

tical opponent, so that when that man comes up to vote he may not be permitted to. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, is that fair? Sir, it is a dishonest act, and it has occurred time and time again in the province of Ontario. This very last election, in my own town, when the clerk of the peace sent down the roll book to the deputy returning officers, my attention was called to the fact that there were names left off the list. I want to give the clerk of the peace credit for this, that when I telephoned and apprised him of the fact, he had the omission corrected, and on election day these men had their votes. But in the adjoining riding of Monck, in one polling subdivision all the names under the letter S and part of those under the letter W were omitted from the voters' list. And, forsooth, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we shall have a complete, honest and fair list if we adopt the franchise of the province of Ontario. No, Mr. Speaker, we shall have anything but a complete and fair list, if we adopt the lists as they are compiled at the present time by those officials. Hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Ontario who have spoken seem much enamoured of our provincial franchise because it is based on the one man one vote principle. If that is good for the province of Ontario, why is it not good for the whole Dominion? Why do these gentlemen not insist on having a uniform franchise of that kind? I certainly approve of the principle of one man one vote. I would be very glad to see that adopted as the principle of the franchise for this Parliament. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the other night said that if we would look at the Statute-book, we would find that the Hon. Oliver Mowat ought to receive credit for giving the young men of the province of Ontario the right to vote. Let me tell that hon. gentleman that while that Act is on the Statute-book of Ontario as having been passed by the Mowat Government, if he will look up the journals of the province of Ontario, he will find that years before it was passed the Conservative Opposition in the local House moved to amend the Franchise Act so as to give farmers' sons and the young men in our towns and cities the right to vote, and every Liberal in the House voted against it. So the hon. gentleman must not attempt to take credit to the Ontario Government for this wise provision in the Ontario law. But, Sir, I would be afraid to trust my franchise with a party composed of men like those who have been conducting the affairs of the province of Ontario for the last 25 or 26 years—and, by the way, there are indications that there may be a change in that respect before long. The Liberal Government in the province of Ontario have not hesitated to do some of the meanest things in regard to the franchise law of the province that could be perpetrated by a government having any preten-

Mr. McCLEARY.

sions to decency and honesty. Need I call to the minds of hon. members of this House the Act passed by that government by which they legislated a man into Parliament who could not be elected by the people. When the city of Toronto was by statute entitled to three members, they provided that a voter in that city should have only two-thirds of a vote. They put on the Statute-book a law declaring that while three members were to be elected for the city of Toronto, each voter could only vote for two. The consequence was that the Liberal party, who were in the minority in the city of Toronto, had their man elected by Act of Parliament. What kind of a proceeding is that? Is it fair, is it right, is it just? Of course, they were shamed out of it afterwards. Then they thought that possibly under a system of registration, which they enacted in 1894, and by carving up and manipulating the city of Toronto they might get a member or two. So they applied to the city of Toronto an Act known as the Registration Act. But their Act proved to be equally weak in that regard, because up to the present time they have not been able to get a member elected in that intelligent city.

An hon. MEMBER. They were near it.

Mr. McCLEARY. Near enough to be left. Referring for a moment to the registration in towns and cities, I realize that it acts very unfairly to the larger towns. For instance, take it in my own county. By an Act of the local legislature last session the Registration Act was extended to the county towns. The county town of my county is smaller than the town in which I live, but the former had registration, while the latter had not. A special Act was passed giving registration to the town of Niagara Falls. This registration cost that town between \$500 and \$600. How unfair it is for any Government to have the right to manipulate any franchise law in that way—to say, we will give certain municipalities the right to registration, and will not give it to others. It seems to me untenable and unsound, and we would be a foolish lot of representatives if we were to hand over to any local government the power to control the franchise for this Federal Parliament. Another objection I have to this Bill is that it will bring into our municipal elections such a party feeling that our municipalities must eventually suffer. This matter was brought out the other night by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore). There will be a desperate effort on the part of the two political parties in each municipality to get control of the municipal council, and what does that mean? It means that the municipality must eventually suffer, because as long as they can get a party man, they will not look for a business man or a man who has the most interest in the municipality; they will not look for careful and prudent farmers, like the hon. member