

"I am a resident of St. Thomas, in the county of Elgin; I am in receipt of wages amounting to \$300 a year, and was in receipt of the same for twelve months prior to January 1st, 1886."

The revising officer rejects this application because he says the applicant should swear that he is a resident "within" the city, whereas the man swears, "I live in the city." The revising officer finds a distinction between in the city and within the city. Perhaps the Secretary of State will be able to point out where he has erred in that respect. He makes this further objection: that the applicant should state that he derives an income from his earnings, while the man swears that he is in receipt of an income of \$300 from his wages. What are his wages but his earnings? and yet this revising officer, appointed by this Government to do justice between man and man, sees fit to reject this man's application on that ground.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). He is a county judge, is he not?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not care whether he is a judge or not. The matter has been published for weeks, not only in the Opposition press, but in the *Mail* newspaper, and it was the duty of the Government to draw this officer's attention to the misinterpretation of the law he was laying down, and compel him, on pain of losing his place, to deal fairly between man and man. It is said that this man has rejected Conservative votes on the same grounds. I do not care for that; it only shows how unfit he is to be placed in a position so sacred and important as that of revising officer. Here is another application, in which the applicant's lawyer, instead of writing January in full, contracted it to Jany., and the revising officer imagined that there was some other month in the year that commenced in the same way, and rejected the application because January was not spelt in full. In no court are such technicalities as these allowed to prevail; and here the law ought to be interpreted in a liberal and generous spirit, and if there is a doubt of a man's right to vote, that doubt ought to be decided in favor of the voter until there is an opportunity of finally testing it at the court of revision. But in cases where there has been no doubt whatever this and other revising officers have rejected the names of applicants. Not so has the law been administered in other cases. We have given some instances in which the applications, verified by the proper evidence, have been rejected. The revising officers had a formal meeting in Toronto, and decided that the names of applicants who made proper application, accompanied by a sworn declaration, should be placed on the list, and that no other names should be placed thereon except those on the assessment roll and the voters' list. But some of these revising officers, in clear defiance of the law and of the statements of the First Minister last Session, have placed hundreds of names on the lists without any declaration having been made. We know that in more than one county, where there are Indians, the revising officer has placed the names of from 56 to 448 Indians on the list without any application having been made by them. Some prominent Conservative has been sent to the Indian agent, and has got the names from him.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I rise to a point of order. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to name the constituency where that has been done, and the revising officer who has done it?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to enquire in the different constituencies where there is an Indian population, he will find the truth of my statement. I am told on credible authority that the names of Indians have been placed on the list without any application having been made by them, and I say that is not in accordance with the statement made last Session by the First Minister, who assured us that Indians should be

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

treated like white men—that if they made application to the revising officer and showed their right to vote, that their names would be placed on the voters' list. I am told further that in some cases where the Indians did not want their names to be put on the voters' list at all, their names appear on the list, and they are entitled to vote at the next parliamentary election. Now, Sir, these are some, but by no means all, of the objections we have to the conduct of these revising officers. The fact is, some of them do not obey the law; they do not care for the law; they are a law to themselves; they do as they please. If the Government has given them instructions, and they do not obey the Government and the law, they have no right to be there, and the sooner they are made aware of that the better. I complained last night, and I complain again, that there is a want of uniformity in the practice. In some constituencies the revising officers give notice of every step taken. That is proper. Some do not give any notice, and they decline to give any information to one side of politics. By referring to the Statute of last year, you will find that by sections 19 and 20 the revising officer is bound to hold a court for the preliminary revising of the voters' list, and section 20 provides that any person who desires to be placed on the voters' list—

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). Before the hon. gentleman enters on that branch of his subject, I wish to ask him if he will have the goodness to place the papers he has read from, on the Table, so that other members may see them, or whether he does not intend to do so.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If my hon. friend or any other member desires to see these affidavits, they are quite open to their inspection. But I am not going to place them on the Table of the House, as I do not know what is to become of them. They were placed in my hands for a purpose, and I have used them for that purpose; and if the hon. gentleman is so curious and anxious to get at the truth, I am perfectly willing to show them to him. I hope my hon. friend is satisfied. I was pointing out, when interrupted, that, as I understand it, the judge is bound to hold a preliminary court and to give a month's notice of its holding. In sections 19 and 20, any person has the right to make application to be placed on the list of that preliminary court, the duty of the judge being simply to add names and make amendments and corrections, not to strike out names. Any person who desires to be placed on the list has the right, by giving eight days' notice, to appear before the revising officer at the preliminary court. In the city of Toronto, notice has been given that this preliminary court will be held at various days in the different wards, between the 5th and 13th April, and yet the *Toronto Mail* publishes the following:—

"The list of voters under the Dominion Electoral Franchise Act have been completed, and no more names will be added, until the final revision in July."

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is in the local column, not over the signature of the judge.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is in the *Mail*, the organ of the Opposition, and the paper they swear by. It has gone abroad to the electors of Toronto that nobody can apply to be put on the voters' list at this preliminary court. Whether the paper be wrong or right, this misleading paragraph has gone abroad to the public. I am told, however, that the *Mail* is not wrong and that the revising officer has so decided. If that be so, he has gone in the teeth of the Statute, and I hope the Government has not given instructions to revising officers to so decide. It is said the Government have found that the costs of printing the lists will reach so enormous a sum that they have decided on putting a veto on adding names at the preliminary court, as in that case the lists will have to be printed twice after the preliminary revision. That somebody is at