

his resolution referred, and which was based on principles which were admittedly sound. This Government had, however, ignored the principles they affirmed when in opposition by paying money to Mr. David Mills, M.P., in connection with the boundary case, to Mr. George Ross, in connection with the Model Schools, and to a gentleman, a member of the House of Commons, who had acted for several years as a Crown Counsel in Toronto. He referred to the fact that the Dominion Government had embodied the principle contained in his resolution in the Independence of Parliament Act recently introduced, and read an extract from THE GLOBE favouring that measure. He did not introduce the resolution as one of want of confidence in the Government, and he asked every member of the House to endorse it.

Mr. MOWAT denied that the principle contained in this resolution had ever been declared by the Reform party in either this or the Dominion House. Although the hon. member disclaimed the intention of condemning the Government, he had told the House that in three instances the Government had appointed gentlemen to positions which they should not have done, and the resolution would, of course, condemn them for so doing. The resolutions moved by Mr. Blake were entirely different in character from this one, their purpose being to secure the independence of this House. He was not attempting to deal with the question of the independence of the House of Commons, that being clearly a matter with which the Ontario Legislature had nothing to do. It was a matter within the keeping of the Dominion Legislature alone. It might or might not be proper to lay down the rule that the Ontario Government should not avail themselves of the services of a member of the House of Commons; but at any rate it was never laid down by the Liberal party. There were persons in this House who held municipal offices, and that fact had not been thought sufficient to disqualify them from doing their duty in the House. It appeared to him to be exceedingly ridiculous to display so much anxiety about the independence of the House of Commons that they should pass a resolution about it. The Reform Government had always acted on the opinion that it was not expedient to appoint a member of the House of Commons to a permanent office to which an annual salary was attached, simply because his duties as a member would occupy a considerable portion of his time.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

Mr. MOWAT resumed the debate by saying that sheriffs who were elected to the House of Commons could not with any show of propriety continue to exercise their duties in the latter position during the three or four months when the House was in session without neglecting the duties attached to the former position. In their own interest, and not from any Quixotic desire to arrange matters for the House of Commons, it was not desirable that such an office should be held by a member of the House of Commons. The honourable mover of the resolution had only been able to justify his motion by referring to three cases in which members of the Ottawa House had been appointed to temporary employment by the present Administration in this Province. He (Mr. Meredith) had entirely failed in pointing out any case in which such persons had been appointed to permanent offices. There was no ground for contending (and the hon. gentleman had not contended) that there was any permanent office which a member of the House of Commons could not fill as well as anybody else. He proposed briefly referring to the three cases which had been enumerated. The first was that of Mr. Mills, who was employed by the Ontario Government to prepare a paper on the boundary question. He was selected because he had previously given some attention to the subject; and he was considered to be a most fit person to make the necessary investigation. He had done so; ably, in two volumes—the second being a digest of the first, with considerable additions. There was, therefore,

a special reason for giving that peculiar work to that particular gentleman. Mr. Ross was the second case. He was employed temporarily to arrange certain matters for the establishment of Model Schools; and he was appointed to the work because he was a member of the Central Board of Education, and eminently fitted for the task. The remaining case was that of Mr. Irving, Q.C., who had been appointed to the Crown business in the city of Toronto. The House would not care to discuss the comparative merits of professional men, and he did not think his hon. friend would desire to do so. It had been urged by the present and past Governments that it was desirable, as far as possible, that the Crown prosecutor should not be a resident in the district in which he acted. The exception to the rule for many years was that of Mr. Mackenzie; but when he was elevated to the Bench it was thought not to be expedient to continue the exception any longer. The discharge of the position in Toronto required a much longer period of attention than a similar position elsewhere. Mr. Irving had considerable time on his hands, and he was not a resident in the county. Since his appointment he had discharged his duties in such a manner as to be spoken of in the highest terms. The duty had been performed by him at least as well as it could have been by anybody else. It would not have been in the public interest to have precluded the Government from appointing these three gentlemen to the particular positions which they had or do now fill. He was satisfied that the Government had acted rightly in making these appointments, and therefore objected to the motion as it stood. In order that the House should have an opportunity to express an opinion upon the matter, he would move, in amendment, that all the words after "that" in the original motion be struck out, and the following words substituted in lieu thereof:—"That it is not expedient that hereafter any person, whilst a member of the House of Commons or the Senate of Canada, shall be appointed to any permanent or annual office or employment in the service of the Government of the Province of Ontario, at the nomination of the Crown, or of the Lieutenant-Governor, to which any salary or fee, allowance, or emolument in lieu of salary is attached, other than to such an office as coroner, justice of the peace, or notary public." (Cheers.)

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) said that the Government at Confederation had decided that a man could not sit in both Houses, and the logical sequence of that fact was the present resolution; and the question now was, whether either House, by its action in conferring patronage on any member of the other, had given rise to any abuse. After criticising the appointments referred to, he said that a certain suspicion always attached to such appointments. What he took exception to in the honourable member's resolution was, that it permitted of temporary employment being given, which might be abused. He maintained that they had every interest in maintaining the independence of the Dominion Parliament. He therefore moved in amendment to the amendment, "That the word 'annual' be struck out and the word 'temporary' inserted in lieu thereof."

Mr. LAUDER said he could see no reason why the amendment to the amendment should not prevail, or why members opposite should vote against it. When they were out of power they objected to a member having a seat on the floor of the House because he was an arbitrator between municipalities, but now things were changed. He said that Mr. Mowat had been doing all he could during the past year to strengthen the Dominion Government, and the Governments were running together. He contended that it did not matter much to which Government the member belonged so long as he was a member of the party.

Mr. FRASER said that he was surprised at the hon. member, who was the one shock-