

suppose he thinks he had better stick to the ship that landed him here.

The hon. ex-Finance Minister has been singularly uneasy since this House met. He has been very restless in his seat. He has been very ready to rise to ask questions, to press for certain measures, and to ask for the Budget. I do not know what is the cause of his uneasiness. The fact that his seat is not now cushioned with the \$7,000 salary which he formerly received may possibly explain why he is so fidgety. All we have to say is that the verdict of the people of this country on the 23rd of June last landed him in the seat he now occupies. I think it would be very much better for the hon. gentleman to cultivate a little patience beneath the wave of popular indignation which placed him where he is, and allow the Government a fair and reasonable opportunity of showing how they can discharge the duties of the Executive of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite may possibly feel sore with the Moses of their party (Sir Charles Tupper) who has led them into the political wilderness, where, in my opinion, they are likely to remain for some time. There can be no doubt that these hon. gentlemen have a record which is exceedingly unsavoury, and I look forward to a better condition of things. I look forward to the present Government administering the affairs of this country honestly and sensibly, and feel confident that we have done with such scandals as the Curran Bridge scandal, the Tay Canal scandal, the McGreevy scandal, which disgraced the last Administration. Let me urge hon. gentlemen opposite to cultivate patience and forbearance, and realize that they are in Opposition. We sat on that side for a great many years, and we tried when there to discharge the duties we owed our country, as we shall endeavour to do on this side. We hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will equally discharge their duties, because the Opposition have very onerous duties to perform, and I have no doubt that the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) will prove himself a very efficient member of the Opposition. He has evidently made up his mind to do a great deal of work, whether the hon. gentlemen behind him perform their share or not.

I hope that the Bill now before the House will receive its sanction. We must not forget that the Government have promised a plebiscite on the temperance question. Now, the plebiscite cannot take place before we have revised the franchise, because it would be a gross injustice to submit the question on the present lists. We have had no revision for some two years, nearly three. Would it be fair, I ask, that a question so vital and prominent should be submitted on defective voters' lists, in which many young men who have just come of age are not entered. I venture to say that 10 or 12 per cent of our young men who have a right to

vote are not on the lists at all. We require a revision of the voters' lists. You cannot possibly proceed to take a plebiscite, until you have a revision under the proposed Act now before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not take a vote on the provincial lists, and provide in the Plebiscite Act for this way of taking it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the proper way to take a vote is to take it on the lists adopted by the Dominion for Dominion purposes, and until we have that list, the Government cannot carry out their promise with regard to the plebiscite. We have it hinted that possibly the Franchise Act will receive very severe handling in the Senate, and some say it may possibly be choked up there. If the Senators are prepared to assume the responsibility of doing so, if they are bound to stand in the breach and not allow the Franchise Act to pass, they will have to bear the odium. But before the plebiscite is taken, we should have a thorough revision of the lists of the Dominion. When that is done, we can take a fair and honest plebiscite, but until then we cannot. Until we pass the present Franchise Bill, it will be an utter impossibility to get a verdict by means of a plebiscite.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I must say that I have not given that attention to the Franchise Act which I would like to do, and which I propose to do in order to discuss it thoroughly in the Committee of the Whole House. But there are some primary objections to this measure becoming law, which I wish to point out to the Government, and, which, if my interpretation of the statute itself is correct, renders it almost impossible for a measure of this kind to become law. In the first place, I understand that, under the present law, in the province of Quebec, the principle of one man one vote does not apply, and it does in Ontario. If that be the case, then the result of this law would be that you would give to the electors in the province of Quebec a very much larger representation at the polls than you would give the electors of Ontario and some other provinces, where the principle of one man one vote obtains. This is to my mind what renders it almost impossible for the Government to go on with the measure during the present session. I cannot conceive it possible that an elector living in Montreal, having votes in seven or eight constituencies in that province, would have the right to exercise his franchise in these different constituencies, whilst an elector residing in Toronto would be tied down, by the principle of one man one vote, to the one constituency, though he might own property in several. Do you mean to tell me that, at the present session, in the face of this one fact alone, without any assurance of a change in the laws of Quebec, we, in this Parliament, are

Mr. McMULLEN.