

who owned 200 acres of land in West Wawanosh, who had lived there 25 years, and had voted at every election during that time until January, 1896, had no vote. His name was on the assessment roll, the collector's roll, and the local list, but not on the voters' list. Another man who had occupied 200 acres of land for four years was left off the voters' list. Another man in the town of Goderich, who had lived there for 30 years, who owned the property where he lived, and who had voted at every election, was left off. Another man, Patrick McCarthy, who had lived in the town for 35 years, was on the local list, the assessment roll, and the collector's roll, but not on the Dominion list when election day came. Another man, James Munro, who had lived there 40 years, and had voted at every election during that time, was on the assessment roll, the collector's roll and the local list, but not on the Dominion list. Scores of names added at the revision were left off the list on polling day, and scores of names that had been stricken off the list were on when polling day came. A law under which such things can happen is a law that ought to be repealed at the earliest possible moment. I care not what the hon. gentleman calls it, to my mind it is anything but trivial and unimportant. It is one of the most important laws we have on the Statute-book—a law which sends the members to this Parliament, and which we ought to see honestly carried out; but it has never been honestly carried out. There were in my own riding at the last revision about 100 names left off that should have been on, or on that should have been off, and you may be sure that those who were on that should not be were not the names of Liberals. In one municipality there were 100 such. There are seven municipalities in my riding, so that on that basis there were 700 votes that were either left off intentionally or put on intentionally, where neither should have happened. All this is owing to this vicious law, as vicious a law as ever found a place on the Statute-book of this country; and this Government would not be worthy of its name as a square, honest Government, willing to carry out the will of the people who sent it here, if it did not repeal this law. When I make these charges, I do not attribute them all to the revising officers. In fact, I am not sure now these things happened—whether by the manipulations of the revising officers or their clerks or at the printing bureau at Ottawa. That they did happen is capable of the clearest proof, and the fact that they can be proved ought to be sufficient to justify us in repealing this law.

Now, there is another reason why this abominable law should be removed from the Statute-book. We were assured when this Bill was introduced by the late Sir John Macdonald, that it would be a law simply and easily worked, and above all

that it would be an economical law. Now, I appeal to the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite whether it be true that this is an economical law. Why, the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) told us that the money extracted from the Dominion Treasury for the purpose of paying the army of officials created under this law amounted to the sum of \$1,250,000; but that is nothing to what it really costs the country to carry out this law—a law so bad so vexatious, so costly, that hon. gentlemen opposite, for twelve years, dared not enforce it, except upon four different occasions. Some elections were held upon lists two years old, and in some cases three years old, so that every young man of twenty-three or twenty-four was disfranchised because hon. gentlemen opposite dared not enforce their law, on account of the enormous cost, and that is what the hon. gentlemen terms a trifling matter. That is the law which the hon. gentleman is pleased to describe as one that does justice and fair-play to the rising generation and the voting population in this country. I am amazed to hear the hon. gentleman make such a broad assertion. The hon. Solicitor General told us when introducing the Bill, that the cost of enforcing this law at different revisions amounted to \$1,250,000. I now make the statement boldly on the floor of Parliament, that every revision of the voters' lists apart from what it cost the country, cost each candidate in each riding at least \$350. I know that in my riding we can never revise the lists for much less than double that sum. Our Conservative friends have to pay the same sum. They do not neglect their duty in looking after the voters' lists, and the result is that in every constituency in the Dominion the revision costs, on an average, I venture to say, \$700 to the candidates, apart from what it costs the Government. We have over 200 constituencies. Multiply \$700 by 200, and you have the cost of each revision, outside the expense to the Government, amounting to nearly \$150,000. You will thus see, Mr. Speaker, the enormous sums extracted, under this so-called Franchise Bill, out of the pockets of the candidates and the electors and ratepayers of the Dominion. Well, I submit, that that is not a condition of things that ought to exist in a country like this, and we ought to repeal this law, which we have had now for twelve years on our statutes, and which, the Lord knows, we have had long enough.

There are other objections that, in my judgment, are of paramount importance. I have only glanced hastily over the Bill of my hon. friend, and I do not see in it any provision for one man one vote. If there is not such a provision in the Bill, the hon. gentleman ought to insert it. Let the man vote and not the property he holds. The man's judgment will then be exercised and not the judgment of the inanimate thing.

Mr. CAMERON.