

islatures do not exercise? Have we not to exercise higher powers? Is it not possible that the same class of people who would effectively choose the minds that should control a municipality or a county may not be the persons who should choose the minds to control a local legislature, still less to choose the minds to legislate in this House. Suppose that we were independent and had to have a foreign policy and still greater questions were coming before us, is it not possible that we should require a different matrix to get a good House of Commons from that which would give us a good local assembly? One of the objections I have to this is that it thrusts will-nilly upon people who may not wish it the system of manhood suffrage for election to this House. In Ontario, instead of giving manhood suffrage certain evidences are required that people are fulfilling their duties to the state. The hon. Solicitor General said that he was determined to keep for Quebec its own franchise. But hear what he says about the poor people of Ontario:

It may be that a desire exists in some provinces to extend the franchise so broadly that all men may have a right to participate in the elections; there may be a desire that all men, even those whose only asset in life is the vote they may dispose of as a marketable commodity in the elections, should occupy the same position as the man who has some stake in the country.

My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) nods to me. Even when after the monstrosity has been brought before him, he smiles approval of the abominable concoction that marks his legislative reign. He says in effect: I am ready to give you an Act of Parliament to give men the franchise whose only estate is the vote you give them and the price they can get for their treacherous act in selling it. And he still nods at me. I say that it is unworthy of this legislature and unworthy of my hon. and learned friend, and still more unworthy of his position, to be ready so to legislate as to give the franchise to those whom the greatest radical that ever lived declared should not be endowed with it. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim to be Liberals. Do they honour the name of John Stuart Mill. Mill declared that no man should be given the franchise who was of this character. No man should be given the franchise, unless though in some small way, doing acts of citizenship and contributing to the common stock. No bankrupt should have it and no man in receipt of public alms. For, as he says, why should we give to these the control of the money of the state? That is what we do. The people who send us here send us to spend money, and if they are a low class of people their representatives here will be of a low class. Mill denounced the idea—I have his words here under my hand—that a man who could not read or write, a man who did not pay his taxes or even an insolvent who had not

got a satisfactory discharge should be on the voters' list. And yet my hon. friend says: I am ready to legislate so as to force upon Ontario, what Ontario does not now allow, that the electors for this House shall include men whose only asset in life is the vote which is for them a marketable commodity. But what I particularly find fault with my hon. friend for is that he, a gentleman of experience, a gentleman learned in the law, should state to this House that this Act is founded upon and was an imitation of the precedent set by Sir John Thompson in 1894. I have Sir John Thompson's proposed Act here before me. I will not take the time to read it, but hon. gentlemen who care to compare it with this Bill will find the comparison instructive. Sir John Thompson proposed to do what I should not object to—to use the municipal lists and the provincial lists to get a Dominion list. I do not mind what you make use of to get a list, so long as that list shall be subject to the control of this Parliament.

The argument of expense is the only one that I have heard strongly used against the present Act. Two kinds of expense have been complained of. I must say, in passing, that we have had from both sides of the House speeches that were most instructive to me. I have listened to them with great interest. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) pointed out that the chief expense was the revision of the lists by the judge. If we pay the judge for the revision of the lists the same price paid by the province, one-half the expense will disappear. My hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Moore) showed the other night that the amounts stated by the Solicitor General as to cost had been exaggerated.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I think my hon. and learned friend is going a little too far. I took my statement from the Auditor General's Report. I am willing to lay it on the Table, giving the page from which I quoted.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I see that, by refusing to agree to that statement of mine, my hon. and learned friend makes his case worse.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I draw a distinction between fact and fancy.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose I take that sum and divide it by two, and spread it over thirteen years. Mind, I am not saying you must have that Act, but I say that, for the ultimate revision of any lists, we must not be thrown at the mercy of such revising officers as we have in Manitoba; we must not be placed at the mercy of creatures of the provincial governments, who can be got to do any iniquity that is demanded of them by their provincial leaders. In the ultimate revision we must have judges to deal with, and, provided we have due safeguards, I would not care very much what was the process by which you got out the list. But I re-