

and free for electoral frauds of all kinds in the preparation of the voters' lists. Let me give the House a sample or two which have come under my notice since this Bill became law. It was declared, when the First Minister was pressing the Bill through Parliament, that the mixed and complicated franchises he was proposing for some of the provinces would necessarily entail expense, labour, trouble and complications of all kinds; that the returning officers would not all decide alike on the same questions; that one revising officer would decide the point in one way and another returning officer in quite another way. I know of one electoral district in which an income franchise voter made a declaration in order to have his name inserted on the voters' list. He made the usual declaration. He swore to that declaration on oath, and made his application to the returning officer; and the oath—and it is that which substantially affects the merits of the case—was in the following words:—"I am in receipt of wages to the value of \$300 a year or over; I have been so for one year prior to 1st January, 1886, and have been a resident of the city for that same period." One would naturally think, that the object of Parliament and of the returning officer would be, that any man making a *bond fide* application to be placed on the voters' list, asking to enjoy the right that every British subject ought to have the right to enjoy, should have his application dealt with, not in a technical spirit, but in a broad and liberal one. This worthy returning officer rejected the declaration and cut off the unfortunate man from his right to exercise the franchise, and the grounds on which he did it emphasizes the stand we took when we opposed the Bill in 1885. The returning officer said: I want information, and the information must be supplied in an intelligible form; the 1st of January must be supplied in so many words, and not by contractions, the words "\$300 or over" convey no meaning, the law requires "not less than \$300." "Prior to 1st January" is bad. On these four grounds that intelligent and unpartizan returning officer—I am bound to assume that he was such—rejected this man's application to be placed on the voters' list: because the figures "1st January" were inserted, because the words "three hundred dollars or over" were used instead of "not less than \$300," and because the words "prior to 1st January, 1886," were used. I say the work of carrying out the Act is difficult besides being expensive. I say that it leaves the doors open to all kinds of electoral frauds. I will give you an illustration of this instead of an argument, because I believe that one illustration is better than an hour's argument. I have in my mind an electoral riding in the Province of Ontario where 125 names on the voter's list were put upon the voter's list twice; on the same voter's list, 15 names were inserted three times, and on the very same list 50 voters put on as income voters had not been living in the riding, nor in the electoral district, nor in the county, for a year or more before the application to put them on the list was made, and yet every one of these irregularities were on the face of the voters' list when the election was held. Is it possible that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House can be satisfied with this mode of preparing the voters' lists: 125 names inserted twice on the one list, 15 names three times, and 50 voters who were not living in the district at all, many of them

living in the United States, more of them living in the North-West Territories, and yet every name was inserted on the voters' list when polling day arrived. In the same riding, but in another polling sub-division, 119 names were added to the voters' list by the court of revision as I understand it, and yet when the electors came to the poll their votes only 12 of these 119 names were found on the list. In addition to that, upon that same voters' list and in the same polling sub-division there were 12 names inserted every one of whom was a minor. I have the names here, and they are as follows:—

"Jas. E. Oldershaw, aged 17; Fred. Northwood, 18 years old; Ed. Delahanty, 20; Philip Coate, aged 20; Geo. Northwood, 17; Morton Rolls, 16; Adam Redner, 18 years; Walter George, 16; John Snape, 20; John Synington, aged 18."

This shows you that the electors, the great mass of the people of this country, have no protection whatever for their franchise. They may have their names inserted upon the voters' list at the preliminary or final revision, but they have no guarantee whatever that these names shall appear upon the voters' list when they come to record their votes for or against one candidate or the other. Let me give you another illustration. In another constituency 150 names were stricken off the voters' list altogether. You would think that would be the end of it, Mr. Speaker. I suppose, for I am bound to suppose, that the Government honestly intended to carry out the law. One would naturally suppose, giving everybody credit for fair dealing and honesty, that the revising officer would act the same, but of the 150 names I refer to which were erased from the voters' list, every one of them was upon the voters' list when we came to record our votes. I do not know where the fraud arose. I am hardly prepared to say that it was a fraud, but it was an extraordinary circumstance that 150 names were struck off the voters' list in one riding, and that the revising officer so decided, and yet everyone of these names were upon the voters' list when we came to vote on polling day. I can point to the facts in my own county with absolute certainty and without fear of successful contradiction, and I can state that scores of names which were added to the list, both by declaration and at the preliminary and final revision, were not found upon the voters' list that was sent to Goderich and upon which we recorded our votes on the 5th of March last. Scores of names which were erased from the voters' list by the revising officer remained on the voters' list. Men dead for five years, men who all these years had been sleeping their last sleep and whose names were stricken off, suddenly appeared upon the voters' list. I do not know that there was a resurrection and that these dead men voted, but I do know that they were personated in more than one instance. Dead men voted through their proxies; the grandfather and the father were dead for five or six years, the grandson and the son living on the old homestead for ten years had no vote at all under this beautiful Franchise Act which was to correct all the errors and cure all the mistakes, and be perfect in every respect, as we were told by the First Minister and his colleagues when we were fighting this Bill for months on the floor of Parliament. I will give you another instance which came under my personal observation. In the town of Clinton, with a population of