

sole purpose of promoting the interests of their party in the federal elections, intending subsequently to repeal that Act and to go back to their old franchise before the provincial elections come off. That has occurred before, and you will search the world in vain to find anything that will correspond with such a state of things as that which can exist under these circumstances. But that is not all. What have we here in evidence from gentlemen who not only know whereof they speak, but who have had a practical experience of the effect of the franchise of some of the local legislatures. Does my right hon. friend admit for a moment, that any member of the Parliament of Canada should be subjected to a franchise under which, not the legislatures but the government of a province can control the representation in this House from that province? My right hon. friend will, I am sure, instantly repudiate the idea that we should have members of the House of Commons of Canada elected from any province, not by the independent electors of that province but by the government of that province. Go to Manitoba, and what do you find? It has been proven by indisputable testimony—testimony that no man has been able to refute—that the franchise of Manitoba is a franchise under which the Government of Manitoba can elect whom they please.

Mr. LISTER. They lost an election a short time ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They did; but there is such a thing as a Government becoming so unpopular that a province rises in revolt against it. If the hon. gentleman wants an illustration of what I am saying, let him look at the two elections that took place in the province of Manitoba, one almost immediately following the other. I mean the elections of 1896, when a general election took place for the local legislature, in which only four or five members opposed to the Government obtained seats, and a short time afterwards a Dominion election took place, in which but for the fact that our candidate for Lisgar was attacked with typhoid fever, the Liberal party would not have elected a single member from that province.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Providence interfered.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Providence has done a great deal for hon. gentlemen opposite—a great deal more than they have done for themselves, in many instances. Then everybody knows that the hon. gentleman who represents Selkirk in this House would not be here to-day but for an unfortunate error on the part of the judge, a friend of ours, I admit, who advised the Conservative candidate to deposit his \$1,000 in the wrong place; and that prevented a recount, which would have given a majority of at least twenty to the Conservative can-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

didate. The constituency of Brandon was carried by a very distinguished member of this House, but certainly not under the banner of the Liberal party; it was carried on a religious question, the school question. But apart from Lisgar, where, as my hon. friend suggests, Providence interfered in their favour, the Liberal party returned only one man out in the whole province, and that in a province where the battle-cry was that the Conservative party were for coercing Manitoba and the Liberal party were for preventing that coercion. I give that to my hon. friend as an evidence of the most overwhelming character to show the frightful nature of the local franchise of Manitoba. Under that franchise they appoint an insignificant member of the community, some person who has no standing, no character, who has nothing to lose, and they place the control of a constituency in his hands. I gave an illustration of this to the House before, but it will bear repeating, because it is a historical matter. Where there was a real majority of at least fifteen for the Conservative party in a constituency, fifteen names were put on the list. What names? Names of people who did not exist in the country at all, known to nobody—utterly fictitious names. What happened then? Of course, they were challenged.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I call my hon. friend to order. He is not speaking to the amendment, which has reference to the Indian vote, but he is going into a general discussion of the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I hope it is not too late yet for the hon. gentleman to learn from the discussion that has taken place on the Indian vote, that he is making a frightful mistake in this measure, and I am endeavouring to draw his attention to the fact that his own strongest friends and supporters are denouncing this measure in this particular; and where does that denunciation come from? It comes from the vicious character of this measure, that hands over the franchise of the members of this House to the local legislatures, and leaves us powerless, however desirous to protect the Indian vote, or any other vote that ought to be protected; and I hope it is not too late to make every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House feel that we are not asking to take away any control or any power from the Government. In every word we are using in relation to this measure we are placing ourselves largely in the hands of the Government to which we are opposed; and if we do that, I think hon. gentlemen opposite ought to feel that we are asking for no party advantage, but are asking for an independent franchise that will protect the rights of every elector in this country who is entitled to exercise the franchise. I will not pursue the subject further; but I leave with the House that