hearty approval and support. He would, however, make some suggestions with reference to the wording of some clauses when in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron South) congratulated the Minister of Justice on the extraordinary success this measure had met with. It had been generally approved of, though some of the details might require amendment. He was entirely opposed to the abolition of the property qualification. By this Bill a candidate might be in a worse position than the elector, and to be logical the Bill should provide for manhood suffrage. He was in favour of retaining public nominations, where people could hear both sides. He supported the proposal to adopt the voters lists in the several Provinces, but hoped the oaths used in connection with the lists would also be adopted. He criticised some minor details of the measure, and stated he was not greatly enamoured of the ballot, but if it prevented intimidation he should be satisfied. He expressed regret at the absence of any provision for scrutinizing, and wished that a clause should be introduced to compel men to vote.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD said public nominations did not prevent sham nominations, and therefore he could not see how the Bill could be objected to on that ground. The people were able to hear public affairs discussed on occasions other than those of nominations. He did not see how personation could be entirely prevented if voting was perfectly secret. The clause, however, limiting the number of voters at each polling place to three hundred would obviate the difficulty to a great extent. On the subject of cumulative voting, it was simply a theory which he thought it undesirable to introduce into the politics of Canada. The only way in which it could possibly succeed would be to group several counties together.

Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD differed in regard to doing away with public nominations. It was said by the hon. gentleman that public nominations did not dispense with sham nominations, but many of the most eminent men in England had commenced with only a few voices. If they had no public nominations he feared in future there would be no returns without contents. Few men were willing to come forward on the hustings unless they were sincerely and really anxious to be returned. Should, however, there be no nomination in public, there would be no difficulty in getting men for the sake of the prestige of being brought out having the requisite number of names attached to papers in their favour. A man proposed by ten of his neighbours attaching their names to a paper would say in case of failure that the act was none of his, but if perchance he succeeded, he took his seat as a representative.

He denied that as a general rule nominations in public were attended by violence. In this country, especially in the rural parts, there were present more electors than non-electors at nominations. In England the loss of a day was a matter of consequence to the people, but here people were not as much pressed, and if they had more holidays than they have, it would be better for them. In England the cost of the contest was a burden which fell, not on the country, but on the candidates; but in the general law of Canada this was impossible. There were various interests which desired a contest, particularly the inn keeping and cab driving, and all the clauses of the Bill designed to prevent the operation of those interests at elections would not secure the desired effect.

He held to the same opinion he had always held, that there should be a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion—not universal in the sense of a cast iron rule, but so as to bring in all of a similar class. Some hon. gentlemen were in favour of manhood suffrage, but he believed in a property qualification for a vote; he did not believe in giving people who had no property the right to tax others who had property. He believed in the widest extension of the franchise consistent with the principle that no one should have a voice in the government of the country except those who were interested in the good government of the country.

The difference between Canada and the United States was that here, instead of a union of sovereign States, each reserving its own rights, we were one body politic, each Province only a municipality having large municipal rights; but Congress had always asserted its right to define the franchise when the State Legislatures failed to do so. The three kingdoms forming the United Kingdom had been separate States, and the right of each had to a certain extent to be retained. There, however, legislation was constantly tending to assimilate the laws of the three countries. He pointed out the long intervals of time that elapsed in England between great constitutional changes, and urged that the result of this measure would be that constant agitation and change would take place.

It was highly important the Local legislatures, in arranging the mode of representation, should have a single eye to their own affairs. This Bill would force them to attend to representation in this House, and this Parliament would abnegate its functions in this respect. If, however, they were giving this matter to the Local Legislature they ought to adopt the local franchise of a certain date, and prevent the constant change which would otherwise result. He believed the franchise proposed in the last bill which he had brought down had been quite liberal enough to include all those classes which were really entitled to vote. He felt last year that when the ballot was adopted in England it was a foregone conclusion that it would be adopted here also; and he thus accounted for his having incorporated the principle in his own election Bill.

He was in favour, however, of such a system as would afford the opportunity of a scrutiny, and he hoped the Minister of Justice would so alter this portion of the bill in order to secure this advantage. He gave the Minister of Justice great credit for the care he had bestowed upon the Bill, but he assured him he would receive far more if he were willing to accept such amendments in detail as would suggest themselves to him as proper, come the suggestion from what source it might.

He would only most unwillingly change the property qualification. He believed that the vast majority of the members of this House had a property qualification, and if there were one or two who had not that qualification, it was confined to those few; but this trifling exception, if it existed, could not be used as an argument against property qualification. In England, where the property qualification had been abolished, it was different. There they were in the habit of electing men possessed of property, and