

have no doubt that the local government, the local legislature and the courts of Nova Scotia will afford all the remedy that is necessary.

Mr. KAULBACH. I cannot endorse the views of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) as to the certainty that the local government will adjust these matters.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, spoken.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). Perhaps the House will indulge me for a moment, as, perhaps, I may not be here when we are in committee and dealing with section 90 and subsequent sections—

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) has no intention of shutting off the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) from making his explanation.

Mr. BRITTON. I thought the discussion on that point was out of order, and so I wanted to bring the House back to the Bill under discussion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Britton) will allow me to make an observation on the question of order, I would just say that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) brought to the attention of this government what is notoriously true—the disgraceful conduct of the sheriff of Lunenburg—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has spoken, and I protest against his using—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member (Mr. Kaulbach) brought up that subject, and he has a right to do it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He has not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot admit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) has the right to do that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I will explain my point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to explain this point of order. What was the ground on which my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) had the right to draw the attention of this government to the conduct of the sheriff of Lunenburg? It is that the sheriff is the person appointed by this government as returning officer, and will be in a position to commit the same frightful frauds in a Dominion election. Nobody knows that better than the hon. Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has not stat-

ed his point of order, and I deny his right to be heard.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think there is any ground for impugning here the conduct of a sheriff in a provincial election and bringing in issues of that kind in this House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think, however, Mr. Speaker, that that was the point of order the Minister of Finance raised.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I objected to the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) making another speech, that is all.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made a speech in the middle of the hon. member for Lunenburg's (Mr. Kaulbach's) speech.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He had sat down.

Mr. KAULBACH. By way of explanation—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KAULBACH. I wish to explain. I say I had the right to bring this matter to the notice of the government—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KAULBACH. Because the sheriff of Lunenburg—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, chair, sit down.

Mr. BRITTON. The question was discussed a little while ago of the abnormal number of rejected ballots which appeared in the election of 1896. The question came up in my own election, because on the return of the poll, though Kingston is not a large constituency—the total number of votes being only in the neighborhood of 3,200 in the last election, if I recollect aright—it appeared that there were 215 rejected ballots and 23 (if I remember well) spoiled ballots. That naturally suggested the query why it was, that in an intelligent constituency like Kingston and with a comparatively small number of voters, there should be such a large number of rejected ballots; and the natural thing to do in order to discover if possible what was wrong, was to have a recount. I wish to say now, that the deputy returning officers in that city were all, so far as I know, local men, and I have not the slightest suspicion of any of them. Nor have I any suspicion in regard to the scrutineers. They were all men known to myself, and I am quite sure that those appointed by the opposite party only wanted to do what was fair and right, as did the scrutineers on our side. We were not up to the tricks that were alleged to have been perpetrated in other places; so far as I know, we knew nothing of that kind of thing in Kingston. But the question arose