

us of disloyalty or want of patriotism. I say, speaking at least for the members representing the province from which I come, that such an assertion is a calumny. While I admit that those who oppose us are entitled to consideration, I hope that they will respect equally the position which we are obliged to assume, and that they will refrain from impugning our motives. We are told by those who support the Bill that we have no good reason for our opposition to the measure—at least, in the debate yesterday one hon. gentleman stated that he had heard up to that time not one single reason to justify opposition to the measure. Will those hon. gentlemen repeat that statement? If there is no ground for our opposition to the Bill, why is it that several hon. members, who have been life-long and consistent Conservatives, find themselves forced to range themselves with the Liberal party on this important question? It must, indeed, be an obnoxious measure which leads to such a result. I therefore feel bound to tell these hon. gentlemen that we, on our side, have yet to learn of any necessity for establishing a uniform franchise for the Dominion, the tendency of which would be to lead to a legislative union. The Government are trying to bring about legislative union, while we, on the other hand, desire to maintain the privileges which we enjoy under the constitution. Under the Confederation Act, the Government possess the right of legislating in this direction of a uniform franchise, but for eighteen years they have hesitated to introduce the system. They tell us that they wish to imitate the English franchise, that this measure is based on the English system. They seem to forget that there is no analogy between the circumstances of the two countries. In England there is no federal pact as we have here. They possess a legislative union; ours is a federal union. The two systems are different. The hon. member from DeSalaberry argued with great force yesterday that we have a great many tribunals already, and that this change will tend to increase the number, to create confusion and give rise to public discontent. We are told that the main reason for introducing this measure is because of the hostile legislation of some of the local legislatures. The Bill

was conceived in a spirit of retaliation and not with a view to doing justice. I hope, however, that in this honorable House the minority will not have to look in vain for justice. One source of difficulty which is likely to arise under this Bill is the possibility of partiality on the part of the revising barrister. Another great objection to this Bill is the cost which it will entail, not only on the country, but on those who may find it necessary to appeal from the decision of the revising barrister. The hon. gentleman from Niagara says that the expense will be trifling, but he must bear in mind, that under any circumstances the appellant, whether he succeeds or not, will have to pay the costs of solicitors, witnesses, bailiffs, clerks &c. The only man who will have no such expense to bear will be the revising barrister; he will be free from any such cost whether the appeal is successful or not. Is that just? Is it desirable that this heavy expenditure should be incurred when, under the present system, the municipalities have always done the work of preparing the lists gratuitously? Has any one ever heard of the electors in any part of the country petitioning for a measure like this? No, it is introduced simply for the purpose of retaliation. It will involve an expense to the country of from \$250,000 to \$300,000 a year. That is a very considerable sum, and it would be much better expended if applied to the extension of our railways, the great civilizing agents of the age, the repatriation of our fellow countrymen who have gone to other lands, or at least towards the establishing of a permanent force in the North-West in order to prevent a repetition of such disasters as have occurred there, and are still fresh in the public mind, and for other purposes, such as fostering agriculture etc. We are told that uniformity in the electoral franchise is necessary; yet an exception is made in favor of two of the provinces. No exception, however, is made in favor of the Province of Quebec, against which this Bill is evidently directed. It would be better to say at once that, after eighteen years of hesitation, they are now bent upon despoiling it little by little of its privileges. The Premier has always been in favor of a legislative union, and he seems determined now to accomplish his work. The Province of Quebec is, as you