suffrage, he contended, the hon. member for Cumberland was opposing the only system upon which a uniform franchise could be introduced.

There were fraudulent voters put upon the lists even now, but how much worse would the case be if the voters lists were in the hands of revising barristers appointed by the Government, as the hon. gentleman proposed. (*Hear, hear.*) Under such a system the Government, without being extremely unscrupulous, might manage affairs so as to ensure for themselves the gaining of many doubtful elections. Too many grades of qualification for the different elections in a constituency were not advisable, and tended to confuse the public mind. He commented upon the different classes of property which constituted a man's wealth in different portions of the Dominion, showing the difficulty and even impossibility of making the franchise uniform.

With regard to the ballot he said he had never been an ardent admirer of secret voting, and held that much might be said in favour of the open system. He repudiated the idea thrown out by the hon. member for Cumberland, however, that secret voting was cowardly or sneaking. If an elector had been influenced to make a promise to vote against his conscience, and had violated that promise under the cloak of the ballot, he considered that the least of two evils had been chosen. If it was cowardly to promise one way and vote another, it was still more cowardly to both promise and vote against conviction. If a man in voting must necessarily be false, it was better, at least, that he should not be false to himself. (*Hear, hear.*) The ballot did not compel a man to hide for whom he voted, but if a man did desire to give his vote secretly, he did not see that the law should be such as to compel him to make it known.

The franchise, notwithstanding arguments to the contrary, was a trust. It at least was not personal property, or else a man would have the right to sell it. If, then, it was not personal property, but was a trust, a man had a perfect right to exercise it in secret if he chose. He admitted it was a great public trust, but all the more reason why it should be exercised free from outside and undue influence and according to one's own judgment.

There were many reasons, in his opinion, for the retention of public nominations, and he contended that in Ontario, at least, they would practically be retained. He thought the Bill did not make sufficient provision against sham nominations, and in order to secure bona fide candidates, as far as possible, he declared himself in favour of Hon. Mr. Blake's suggestion that a deposit of money should be made. The hon. member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) objected to the reception of a vote which was claimed to have been recorded previously by personation on the ground that a bona fide voter might, in order to secure an additional vote for his own party, send someone to personate himself, and afterwards come up and record his own vote. In the majority of cases the elector who presented himself second would be the proper party, and in order to guard against the contingency suggested by the hon. member for Cardwell, it would be simply necessary to make him swear that he was a party to no such transaction. The difficulty was one which should be met and provided for.

He contended that the objection taken by the hon. member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) to the clause providing that bribery and corruption on the part of a candidate's friends, without his knowledge, should make his election void was not sustained by the letter of the Bill and he asserted that in such a case the candidate might offer himself for re-election. He thought it would be advisable to have some system of ballot by which a scrutiny would be made possible, and he was more in favour of the English plan than that proposed by the government. On the whole, however, he was well satisfied with the Bill, which was a vast improvement on the present state of things. (*Cheers.*)

Mr. PALMER said that while he could not agree with every proposition in the measure he was very much pleased with its general tendency, especially with the introduction of the ballot.

He was of opinion, with the hon. member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron), that as the Bill stood at present it was perfectly open, in point of the law, to elect anybody to this House—an alien, or even a lady, were it not for the 41st section of the British North America Act. He was opposed to the abolition of the property qualification, and thought that there were many reasons why nomination day should be retained. Both sides of a question were fairly discussed upon those occasions which was a very great public advantage. He did not see why, as each Province had the power to fix its own franchise, they should not make their own regulations as to property qualifications for members.

He was in favour of the enfranchisement of unmarried ladies possessed of the qualification which entitled a man to vote, but he did not see why married ladies should have the right of voting, as they were represented by their husbands. While he desired to see the franchise made uniform, he did not think it was possible. He entirely approved of the proposal to appoint the Returning officers by statute.

He thought the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) misconstrued the meaning of the Bill as to corrupt practices exercised by a candidate's friends, and contended that to be unseated upon that ground disqualified him from again being elected if he contested the seat. At any rate the clause should be made more clear upon this point. With these few exceptions, he thought the Bill in the main was in accordance with the views of the House and of the country.

Mr. LANGLOIS said he was in favour of the general principles of the Bill, but there were a few particulars to which he took exception. He pointed out that under the old law there was great inconvenience arising from sham nominations, and the crowds who attended, especially in cities, were generally made up of non-electors. The intention of the framers of the Bill was evidently to do away with that, but there was no power to preclude the public from congregating in the room where the nomination was made. The law should provide for that exclusion.

He also thought that the number of electors required to nominate a candidate should be limited to ten, and if that were not done, say, a hundred nominate the candidate, and let the nomination be receivable at the domicile of the Returning officer within a certain number of days. Either of these plans would prevent crowding at