

secret one. On the other hand, the whole of the legislation by the Dominion Parliament had been to endeavour to make the ballot secret. The system of the ballot was a harmless one, but it was unnecessary, especially in the present Bill, and it would never be carried into effect.

MR. TUPPER: Before we pass from Schedule C, I may say, I suppose, that the real object of this mode of action, which is somewhat new and which is not in our Election Law, is to provide against a ballot being taken out, and yet it is not carried so far as to provide means of identification as to the party by whom the vote was given. Under the Ontario law, as I understand it, every ballot is so marked that it can ultimately be discovered by scrutiny by whom the vote was cast in each case; but that is not our law.

MR. MILLS: The main object is to prevent an improper ballot paper being deposited in the ballot box. The initials of the returning officer are placed on the ballot paper, and, therefore, he knows that it is the genuine paper which he has given to the voter so that the ballot box cannot be stuffed.

MR. TUPPER: In fact, the voter cannot put in any paper other than the ballot handed him by the officer.

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. TUPPER: I would like to ask the hon. the First Minister whether it is proposed to amend the Ballot Act for the House of Commons in some such mode as this, by which the same fraud on the ballot, which obviously can take place without some such protection, would be entirely prevented.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, we have been considering some such amendment.

MR. PLUMB: Will this Bill be translated into language that these people understand.

MR. MILLS: Undoubtedly that can be done.

MR. MACKENZIE: The Council can do that or not, as they please. They can take care of themselves.

Section agreed to.

MR. PLUMB.

On the motion to report the Bill,

MR. MITCHELL said the Bill was one of such an extraordinary character that it should not be allowed to pass without a protest being made. While its details were being described, he had not raised a single objection which would impair its efficiency or prevent its becoming as efficient a law as possible. No one on either side of the House could say that he had in any way attempted to limit the judgment of hon. gentlemen in their action in relation to the Bill, and he therefore felt that the insinuation thrown out by the hon. the First Minister was quite unwarranted and uncalled for. He wished publicly to disclaim any desire to protract the business of the House, but he did feel it his duty as a representative of the people, when a measure of such an extraordinary character was applied to a section of the country, to show that it was not wanted. The district for which this legislation was intended comprised, he was informed, about 1,500 souls altogether, of whom something like 80 were voters. Now, if such a piece of machinery was proposed to be introduced into the city of London, would not the utmost consideration and the gravest deliberation be given to it by the most careful lawyers? If it was offered to Montreal, Halifax, Toronto, St. John, Quebec or Hamilton, would it, he asked the House and the country, be adopted? He must say that the attempt of the Government to place a measure of that kind at work for 1,500 ignorant Icelanders, who had never had the opportunity of understanding the administration of municipal affairs or exercising the powers to be vested in them, was the most preposterous piece of legislation which had ever been submitted during his experience as a public man. Let anyone consider what this legislation would cost and look at what the working of the Bill would involve. He was told there was only one English-speaking man in the district. How, then, were these people to learn the language? Was the Bill to be translated into Icelandic? Were the people to have tutors to teach them, or were men to be sent from Ontario and Quebec for that purpose? He pre-