

coming from the hon. gentleman; he has always been opposed to the independence of Parliament; he has always been anxious to have surrounding him, in and out of Parliament, hangers on and seekers after office under the Crown. From the moment he first took his seat in Parliament, he has persistently and consistently opposed every movement in the direction of making more stringent the Independence of Parliament Act; he has constantly and persistently advocated the policy of leaving in the hands of the Government the appointments to high places of trust under the Crown and of giving those places of trust to members of Parliament. I have a right to go further than that; I have a right to say, and I do say, that every change in the Independence of Parliament Act tending to restrict the power of the Government to appoint members of Parliament to office has been forced on the Government by the Liberal party. The only Independence of Parliament Acts that we have, that are worth being called so, are Acts which were forced through Parliament by the action of the Liberal party. In 1843, shortly after the Union, the first Independence of Parliament Act was passed by the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government, and provided that "all officers employed under the Crown receiving annual salaries or allowances should be disqualified" from sitting or voting in Parliament. This would disqualify the nominee or appointee, who had either salary or allowance, from sitting or voting in Parliament. This Act was continued down to 1855. In 1855, the hon. First Minister was in power, he was the ruling spirit in the Government, and he changed the Independence of Parliament Act. He found it too stringent, so he introduced the Act of 1855 which provided:

"That no person holding any office at the nomination of the Crown to which an annual salary, or any allowance, fees or emoluments, in lieu of an annual salary, are attached shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly."

The only disqualification was appointment to an office with a salary or something in lieu of an annual salary. That was a retrograde step; it was going back from the Act passed by the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government. In 1857, this was changed. True the hon. gentleman was in power, but he had fortified his Government by receiving into it Messrs. Spence, Cartier and J. C. Morrison, all of whom had been old Liberals, and the power of public opinion was so strong that he was compelled to pass a more stringent Independence of Parliament Act; and he, therefore, passed the Act 20 Vic., chap. 22, the 3rd section of which provides:

"That no person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, at the nomination of the Crown, to which an annual salary, or any fee, allowance, emolument or profit of any kind or amount whatever from the Crown is attached shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly."

That is the Act we have now; that is the Act which was passed in 1857 and continued in force down to 1868. In 1868, the hon. gentleman was again in power; he was sustained by an immense majority in this House; he had just come from the country triumphantly; he was intoxicated with the marvelous success which attended him in the Elections of 1867; he was surrounded by hungry hangers on, and placemen and office hunters, whom he could not feed with the crumbs which fell from his table, because the Act of 1857 was in force. But the hon. gentleman was equal to the occasion; he changed the Act of 1857, and introduced the Act of 1868, which provided:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, to which an annual salary, or any fee, allowance or emolument, in lieu of an annual salary from the Crown, is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote in the same during the time he holds such office, occupation or employment."

You know what the result of that was. Parliament, to a large extent, was filled with place hunters and placemen, and the evil culminated in the appointment of an hon. member to a position under the Government which he held for two years, in which time he drew \$14,000, besides his sessional allowance, and also sat in Parliament during all this time. Public sentiment became aroused to such an extent that hon. gentlemen opposite were compelled to take action. In 1871, the hon. member for West Durham made a motion on this question affirming the necessity of a more stringent law; that motion did not pass, but it had the effect of compelling the Government, during that Session, to introduce the Act we now have on the Statutes and which is practically the same Act as that of 1857. Let us see what the intention of Parliament was in passing this Act. Let us see why it was passed. We are told this acceptance of the High Commissionership is not a violation of the independence of Parliament because there is no salary attached to it; we are told that the Crown has a perfect right to avail itself of the services of members of Parliament so long as it does not give them an annual salary. Let us see what was said on that question when the Act was brought before the House in 1871. Mr. Blake moved:

"That in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient that any member of this House should be engaged in the service of the Government of Canada in any paid employment, such as that in respect of which the Hon. John Hamilton Grey, member for the city and county of St. John, in 1868, entered into the receipt of \$300 per month of the public monies."

That motion was voted down; but as a result of public opinion, a Bill was introduced into Parliament, on the discussion of which a good deal was said by some leading members supporting the then Government. The late Sir George Cartier made some observations on it, and Mr. Masson, now of the Senate, made the following observations:—

"He hoped to see the Independence of Parliament Act amended so as to prevent any member from receiving from the Government any emolument, whether yearly or otherwise. At the same time, he thought that the Government were not to be blamed because they did not contravene the Independence of Parliament Act in giving Colonel Grey a monthly salary."

There you will see what the hon. member was driving at—that the law should be made so stringent that the Government would not have it in their power to provide any member of Parliament with any office under the Crown. On the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, the late Sir George Cartier said:

"He would now announce that the Government, having considered the Independence of Parliament Act of 1868, had come to the conclusion to introduce a measure to re-establish the state of things that existed in the old Parliament of Canada in reference to the independence of members."

Under the law of 1857 and 1871 it is quite clear that no member of Parliament could be appointed to any position in the service of the Government, under the Crown, while he occupied a seat in Parliament. That was the condition of affairs until 1868, that condition of affairs was restored in 1871, when the Hon. Sir George Cartier introduced his Bill; and section 1 of the Bill of 1871 and section 1 of the Bill of 1878, which the hon. member proposes to amend, are the same. The hon. gentleman is now proposing to amend the Bill of 1871, because the Bills of 1871 and 1878 are identical. In introducing this Bill Sir George Cartier said:

"He explained that the principal provision of the Bill was to restore the independence of members as it was under the *regime* of the old Parliament of Canada, viz.: that the Government could not employ annually, monthly or temporarily, or at all, any member having a seat in this House."

That is just what the hon. gentleman is violating, that is the ground upon which Sir George Cartier introduced the Bill, that is the promise he made to Parliament, that is his interpretation of the provisions of the Bill; yet we are told now the Government have a perfect right to nominate any member of this House to a position under the Crown, so long as