

contest between the two parties to get to the revising officer to try to influence him to put on names, and others to try to prevent those names from being put on, or to put on others from the opposite side. I do not accuse the revising officer in my division; I do not believe that he would have been guilty of putting on any man that should not have been put on that list. But I know that he has put on names there through misrepresentation, and he has left others off, although acting in the very best good faith, he has left others off by being misinformed, by being led into an error by parties who are interested in doing it. Now, when the list is left to the preparation of the local councils, when these seven councillors are sitting there acting without any party or political prejudice at their council board, they cannot be led into that error, because each one of them knows his own section of the municipality, and on his representation no one can come in and deceive the other members. Therefore, with regard to the preliminary stage of the lists in Quebec, that objection does not carry. With regard to the payment of the judges and clerks in the province of Ontario, as mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that does not apply in Quebec. Now with regard to the list being revised only on the eve of the local elections, that does not apply either in the province of Quebec, for in that province, in the month of March every year, these lists are carefully revised by every local council in the province who does its duty at all. Therefore, the lists are perfectly new every year. Now, with regard to this statement of the hon. member for Bothwell that the Liberals gave a pledge to bring in a new Franchise Bill without being asked, I have only to say that during my contest, not only was I asked but I promised to have the old Franchise Bill abolished, and to have as far as possible a new one based upon provincial franchise. If any proof is wanted that petitions have been sent in, the hon. member for Bothwell ought to be satisfied that a large number of petitions have been sent in here when he sees the majority of members who have been elected to assist the right hon. leader of the Government to abolish this Bill, for it is one of those pledges that we made, and it is a pledge that we are bound to carry out.

Mr. TAYLOR. The only one.

Mr. STENSON. In time we will carry them all out. Now, with regard to the limits of the constituency, the hon. member for Bothwell attempts to make a point by saying that this cannot apply because constituencies for the provinces and those for the Dominion Parliament have not the same limits. I admit they have not the same limits. Too many have been gerrymandered to have the same limits. But notwithstanding the gerrymander, this Bill does apply

Mr. STENSON.

and applies without there being a fault found in it, for surely the hon. member for Bothwell won't find in his gerrymandered constituencies any one municipality that has been split in two.

Mr. CLANCY. Oh, yes.

Mr. STENSON. Well, it will apply all the same, because if there is a list being arranged it will apply everywhere as long as it is done for the Dominion House.

Mr. CLANCY. These municipalities were split, but not for the Dominion.

Mr. STENSON. Well, then let this law be passed and it will apply just the same if they were split into a dozen parts. The list is there for the Ontario elections, the same list will be there in each municipality, and even if a portion of that municipality is put into another constituency, that does not disfranchise those who were set off for they can vote in the constituency in which they reside.

Mr. CLANCY. You do not know much about the Ontario law.

Mr. STENSON. I know something of common sense, and common sense will tell you that that does not disfranchise the portion taken off, but sets them in another constituency. I do not believe my hon. friend will say that the Ontario law is not based on common sense, we have too many sensible men coming from the province of Ontario to believe that. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the municipal lists cannot be made practical in Ontario. Well, I do not know why. We can make them practical in Quebec. If they are not practical in Ontario, go to work and make them as we have made them in Quebec and they will be just as practical in Ontario as in Quebec.

Mr. COCHRANE. What about the manhood franchise?

Mr. STENSON. I have not the slightest objection to manhood suffrage in Ontario. If you have manhood suffrage in Ontario, very well, keep it and use it, but do not ask us in Quebec to accept it, because we do not want it. Leave us free to apply the franchise as we please in the province of Quebec; leave us free also to apply it to the federal elections. I do not see what objections hon. gentlemen from Ontario or any other province can have to Quebec people electing members to this House by the votes that they think best qualified to elect them. As long as we elect our 65 members, we ask no advantage because that just allows us to conduct our affairs according to our views, and you can conduct yours according to your views. In that way we will secure provincial autonomy, and we will allow the province of Quebec and every other province in the Dominion to make its own electoral lists as it may see fit. When this is done, no province will