

affords to a man who is blinded by party ties or interests.

There is a case which is well known, where a clerk so appointed admitted that he had prepared his list from that of a Liberal scrutineer used at previous election, and this is the Act which Mr. Laurier intends foisting upon the Dominion. Another thing that has been done is to place bogus names on the list after it was declared completed. This was done to his friend from Emerson, who, when he heard of it, had subpoenas issued and given to a constable to serve, but the constable made a return that he could not find these men, for the very good reason that they never existed. Yet some of these names were retained on the list.

And why do you suppose did they decide that these names should be retained on the lists? Because the revising officer declared that unless it was proved that the subpoenas were served he would not strike the names from the list, and as these people never had any existence, it was not very easy to prove that the subpoenas had been served.

The Act say the clerk shall post up, thirty days before the court of revision is held, the list of voters. Is this ever done? No, it is not. The speaker then read a correspondence between Mr. McDonald, president of the Conservative Association, and the registrar of Brandon, Mr. Maclean, to show that in the case of the election held at Brandon, the court of revision was held before the list was completed. Mr. McDonald asked that the court should adjourn until the list was completed, but this Mr. Maclean refused. It is to avoid a repetition of such infamous conduct as this that he is now addressing the House. His friends opposite are opposed to the Dominion Act on account of its cost, but more particularly because it works out against them. Under the provincial Act there is no appeal from the revising barrister, while under the Dominion Act there is an appeal to a judge.

He had in his possession the names of 200 voters which were given to Albert Monkman to place on the voters' list for Dauphin, yet this Monkman refused to say whether he would or would not place them on the list. From this it can be seen that all that was required were seven Albert Monkman's, and where would be the votes opposed to the present government? This was no hearsay story, for he had in his hand a sworn statement to this effect. In the little town of Morris, in 1892, there were 108 names of French Canadians kept off the lists, but fortunately they were righted by the court of revision, yet it was through no fault of Dr. McTavish that these Frenchmen were not disfranchised. Again, this McTavish, in a small settlement, left off the list 55 names of men well known to him. Later on, however, thanks to the returning officer, Mr. Dawson, these names were added. The same state of affairs obtained in many other districts, such as Hamiota. It is only in constituencies where it is known that the Conservative vote will not affect the result, that this is not tampered with.

Right here in Winnipeg, in 1896, 800 names were omitted from the voters' list so as to ensure the election of a supporter of the government. The Greenway Government owes its return to power more to revising officers than to the votes of the people.

\* \* \* \* \*  
In North Winnipeg, 400 names were left off the list at the last provincial election. When Mr.

Laurier made such a slanderous statement as he is reported to have done, he should be informed of this. The registration clerk in Winnipeg has been charged by Mr. Haggard with perjury. When we have a law which permits, which in fact encourages, such deeds of infamy, it is high time to ask that such a law should be repealed or amended. It was for an honest franchise that he was to-day contending. Should Mr. Laurier's intention be to submit this Act for the Dominion Act, it would be a lasting disgrace to the country at large.

Now, Sir, I do not require to say another word in order to prove to the House that nothing could be more unjust, nothing could be more calculated to destroy the character of this House in the estimation of the country than to provide that the members of this House shall be elected under such an infamous Act as this is described to be. But, Sir, this is not all. I have under my hand a statutory declaration by D. H. McFadden which also, I think it my duty to read to the House:

Dominion of Canada.  
Province of Manitoba.  
To wit:

In the matter of the Emerson Voters' List.

I, David Henry McFadden, of the town of Emerson, in the province of Manitoba, veterinary surgeon, do solemnly declare, that—

1. I was first elected to the provincial legislature of Manitoba in the year 1892, by a majority of fourteen votes, as representative for the electoral division of Emerson.

2. The aforesaid constituency of Emerson was represented by one James Thompson from 1888 to 1892, and who, in 1888, was elected by a majority of fourteen.

3. The aforesaid Thompson was my opponent in 1892.

4. Donald Forrester, barrister, of Winnipeg, was appointed registration clerk and W. E. Perdue, barrister, Winnipeg, revising barrister for the Emerson division, to revise the voters' list previous to the last provincial election.

5. The said registration clerk opened an office at Emerson according to the terms of the Election Act of this province. Every night I had a clerk go to this office and make an exact copy of the list as it was from day to day altered or added to, and continued this rule up to the last day for receiving applications to be put on the list. Late in the evening of that day, I had the said list completed as it was made out by the registration clerk.

6. When the list was printed and distributed, according to the provisions of said Act, I found 13 names on the printed list which were not on my copy of the list, the names being as follows:

Poll No. 10.

No. on List.

- 13 Campbell, Arch.
- 48 Leith, Alex.
- 49 May, Chas.
- 62 McEwan, M. W.
- 88 White, Wm.

Poll No. 11.

- 14 Hargrave, P.
- 22 Munro, Alex.
- 34 Pullar, James.
- 47 Singer, Joseph.