

ing, startling, and astounding example of a placeman sitting in Parliament through the courtesy of a compassionate majority, raising his voice in such a manner. The House at Ottawa was perfectly able to look after its own independence, and a placeman in either did not affect the other. It was only on the ground as it affects the efficiency of our own service that the hon. the Attorney-General had drafted his amendment. The other hon. member who had spoken had also experienced a kindness from the House. He continued by twitting the hon. member for London on his motives for bringing up his motion. He asked if the public interests were prejudiced or sacrificed by the appointments of Messrs. Mills or Irving. It was worse than impertinence for them to legislate for the independence of the Ottawa House; it might be left to look after its own independence. He was not prepared to make such a sweeping change in the public service now, for such it amounted to after all, for the giving employment to a member of the Dominion Government did not make him forfeit his seat on the floor of that House. He therefore could not vote to prohibit him from having temporary employment. The amendment to the amendment was an absurdity, and should be voted down.

Mr. CAMERON said that he was one who thought as few obstacles should be placed in the way as possible to keep the country from securing the services of the most desirable men. Hon. gentlemen opposite had, however, acted so that now their course must be carried to its legitimate issue, and all cause for these entangling alliances be done away with. If it was undesirable to have an annual or permanent appointment it was undesirable to have even a temporary appointment. The moment that the hon. the Attorney-General made his amendment he accepted the propriety of the hon. member for London's resolution, but declared himself desirous of limiting it. There was no principle in the amendment except that it was not desirable for any member of the Commons to hold an appointment under this House. He said that hon. gentlemen opposite had appointed men to positions when there was no necessity for it. He thought that Mr. Irving had ably discharged his duties, but there were others who could have been appointed. Mr. Blake once said that men might be trusted with the reins, but the time might come when men held the reins in whom the people had not confidence. He continued by defending the hon. member for East Grey, after which he declared that hon. gentlemen were voting for the continued existence of entangling alliances if they did not support the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HARDY said that the hon. member's speech amounted to this: that he did not believe in the doctrines of the members of this side of the House when they were in Opposition, nor did he in those of his own side now. Therefore by two negatives he arrived at the affirmative of supporting the amendment to the amendment. The hon. member had supported entangling alliances when he voted for dual representation, and was there any comparison between the possible harm in a person being able to sit in both Houses, and in one of a superior house being permitted to have temporary employment under the inferior. He went on to examine the position of the hon. member for East Grey when he was a fund trustee, contending that he was a placeman then, and then held his seat under conditions which he now condemned. He went on to quote from the Public Accounts to show that the hon. member for South Simcoe had accepted employment under the Government; that the hon. member for East Grey had supported that action in which the hon. member for East Toronto had been the prime mover. Mr. Blake's resolution had been to secure the independence of his own House, but now the Opposition were troubled in their souls about the independence of the other House. He proceeded to go into the facts concerning the appointment of Mr. Ross, which he had never heard any educational authority say was not a fit appointment. He found the name of the hon. member for

South Simcoe in connection with the Sandfield Macdonald Government upon the Public Accounts for services rendered in the North-west boundary, the same kind of services as were performed by Mr. Mills. He concluded by reading a list of appointments of the same nature.

Mr. CAMERON said that up to March, 1872, a member of the Commons could sit in this House and was eligible for employment. The action of the hon. gentlemen opposite had rendered such a course now improper.

Mr. SCOTT said he could not see what reason there could be for such a nice distinction as that drawn by the hon. the Attorney-General. He reminded hon. gentlemen that in the case of Col. Gray they had condemned the principle which they now wished to recognize. The hon. gentlemen opposite had talked round the question and indulged in left-handed slaps at members opposite, who were then occupying their seats lawfully, as the Act had been passed that session and was not applicable to members of the then House. He proceeded to refer to the declaration anent the appearance of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald and Sir John Macdonald on the same platform, that there was to be non-intervention in the affairs of the Government. He went on to say that officers of the Government, forest rangers, had gone round from week to week canvassing in favour of members of the Government and giving receipts for Crown dues, not one copper of which had been paid. He instanced one case of seizure and subsequent relief by this process. It was permissible now for members of this Government to sustain their allies in the Commons by funds of the Province. The public service might suffer from the possibility of persons being appointed to positions because they were members of Parliament to the exclusion of others. He continued by contending that if the members of the Commons would not protect their own independence, the Province members should, in the interest of the constituencies which they both represent, protect these constituencies. There was no one so imaginative as to conceive that Messrs. Mills, Ross, and Irving would have got their appointments had they not been supporters of the Government. He did not by any means assert that these gentlemen had abused their office, but the door to such abuse should be shut.

Mr. PARDEE said that so far as he could find out there was not one word of truth in the assertion of the abuse in the Land Office. A forest ranger, Mr. McWilliams, had been belied in this matter; so far as he (the speaker) knew, he (Mr. McWilliams) was an honest man, and an efficient officer he knew him to be. If the hon. member would give him full particulars when he brought up his motion he would do his best to satisfy him and disprove the assertions. Hon. gentlemen were determined to misunderstand the hon. the Attorney-General. It was not a fair comparison to say that 11 months and 29 days was temporary, and one year annual employment. The action of the Government had been to determine the independence of their own House.

Mr. WILLS said he believed that the Government should have perfect freedom in selecting its officers. He said that in the Old Country no such rule would obtain.

Mr. MEREDITH said that our statutes declare that it is dangerous for any placeman to hold a seat in the House of Commons, and this was a natural sequence. He then read from Mr. Mackenzie's speech in support of a motion of Mr. Blake's in the direction of the independence of Parliament in the matter of members holding positions of emolument under the Government, and he said that the party was going back on these principles. He threw the responsibility of rejecting the resolution and its principle upon hon. gentlemen opposite.

The amendment was then put to the vote and lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Cameron, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Macdougall (Middlesex), Macdougall (Simcoe), McGowan, Merrick, Monk, Mostyn, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley, Wigle.—27.