questions discussed in public? He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) had had twenty years' experience of political struggles, and had seen nothing but good come from the occasion when, face to face, public men discussed questions appertaining to the prosperity and progress of the country.

He believed that he had about done finding fault. The bill contained several matters to which he could not take exception. Simultaneous polling and other features were introduced last session. He regretted that this principle was not more present to the minds of the Government when they conducted the recent elections, when they were pledged to carry out this principle so far as the law would permit. The unfair advantage to be derived from the fixing of elections was never more used than then. Before a vote was polled in Nova Scotia the hon. gentlemen had placed Nova Scotia at an unfair advantage by making that Province have to face the votes of Ontario and Quebec.

**Mr. MILLS:** How about 1872?

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** said that the hon. gentleman might search all the records of the past Government, and he would find nothing analogous to it. There never was any occasion when any Government was so unjust and took so unfair an advantage of their opponents. The writs were out in ample time to allow of the elections going on at the same time as those of Ontario and Quebec. As regarded the ballot, the House would without doubt accept it. When his right hon. friend had introduced his election bill he had said the ballot would be an open question. His hon. friend the Premier had said the right hon. gentleman was a recent convert. He thought that he would find upon his own side a recent conversion. His right hon. friend had thought that after the ballot had been adopted in England, it would be impossible to withstand it here. He said, if the House adopted the principle, measures would be taken to carry it out. The reason why his right hon. friend's election bill had not become law was that he had withdrawn it in order to have the clauses regarding the ballot more carefully considered.

There was one other point, and only one which needed a passing word, and that was a new feature—the abolition of the property qualification. With this he entirely concurred. In this hon. friend had only copied the example of Nova Scotia. Although there was a property qualification there, it was not large enough, being only the same as that of the electors, viz., $150, real estate. He was only sorry he could not give the same cordial support to all the provisions of the law as he could to this.

It being six o'clock, the House rose.

## AFTER RECESS

**Mr. FLYNN** resumed the debate on the Election Bill. He said that he thought the measure was just such a one as the country required. He explained the system of revising the voters lists followed in Nova Scotia, and went on to show that the election Courts of that Province did not afford a remedy for the evil of partisan assessors rating the property of electors too low, and the Legislature had to pass a law under which electors who swore that their property was not valued high enough could have their names put upon the voters lists. If the Government of Nova Scotia had assumed an attitude of antagonism to the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, the hon. gentleman and his friends were to blame for it. They thought they would be able to crush the Government of Nova Scotia out of existence, but they failed. (*Hear, hear.*)

The Government of Nova Scotia was now as firmly established in power and in the hearts of their fellow countrymen as any Government could possibly be, while the Province of Nova Scotia, like all the other Provinces of the Dominion, when it had an opportunity of pronouncing upon the conduct of the hon. gentleman and his friends, sent them to this House with the miserable following they had now at their backs. (*Loud cheers.*)

**Hon. Mr. BLAKE** said that if the House and the country had been fortunate enough to have sooner the benefit of the eloquence of the hon. gentleman who had just sat down, he (Mr. Flynn) would have not been surprised at the language of the hon. member for Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Tupper). He denied that in passing this Bill Government were abandoning the powers of regulating the franchise. The House had not exercised that function for many years.

He repudiated the idea that there was anything degrading in a difference being allowed to exist in the franchise of constituencies which elected the members of this House. He could not understand the observation of the hon. gentleman to that effect; it did not seem to him to be a reasonable observation. They had been each elected in their own Provinces by those persons who were considered possessed of the proper qualification to do so. The power of fixing the franchise was delegated to the various Local Governments because of the confidence reposed in the Local legislatures. If it turned out that they abused this power, this House had the power of taking it out of their hands.

The hon. gentleman and his friends had an opportunity of dealing with this question, but they found it rather a difficult task. Twice in speeches from the Throne they had been told by the late Government that this matter must be settled; twice, at least, they had made attempts to equalize the franchise; one Bill went into Committee and never came out of it, the other never went in. And why was this? Because the promises of the hon. gentleman opposite were false, and because it was more difficult to establish a uniform franchise than the hon. gentleman had supposed. The fact was that when the friend of the hon. gentleman attempted to settle that matter they managed to displease everybody, and to please nobody.

He was not at all above looking in countries with Republican institutions for light upon subjects of this kind, and the constitution of the United States of America exhibited, in this respect, the marks of that wisdom which distinguished the great and able men who framed it. The franchise for the Senate in that country was the same franchise for a vote for the Legislature. The principle had been maintained for ninety-one years and he was not aware that in any instance it had been found to fail. In fact the hon. member had not been able to cite an instance in which it had, and he had no doubt that he was too acute not to have done so if he could. In no instance