

taken no matter how wrongfully he may have got on that list. On the other hand, no matter how much entitled a man may have been to be on that list, if through the machinations of some of the officers his name is left off, there is no remedy to which he can resort. If this Bill, speaking for the British Columbia franchise, should become law, the voter finds that his name is not on the list, then he may appeal to the county court judge, and from the county court judge he has a further recourse to a Judge of the Supreme Court. That gives him the fullest and most ample remedy if his name has been left off the list, either intentionally or otherwise. The fact that under the old law there was such arbitrary power placed in the hands of any official—whether he used that power arbitrarily or not—is sufficient to condemn the law. I say that any Act, I care not by what name you call it or by what party it is introduced, which includes provisions so pernicious as the provisions of the existing law are admitted to be by both sides, should not be tolerated in a constitutionally governed country. To the extent even that the present Bill eliminates those pernicious provisions, it is infinitely better than the existing law. I simply rose to refer to section 7 which I consider to be the main point in reference to this Bill, and for my own part I should like to have heard of hon. gentlemen on the other side who have attacked the measure state their reasons against the principles involved in it. If this Bill is so objectionable as gentlemen opposite contend—and I have no doubt they are honourable and intelligent men and actuated by the best motives—surely they should have given some reasons for their objections. I am free to admit, that I am open to conviction, and I would be the very last man to vote for this Bill if it is all that hon. gentlemen opposite have said that it is. However, I shall not take their ipsi dixit for that. I expected that men who have the confidence of their respective constituencies, sufficiently to send them to this House, would have discussed a matter of such great importance as this, in an intelligent manner, and given the reasons for their opposition. With one exception, not a single member on the other side of the House has given us his grounds for his objection to this Bill. To that extent they are culpable and reprehensible for uselessly taking up the time of this House and of the country. I believe that the country, and the Government, and the House want an intelligent discussion on this question. I am a new member of this House, and it is inexplicable to me how an hon. gentleman like the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), could rise ostensibly to discuss the Franchise Act, and then direct all his remarks to extraneous matters, the discussion of which is entirely premature. It is inexplicable to me, how an hon.

gentleman like the ex-Finance Minister, should resort to what I deem an anomalous practice in the rules of debate in this House, and avail himself of the artifices which are at the disposal of any hon. member who chooses to use them. If hon. gentlemen opposite are in earnest in condemning this Bill, they should give us some reasons why it should be condemned. I am afraid, however, that if the debate continues in the same line as it has since it opened, we shall have a discussion on extraneous matters, such as the tariff, and the Superannuation Bill, measures not now before the House, and that no light will be thrown upon the principles of this Franchise Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 14th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian Securities Company of Montreal.—(Mr. Madore.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Niagara and Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to the next order of business, I rise pursuant to a statement that I made last night that to-day I would make a personal explanation in reply to a certain charge that was alluded to by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) last evening.

If necessary to keep myself in order, I will conclude my statement with a motion. The statement referred to by the hon. gentleman last evening, as I understood him, was con-