

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the date of that article?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. April 15th, 1897. And as I have said, it is a paper that certainly is no supporter of hon. gentlemen on this side. I might call attention to another opinion. I have not the paper under my hand, but I have a reference to it, and that will take less time. The "Globe," on the franchise, on May 14th or May 20th, 1896, said:

The qualification of electors cannot be left to the provinces.

Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman will listen either to his own friends or to the dictates of justice, and will be disposed to do that which is fair between man and man and party and party, I think we will be able to get along and he will save a great deal of time. I think we would then be able to remove all the objections to the old law and arrive at a franchise that will be regarded as a fair and just franchise, which will protect the rights of electors all over Canada.

Before I sit down I intend to make just one general reference to some observations made by the hon. Minister of Finance. I cannot understand that hon. gentleman. He got up the other night, at the close of the debate, after I had spoken just before the question was put, and made a number of statements to the House on what he regarded, I have no doubt, as matters of fact. Well, he has found out that his statements were not statements of fact. He found out that he was altogether wrong, and to-night he admitted that he had been altogether wrong in the controversy I had with him on that subject. But he still claims that he was not wholly wrong. I would just say to him that he must not hope in this House, by vehemence of statement, to prevent people understanding facts when they are established beyond controversy. The hon. gentleman, with great warmth, when my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) read the law and showed that he was altogether wrong and that under the laws of Nova Scotia these officials, who had been disfranchised, could not be on the lists, his answer was: Oh, I saw them on the lists. But I must say to my hon. friend that vehemence of statement is worthless.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the face of absolute proof made by my hon. friend from Richmond, I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would have done better if he had simply said: Well, I find that I was mistaken.

The following persons, if of the full age of 21 years—

—this is the present law of Nova Scotia—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

—of the full age of 21 years, and subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified by any section of this Act—

Mark, this Act contains that disqualification, the Act which you have on the last page of this Bill, under which a large number of officials are disqualified—

—and not disqualified by any section of this Act, or otherwise by law prevented from voting, shall be entitled to have their names entered on the lists.

Now, can the English language furnish proof more conclusive of the fact that the names were not allowed to be entered on the lists than the law declaring that only those could have their names on the voters' lists who were free of any disqualification by this Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let us go back to the Indian.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will come back to the Indian.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman the same question that I was desirous of asking the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies). The revisers make up their lists some time in April or May. Now, by what possible divination or inspiration can they know who will or will not be disqualified from voting in an election which may not take place for two or three years, seeing that there is no disqualification in the Nova Scotia statutes of Dominion officials as such, but only a disqualification of persons who, within a certain fixed and limited period receive Dominion money as officials of the various departments? How, then, can a reviser undertake to leave a Dominion official off the list when he is revising, simply because he imagines that probably, two or three years hence, when an election is on, that Dominion official may be disqualified? I think it was the discovery of that impossibility that led to the repeal, in 1885, of the provision that these officials should be struck off the lists, and my apprehension of the matter is there has never been any attempt on the part of the reviser to leave Dominion officials off the lists, because they were not disqualified and disentitled to vote as Dominion officials pure and simple, but only if they continued to be in the employ of the Dominion within 30 days, or, as amended 15 days, of the time of an election. The provision which authorized and instructed the revisers to strike the names off the list was repealed by the repealing clauses of the statute of 1885, and since then there has been no power in the revisers to leave off the names of Dominion officials, and I am certain, as a matter of fact, they never were left off, except in such cases as that