

the hon. member for North Wellington. Considering the new element in which he found himself, he did fairly well. The hon. gentleman found himself adrift, so to speak, in this respect that he was not able to indulge in his old-time abuse and vituperation of his political opponents, but the hon. gentleman has sufficient of the old leaven left in him to forget occasionally which side he is on, and indulges in a strain that reminded one of his former efforts, and in the course of his rhetoric he has even drifted into scripture. I must confess that my biblical lore will not compare with that of the hon. gentleman, but he recalled to my recollection the fraud that was perpetrated when Jacob, inspired by the evil to which unfortunately mankind is too prone, attempted to defraud his ancient father by passing himself off as his brother Esau. In like manner while the hon. gentleman this afternoon tried to masquerade as a protectionist and while the mask, though not very thick, perhaps might pass, still the voice of McMullen the free trader was there and that voice could not possibly be forgotten. The hon. gentleman, in his remarks on the Franchise Act, set a pace which excited emulation on the part of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who endeavoured to excel him, and I must certainly congratulate that hon. gentleman on the tone of his remarks this afternoon, characterized, though they were, by that acerbity which usually marks his utterances, and which no doubt is due to the fact that the hon. gentleman's exclusion from the Cabinet has not had the effect of mollifying his feelings. Why he should have been treated in the way he was is more than passing strange. In the first place the hon. gentleman had the financial status to entitle him to a place in the Cabinet, and in the Ontario representation that seems to be taken as the standard and not the question of ability at all, because we all recollect how for years and years the hon. Senator from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), while a member of this House, toiled and slaved in the interests of the party only to be cast aside at the last moment in favour of hon. gentlemen who had not a tittle of the claims on the party which he had, if we leave aside the financial point of view. Considering therefore the reflections in which the hon. member for North Norfolk must be indulging to-day, his remarks are not to be wondered at. As usual, he made an attack on the revising officer in his own particular riding, and I would remind hon. members of this House that upon another occasion the hon. gentleman made just as bitter and acrimonious remarks concerning the revision of the lists in his riding, for which he was at once severely taken to task. He was taken to task then because he made statements of a grossly libellous character, and he has made statements equally libellous this afternoon, on

Mr. BENNETT.

the Superintendent of the Printing Bureau at Ottawa, and the revising barrister of his riding. When the hon. gentleman was taken to task last year for his charges of wrong-doing on the part of these gentlemen, what did he say in reply? He said: I do not know that I am warranted in saying it was done in the printing office or that the authorities at Ottawa are responsible, because I imagine it might have occurred in this way, namely, that the revising barrister completed his investigations and left his clerk to make out the lists, and possibly the clerk might have been tampered with. Therefore the remarks of the hon. gentleman in this connection must fall to the ground. If he was honest enough to withdraw the insinuations he made a year ago, surely he will be honourable enough to-day to withdraw the reflections he has made on the revising barrister or the Superintendent of the Printing Bureau, and no doubt he will again attach the blame, not to the Superintendent of the Printing Bureau or the revising barrister, but to some other person, for tampering with the lists.

In reply to the sweeping denunciations of the hon. gentleman of the characters of some people, let me say that within the walls of this building, are the original lists made up by the judges in the different districts from one end of the Dominion to the other. The hon. gentleman can have access to those lists, he can examine the handwriting and make a comparison to ascertain whether the lists have been tampered with. There rests an excellent opportunity for the hon. gentleman to give free play to that curiosity which so thoroughly possesses him and discover for himself whether any wrong-doing existed.

The hon. gentleman at the outset charged that there was fraud perpetrated in the original making-up of the lists. I would ask the hon. gentleman, who revised the lists for the Dominion elections in the province of Ontario? Are they not the county court judges? Are they not the very men before whom will come the revision of these self-same voters' lists? One would imagine that in the revision of these lists there were employed none but parliamentary hacks, but the hon. gentleman knows well that even in his own constituency the lists are revised by the very same judge in the Dominion elections who revises them for the local elections. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say? He did not go into details. He did not place side by side the local lists and the Dominion lists, as they are prepared, and submit them to the judgment of the House, as they are prepared in the province of Ontario. Now, Sir, what is the system of preparing the local lists in the province of Ontario? After the municipal council is formed each year, it is their duty to appoint an assessor, and early in the year—some time in the month of February, I believe—the assessor,