

gard the thing as a means to an end. Now, is it consonant with our dignity that we should allow another and inferior body to fix that which the right hon. gentleman describes to be the very basis and foundation of our political life? I will not so far forget my duty on the present occasion as to go into the details of this measure; I will only point out the course which I think we should follow. My hon. and learned friend introduced it as a Bill that would give us the provincial lists as our lists, and what is the principal clause, after all, in his Bill? The principal clause is the 8th clause, and in that he tells us that the basis he is going to give us for our list is a basis as shifting as the sand of the seashore. It is a basis that has no permanency whatever. He gives you a list that you may find, when you want the list, that it is not there. Then, he provides the same machinery—I wish my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) was here—he provides the same machinery precisely, as an alternative, that he admits now this Act is introduced to supersede. He tells you that, in certain cases, you may not find that you have a provincial list within the twelve months, and then,

If such lists have been prepared not more than one year before the date of the writ for such Dominion election; otherwise new voters' lists shall be prepared, and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers, and in the preparation and revision and bringing into force of such new voters' lists the provision of the laws of the province, regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases, shall as far as possible be observed and followed.

But the officers will be Dominion officers, and you may have, therefore, a machinery very much like that which he wants to supersede. So that, after all, we are not going to have such a cheap system as has been suggested to us, and my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) showed this evening, very clearly, how that was. Now, to show that my fears are not groundless, that we may get little help to guard us against such officers as I have spoken of, as exist in Manitoba, if you turn to the 17th section, which is a section amending the Dominion Elections Act, we read:

Not more than one elector for each compartment shall at any one time enter the room where the poll is held, and each elector upon so entering shall declare his name, surname and addition, which shall be entered or recorded by the poll clerk in the poll-book provided for that purpose, which shall be kept in form R in the first schedule of this Act; and if the same are found on the list of voters for the polling district of such polling station, or if he is found entitled to vote—

“Or if he is found entitled to vote”—what is the meaning of that?

Mr. DAVIN.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that to be for the returning officer to decide?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They have no list in Prince Edward Island to prepare, and you have, therefore, to leave it in the hands of the returning officer.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that a satisfactory state of things? There is another gap, another pit-fall. I pointed out, a moment ago, that what we were doing was forcing on Ontario manhood suffrage for the Dominion, and what you are doing in Prince Edward Island, which now has a good and fair system of returning men to Parliament, is to force on them such a system as they have in Prince Edward Island, and leave it entirely with the returning officer as to whether he will put a name on or not. Now, when we go into committee, I do hope that we may find between the two sides of the House a modus vivendi, some means of coming to a fair arrangement by which, instead of talking of principles and talking of philosophy, we shall regard the making of the lists as a means to an end, an honest means to a noble end, a fair means to a desirable end, a means of giving us honest and trustworthy lists that shall send to this House a fair, just and effective representation of the opinion of the country.

Mr. MOORE. I do not rise to make a speech on this subject. But I have noticed that some hon. members, in commenting upon a speech I made upon this subject last week, dispute the figures which I quoted as to the cost of the various revisions of the voters' lists which were made since the Act was first passed. I understand from the Solicitor General to-night, that he called those figures fancy figures, and disputed the correctness of those which I had quoted. I will say here now, that I took my figures directly from the Auditor General's Report, and I challenge him, or any other man, to show that they are incorrect. The statement I then made was, that the four revisions that have taken place during the operation of the Act, in the last twelve years, cost \$826,782.97, which would amount, spread over the twelve years, to \$68,898 a year. So I say, that the statement made by the Solicitor General, that the cost had been \$1,500,000, does not agree with the Report of the Auditor General, and that my figures are absolutely correct.

Mr. WALLACE. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this subject, have taken it for granted that there was nothing to be said in favour of the present Franchise Act; but, when the debate had gone on, we found out that there is nothing to be said to-night in favour of the proposed new Franchise Bill. Speaker after speaker have got up on the Government side and have