

occasionally depend on the skilful management of these valuations by a partisan and dishonest reviser. Now, Mr. Chairman, that I have spoken of the preparation of the lists by the revisers, I have an objection to make to the system proposed for the preparation of these lists on the ground of what they will cost to the country. It has been proved by several members that it would be a very expensive system to have the lists prepared by the revisers. These men will be obliged to travel several times over a county in order to make the valuation of properties and to prepare the lists; they must have secretaries, bailiffs, and a host of officials who will cost a great deal to the country. It has been estimated that the probable cost of the preparation of the lists by the revisers will be something like \$600,000 or \$800,000. But I am not exaggerating when I say that the cost of preparing the lists will be about a half million of dollars or from \$2,000 to \$2,500 for each county of the Dominion of Canada. Why not maintain the mode which exists to-day? Everybody is satisfied with it or at least nobody complains of it, and it offers the great advantage of not costing anything. The municipal councils are obliged to prepare the voters' lists for the Local Government, why not use them for Dominion elections? By admitting the lists prepared for the Local Legislatures the extraordinary expenditure of \$500,000 would be saved to the Dominion of Canada. I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House. I cannot, however, resume my seat without remarking that the measure which is now submitted to us is so objectionable, it is such an infamous Bill that we hardly see any Conservative members rising to defend it. It is true we saw a few Ontario members defend it, but it is a well known fact that the members from Ontario who are supporting Sir John are ever ready to defend any of his acts. But I must be grateful to the Conservative members from Quebec for not having stood up to defend this measure in this House, although I very deeply regret that a large number of them are too submissive to the First Minister, and that they should have voted for the second reading of the Bill. However, I am glad to make an exception in favor of the hon. members for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), and for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), who have separated from their party on this question. I shall quote an extract from the speech delivered by the hon. member for Bagot before the second reading of the Bill. He said:

"Mr. Speaker, I would be ashamed to go back to my constituency after having sanctioned by my vote, such a monstrous principle as that which is consecrated in the Bill now before us. I would prefer to be defeated in any electoral contest, with three-fourths of my party than to achieve a victory which might be suspected of being the result of such a tyrannical law as that which is now before us. War comparisons are in order in time of war, I shall make one: It would be better for the general of an army to lose a battle fairly and while knowing the result before hand, than to employ, in order to achieve victory, destructive weapons which are prohibited by the laws of civilised warfare. If he employs these destructive weapons which are forbidden by the international law, he will have against him the whole world who will march against his army, and will crush him if he has been victorious. On the contrary, if after having fought fairly and loyally, he is beaten after having shown that courage which one has a right to expect from the chief of an army, then he will, at least, have the consolation of saying with the illustrious vanquished of Pavia: 'All is lost save the honor.' Just so in political contests. Never should any party do anything which is not according to the law of nations in order to get the control over straightforward opponents. Now, I consider that the present Bill is an infringement on the law of nations. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, could any one imagine a law which would be more contrary to the principles of constitutional government, a more arbitrary law? A law so extraordinary in fact, that I believe that even if we should use the means which it puts at our disposal to control the electorate, we would be crushed in the next electoral contest; because, in my opinion, this law will have the result of stirring up against us our own followers, who will say: If to-day we deprive our opponents from their liberty, to-morrow they may deprive us from the liberty we now enjoy."

It will be seen by this extract from the speech of the hon. member for Bagot, that a certain number of Conservative members are opposed to this measure because it is contrary to the law of nations. I am wondering what may be the object of such a Bill as this, for what reason is it sought to

be forced upon us, when nobody wants it and when a large number of Conservatives are opposed to it. There can be but one object and that is to gag the electorate, and prevent the expressions of public opinion at the next elections. One thing has been remarked, and it is that at each election since 1872, that is in 1872, 1878 and 1882, the First Minister has had at his disposal such means as he has to-day to gag the electorate. We remember the corruption which he practiced in 1872, and which resulted in the Pacific scandal. We also remember the scheme of a new legislation which had been initiated before the elections of 1878 and by which promises were made to the great commercial corporations. In making these promises, the First Minister has been able to collect enormous subscriptions to carry the elections which brought him to power. In 1882, he introduced the famous Bill for the re-distribution of seats, by which he changed the electoral divisions for the purpose of gaining some fifteen or twenty counties in Ontario. To-day the Government see that public opinion is turning against them, and once more they have recourse to great means. They propose this Bill in order to gag the electorate. What will be the effect of this Bill if it becomes law? I must admit that it is very difficult to calculate what will be its consequences, because if this contrivance, which is proposed by the Government, is destined to cause the defeat of a great many members, we must admit that it will stir up public opinion against the party in power. There is no doubt that in the Province of Quebec there will be such an uprising of public opinion that it will, in a great measure, counteract the pernicious effect of the injustice about to be committed. But, unfortunately, I am told that it will not be so in the Province of Ontario. I am told that every Tory there in Ontario is just as slavish as the Tories who support the First Minister in this Parliament. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that these consequences are easy to foresee. We have every possible reason to suppose that its effect will be to bring back a majority of Ontario Tories in this House. An omnipotent Tory majority in this House means the incorporation of the Orange lodges in all the Provinces of Canada, and within a few years the establishment of legislative union. I hope that when it comes to that we will see the Conservative members of the Province of Quebec show enough patriotism to try and control the influence of their friends, the Ontario Tories, but will they be able to do it? There is one certain fact which ought not to be forgotten, and it is that each Liberal member from Ontario, who will be defeated by the effect of this Bill, is a good soldier lost by those who are in favor of French Canadian influence in this House, and of independence of the Provinces. There is one possible fact, Mr. Chairman, if this Bill has the disastrous effect which we are pointing out to-day, there is one man in this House who may, perhaps, have to atone in the end for the iniquitous provisions of the measure which he is trying to force upon us. If this Bill causes the election of a large majority of Tories in Ontario, through the obnoxious provisions which it contains, on the other hand, I hope that it will awaken the patriotism of the Province of Quebec, and will bring about a split in the Conservative party, which is so powerful to-day. And I would not be surprised if that infamous Bill, which is sought to be forced upon us, would fall back on the head of the First Minister; and if the members from the Province of Quebec would abandon him in the end, to punish him for the absolutism shown by him on the present occasion.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak for the first time in this House I am happy to have an opportunity of claiming the rights of the Provincial Legislatures. In fact, what is the object of the sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald), and of the amendment moved by