, that your predecessor, Mr. Kirkpatrick, decided, in 1884, that these resolutions and these opinions were the law of this Parliament. I will refer to the opinion of Sir Charles Russell, now the Lord Chief Justice, when Attorney General of England. He stated in 1895:

The object of the rule no doubt was, that a person should not advocate the same thing in

this House, for which he had received fee or reward out of it.

I call your attention, Sir, to the opinion of the present Attorney General of Great Britain, who said:

I think no member should in his capacity as a member of this House, advocate afterwards, any case in respect to which he has received fee or reward.

I call your attention, Sir, to the opinion of a former Attorney General of England, Sir Henry James, now Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, who said:

The object of the rule no doubt was, that a person should not advocate the same cause in this House, for which he received a fee out of it.

And, coming to our own Parliament, I ask you, Sir, to recollect that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who was a member of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, had his conduct commented on by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in the year 1880. In that year, a discussion took place concerning the boundary between Ontario and the unorganized territories. What did the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) think of the position of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) then? According to our "Hansard":

He contended that the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was biased, and it was an unfortunate circumstance that he (Mr. Mills) happened to be the paid agent of the Ontario government, when he first received his impression on the subject.

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) interrupted, saying:

That recognizing that, practically he took no part in the discussion of the question, and that it was dealt with by the First Minister and the Minister of Justice.

And then my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) answered:

If Mr. Mills was incompetent to take any part in the case as Minister of the Interior, he supposed he must be equally incompetent to take any part in the discussion in the House of Commons.

And later on, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy), representing, if you please, a helpless minority, a minority of one, in the case of the Streams Bill; he rose, after the litigation had run its course, to deal with the subject before this House, and he apologized for speaking on the subject, and stated, to use his own language:

That he rose to reply with some hesitation as he happened to be counsel for one of the parties, Mr. Peter McLaren.

But what was his excuse for taking part in the discussion? I submit, Sir, that his excuse on that occasion places him in a deplorable position on the present occasion, for his excuse then cannot be urged now in connection with this matter under debate. The member for North Simcoe then said:

The question is no longer of any interest to Mr. McLaren. My connection with the suit of