

that her experience, as regards illegitimate expenditure, for which the ballot was thought by the Minister of Agriculture a remedy, was the same as that of the other Provinces. In the United States the ballot had certainly not diminished this expenditure. (Hear, hear.) He disliked making it imperative upon the people to conceal what they were about to do. There was, to his mind, something unpleasant in it. A man did not like to pursue such a course, nor to impose it on others. There was something sneaking in putting in a ballot. It was not the straightforward, manly way in which one would desire to perform any action.

Hon. Mr. LEFELLIER—Why was it followed in voting in large companies and similar bodies?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the motive was different in club and similar elections. This mode was followed among a small circle of gentlemen for the purpose of preserving quiet and harmony. That was very different from performing a public duty. There was nothing analogous in the cases. He did not see there was any occasion in the social position of the electors to render this concealment necessary. The bill to a certain extent was open to objection. He noticed, moreover, as a defect, an exception in the case of Prince Edward Island, which has not for the present to possess the franchise extended to the other parts of the Dominion. He was content to see the bill tried, to ascertain how it would work. (Hear, hear.) He agreed with his hon. friend, it was not desirable for this House to interfere with a bill of this kind, respecting elections to the House of Commons. We should offer our criticism upon it, but unless it interfered with some principle of real value, in our judgment, we should not propose alterations, for they would be received very jealously in the other House. Notwithstanding, hon gentlemen might hear his hon. friend (Mr. Bellerose) on the motion he had put on the paper, with respect to the qualification of candidates. He again called attention to the departure from the general rule of the bill in the case of the elections of Prince Edward Island. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND fully endorsed the sentiment of the last speaker that this was not a bill with regard to which it would be right for this chamber to obstruct the legislation of the other House; but, at the same time, when they saw any glaring errors or inconsistencies in a bill, they were justified in pointing them out. This Upper House had the privilege of

criticising, improving, and if possible, amending a bill in its details. He agreed with many of the principles laid down in this Bill. They had had simultaneous polling in Prince Edward Island for twenty-four years, and their elections were over in one day, and the system had worked satisfactorily. He thought it unnecessary in a young country like this to have a property qualification for members of the House of Commons. He thought that as long as a man was honest and had capacity for public business it was of little consequence as to the amount of his credit at the bank, or the value of the real estate he might possess. (Hear, hear.) The only thing he felt sore upon in this Bill was the provision with reference to the franchise. He thought that there should be a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion. This Bill would rob a third of the electors of Prince Edward Island of their votes. They had had universal suffrage in Prince Edward Island for twenty years, and it had given so much satisfaction that if a man got upon the platform there and advocated a retrograde movement to a property qualification for electors, he would not get twenty voters in the Province. He replied to objections to the same treatment for Prince Edward Island as the other provinces had received, saying as to a register of votes, there was none for the Legislative Council either. Why not leave the necessary assertion or proof of qualification to the oath of the voter for the Assembly as well as for the Council? The Government rather than disfranchise any electors, should have gone out of their way to provide the means of registration with a view to the qualification of all who had a just claim. He would move to strike out the 42nd Clause when the House went into Committee. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Dr. CARRALL argued this House had power to deal with this measure, and said he never had other belief than that putting in a ballot was voting in a sneaking way, and he might set the example of the States against that of England in the argument on this subject. British Columbia had not had time to test the matter thoroughly, while Nova Scotia had eliminated the Ballot Act from her statutes. He did not approve of the suffrage clauses, and argued it was competent for the present Government to have made the franchise sufficiently elastic to suit the whole country. [Hear, hear.] He also differed with the Government as to the qualification for candidates, on finding the bill did not provide for a residuary real