

lists. What is to be done under the circumstances? If the hon. gentleman will consult the figures under the old Dominion Act, he will find that the great cost of the old Franchise Act—and I am applying myself now more to the province of Ontario—lay in the payment of fees to the judges. Hon. gentlemen have said that their opposition to the present law, when it was brought in, some ten years ago, was so determined that they fought against it day and night. All I can say is, that I have read a good deal of the discussion which then took place, and I have noticed that it was conspicuous by the absence of any suggestions at all to improve the Bill. And if these hon. gentlemen on that occasion had made some suggestions as to cheapening the lists, the lists would not have caused so much dissatisfaction as they have. Now, let us look at the figures. In the Public Accounts for the province of Ontario, 1897, it will be found that there was paid to the county judges, in round figures, \$7,700 for revising the voters' lists for the local legislature, and I find that the judge of the county of Simcoe disposed of all the appeals in that county for the sum of \$214. Now, what does that mean? I do not know how many appeals there were in the other ridings, but I do know that there were upwards of 1,400 appeals in the riding of East Simcoe alone. But hon. gentlemen will stand up and say that if there is in the county of Simcoe this enormous number of appeals, they never have anything of the kind in their ridings. Now, these fees to the county judges must be paid on some scale or allowance, and if hon. gentlemen will look at the accounts they will see that in many of these counties the cost to the province was a great deal more than for the county of Simcoe, and therefore there must have been a great many more appeals in the other counties than there were in the county of Simcoe. I assume that there must have been in the county of Simcoe upwards of 2,500 appeals. We find that the judge was paid there \$214 for disposing of those appeals. Under the Dominion Franchise Act we find that the revising officer in the county, who is the county judge, Judge Ardagh, was paid \$1,100 for disposing of the appeals in that one riding alone. My suggestion is to pay these gentlemen about \$150 in each riding, and I will be bound to say that the county judges will be only too pleased to accept that amount and revise the appeals in each county. Do not run away with the idea that county court judges are driven to death. We find that they have time to go here and there to decide arbitrations. I know that at the present time there is an arbitration pending in the town of Barrie on the subject of waterworks, and the county judge of the county of Durham is one of the arbitrators. I think that a method could be devised which will be simple and inexpensive. My suggestion is to

Mr. BENNETT.

accept the local voters' list of a year preceding that when the revision is determined upon, and then provide a cheap system of appeal. Provide that the appellant may give notice to a man by letter, and let the appeal be heard without making the attendance of the man before the county court judge necessary as it is under the provincial system at present, where a man must be paid his fees to attend. I would have one month allowed in which appeals could be made. Let appeals to add names be made just as under the present arrangement—that is file an affidavit showing that the party whose name is sought to be added has the necessary qualifications, as to age, as to being a British subject, and so on, and, at the end of a month let the court be held. I will be bound to say that there would not be one riding, in the province of Ontario at any rate, in which the county court judge would not be pleased to dispose of all appeals for the sum of \$150.

Now, we have disposed of the cost of the judge. Let us come down to the greatest question of all, the matter of having an honest voters' list—and I know that hon. gentlemen on the other side, some of them at all events, and I will give most of them credit for it, want to have a semblance of fair-play in these lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is what we have not had for twelve years.

Mr. BENNETT. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman will not stand up in his place and claim that the county court judge who revised his list did anything wrong.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have done that many times in this House before, and I am prepared to do it again.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) will not allege that Judge Bell, who I am told is a Liberal and an honourable man, ever tampered with these lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But it happens that Judge Bell is not the revising officer in my county.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I am misinformed as to who he was. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) will not rise in his place and say that Judge Woods ever tampered with the lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I do, and have done.

Mr. BENNETT. Then all I can say is that the hon. gentleman was not sure of his ground, or he would have called for an investigation long ago. I stand in the judgment of the House when I say that the hon. gentleman never made a charge in this House that Judge Woods tampered with the lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I can prove by "Hansard" that I did.