

minion government in its elections. It is a matter on the part of the townships that they are, for the first time, having forced upon them the cost of the revision of the lists for the Dominion House which was formerly paid for by the Dominion House itself. In addition, the judge who is engaged to revise these lists is paid by the local government, so that the only difference in the matter is that the cost is simply shifted from the Dominion government to the local municipalities. I challenge hon. gentlemen to say that it is not a matter of demurrer on the part of the municipalities that they should be borne down with this expense. They say, that before, the revision was done by partisan judges. The answer to that is, that the partisan revising barristers before were country court judges and the revising barristers to-day are county court judges. The whole difference is that these hon. gentlemen have taken the burden of expense off the Dominion government and placed it on the municipalities. The result is that we have a Dominion voters' list that is totally different in every province of this Dominion. You may reside in the county of Glengarry, adjoining the province of Quebec, you may be a large property owner in that county, you may happen to live in the adjoining riding of Stormont, you may be a large property owner in the adjoining riding, you may be a property owner in three different ridings in the province of Ontario and have the right to vote once in the federal elections. But, if you live in the province of Quebec and you happen to have property in four different wards in the city of Montreal, you have four votes. Why should the people of the province of Ontario suffer this disadvantage? I ask the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) why he, as an Ontario minister, says that every man who may own property in three or four divisions in the city of Montreal, should have three or four votes and that a man who may be a large property owner in the province of Ontario should only have one vote. The principle is unfair and unjust. These hon. gentlemen found that there are a large number of men in the country employed in what is known as the Permanent Force, in other words, the paid soldiers of the country, men who are entitled to have a vote, men, who, when called to duty, have to do the fighting. These hon. gentlemen are, to-day, by a Bill before the House, going to debar these men from having the right to vote, while a Chinaman in British Columbia has the right, under the provincial franchise, to vote. Is it not a beautiful thing to say that every intelligent man in the province of Ontario who has taken up the business of a soldier on behalf of his country, has no right to vote, but that a Chinaman in British Columbia has the right to vote? All that hon. gentlemen can make out of the Franchise Act

in Ontario they are quite welcome to, because the people see very clearly that the whole starting point was in favour of hon. gentlemen themselves, and nothing else. There was one thing that the farmer was to have done for him. Hon. gentlemen were going to decrease duties, and, as a result, they would decrease the revenue of the country. The reason why there was to be a decrease in the revenue of the country was that there would be less duties drawn out of the pockets of the people, and they would have less money to pay out in that way. What have these hon. gentlemen done in that regard? These hon. gentlemen, who were pledged to reduce the number of cabinet ministers, added two to the number, these hon. gentlemen frittered away \$200,000 for the plebiscite, these hon. gentlemen frittered away \$35,000 on their reciprocity trip to Washington, these hon. gentlemen frittered away \$10,000 upon an inquiry into Manitoba elections which was no duty, or business, of this parliament, and they have increased the expenditure of this country from \$38,000,000 to \$51,000,000. That is about the gauge of what they have done, and you cannot go into a constituency of this country but you will find that there are party friends who are being benefited at the public cost. The Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) went to Orillia in East Simcoe, and he found a most capable officer there as inspector of weights and measures. This official was a man in the prime of life, but the minister (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), in order to give a place to a party friend, superannuated this official, Mr. Bolster, at \$360 a year, and appointed a gentleman named Smith to the position at \$600. I am surprised that the minister permitted himself to be prevailed upon by his party friends to do such a thing as that, and to place this extra charge on the taxpayers of the country without any reason in the world. It is that way all along the line. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) found Col. White, one of the most capable deputy ministers in the service, in his department. He superannuated Col. White, at a cost to the country of \$2,240 a year, while at the same time there is another gentleman named Griffin drawing \$2,053 a year as a superannuated Deputy Postmaster General. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) did that because, in his riding there was Dr. Coulter, who was an aspirant for the nomination against him, and so he got rid of Dr. Coulter by making him his deputy. This same Postmaster General thought the postmaster in the city of Kingston was too old, and so he superannuated him at \$700 a year and appointed a man to office who was several years older than the former postmaster. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) found in his department a gentleman named Hayter