

from one end of Canada to another—that he was perfectly fair. He laid down one rule at the outset; both parties knew what it was and were kept to it, so that there could be no injustice. Now as to leaving names off the list. Is it not perfectly plain that whatever system you adopt, some names will be left off. It is utterly impossible to frame a Franchise Bill so as to have every name put upon the list that might reasonably be expected to appear there. I must call attention to another statement that was made, namely, that there is a disagreement among the judges. Well, is that a new thing? If a layman were to make a statement like that in this House, he might be excused; but when a member of the legal profession says that because judges disagree regarding the voters' lists that is a reason for taking it out of their hands, it does seem to me the most extraordinary statement coming from such a source that I ever heard. Then the hon. gentleman spoke with regard to dead men voting. I am sorry that he did not call my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) as a witness. I am sure he could tell him about the dead men who came from London to Brantford to vote, who were caught red-handed in the Liberal committee room, who were arrested in the Liberal committee room, and led off by a friendly policeman. Then the hon. gentleman has a nightmare over the gerrymander. I would like to know if the Liberal party ever gerrymandered. I would like to refer him to the province of Ontario, in the very year in which this franchise Act was passed, in 1895, when the present Minister of Justice was at the head of affairs in that province. Why, Sir, he is a pastmaster in gerrymandering, he is the prince of gerrymanderers in this country. He was able to shape constituencies in the province of Ontario with loaded dice. He is perfectly safe, he is able to defeat the will of the people in that province. And how far did he go? Why, he went so far in the very judicial county in which the hon. gentleman resides who spoke last, as to cut a township in two in order to serve his own party. Yet this hon. gentleman had never heard of a gerrymander before. Then he is shocked again for fear the Government will appoint as returning officers other than those who are registrars and sheriffs in the province of Ontario—because he speaks more particularly for that province. Now, let me ask that hon. gentleman, How do these gentlemen earn their positions under the local government? Are they not picked up because they have been partisans in the past? They earned their wages before they received them, and they walked out of the legislature and were placed in these positions. I say if there are partisans in this country, these gentlemen are partisans of the worst kind. I say the great army of officials in the pro-

vince of Ontario have been appointed to these positions simply in order that they might do service to their party afterwards. I am not making a charge against returning officers in that province. I believe that men may be appointed by this Government as returning officers in the province of Ontario, or elsewhere, who are not so degraded, who are not quite so low as to violate their oath any more than the returning officers did who were appointed under the late Government. It does seem to me to be a serious charge, and I think it hardly a fair charge for any hon. gentleman to shelter himself behind. Let the hon. gentleman point to the cases where wrong has been done. That some person may have gone wrong, may be the case. But is that a fair argument to use here because you can point to a single instance in a whole election, or a few instances? The hon. gentleman cannot hope to make a case out of an exception; it should be substantially the rule before there is an outcry. Now, I do not propose to go further with that. I simply wish to say that the hon. gentleman who made his little speech and then went out, was somewhat disappointing to the House, at least to this side of it, and I am not at all sure that he was not disappointing to the First Minister. That hon. gentleman sat down without giving any good reason why we should not proceed with the Tariff Bill, rather than with this Franchise Bill. Now, I think every hon. gentleman in this House must feel impelled to support the amendment moved by the ex-Finance Minister. The arguments which were adduced in favour of his amendment are wholly unanswerable. No doubt, the course of hon. gentlemen opposite will be a surprise to both sides of the House, and a surprise, I fancy, to the country. The whole country is in such a state of feeling that no matter what position the hon. gentlemen may take, it will be a surprise. If the hon. gentlemen should turn their backs upon their pledges, on the strength of which the most of them have come to this House, will it not be a surprise to a great many of their friends? Will not one-half of the people at least be greatly surprised that they should take a position of that kind? Then let us suppose that hon. gentlemen should live reasonably up to their pledges; will they not surprise the electors in whose ears they have been whispering during the general elections and the by-elections, that no great changes would be made in the tariff? The people will be surprised if the hon. gentlemen keep their pledges; but so far they have not made a record in that direction. I am sure those who have been threatened in this country with complete commercial annihilation, those who have been kept in business suspense for nearly nine months, may possibly have little fear that anything will overtake them, because they can