motion was lost on the narrow vote of 5. 52. He was not aware that the matter h again been brought up in the Commons, a. it may have been that the practice that wa sought to be condemned had been discontinued. He read the rule as laid down in May, and said he proposed to extend it by providing against the partner of any member engaging in Private Bill practice, even though that partner received all the pecuniary advantage and the member received nothing. He thought the rule should apply to members who received a fixed sum from their partnership, whatever the income of the partnership might be.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said the resolution pointed to the legal firm of which he was to a certain extent a partner, as well as to other legal firms who were practising law in Toronto and who might have occasion to transact business in connection with Private Bills before the House. He did not rise for the purpose of arguing the question of abstract principle so much as to inform hon. gentlemen of the true position which he occupied in connection with this question. Hon gentlemen who were members of the last Parliament would know that before he became a member of this House, the firm of which he was a member had occasion to be employed as Parliamentary agents before the Railway and Private Bills' Committees, and he had on many occasions appeared as counsel before these Committees. When he became a member of the House in March, 1871, there were several matters pending in his office which necessarily involved applications to the Legislature Upon his election, he at once understood thoroughly the altered position which he occupied with regard to that class of business. He felt that it was due to his own reputation, as well as a duty which his election had thrown upon him, that he should free himself entirely from any connection, either directly or indirectly, either in name or otherwise, with that class of business which the firm of which he was a member had for four years been transacting. It was, therefore, a matter of distinct arrangement that their partnership should be dissolved—that so far as any interest was concerned which the partnership had, either nominally or in substance, with any Bills before any Committee or before the House, or with any matter before any of the departments, there was to be an absolute dissolution of the partnership That dissolution took place as a matter of fact. Every client for whom the firm had been discharging professional duty before any of the Committees, was perfectly aware that he had no longer any connection whatever with this new partnership so far as that business was concerned. Every one of such clients knew that for such business they had to look solely to the firm of Cattanach & Kingsmill, and that the firm of Crooks, Kingsmill & Cattanach had not the slightest connection with it. That was thoroughly understood and acted upon throughout. The proceeds of the class of business which had been referred to did not in any way form a part of the income of the firm of which he was a member; nor did those who paid for this service suppose that they paid to the firm of which he was a member. Anything which Messrs. Cattanach & Kingsmill received they received for their own use, without in any way assuming to receive it as members of the firm of which he was a member. Not only that, but in order that he might make them some compensation for the loss of his time which they necessarily sustained in consequence of his public duties, he made them an additional allowance out of the returns of the ordinary business of the firm of Crooks, Kingsmill & Cattanach; so that instead of his being in the slightest degree pecuniarily interested in such business, he went a step further, and gave additional allowance to his partners for the loss of time involved in the discharge of his public duties. He confessed that his own desire was in the direction of occupying a position which would free him entirely from any business relation whatever. Since he became a member of the House he had resigned several responsible positions, to some of which pecuniary rewards were attached, for fear that even by implication it might be said that as a member of the House and the Government he occupied an inconsistent position. He had gone further: he had had applications which would have been attended with large pecuniary advantages, but which he had refused in any way to accede to for the very same consideration. He was asked to act as standing counsel for two railway companies which had obtained their charter from this House. Other members of this House had accepted retainers from such railway companies, but he had declined them on the ground that he wished to hold a perfectly independent position towards them. It was impossible for a public man to avoid having all sorts of inuendoes and false motives ascribed to him unless he would isolate himself entirely from every individual community. He must isolate himself entirely from every business relation if he was to escape those aspersions of character which he was sorry to say the public press were too ready to indulge in. He made these statements not with the view of arguing the general question. He was perfectly content to abide by any rule which this House might lay down; but he went farther, and felt himself perfectly able to lay down a rule of honourable conduct which should protect his conscience and his honour without the necessity of there being any rule of this House.

Mr. BETHUNE referred to a charge which had been made in the press that the firm of Blake, Kerr & Bethune had received the sum of $250 for conducting a case before the House. The statement was inaccurate. He believed, however, that on one occasion either Mr. Kerr or Mr. Samuel Blake did act as counsel before a Committee of this House, but neither Mr. Edward Blake nor himself (the speaker) was in any wise concerned in that matter; it did not fall within the scope of their business in any way, and they received no remuneration for it. In justice to Mr. Edward Blake and himself, he felt that this matter should be distinctly understood, and that it should be cleared up. In reference to the motion before the House, he could refer to it free from any personal consideration, for he did not intend to be engaged in any matter of a private business nature which might come before the Legislature. He did not, however, accede to the propriety of the principle for which his hon. friend from South Leeds contended. So long as gentlemen continued to practice professionally while having seats in this House, it seemed harsh to lay down a rule that the moment their partners accepted retainers on their own account to act in cases which were to come before a Parliamentary Committee, and with a view of securing fees for their own individual benefit, they would have to dissolve partnership with members of their firm holding seats in this House. If such was the rule, very few legal gentlemen would accept seats in the Legislature. They gave a large portion of valuable time to the public service, at the sacrifice of a very large amount of business This he might say of legal gentlemen on both sides of the House. It was proposed to carry the principle to a very unfortunate length, and he could see no necessity for the enactment of such a rule as that sought to be adopted. It might lead to cases of hardship, and therefore, unless a very clear case could be made out for the necessity of passing such a rule, the House should hesitate before doing so. A gentleman sent to the Legislature ought to abstain from voting, or possess integrity enough to vote, irrespective of his partner, in any matter in which the latter might happen to be concerned specially. The rule laid down in 1830 applied to members of the House of Commons in regard to Private Bill practice; but his honourable friend proposed now to say that a member's partner should not engage in such practice on his own account. What control had he or any other gentleman over his partner? He might, of course, make a bargain before the partnership was formed, and in that way control him, or the agreement might be altered afterwards; but the rule would act unfairly. In the case of two or three large firms in this city it might operate very hardly; and it seemed to him that the House was not warranted in going further than had been done in England in this matter.

Mr. WOOD thought the motion went too far. He did not see why a person might not be engaged in doing counsel business in a firm doing Parliamentary business without being in any way biassed for or against any Bill in which the firm was engaged. It had never been extended to the proposed length in England. If the motion carried the principle must be carried further, and a rule made that no Director or person connected with any railway or other corporate body shall, as a member of this House, exercise any power of discussion or voting in matters relating to that corporation.

Attorney-General MOWAT said the hon. mover of the resolution asked the House to affirm that it was contrary to the usage and custom of Parliament that any member of the House should have a partner who is pecuniarily interested in any matter that he may manage before the House or any of its Committees. He (Attorney-General) denied that there was any such usage. The hon gentleman had not cited a single word from any book or authority to show that there was