

The date of the valuation; copy of the Order in Council or other authority, except the Act under which the reduction was made.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that there would be no objection to giving the information required.

The motion was agreed to.

LOTS IN PAIPOONGE.

Mr. OLIVER moved an address asking for—1st. Copies of all Orders in Council passed between the 25th day of July and the 20th day of December, A.D. 1871, if any, relating to lots or concessions or parts of lots, or parts of concessions in the township of Paipoonge. 2nd. Showing whether such Order or Orders were published or not, and if published, the date and place of such publication. 3rd. The date of application for the purchase of any or all of such lots, concessions, or parts of such lots or concessions referred to in such Order or Orders in Council, together with the name or names of such applicants and the date of payment made for the same.

The motion was agreed to after a brief discussion.

PRIVATE BILL PRACTICE.

The debate on Mr. Macdonald's resolution in reference to the Law and Usage of Parliament was resumed by

Mr. MERIDITH, who said that he agreed with the principle of the resolution, and would like to see a law made preventing partners of legal gentlemen who are members of the House from engaging in Private Bill practice. That was the rule adopted in the appointment of deputy-masters and deputy-registrars of the Courts, and he saw no reason why a similar rule should not be adopted with reference to the members of Parliament. It would be in the interest of the country and of the profession also, that such a rule should be adopted. He concluded by moving an amendment so that the motion could read as follows:—"That it is inexpedient that any member of this House shall hereafter be permitted to engage, either by himself or any partner, in the management of any Private Bills before this House or any committee thereof, for any pecuniary reward to be received by such member or any partner thereof."

Mr. WOOD moved in amendment to the amendment that all the words after "that" in the amendment be struck out, and the following substituted:—"That such members of this House as are of the 'long robe' shall not be of counsel on any side in any Bill pending before this House."

Mr. ARDAGH opposed the original motion.

Mr. CAMERON spoke in favour of the resolution, because the principle involved was one which should be adopted. Referring to his own conduct of having, when Provincial Secretary, defended a notorious criminal, the speaker defended it, saying that he saw no reason why he, as a member of the legal profession, should not have taken the course he did, however obnoxious the criminal personally might have been to him. Evidently honourable gentlemen and their friends had paid great attention to the proprieties on that occasion, but he thought propriety would be more regarded by not allowing partners of legal gentlemen in this House having control of any business before it.

Mr. RICHARDS was in favour of the resolution, as he thought that there should be no chance given for members of this House to place themselves in any position which might give rise to charges of their being influenced unduly in business before the House. He denied the statement made on a previous occasion by the member for South Bruce, that his (the speaker's) legal partner had been concerned in a case coming before the Crown Lands Department, and he proceeded to explain the circumstance. Mr. Hall merely applied to his common law agents, Messrs. Richards & Smith, for them to get the affidavits required, and the firm sent to the Department and obtained them. The letter alluded to was written by a clerk and not entered into the letter book. He denied that Mr. Smith ever appeared before him whilst he was in office. He thought if ever there was a transparency charge brought against a public man in this Province this was one, and he could not see the slightest impropriety in the matter.

Mr. WELLS said that he accepted the hon. member for Niagara's explanation, but at the same time the whole purpose of the gentleman's speech was to show that the transaction referred to was an isolated one. He was sorry, therefore, that the matter had been brought up to-night, because it was touching upon tender ground; and he would now state that there were scores of instances in which the firm of Richards & Smith had been concerned in business connected with

the Crown Lands Department. He had availed himself of the only means within his power to find out the extent of that practice, though, of course, as honourable gentlemen were aware, there was not one case in twenty which could be found from which it could be seen that the firm of Richards & Smith must have had a great deal of business to transact with the Department. He would take occasion to state also that the head of the Department had in no way sought to bring about the investigation which he (the speaker) had made; but he had found the letters to which he referred indexed in the general register of letters received from Messrs. Richards & Smith, as follows:—Richards & Smith, Nov. 8, '67, S.W. 1/2 6, 10 Missouri; do, Jan. 21, lots in Nepean; Feb. 6, as to water lots 2, 3, and 4 Ottawa; March 10, N. McIntyre, per R., S.S., petition enclosed 53 in 3, N.D. Road, Glenelg—affidavit enclosed; March 17, as to plan of Woodstock; April 1, for John Coby, re 221, E. 1/2 20, 6 Yonge; July 10, as to work on Ecles Lake; Sept. 8, enclosing affidavit for Wm. Mather, 48, 3, and 5, D.R., Bentinck; December 24, for Mrs. McIntyre, application for patent for commons, 38, 4 Matilda, enclosing surveyor's certificates and letter; January 11, '69, application for copy of part of plan of Marlboro; January 22, for Mrs. McIntyre, with \$19 20 account, 38, 4 Matilda; February 27, for Mal. McKinnon, affidavit 9 in 3, N.D.R., Glenelg; April 6, for advice re 9, 3 N.D.R., Glenelg; April 29, application with affidavit for G. Robins, enclosing surveyor's certificate, 23, 11 Sullivan; April 29, enclosing assignment G. F. Marsh, N. 1/2 3, 4 Carden; June 8, advice, 23, 11 Sullivan; June 8, for decision 9 3 Glenelg; Aug. 18, enclosing two affidavits from M. & E. Robins, 23, 3 Sullivan; Oct. 18, for copies E. 1/2 1, 5 Dalhousie; April 7, '70, for John Smith for patent, N. 1/2 6, 13 Emily; April 21, for A. McLellan, with acct. of Department, \$100, 9, 3 Glenelg; and six others. There were six packages of papers filed by and endorsed Richards & Smith. He (the speaker) read the following letters addressed by the firm of Richards & Smith to their Commissioner of Crown Lands, with a copy of an order from the Commissioner in reply to one of the letters:—

TORONTO, April 5, 1869.

HON. J. RICHARDS,
Commissioner Crown Lands.

DEAR SIR,—On lot 9-3 N. O. R., Glenelg, about a year ago an application was made for purchase of above lot, and all papers relating to same filed with the Crown Lands Department. The applicant is desirous of having your decision in the matter as soon as possible, as the matter has been standing a long time.

Yours truly,
RICHARDS & SMITH.

TORONTO, July 7, 1869.

HON. J. RICHARDS,
Commissioner Crown Lands.

DEAR SIR,—On lot 9-3, Concession Glenelg, an application for purchase of above lot has been before the Department for over a year.

The parties are very anxious to hear your decision in the matter, and you would greatly oblige by giving same as soon as possible.

Yours truly,
RICHARDS & SMITH.

Rating.—I do order the sale made to Allan Cameron of the above west lot 9-3, Glenelg, be cancelled, and that same be resumed by the Crown, and that it be sold to Mal. McKinnon, the occupant, or his assignee, at \$2, cash.

S. RICHARDS,
Commissioner.

Toronto, April, 21, '70.

For a Commissioner so careful as the hon. member for Niagara had been, it was strange for him to say that he knew nothing of his partner's practice in connection with the Department, and it but argued for his bluntness to an extent that was almost incredible; but still he would believe the hon. gentleman if he declared that he knew nothing of his partner's transactions in these matters. He (the speaker) repudiated the idea that the hon. gentleman had been influenced in his decisions by these means, but still he thought he had said enough to show that his partner's practice connected with Departmental business had been carried on at a very considerable extent, and from what he had learned it was almost an every-day occurrence.

Mr. RICHARDS—The honourable member for South Bruce cannot show a single contested case in which Mr. Smith ever appeared before me.