

themselves, so that the House may judge whether the objections were quibbles or not. The first case I meet is rejected as being illegible. The revising officer endorses these words: "Many of the words are to me perfectly illegible." I submitted the application to several gentlemen, who had never seen the applicant's handwriting before, and they all declared that every word of the application was legible; while, on the other hand, some of us had considerable difficulty in making out the endorsement of the officer. I submitted the application to the editor of a newspaper, a gentleman who understands manuscript pretty well, and he said it was good copy, such as compositors would declare excellent. If applications are to be rejected on the ground of their being illegible to the revising officer, though perfectly legible to other people, we can only come to the conclusion that the officer is not fit for the place. On another application the officer endorsed that he is the judge of the facts and that no conclusion should be stated in the declaration. Then we have another one rejected on the ground that "the declaration must show that the applicant is a tenant on lease." The applicant simply states the nature of the property on which he claims to be qualified, and that he holds it as tenant and has held it as such for the required period, but he omits to say "under lease." I think there is a fair presumption when a tenant has held property for some time, he is holding it under lease. If I am not wrongly advised by legal gentlemen, a lease, under the wording of the law, need not necessarily be a written document, a verbal agreement being sufficient. Another application in which the applicant states: "I am a wage earner of at least three hundred annually, and have derived such wages and have been such resident for one year before the first of January, 1886," is objected to because the word "dollars" is omitted, as if the applicant could have meant cents; and again on the ground that "wage-earner" is not sufficient, that the applicant "must derive an income from his earnings." I take that to be a technical quibble. We know that a wage earner means a laborer in some calling, and not a salaried official, or he would call himself so. I do not think it is the officer's business what the man's calling is, so long as he is shown to derive an income, wage or salary, of \$300 from whatever he does. His legal description is not entered on the voters' list; he is merely put down as an income voter, and it does not matter in the least from what source he derived an income, so long as it is not from an investment out of Canada. Here is a very remarkable case: A man applies to be registered, saying he is owner of a lot on such a concession in such a township, and is assessed on the same for the sum of \$150. The officer endorses: "if it is not too late and his name appears on the assessment roll at a valuation of \$150, it may be entered; otherwise not." He objects to a reference to the new assessment roll as a proof of value, but if the name is on the old assessment roll he is willing to keep it. What right has he to object to the new roll? He is obliged by section 16 to take the assessment roll as *prima facie* evidence of the value. It will be rather startling to hon. gentlemen concerned in the passing of the Act last Session to be told that wages earned will not qualify. "It is not sufficient to earn wages," says the revising officer—you must "derive an income." But how can a man earn wages and still be said not to derive an income from his work in money or money's worth. That is a peculiar state of things that no one can understand. I think it is only the mind of a revising officer that could conceive such a state of things. Here is another one rejected because the legal description of the applicant is not inserted. I argued before, that there is no necessity to insert the legal description. It is nobody's business what the man is as long as he has the required income. Again, another point is made that the declaration says: "I am a British subject by birth or naturalisation," and our intelligent revising officer says he must state

whether he is one or the other, and will reject the statement that he is a British subject by either the one or the other.

An hon. MEMBER. He is a painstaking officer.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; he has taken all pains to find excuses to reject these declarations. Another application states:

"I derive an income from my trade of not less than \$300 annually, and have so derived such income and been such resident for a number of years, and now reside at the village of Morpeth."

The intelligent officer says he "must have been in receipt of such income for twelve months next before the first day of January, 1886." He cannot understand that, having been there for a number of years, he must have been there for twelve months.

Mr. VAIL. What is the officer's name?

Mr. CASEY. His name is Hughes. Here is another one rejected. The applicant states that his name is John Praschau; that, by a mistake on the voters' list, his name and that of his father had been exchanged; that he has been put down as the farmer and his father as the farmer's son, and that he desires to be put down as the son of the man who owns the north half of lot 3, in the 11th concession of Aldborough. This is refused on the ground that he must state the value of the real estate. It happens that both the farmer and the son are on the voters' list which the judge is to take as the *prima facie* evidence, and yet he rejects this application and throws them both off. This man's father is shown by the declaration to own 100 acres in a prosperous part of the country, which the judge must have known to be worth much more than \$300, and if that is not *prima facie* evidence I do not know what is. Here is another case in which the judge objects to a man stating he is a British subject by birth or naturalisation, and he goes further. The man states:

"I am the son of Donald Campbell, of the Township of Howard, in the County of Kent, who is the occupant and owner of the south half," &c.

The judge endorses this:

"Is he a British subject by birth or by naturalisation? Which is it? In what municipality is the land situated?"

The man swears he is the son of Donald Campbell of such a lot in such a township, and has been a resident thereon with his father for one year before the 1st January, and this intelligent official wants to know the municipality in which it is situated after being told the lot, the township and the county, and that the man has resided upon it continuously for a certain time. The applicant in this case is not a Conservative. Here are several others endorsed "too late, list printed." This recalls the remark I made before that notice should have been given of the time when the list would be printed so that applications might be put in before that date. Here is one who swears he is the son of Donald Shaw, who owns certain land which is worth \$6,000, and that he has been a resident on the said land at least one year prior to 1st January, 1886. The judge says he must have been a resident "continuously" on the farm. Well, if he were dealing with a pleading in court upon which a large sum of money depended, perhaps such quibbling might be defended, but to require from a farmer's son who fills up his own declaration such an amount of legal acumen as to insert every particular word would be to require impossibilities, and to make it impossible for these persons to be registered. Another person swears he has been occupant of a lot for a certain time, describing it definitely, and the revising officer cannot make out in what municipality that is situated. This again is the type of a considerable number on which I ask the judgment of the House and of the lawyers in the House. The applicant declares that he derives "an income as a railway em-