

April 21, 1874

What was there in the different Provinces that rendered any difference of the franchise necessary? Was there not the same average intelligence and general diffusion of knowledge; and did not the same qualifications regulate and constitute the franchise? He would not make the same remarks regarding Manitoba and British Columbia, for their cases were somewhat different; but there was nothing to induce him to depart from the general principle as to their common standing, and he saw no good ground for the adoption of any other principle.

He further contended that the House and the members should have a guarantee that no Local Legislature should be allowed to tamper with the franchise in relation to members of Parliament. There was no such guarantee under the law now introduced, as it was perfectly competent for the Local Legislature to have one election under one law of the franchise, and the next so to alter it either to benefit or to injure any particular party. He had evidence that this had been done. One of the most monstrous alterations of the law had been put on the statute book of Nova Scotia. The law provided for the registration of voters and the revision of the list by a Court which could hear the claims of all parties, and as to whether the rate of assessment was too high or too low, et cetera. From this return the election list was published; and then, because the completed and perfected list did not suit, an amendment to this law was passed after the general elections in Nova Scotia, which offered such a premium on perjury as no Legislature ever offered. The law provided that a competent Court should establish who had a right to vote.

The amendment provided that all who claimed to be electors and had not been put on the voters list would be allowed to exercise the franchise on swearing that they were entitled to vote. What was to be thought of a law which first provided who should be assessed and who should be allowed to vote, and then allowed all these provisions to be swept away, and persons allowed to force themselves upon the voters list in face of the decisions of the Court of the land? This was but an illustration of what might be expected if parties were not amenable or responsible to the control of this House. Assuming that it would cost \$50,000 or \$60,000 every five years to make this voters list, that sum was altogether insignificant as compared with the importance of having a sound and wholesome control over the basis of the representation of the people, which was so essential to the dignity of Parliament, and was the foundation of the Parliament itself. He was surprised that the gentleman who took exception to the voting of public officials in Nova Scotia did not seem to know that these very officials had voted in virtue of a resolution of his.

**Hon. Mr. BLAKE** said he had objected to the motion to which the member for Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Tupper) referred and moved an amendment to it.

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** contended that under that very amendment they had voted. If this House were going to adopt a franchise made not for us but for others who, according to their caprice, might so apply it as to suit one election, and then alter it to suit another, he felt that he should be failing in his duty if he had not pointed out these defects and illustrated them.

This bill also made another provision which was open to the gravest objection. It provided that to a class of officials over which the Government had not control should be delegated the most important functions. He would ask how often the present leader of the House had challenged the late government for having abused their powers in the appointment of returning officers. He had no hesitation in saying that these men and the agents employed by them had the control over the whole elections the moment this law passed. It violated the essential principles of Parliamentary Government, which made the Government responsible to Parliament for the use of its patronage. The moment this was passed parties irresponsible to this Parliament were put in a position to control the whole elections.

When the late Mr. Howe ran for a seat in the Cabinet the Attorney General of Nova Scotia was sent from Halifax to Windsor, a distance of forty-five miles, and gave to the Sheriff, who was also the returning officer, written directions on how to manage matters in relation to this House of Commons. Was not this sufficient to show that when the House was asked to divest itself of all power over the conduct and selection of returning officers, it was acting at variance with the dictates of experience and common sense?

Then we were told that when Sheriffs were disqualified, the vacant places should be filled by the Lieutenant-Governors in Council. For his part, he would rather a thousand times be left to the tender mercies of this Government than to the Government of Nova Scotia.

There was another point which did not commend itself to him, the abolition of nomination. He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) believed in reform. He was an advanced Reformer. Still he believed that changes could be made for the worse as well as for the better. He had failed to hear any observation from the Minister of Justice which was sufficient to convince him of the advisability of the change. Those who knew England knew that we had no such necessities for the change as they had. It did honour to the people of Canada, to their intelligence and qualification to exercise the franchise, to know that one might search in vain for those collisions, riots and struggles, which had too often disgraced other countries.

**Hon. Mr. BLAKE:** How about Quebec Centre?

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** replied that we never had an election more calculated to stir up the deepest feelings than the last election, and he was proud to say that for a solitary case his hon. friend had had to go beyond it.

**Hon. Mr. BLAKE:** What about the Charlevoix election?

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** said the affair was not serious, as he had never heard of it. If there was only one solitary instance, it confirmed more strongly the ground which he had taken. Upon polling days people were liable to come into sharper collision than on nomination days.

He would say that many features of the speeches of the hon. member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) had been generally read with much interest, and much valuable information had been obtained from them. Was there then to be no opportunity for having