

judges and other gentlemen who have accepted the position of revising officer have done so under the loose promise that they would be paid according to their work.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not the slightest information has been given them.

Mr. CASEY. Then they are more careless than I would have expected them to be. The result will be that, as their pay will depend largely on the amount of work they have to do, they will make work for themselves, as the revising officer has done in my riding, so as to get as much pay as possible. The revising officer in my riding rejected, on the most ridiculous grounds, a number of applications to be put on the primary list, with the idea of making work for himself in the final revision, for which he would charge the Government. How can the revising officer act independently of the Government, when his salary is not fixed. We were told these gentlemen would be independent as judges, that their position would be fixed, and now we find they are working on the job system and are utterly dependent on the Government. You cannot imagine that these people can be looked upon as independent while they are in that dependent and slavish situation, with regard to the Government, when the whole question of their salary depends upon the favor of the Government, and if they offend the Government their salary may be put down to a beggarly pittance. Several of them have acted fairly, and my own revising officer in Elgin has acted with more fairness of late than he did at first, in fact with complete fairness, as far as I know. But they cannot be looked upon as independent when the Government have kept them under their thumb until the list is finished. It is a disgraceful proposition to make that they shall be kept under the thumb of the Government until the revision is finished. Then, with regard to the clerks, the Minister has stated that they will be paid \$2 a day for the time they are actually employed, but he took good care not to say what actual employment meant. If it means the total number of days, that the total number of hours they are employed would amount to, it is absurd. Most of them are lawyers in practice, and you cannot hire a lawyer in practice for \$2 a day. If it is to be any remuneration to a lawyer, it must be calculated from the time they begin to the time they finish their services as clerks.

Mr. THOMPSON. If they were lawyers of any credit, the longer they were at it the more they would lose at \$2 a day.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister has shown the absurdity of his first statement by that. That is exactly the point I was making. Therefore they will be paid for some supposititious period.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to have some information from the Government as to whether they intend to adopt the suggestion I made, and give us, on concurrence, an approximate statement of the probable cost. I think we are entitled to have it, and I have three times called attention to it without getting any answer.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have already explained, that until the revision is more advanced, it is impossible to state the expense. The courts for final revision have yet to be held, the printers' bills are not all in, and the assessment rolls are not all printed yet.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree that it is impossible for the Government to give any information. It is unreasonable for my hon. friends to expect any more information than we have received. We have had such a satisfactory financial statement, what more remains for any paternal Government to do?

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose I shall have to put up with the information we have got. I certainly did not

expect much information when I asked for it. There is one thing, however, they might fairly do. They state how much they allow a clerk and a constable per day, and I think it ought not to be so serious a matter to say how much they allow the revising barristers a day. However, as it is likely to embarrass them, I will withdraw my demand.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 3:35 a. m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st June, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, there is a matter to which I may be allowed to refer. I stated last week, during the debate on the Franchise Bill, that in the riding of East Toronto a number of names had been put on the preliminary voters' list of persons who are not qualified under the law, as it stands, and that the revising officer's clerk, when his attention was called to this, said that the law would be altered at the next Session so as to qualify those voters. My statement was questioned by the hon. member for East Toronto on that occasion. I saw by the papers in Toronto yesterday, that on Saturday, in the House, the hon. member for East Toronto had read a letter from the revising officer's clerk formally contradicting my statement, and I took occasion to enquire of my informant as to the correctness of the information he had given me. He not only stated that what he had told me was correct, but he said he was willing to furnish me with a statutory declaration to that effect, and I have the declaration here, which I will read to the House:

"I, Daniel Hugh Allen, of the city of Toronto, in the county of York and Province of Ontario, gentleman, do hereby solemnly declare as follows:—

"1. Soon after the publication of the parliamentary list of voters, under the 'Electoral Franchise Act,' for the city of Toronto, my attention was called to the fact that, while in the lists for the electoral districts of Centre and West Toronto, for which His Honor Joseph E. McDougall is the revising officer, there were comparatively few names as on income at their places of business, there was a large number of those on the lists for the electoral district of East Toronto, for which John Boyd, Esq., is the revising officer.

"2. My attention was specially attracted to the large number of such cases in the Ward of St. Lawrence, in said electoral district of East Toronto; there being no less than sixty-three on the list, as at the City Hall, in polling sub-division No. 9 of this ward.

"3. Soon after making the above-mentioned discovery, being in the office of the said revising officer for East Toronto, and said revising officer not being in his office at the time, I called the attention of his clerk, Mr. Walton, to the above mentioned facts, saying that unless all those parties who had their names so placed as on income at their places of business, would have them changed on revision of the list, they would all be disfranchised.

"4. Mr. Walton at once replied that the Act was to be amended before the revision of the list would be completed, so as to make good all such votes.

"5. I was surprised and indignant at this information, and so expressed myself to Mr. Walton, who appeared to realise he had made a slip, and declined answering further questions as to his grounds for the statement he had made.

"6. I afterwards mentioned what Walton informed me to Judge McDougall and others. Judge McDougall thought no Act would be passed which would affect the lists of the present year, as it would greatly add to the labor and expense connected with the preparation of the same; and I believe there are over a thousand names wrongly placed in the St. Lawrence Ward alone. And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act