

who are no longer interested in the constituency, and, possibly, others no longer interested in Canada: whilst they exclude the new-comers and the young men who, since the last revision, have reached the age which qualifies them to vote.

What we want is a system that shall not give us voters' lists when they are not wanted: and this can only be assured by adopting, in connection with the principle of manhood suffrage, a plan of registration, similar to that in operation in some of the neighboring states. There, registration is a part of the election machinery. The city or county is divided into precincts or districts, analogous to our polling districts. You want to vote. In order to assert your right, you visit the polling booth that is to be, a week or two weeks, as provided by law, in advance of the election. In the presence of representatives of the opposing parties you declare that you are a resident of the precinct, give your address and register your name. In the course of a few days the agents of the parties, who are termed supervisors of elections, make the necessary inquiries as to your residence, and, if the claim to the franchise is not appealed for further and immediate inquiry before an election judge, the franchise is yours and you can duly exercise it on polling day. This plan of registration has the merit of simplicity. It is also inexpensive, timely and fair.

Objection may be taken to the manhood suffrage principle on the ground that it affords too wide a distribution of the franchise. But it is impossible to understand how a supporter of the present Dominion law can oppose it with such an argument. We have manhood suffrage in Ontario. The system, however, gives no one a vote who, if his case is fairly adjudicated upon, is not also entitled to a vote under the Dominion act. It is impossible to compare, with accuracy, the strength of the electorate under

each plan, because the principles of registration differ: but it is a fact that in some municipalities the number of electors on the provincial lists is identically the same as the number on the Dominion lists. Another objection may be based upon the fact that with manhood suffrage a residential qualification is necessary, and that in consequence the one-man-one-vote principle must be adopted. But why, in Dominion, above all other elections, should any individual have more than one vote? Is it because he has more property than his poorer neighbor? Then the reply is that the Dominion House does not legislate for property. Is it because the multiplicity of votes is an ancient privilege? Then the answer is that history tells another story. The old forty shilling franchise conferred but one vote in England and in Canada. But if men are to have votes according to the value of their property why not be just? An elector to-day having \$100,000 worth of property in one constituency has only one vote. His neighbor with \$20,000 worth distributed over three or four constituencies has three or four votes. Why not deal fairly with the richer man of the two by allowing him to cast fifteen or twenty ballots in the constituency in which his \$100,000 worth of property is situated? Or if wealth is a fair basis for the franchise why regard property only as wealth? Surely bank stocks and mortgages ought to entitle the holder to a multiplicity of votes calculated upon their value.

The great point to be insisted upon is that the citizen shall be allowed to vote, and that it shall cost neither his party nor the State any very large sum to secure him his right. This point cannot be reached under a system which gives us more law than justice and compels each man to fight, as for his life, for that political recognition, to which as a tax-payer he is fairly entitled. It is, let it be observed