

be allowed to speak at any Dominion election, or to be present further and prevent them from voting. His hon. friend might have left the proposition to some member of the Dominion House of Commons. If he proposed that they should be prevented from voting at Dominion elections, that was a matter with which this House could not interfere. The House of Commons was charged with the preservation of its own privileges; it had the right to say who should vote at its elections and who should not, and it was a right which he did not apprehend it would thank this Chamber for offering to interfere with. This Chamber had the right to say who should interfere with its own elections, and who should not, but further it could not go. It had no right whatever to pass any such resolution as that offered by the hon. member for North York, which might be contrary to the policy of and clash with the policy of the Dominion Parliament — the Parliament which, and which alone, could come to any decision on the matter. Nothing, in his opinion, was likely to be more injurious to Confederation than any attempt on the part of this or any other province to meddle with the privileges of the House of Commons, or with the rights of voters in connection with elections to that House. The question was entirely distinct from the question of dual representation. It was, he thought, befitting and right, in order to guarantee the independence of this House, that should be provided that no member should owe allegiance to the House of Commons. The good result of the measure had been seen in this House already, for the moment that it became the law of this Province there was an immediate change brought about. A similar change also resulted in the House of Commons. This resolution involved an entirely different principle, and one altogether out of the power of this House to affirm. Supposing, however, that the resolution were confined to county officials, it went too far. Certain of those officials were already excluded, and there were others who were not and ought not to be so excluded. The length which the hon. member proposed to go was too far, and he did not think it would be proper for the House to assent to the proposition, were it merely for that reason. There were certain land valuers whom the hon. member desired to exclude from the right of the franchise for the House of Commons. Could the hon. member give any reason for his proposal? He did not presume that his hon. friend wished to alter the Independence of Parliament Act so far as related to this House, nor to change the statute which defined who should be allowed to vote for representatives in this House; but the hon. member presumed that this House had the power to prevent certain persons from voting at Dominion elections that was beyond their power. Whose fault was it that Government and County officials were not excluded from voting at elections for the House of Commons? That question was brought up at Ottawa by the late Opposition, and a measure of this nature was proposed by them; but so far as he remembered, and he believed his memory was correct, the majority, which then supported Sir John Macdonald's Government, voted it down. If that was the policy adopted by the House of Commons, what right had this House to pass the resolution now before it? (Hear, hear.) They had no right whatever, and it would be highly improper to do it. (Hear, hear.) What right, either, had this House to refuse Mr. Speaker the privilege of recording his vote as a citizen of Dominion, unless they also exclude every member of this House? During recess, Mr. Speaker was simply a member of the Legislative Assembly, and he had just as good a right to take part in the election of a member for the Commons, in his private capacity, as he had to take part in a municipal election. He presumed no one would object to Mr. Speaker becoming a candidate even, not to speak of voting, for the mayoralty of any town or city, for these elections had nothing to do with the elections for this House. Just the same principle applied to the Dominion elections. He would be very sorry indeed if the House decided that Mr. Speaker should not cast his vote or interfere with Dominion elections. He quite admitted the correctness of the practice which prohibited a Speaker from taking part in the discussion of matters which came before the House over which he presided, but that principle in no way applied to the discussions in the House of Commons, with which Mr. Speaker was not at all connected. If the resolution of the hon. gentleman had been framed with any view to consistency, it would have proposed that when an hon. member took a seat in this House he was practically disfran-

chised so far as the Dominion elections were concerned; in other words, that no member of this House should take any part in or vote at those elections. He would be sorry, indeed, were such a proposition supported in this House, for it would be a great loss to this country were hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially the hon. member for North York, prevented from addressing those eloquent appeals to the electors which it was their custom to make. (Hear, hear.) If the purpose of the hon. member had been to condemn improper interference by land valuers and others, he would have been very glad to support his resolution, but it was unhappily of too sweeping and general a character to mean anything of the kind. If the hon. member was aware that any land valuator in the employment of the Crown had been guilty of any corrupt practice, and the charge was fully substantiated, he (Mr. Bethune) and every member upon his side of the House would support him, and he had no doubt the Government would at once see to the removal of the offending officer. The hon. member would pardon him, however, if he did not go the entire length indicated by the resolution. There were times when members of the Local Government, not as such, but as private citizens, should be prepared to give their advice and assistance at Dominion elections. He could conceive of a grave attack being made upon the interests of this Province, when it would only be right and proper that a member of this Government should go to the hustings and take part in the discussions on behalf of those interests. (Hear, hear.) should at least be within their power to do so. If there had been any case of undue interference on the part of any member of the Government — any prostitution or misuse of power, and if a specific charge were made accompanied by the proof, he would be perfectly ready to join in condemnation of the Act. In the meantime, he did not intend to countenance this general charge of the hon. member against the Government. As to county officials, he would simply say that he thought it would be quite proper for the Government to dismiss any of them who had been found abusing the power entrusted to them, even if that abuse took place in relation to the election for the House of Commons. But such a case must first be made out satisfactorily, in order that this House should see it, and understand it; and it should be brought before the House in a separate form, and not in a general way as had been done to day. It was not the intention of the British North America Act that the members of this House should be deprived of their franchise as far as the House of Commons was concerned, and practically that would be the result of the resolution of the hon. member for North York. Already a Dual Representation Act had been put upon the statutes of this country, and nothing would be gained by the passage of an abstract resolution like this.

Mr. PRINCE rose to move an amendment, and in doing so expressed the opinion that the hon. gentleman who had moved the resolution should, if he only made any claim to consistency, be the very last to do such a thing. He referred to a case where the former member for Essex and Kent (the Speaker's own father) had given his adhesion to the principle advocated by the hon. member for North York, but also showed that in Great Britain, where, rightly or wrongly, we looked for an example, no custom of the kind prevailed, and no principle of the kind was ever advocated. He was surprised that any hon. member should wish to preclude the members of the Government from taking their just part in what interested the whole Dominion, and he could not see why Mr. Speaker should be supposed to forget that there were any politics in the country at all. It would be just as well to expect that he would part with his brains at once, and he was of opinion that the gentleman who conducted the deliberations of this House required some little brains. He described the motion as a piece of bunkum, and moved that the following words be added to it:—"That it is also inexpedient and improper that any member of this House, or any official employed therein, should interfere." (Hear, hear.)

This motion was not seconded.

Mr. M. C. CAMERON said he had been under the impression that an important resolution like this would not have been allowed to pass without the Government taking the first opportunity to state their views, and he had kept his seat in order to give them that opportunity. It appeared, however, that such was their indifference to the action of their own colleagues and their own action in the past.