

I found the name of a man on the list who had been dead for over two years, but whose name had been taken from the assessor's roll of that year. I knew as a fact that a man who had been dead two years appeared on the list. The assessor had put him on the roll a year after he was dead, and the clerk continued his name on the list, so that the fact of a dead man's name appearing on a list is not the fault of the Dominion Franchise Act, because the same thing occurs under the municipal system.

A strong charge is made that the cost of revising the lists under the Dominion Franchise Act, is excessive. True, that law imposes heavy expense on the Dominion, but at the same time there is the expense to be borne by the municipalities in the preparation of the provincial lists and the expense to be borne by the candidates concerned in revising the lists. In my experience, and I say it without hesitation, and with some considerable knowledge of revising lists, I would rather undertake to revise a list under the Dominion Franchise Act than under the provincial law. I believe I could do it more cheaply, more easily, with less labour and inconvenience, and more thoroughly. I do not see why there should be such a very large expense to the candidate in connection with the revision of the lists. In the county of Halton, which I have the honour to represent, I have had occasion to revise the list at various times under the Dominion Franchise Act, and I am satisfied that at the expense of \$100 we make a very thorough list indeed. Others perhaps may have paid a great deal more, but that is their fault. With a properly organized system throughout the county for the revision of lists, the thing can be done under the Dominion system, at a cost, I am quite sure, equally as low, if not less, than that of revising the provincial lists. Let us look for a moment at a single municipality, and I have in my mind one in which I was interested in revising the list for the provincial election. There were presented 175 appeals in that township after that so-called "complete" list had been made by the officers. Take it for granted that twenty-five of these appeals related to municipal appeals only. That would leave 150 as the number of names that had been wrongly put on or wrongfully left off, and I am satisfied that there were that number, at any rate, that related exclusively to the list for the purpose of election to the local legislature. This meant that 150 different men had to attend the court in order to have their names put on, or to defend them if they were attacked and an attempt made to strike them off. These 150 men had to be served personally by a bailiff with a notice prepared by the clerk. The clerk had to be paid for preparing it and the constable for serving it, and in reference to many of them subpoenas

Mr. HENDERSON.

to be issued and conduct money paid as well as the cost of the service. The clerk has to be paid, and the judge has to be paid for holding court. Altogether the cost to the candidate, at any rate, is as great if not greater, than in the revision of the Dominion lists. The Dominion system is more perfect than the provincial. There are many young men working as farm assistants or otherwise whose names it is desired to add to the list, who are not allowed by their employers to attend court. If a young man happens to be a Conservative and is employed by a Liberal farmer, he may be detained at home, and his name is not put on the list, as the judge will say—as I have heard him say more than once—that if the young man does not consider his vote worth his day's pay, he should not have it. Under the Dominion Act, we have the plan of adding that name by means of a declaration. The party can make a declaration in the evening without losing time. He can make it before a municipal councillor or a justice of the peace. It is placed in the hands of the reviser, who examines it to see if it complies with the statute, and if it is all right, the name is added to the list. This allows a saving of time and adds the name of a voter to the list in many cases where under the provincial system, it would not be added.

Now, what is wanted, we say, is not the substitution of the provincial lists for the present Dominion lists, but rather some modification of the provincial lists, some machinery by which the Parliament of Canada would have control over the final revision of these lists, so that they could be revised in the interests of those who are to represent the electorate that are placed upon those lists. And I am quite sure that some additional machinery of that kind, a system of revision cheaper and more thorough than that of the province, at any rate in Ontario, would meet the approval of this House very much better than the sweeping proposition that has been made by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). For these reasons, I am constrained to vote for the amendment that is proposed against the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. GILLIES. In rising to offer a few observations, I may premise what I have to say by congratulating the House upon the tone of the present discussion. It is very different indeed from the debate that took place in this House in 1885, when the Franchise Act was introduced by the late Sir John Macdonald. I cannot help observing that the spirit of that debate was most partisan, bitter and extremely rancorous. In that respect, this debate compares very favourably with the other.

I may say at once that I am entirely opposed to this Bill, and will vote in favour of the amendment. I hold that this Parila-