

he had communicated with the Government in this regard.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman asked that the Bill be not read the third time, as he had an amendment which he wished to propose. I asked to see it, and I did see it. This was only the day before yesterday, and he announced his intention at any rate of moving it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said they had not been informed as to the character of the proposed amendment. The hon. gentleman ought not to have taken the House by surprise in this manner. He thought, as a matter of justice to the House, this resolution should be allowed to stand over till to-morrow, in order that it might be considered.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said, as the law stood in New Brunswick at present, a non-resident elector had to notify to the Sheriff, on some day previous to the 24th December preceding the election, that he desired to vote, not in the shiretown, but some other polling place. Now, he presumed that very few non-resident electors made a selection before the 24th December, and what the mover of the amendment proposed was that a voter should give notice to the sheriff in writing, before the nomination day, that he wished to vote at some place nearer where he resided, instead of going 90 or 100 miles off to the shiretown for the purpose of voting.

MR. KIRK said the Bill affected Nova Scotia as well as New Brunswick.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said if it was the case that the amendment affected the other Provinces, besides New Brunswick, that was an additional reason why time should be given for its consideration.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no doubt a good deal in what the hon. gentleman opposite said, but his strictures on the Government were out of place. The principle of the present law was to accept the local lists, and the House made the division themselves. Any interference would, of course, have to be avoided, but this amendment made no change.

MR. BURPEE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. member for Sunbury should allow his amendment to drop, and allow the Bill to pass. It was, after all, only a disturbing element brought in at the end of the Session.

MR. BURPEE (Sunbury) said he did not wish to embarrass the House, and he would withdraw his amendment. Perhaps it might be moved and fully discussed in the Senate, after which it could be brought back, when hon. gentlemen would have an opportunity of looking at it.

*Amendment withdrawn.*

MR. LANGEVIN said before the third reading was carried, he wished to record the opinion he expressed the other day to the Minister of Justice about the inconvenience that would be caused in districts where there were only one judge for three or four counties.

MR. TUPPER said he wished to take this opportunity of asking the hon. the Minister of Justice whether any consideration had been given to a point which he had previously raised. It did not come up strictly in connection with this Bill, but had reference rather to controverted elections. Practically, there was no Controverted Elections Act, and no check to bribery and corruption, or any of the questions dealt with at an election held just previous to the last Session of a Parliament. By an amendment which had been made in the Controverted Elections Act, no election could be controverted at a last sitting. But he would take the case of a first election, which was a much more important one. Suppose the writs of general election were issued and made returnable before the calling of Parliament, a new House could not practically be had, and the right of a member to sit there could not be questioned.

MR. LAFLAMME said when the amendment was introduced, it was with the consent of both sides of the House. The late Mr. Hillyard Cameron conferred with the ex-Minister of Justice and they both settled the point, which averted a great deal of inconvenience. If it had been otherwise, there was a possibility that after a general election