

upon the list, and afterwards we have to go to considerable expense in subpoenaing them in order to get them off the list. In some cases in my own county people were put upon the list fraudulently, and when we attempted to subpoena them, they evaded service. I remember in one case we had to subpoena a mother, but she refused to attend, and that fraudulent name was retained. I am giving this as an illustration; there were a good many other similar cases. We went to a good deal of pains and expense in order to purge the list in this particular way, but we found ourselves defeated. We are now simply asking that proper steps shall be taken to prevent these frauds, and I believe that it is the duty of Parliament to take proper steps. I hold it to be an immoral suggestion that if you will only take a little trouble and stretch your consciences a little, and put a good many names upon the list, then it will be difficult and expensive for your opponents to get these names off the list.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I much regret to hear the statement of the Minister of Justice, that he felt it incumbent upon him to refuse to make any further concessions, after the emphatic statement is made that fraud, in the past, has been inflicted upon many of those who had to do with the voters' lists. I think the statement of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell), that there were 2,000 individuals fraudulently placed upon the voters' lists, ought to be sufficient to convince the Minister that some means should be devised to prevent anything of that kind in the future. The Minister says it will involve an enormous expense. I cannot see any consistency in that statement. When these names are placed upon the list, a large amount of expense will be necessary in order to strike them off, much more than would be necessary if every individual had to make a declaration himself. It is a notorious fact, that just as soon as you allow one individual to make a declaration for a large number, and allow those names to be handed in, you open the door for any amount of fraud. The statement made by my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and the charge that he made against the assessors of that county, was surprising to me. I am surprised to hear any man deliberately charge that the assessors appointed in his locality are, to a certain extent, perjurers in performing their duties. With all the assurance possible he declares from his place in this House that in one of the old counties in the Province of Ontario, not a single man who was sworn to do his duty, does it impartially. That may be the class of men in his riding, but it is not the class of men throughout the greater portion of the Province of Ontario. I say that the assessors generally do their duty honestly, and I repudiate upon their behalf the insinuation that he makes against the assessors in his own riding. Now, I cannot understand why the Minister is so desirous that there should be an open door so that any individual may hand in a large number of names, unless it be as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter), said, that a circular had been sent out advising their faithful friends to see that every individual should be placed upon the assessment roll, because when they once get them there, it would take a great deal of trouble and expense to get them off. Is this the door that the Minister of Justice desires to leave open now, so that they may be able to carry out the advice that is given by that organisation? It certainly looks to me very much like a design on the part of our friends opposite to give every opportunity that this Franchise Bill, which is iniquitous in every sense now, should be rendered more so, and that they should take means whereby they may have greater facilities to defraud the electors and prevent a fair expression of their opinions at the polls. Now, it is my experience, and I think it has been the experience of the Members of Parliament, that it is absolutely necessary, in

order to make the list an honest list, that a personal statutory declaration should be made by the party desiring to be placed upon the roll. That being the method adopted in the past by the judges, who were the best authorities, why cannot the Minister concede the suggestion made and adopt the course approved by these officers. Is he a judge superior to those who have the duties to perform? An hon. member, who had acted as a revising officer, last evening stated that such was the proper course, and, in fact, was the only course to prevent fraud. If the Minister is desirous of preventing fraud, why does he not adopt the course suggested by one of his own supporters, who has had practical experience in this matter? I cannot understand why he objects to allowing this amendment. If he wishes to do fairly by the electors, if he is anxious to save expense, as he professes to be, I certainly think he should adopt the course suggested, and allow this clause to stand over until he is able to come down and meet us in a fair spirit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that the Minister of Justice has expressed himself in the sense that he has not finally closed the matter, that he leaves it an open question; but he suggests that we pass the section now, and when the Bill comes up for its third reading, he will, after consideration, have arrived at a final conclusion in regard to it. I do not understand that the question is finally settled, but that it will be kept over until the third reading of the Bill, and the Minister will have an open mind on the subject.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understood the Minister to say that he would give us time to consider it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said that I would consider it before the third reading.

Mr. MULOCK. To revert again to the point that a time should be stated beyond which names should not be added to the supplementary list, I understand the Minister objected to that suggestion on the ground of expense. I did not understand that the suggestion itself was not approved.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said the advertising would be expensive.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, it is desirable that some official notification should be made as to the time when the revising officer was going to sign the list. I suggest that the revising officer should announce when he intends to sign the supplementary list, and that anyone should get a copy of the order on paying for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to fix a date before which the revising officer cannot transmit the list, so that everyone will know there is that time at least. I said it would not suit the whole Dominion to have a date after which the names should not be received; but I am quite willing to fix a date up to which they shall be received, and to provide that the list shall not be transmitted to the Queen's Printer before 1st August, or, it may be, later.

Mr. MULOCK. That is very well so far as it goes; but the revising officer may keep the list on hand, and some people may not happen to know that it has not been transmitted. It would not be unwise, in addition to the clause the Minister proposes to add, to require the revising officer, if he does not transmit the list on 1st August, to issue an order enlarging the time, so that the public may know up to what time the matter might be open.

Mr. BARRON. I draw attention to the great possibility, under the words "sources of information," of revising officers adopting different rules in almost every district. One revising officer may consider the sources of information sufficient, and another the reverse.

Mr. COLTER. I spoke last night to the Minister of Justice, and I believe he was willing to take into considera-