

agrees to their third amendment to the Bill (No. 14) intitled: 'An Act further securing the Independence of Parliament,' and disagrees to the first and second of their amendments, for the following reasons:—

"Because the independence of this House (which it is the object of the first clause amended to secure) might be impaired if persons entitled to superannuation or retiring allowances were eligible for seats in this House, as some of such recipients might be called into active service by the Administration of the day under the penalty of abandoning their pensions or allowances.

"Because it might lead to the superannuation of civil servants in order to make them eligible for election to this House whereby the public service would be injured and the independence of the House affected.

"Because another class, viz., judges, are entitled to retiring allowances only when suffering from bodily or mental infirmity, disabling them from work or are retired under the discretionary power of the Government for reasons alleged to affect the administration of justice. It would therefore tend to affect the independence of the Bench as well as interfere with the independence of this House.

"As to the second amendment:—

"Because it is contrary to sound policy to allow the Clerks of the Peace, who are in several Provinces the custodians of the lists of voters which must be used at the elections of members of the House of Commons, to become candidates.

"Ordered, That the Clerk do carry the said Message to the Senate.

"Attest.

"ALFRED PATRICK,

"Clerk of the Commons."

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The subject was very fully discussed when the Bill was before this House, and when the Senate undertook to make very serious changes in the clause relating to the qualifications of members of this House. The clause affecting members of the other House was very much more stringent than the one affecting Senators. The House of Commons have accepted the terms upon which a Senator shall be disqualified; but they decline to accept the amendment made by the Senate to the clause affecting members of the other House. I think they furnish very substantial reasons for their refusal to concur in the amendment made to the Bill in this House. It seems to me as they have acted with such courtesy to this body, it would be but right for the Senate to recede from the amendment to which the Commons object. I simply make the

*Hon. Mr. Scott.*

appeal to the House as to whether it would not be in better taste and better feeling to accept the conditions which the House of Commons seek to impose on candidates for seats in that Chamber. I therefore move that this House does not insist on the first amendment to which the Commons disagree.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It is very satisfactory in this case that there is no dispute as to the question of jurisdiction. The message does not contend for a moment that this House is not quite as competent to legislate upon this subject as the House of Commons. I do not think any question of courtesy arises. Both Houses are actuated by a desire to do the best they can in the interests of the public service. The fact that the proposed amendments affect the House of Commons does not interfere with our duty to decide on the possibility that we are right and they are wrong. The reasons which are given in this message do not strike me to be very strong. The Secretary of State seems to think they are. The first reason given is that the recipients of pensions are liable to be recalled by the Administration of the day, under the penalty of abandoning their pensions or allowances. That pre-supposes the Administration of the day would interfere unjustly, and contrary to their duty, with the members of one branch of the Legislature. It pre-supposes an act which would be wrong in itself, and which would be a complete dereliction of duty on the part of the Ministers of the Crown who might so interfere. I cannot imagine, if it should so happen that a person entitled to a pension were to serve in the House of Commons, that his independence there would be attacked by the Ministry of the day, by an attempt to recall him to the public service. Neither this House, nor the other branch of the Legislature should pre-suppose such a wrong doing on the part of the advisers of the Crown. I regret that such a reason has been given in the Message from the House of Commons; but the circumstances are so remote, it is almost out of the question that they can ever arise. A person in the enjoyment of a pension can only be recalled if he be under sixty, and if tendered an office not less in importance and pay than the one which he had for-