

Local Government and the Federal Government should be as independent of each other as possible.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: So they are.

MR. LAFLAMME: No, they have not been in the past, unfortunately. The Local Government of Quebec had excluded all the Federal officers from participating in the affairs of their House, and he wished that the Federal Government should take the same course with officers connected with the Local Government, in order to produce the result they were all anxious for—the separation of the Local and Federal Parliaments.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said he had no doubt his friend the Minister of Justice would be glad to receive the assistance of gentlemen on the opposite side, because the question was in no sense a party one, and in view of the coming election it was desirable that everything which stood in the way of the independence of Parliament should be removed. It was necessary that all ambiguity as to the law should be removed because it had been admitted by lawyers that, under the present Act, there was no security. Besides, the Legislature of Quebec and that of New Brunswick denied that they should be quite distinct from the Federal Parliament. In deference to the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite, however, his hon. friend the Minister of Justice, believing that gentlemen who conducted criminal prosecutions on behalf of Local Governments did so merely as lawyers who received a fee for their services, and would not be influenced by other considerations if returned to the Federal Parliament, had agreed to amend the Bill. The question was one of great difficulty, but the line must be drawn somewhere because it would not do to disqualify a man for a trifling matter. The measure was brought forward, not in the interests of the Government, but in the interests of the people. If, therefore, the phraseology made use of by his hon. friend was not sufficiently clear, no doubt he would be quite prepared to modify it.

MR. LAFLAMME.

MR. MASSON: Would it not be better to adopt the law of Quebec altogether?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Will you read the phrase used in the Quebec Statute?

MR. MASSON said there were two Acts. One was passed in 1869, and the first clause of it was amended in 1872. But there was a special clause which was not repealed by the Act of 1872.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was desirable to make the words as distinct as possible, because there were certain classes of officials whom it would not do to admit as members of the House. In Ontario, for example, the Clerks of the Peace and Registrars had the surveillance of the rolls; also to a certain extent the Sheriffs, who were *ex officio* Returning Officers. Of course they were not bound to act as Returning Officers, but if they did, they ought certainly to be disqualified.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### After Recess

MR. OUMET said that the argument of the Minister of Justice was that no member of this House should be under the influence of this Government or the Provincial Governments. If this argument was sound, the consequence would be that not only the permanent employes of the Provincial Government but also the temporary employes of this Government should be excluded from this Parliament. The same principle applied in both cases. The hon. gentleman had laid down a general principle that no member must be influenced by this Government, or by any party outside of this House. That being so, there was no more reason to exclude from this Parliament members who might be influenced by the Local Governments than there was to exclude members who might be influenced by powerful corporations. It was well known that for years the attorney to the corporation of Montreal had sat in this House, as well as members of the council of Montreal. This corporation