

Warden or Reeve might as well be prohibited from holding a seat here as a member of a Local Legislature. The one was a member of a purely municipal body, the other of a Legislative body. There was no analogy whatever between them. He would come now to the argument that this Bill would be a serious infringement of the liberties of the people, which he thought was a fair subject for discussion. Suppose the Lower Provinces, with perhaps Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island added to the Confederacy, permitted the members of their Local Legislatures to have seats here, we might have twenty-five Local Ministers in this House, besides nine Dominion Ministers, and if the Ministry for the time being took the same pains as gentlemen opposite had taken during the late election to compel a kind of harmony between the different Governments, the influences which all these Governments combined would have in a House of less than two hundred members would be excessive and dangerous to the liberties of the people. It had been said that there was no demand from the people for this Bill. As regarded Ontario from all he has seen he was satisfied that public opinion was hostile to the system of dual representation. He thought the Local Legislature should be as independent as possible of the General Legislature, and that the respective Governments might perfectly well discharge their several functions although holding for the time opposite political opinions. Entertaining these convictions he had no hesitation in saying that he approved of the Bill which had been introduced by the member for Bothwell.

Hon. Mr. Cartier was opposed to the Bill for two reasons: First, because if it became law it would be an infringement on the rights of selection of representatives of the people, and second, such Bill could not become law, and if passed by this Parliament would be an infringement of the constitution. With regard to the first proposition, if the electors of any district were prevented from selecting whom they chose, it would be restricting the elective principle. One section of the Reformers of Ontario had agreed that it was proper a member should sit in both Houses. If this Bill had been in operation, either the Local Legislature or the Commons would have been deprived of the services of the able member for West Durham, of South Bruce, Cornwall, and others. Then in regard to Conservative opinion, he (Mr. Cartier) was considered rather Conservative, and public opinion had sanc-

tioned his return to both Houses. Coming to the Liberal party of Lower Canada, he found the member for Athabaska returned for both; and the brother of the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Wolfred Dorion, had run for both Houses. Then coming to the other proposition, that such Bill was an infringement of the Constitution, it provided that no person should sit for both Houses, and if a member of the Commons or Senate was elected to the Local, his seat in the Commons or Senate should be declared vacant. All provisions in regard to the Senate was an infringement of the Constitution. The Parliament of Canada had no right to alter the Constitution of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Chauveau said that notwithstanding a desire not to address the House on a question affecting his own seat, he felt compelled to give his deliberate opinion that members of the Local Parliaments may sit in the Commons. It would be strange indeed if the rights of those enjoying a double share of the confidence of the people should be the first questioned? He was surprised the member for Lambton should have asserted that this Bill would not effect a change in the constitution. He (Mr. Chauveau), was prepared to try this question as representative of the County of Quebec. He had been returned by acclamation to both Houses, although he held office in the Local Government. The British constitution never intended such a narrow construction as to prevent the people reposing a double share of confidence in their representatives. It was because local interests were so closely connected with the great business interests of the country that the presence of Local Ministers was desirable in this House. The most absurd argument was that double representation was unpopular. If so, it was not dangerous. People need not send the same representative to both House unless they pleased. He held that no measure could be more calculated to thwart Confederation than that before the House. They had something else to occupy them in the measures for the development of the resources of the country, than to commence at the outset by making changes in the constitution.

Hon. Mr. Dorion said they had learned from the speech of the Premier of Quebec that there was a great deal to be done to perfect their new constitution, and for his part he was disposed to do it; but the House had been sitting for 21 days, and yet the Government had not brought down their measures; and if they consumed time discuss-