

lated, and probably intended to soothe, pacify, please and gratify, and to have some effect on the person tempted in future sessions of Parliament. He quite acknowledged this was a matter which the House was obliged to treat with a very considerable degree of delicacy, though they had an undoubted right to deal with it as with other measures that came before them. He, for one, could only regret that he could not vote for the bill. Had it been a measure solely to affect persons whose cases had been disposed of, or who had been found by the House of Commons guilty of breaches of the Independence of Parliament Act, or who had admitted they had violated the law inadvertently, then he was sure the House would step in and exonerate them from the penalties. But that was not the case presented by the Government. In many instances they had intentionally tempted members to violate the Act, for the purpose of attuning them to Government measures. Was it not singular that thirty or forty members of the other House should be guilty of contravening the Independence of Parliament Act? He did not remember anything of the kind in connection with the late Administration, which was charged with being culpable of everything that was wrong. It was a serious matter to remove, in this manner, the penalties provided to deter members from violating the Independence of Parliament Act. There was another strong feature in this case. If this bill should pass, it would remove anything like legislative control, and the Government, having a majority in the House of Commons, could control the seats of members.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—They are still liable to penalties if they sit next session.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the whole control for the present would be taken away from Parliament and left in the hands of the House of Commons. True, it would not affect them next session, and so far it was not so bad as might have been expected, but really, after all the professions of purity, it was extraordinary the Gov't should have tempted thirty or forty members of the other House to violate the Independence of Parliament Act, and that they should now bring in this measure to whitewash them. Anxious as he was to do anything reasonable in the matter, he was unable to support the Government in whitewashing all those gentlemen.

Hon. Mr. FLINT said although this was a peculiar bill, he would vote for it. If the object was to enable the Government to seat their friends and unseat their opponents, let them do so, and they would the sooner

be turned out of power. No doubt some of the members affected by this bill had erred wilfully, but he thought it better that two or three such men should escape merited punishment than that a number who had contravened the act without corrupt intent should suffer such a severe penalty.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said he felt constrained to vote against this bill. He thought the law was too severe and that the penalty should be proportioned to the gravity of the offence; yet he could not vote for the measure before the House, because it would establish a dangerous precedent.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL concurred in a great many of the remarks made by honorable gentlemen in opposition to this bill, but he did not feel that he could record his vote against it, especially as it merely removed the penalty up to the present time. There were some defects in the bill, but none so serious as to incline him to reject it, and it was too late in the session to move an amendment.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD thought the bill should be confined to members who had resigned their seats in consequence of having committed a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, or who had been unseated by a vote of the House of Commons. There were two reasons why he would vote for the measure—one, that a majority of those whose seats were endangered had violated the act unintentionally; the other, that the penalty was altogether too severe. He was all the more disposed to support it, because it merely applied to the past.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said he was very much of the same opinion as the honorable Senator (Mr. Botsford.) The Independence of Parliament Act was so stringent that it applied to every member holding stock in a bank or incorporated company holding a contract with the Government.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—I quite agree with you.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT thought the penalty was so enormous that the Senate should help those who had incurred it out of their difficulty.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE said this bill was liable to a great deal of misconception. It was not intended to whitewash members of Parliament, but merely to relieve them of penalties they might possibly have incurred, and which were admitted to be excessive. It was impossible to believe that gentlemen could be influenced by such trifling transactions as had been laid to the charge of many who would be affected by this bill. He would support the measure, and he confessed he would