

another Gerrymander, and he must go in, I say, for a wider policy. He has done so, as I hope to point out in more detail before I close. The policy of the Gerrymander Bill was a policy which was designated at the time as a jury-packing policy; it was an attempt to select from the jurors already in existence those who were expected to give favorable verdicts to the right hon. gentleman, and to collect those together in such a manner that the aggregate of all their verdicts would be favorable to the hon. gentleman. He has gone, on this occasion, beyond packing the petit jury; he has gone down to the root and branch of the matter and packed the whole panel. He is not going merely to select the jury, but to select a whole panel, from which the jury is to be selected. The hon. gentleman has taken into his hands the right of naming the officer who shall select the jury to try the case. He has taken the whole panel into his hands, because, when we speak of the act and pleasure of the Government, we know whose act and pleasure it is. We know that the right hon. gentleman is the head, heart, soul and brain and the moving power of the party; we know, in short, that he is the party. We do not say there are not other men of brain and power in the Government; far from it; but every other brain, energy and will are as completely subservient to the will and brain of the right hon. gentleman as if those other members did not exist. Therefore, every act and pleasure of the Government, whether in pursuance of this Bill or in any other way, have to be credited to the account of the right hon. gentleman himself. I say he has taken power to pack the panel by the appointment of what he calls revising officers. It has been pointed out time and again that this is a misnomer, that they are not to be compared with those officers who are generally called revising officers in other countries. These are officers appointed to construct voters' lists. The officer is directed to procure the assessment rolls of the district, from which to prepare the list, and he is instructed to proceed as rapidly as possible with preparing the list, by procuring other information. He is, in short, by the provisions of the Bill, absolutely free, as regards the choice of evidence upon which he is to frame his voters' list, and as to the law applicable in each case. Having framed his voters' list in this way, taking what evidence he thinks fit, he roughly revises it. He then gives notice of the final revision. Who is to revise the action of this revising officer? Is it to go to the county judge or any other judge, or to a revising barrister? Not at all. This officer, who is given the utmost freedom in preparing the list, is to revise it himself and to be sole judge of what is evidence and what that evidence means, and as to what is the law; and an appeal cannot be taken against a decision, even on a point of law, unless his own consent is given to such appeal. That shows the absurdity of calling him a revising officer. He is a constructing and cooking officer. He is not to revise but to cook the voters' list. If that assertion is too strong, I challenge the leader of the Government to take all the force out of it, by submitting the final list cooked by this officer to an impartial reviser. I am not particular by whom it is revised, provided it is not handed over to the original cooker of the list. If the right hon. gentleman is willing to do that, I am willing to withdraw this phrase, that he is intended to be a cooking officer, but until such a provision is made I shall call him by no other name than the chief cook of the voters' list. The course proposed to be pursued of preparing these lists in privacy is different from that prevailing in Ontario. When our voters' list is made up from the assessment roll it is printed. A large number of copies are distributed; ten to each member in each House and defeated candidates for each House; ten to the reeve of each township and a certain number to each councillor, one to every schoolmaster in the township, and practically a copy is given by the township clerk to every-

Mr. CASEY.

body who asks for one. Then we have thirty days within which to enter appeals. They are entered and tried before the county judge, who may or may not be a partisan, but who at all events is not the individual who in the first instance put the list together, and who has, therefore, no personal interest in maintaining it in the shape in which it was originally submitted. I say, then, that the voters' list, as at present prepared in Ontario, is prepared with the greatest publicity, and copies of it can be obtained without cost by anyone. The result is, that publicity produces the effect it always produces in the conduct of public officers, that the assessors, township clerks, and revising judges all become more and more punctilious in following the law; there are fewer appeals every year, and the voters' lists are generally admitted to be in a better condition than formerly. Now, as to the course of this Dominion official. He is to send two copies each to the member or members in the Dominion House. He is to send two copies to the reeve, clerk and treasurer and other municipal officers. Are these to be printed lists? It does not seem so. He has not necessarily to print these lists, and in case they are not printed, he is bound to furnish copies at the rate of 6 cents for every ten names on the list. Perhaps hon. gentlemen do not realise what a beautiful little tax this will be upon any person not happening to be the member for the county, or the reeve, or the warden, who may wish to criticise the voters' list. Supposing it is a county where the member is perfectly well satisfied with the voters' lists, as I have no doubt most Conservative members will be—supposing a candidate were to oppose the sitting member, and should wish to have a look at the voters' list, he would have to pay 6 cents for every ten names on the list for a copy. Take the average constituency, which is from three to four thousand voters, and from \$18 to \$24 is a considerable tax to impose on any person wishing to have a look at the voters' list, for the purpose of a revision. I may be told that he has to post up a certain number at certain public places. But I would like to ask who is going to stand in a public office until he has gone over the whole voters' list for an electoral division, and compared the names on it with his notes, and ascertained whether every person is on that should be on, or whether there are some on the list who should not be there. I say that is not a sufficient publication of the list, and that no publication is sufficient without printing and publication as now done in the Province of Ontario. But we are told this officer is subject to a check on his actions, because, although he is irremovable during good behavior, in order that he may be independent, he is made removable for bad behavior, on an address of the House of Commons, exactly in the same way as a judge. Now, Sir, this arrangement for securing the independence of these officers is very pretty, when it is recollected that they are all to be appointed by the present Government, and will probably remain in office during a great many years, when the successors of this Government are in office, or would so remain, if the law should be left unchanged. It would be a very nice thing for the Government to leave behind them a large number of irremovable officials, appointed by them in their interests, to serve those interests, and no doubt a dutiful feeling on their part would cause them to be true to the interests for which they were appointed. But we are told there is a check on these officers, because they are removable by an address. Now I think this so-called check is as unwholesome and improper as the original appointment. They are to be continued in office during good behavior. I would ask what would seem bad behavior to a Conservative majority in this House, on the part of revising officers appointed for their own purposes? What would be good behavior? An hon. member beside me says "to put out all the Grits." That is what they are appointed for, and as long as they do that their