

and so on. For these reasons, they say: "We are quite willing that these lists should be submitted to the county judge."

Now, we have all got to the point that the lists should be submitted to the county judge for revision; and I have pointed out, as clearly as I am able, the reasons why in my judgment and belief there would be no extra expense put upon either party by reason of his being the appellant to the county judge.

Now let us see what will happen before the enumerator. Honourable gentlemen have with one voice averred that there are very few, if any, inaccuracies in these lists, and have called in evidence the fact that year after year few, if any, objections have been taken to these lists. If that is true, then, when the matter comes before the enumerator, he is bound to take evidence, and he is sworn to perform his duty, and he has before him the fact that the case is appealable to the county judge. Both sides are represented before him. Is it conceivable that a man, knowing that the county judge will sit in appeal over him, will strike off wholesale names from that list?

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: He can do it.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUTON: Oh, he has the right, and so has the county judge. It is a matter of indifference to me which contention succeeds in this. I am only trying now to explain the matter as it strikes me, and not to express any opinion on it. My honourable friend says that when the lists come before the enumerator, it is left open to the Government to stuff them. Well, if you have men brazen enough, in broad daylight, in violation of their oath, with both sides represented, with an appeal to the county judge, open to stuff the lists, then you are better—or worse—politicians even than Sam Slick said you were. But, from what I have been told by honourable gentlemen on the other side, I do not believe that when these lists come before the enumerator he will strike off more than 10 or 20 names, or add more than 10 or 20.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: He might add a hundred.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUTON: He might add a hundred; he might add a thousand.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Without notice.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUTON: No, no—as I understand it. If it is not so pro-

vided, it should be provided, that he should not have power to add any names except in the presence of both sides and after hearing evidence from both sides. That is the way I read it.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: That is not provided in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUTON: If it is not provided for, I agree that it is improper that it is not. It should be. I say that the enumerator should sit in open court, that both sides should be represented, that either side should give evidence, and that he should give judgment on the facts, and if he does not give that judgment on the facts, he is a disgraced man. If the enumerator is put in the position of a judicial officer and changes the list only on evidence and in the presence of both sides, there will be, in my opinion, no appeal from him in nine cases out of ten. You must necessarily go before the enumerator when you apply to strike off the alien vote; or when you apply to add the women's vote; and, according to the memorandum, you could then have to go to the county judge and have yourselves put to four or five days' trouble, when you could settle the whole thing before the enumerator and in nine cases out of ten there would be no appeal to the county judge. To my mind the present amendment cuts down the trouble for the candidates and their friends by one-half. To my mind this reduces the expense. To my mind it is absolutely fair. To my mind this machinery is more desirable than the other. The only objection to it is the assumption that the enumerator will act as a felon and not discharge his duty.

I have heard members from Nova Scotia on this side of the House and in the House of Commons say: "So far as I am concerned, I am willing that any barrister in the province of Nova Scotia should be appointed by the judge as revising officer; I am not in the least concerned what his politics are." I think that the members on the other side of the House have equal confidence in the integrity of a member of the legal profession when acting in a judicial capacity. So if men are to be selected as enumerators in Nova Scotia who are respectable men—and I have not noticed in any election, provincial or Dominion, any quarrel as to the selection of the returning officers, who have far more power, or of the deputy returning officers—I cannot see, unless we are going to stickle on a question of principle quite irrespective of whether or not