

ments which he felt it necessary to refer to before this matter was finally settled. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to refute the argument which he (Mr. Mitchell) advanced, that such cases should be tried in Courts of law, by saying that Judges as well as arbitrators were appointed by the Government. But there was not the slightest parallel between the cases; for, while Judges held their offices for life, and could only be removed by the Imperial Parliament, arbitrators could be displaced by the mere whim of the Government in office. For the time being, these arbitrators were the mere creatures of the Administration, and no assurance could be given that their awards would be strictly impartial, as far as the Government was concerned. The hon. the First Minister had also tried to throw suspicion on the claims which came from his (Mr. Mitchell's) county during his administration. Now he challenged the hon. the First Minister to prove that any one of these was a bogus claim. Seven of these were sworn to, and the hon. gentleman had certainly no right to make such insinuations. Before the motion was put, he wished to give notice that he would move an amendment to the Bill, giving to the persons who were suffering from the misconduct of officials, and the mismanagement and mal-administration of Public Works the right of remedy in the Courts of law.

Bill, as amended, *ordered* to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

#### INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

[BILL No. 14.]

(Mr. Laflamme.)

#### CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1

Mr. LAFLAMME moved an amendment to include within the operations of the clause only those who were

permanently employed by the Governments of the Provinces.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the amendment would simply have the effect of enabling a few lawyers to get fees while everybody else employed by a Provincial Government would be excluded. The proposed amendment was entirely opposed to the spirit and principle of the Act, which was simply intended to protect the House and persons dependent on the general Government. It was an attempt to exclude persons from being members of Parliament who were otherwise properly qualified. Why should the clerk, who acted as a legal adviser, the treasurer, or any corporation officers who received salaries be admitted, and the employes of the Province of Quebec be excluded?

MR. MACKENZIE: To what corporations do you refer.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Montreal or Toronto. The officers of the Government of Quebec or any Province were just as free to act in this House and as free from the influence of the Dominion Government as any member of Parliament. The salaries of provincial officers could not be affected by their connection with the Dominion Parliament and why then should they be excluded? Then, as regarded the part of the amendment which referred to permanent employment, he would like to know whether a person who was employed for a year or two years, as the case might be, could be considered as having a permanent appointment. The very fact of its being for a specified time showed that it was temporary, and unless an appointment was one for life no Court would consider it anything but temporary. The Parliament had no right to limit the choice of the people.

MR. LAFLAMME said that, in his opinion, there was just as good reason for excluding an officer of a Local Government as of the Federal Government. A man was just as much in dependence on the Crown under a Local Government as under the Federal Government, and if he did his duty to the former his time and attention would be fully occupied; besides, the