

that these matters should be decided very often by an unknown party, and at all events by a person directly paid by the party in power and whose appointment is not always in the public interest? I defy any one to say that our municipal authorities in this country are corrupt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. AMYOT. Are there some dogs in that party who yelp? Is there a man in this House who will state that the municipal authorities of this country are not capable of knowing those who live alongside them? In the County of L'Islet, who is making the lists? A lawyer residing in Quebec, nearly 100 miles from that county. Whom does he know in that county? If the hon. member who represents that county has one of a majority it may be due to the omission of the names of those who would be on the list if the municipal authorities were making them as they should have the power of doing. We complain that the lists are not made by the parties who should make them. We complain that this system costs a great deal of money to the state and a great deal of money to the various counties, and is unnecessarily costly to the candidates. If you choose to have the franchise settled by this Parliament, at all events let it be applied by the local authorities. In the Province of Quebec the municipal system operates perfectly in this respect. My hon. friend says he has seen some unfairness and some injustice in connection with it. So long as humanity exists, there will be some unfairness somewhere, but I prefer the lists which are made by responsible members of local councils, who may be changed every year, lists which are made every year without costing one cent, to lists which are made every three or four years by paid officers of a Government or a party. I have heard the statement of some hon. gentlemen that they would not take the electoral franchise of the Province of Quebec because some employés of the Federal Government have been denied their right of voting. The Province of Quebec has seen fit to say that the employés of the Intercolonial Railway, whose number increases during an election and who are paid by the country, and who are moved from county to county as the Government may desire, that those paid electors, selected by the paid agent of the Government and transported unduly on the public railways of the country, are no longer able to express a free and impartial opinion, and it has taken away their right to vote, as I think justly. Examples have been given of the unfairness of revising officers in the preparation of the list. In one parish in the County of Bellechasse which I represent—the Parish of Beaumont—and it is a small parish, in the federal lists there are about forty names missing which are to be found on the local list. In one parish I was deprived of forty votes of my friends. We were told not to revise the list last year because there would be a revision in 1891, as well as a census and a redistribution of seats. In Bellechasse I was deprived of about four hundred votes, owing to the bad preparation of the voters' lists then in force. Now, if there is a revision, everyone of us will have to go to his county and do nearly the same work as at elections, in order to remedy the fact that the revising officers will not know the parties they will have to deal with,

Mr. AMYOT.

will not know those who will be dead, and who will be replaced by this and that proprietor. Admit or deny the principle that this or any other Government has the right to say who shall vote and how shall be constituted the House of Representatives. Decide as you like on that; but at all events make the provision practicable. Give it to the municipal authorities who are presumed to be honest and who know what they are about. We understand that it would be hard for the governing party to dispense with a lot of officials who think themselves in duty bound to work for those who have appointed them for life. We understand that, and that is the underlying reason why the Government and their supporters cling so tenaciously to the Franchise Act. For my part I would be in favour of any Franchise Act which would be sincerely, honestly and fairly applied, but it will never be sincerely, honestly and fairly applied so long as it is controlled by an officer not a resident of the county, who very often resides far from the county, who is responsible to nobody, and who receives his pay directly from the power that has appointed him.

Mr. DALY. I would not trouble the House to-night upon this question were it not that we have had a Franchise Act passed in the Province of Manitoba lately by the Legislature of that province, a Legislature composed principally of gentlemen of the same political persuasion as hon. gentlemen opposite, and having at the head of its Government a gentleman whom the mover of this Bill is no doubt very well acquainted with, the Hon. Mr. Greenway. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), who has this Bill in charge, will remember the name of Mr. Greenway, and he will recollect that in days gone by Mr. Greenway was his opponent, and he will recollect that he was left at home, and Mr. Greenway sent down here to represent his constituency. It is true that Mr. Greenway was not sent here by the majority of the electors of that constituency, but he came here by the leave of the hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill. This Mr. Greenway went to Manitoba, where he has since become premier of that province. He leads a Reform Government there, he leads a Government which hon. gentlemen opposite delight to honour, he leads a Government of which the Hon. Mr. Martin is Attorney-General, a gentleman who opposed me during the late election; and this gentleman, I believe, on different platforms during the Dominion election that took place in our province some years ago, had as much to say against the Dominion Franchise Act as the hon. gentlemen have to say to-night, and as they have said in previous debates. But a change has come over the dream of the Greenway Government in the Province of Manitoba, and they have introduced a Franchise Act there, which exceeds in enormity, I may say—using the terms of the hon. gentleman opposite respecting the Dominion Franchise Act—exceeds in enormity the Act which was passed by the right hon. gentleman and his Government in 1885. Why, Sir, I have no doubt but that when the hon. member for Huron, with very sweet simplicity and charming nonchalance gave his views to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House respecting the repeal of the Franchise Act, he did not tell those hon. gentlemen who support him that this Greenway Reform Gov-