

ing this question, surely Government had no right to complain, seeing they had not a single measure ready. The question before the House was an exceedingly important one. If he had any doubts of its propriety before, these doubts were dispelled by the arguments of the gentlemen who opposed this Bill. It was very comfortable to members of the Government to combine—as had been done during the last elections the influence of the Ministers of the Dominion and the Local Governments in order to secure a large majority in their favour; and he was not at all surprised to see Ministers of both Governments anxious to sustain the advantages of that position. The present system gave undue influence to the government of the day over members of the House. He held that the people were in favour of this measure, though in some individual localities they had elected the same members to both Houses, under those combined influences to which he had referred. The interests of the two governments might clash; in that case the interests of the whole Dominion should be first consulted. But those gentlemen elected to represent both interests came to this House as interested parties. Not only were the people of Ontario and Quebec in favour of this measure, but the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had enacted in their Legislature that members of Local Legislatures should not be qualified to sit in the Commons. Gentlemen opposite had stated that this measure would infringe the rights of the people in not allowing them to choose certain men to represent them. Why, they were doing that every day. Judges and other officers were not allowed to be elected to Parliament, though they might be the choice of the people. He believed the Bill was a good one, and he would support it.

Mr. Young thought the argument of the member of Hochelaga well timed indeed. The House had now been in session three weeks, and very little had yet been done. The result would be that at the end of the session everybody being anxious to get home important measures would be pushed through without receiving that attention which they desired, and which should be bestowed upon them by the House. He argued against the doctrine advanced by the member for Missisquoi, and held that, to a certain extent, members of the Local Governments in this House were dependent upon the Government of the Dominion. He commented on the fact that since the opening of Parliament those members who held seats in Governments of

[Mr. Dorion (Hochelaga)]

Provinces had been silent upon various subjects that had come before the House. He thought this showed they occupied a position of dependency upon the Government of the Dominion, that they were subordinate to it, and that they themselves were conscious they were not free to act independently, according to the dictates of their judgment and the interests of their constituents. Suppose the Premier of Ontario should, as a member of this House, take a stand on any question in opposition to the Premier of the Dominion, was it not likely that Conservative members in the Ontario Legislature would withdraw their support from him? In the same way, if the Premier of Quebec should place himself in an attitude of hostility to the Minister of Militia in this House, would not the friends of the latter array themselves against the Government of that Province? He thought this afforded a powerful argument why this Bill should be pushed by the House. Then there was a great practical inconvenience in having gentlemen occupying seats in both Houses, because it then became impossible for both Houses to meet at the same time without injury to the business of one of them. He thought the principle a sound one that no man could serve two masters—that one could not serve both God and Mammon. Questions would be continually arising, in regard to which it would be impossible for a member sitting in both Houses to discharge his duty faithfully and honestly to both. If he did his duty to one, it must be at the expense of the other. For these reasons he supported the Bill, which he found was favoured by journals of all shades of political opinion, and he believed, by the people of the country generally.

Hon. Mr. Holton said the case cited by the Minister of Justice, of Lord Castlereagh and Grattan, who held seats in the British as well as the Irish House of Commons, afforded no analogy, because Ireland at that time was entirely separated, as far as legislation was concerned, from Great Britain, and had no representation in the Parliament of the Empire. In this case, on the contrary, we had gentlemen sitting for the same constituency in both the general and Local Parliaments.

Sir J. A. Macdonald held that the principle was the same in both cases. He argued that the Bill was *ultra vires*, because the House had no power to change the qualifications of senators or add to their disqualifications, which it was proposed to do in this measure.