

makes any reasonable attempt to be placed there. Such a course on the part of the Government would redound to their credit and to the good of the country.

Mr. CASEY. I agree with what the hon. the Secretary of State said yesterday in one respect, namely, that I could not expect him to answer in detail on the spur of the moment the charges I brought, but I feel deeply disappointed that he did not express his condemnation of the transactions which I laid before the House. Even if he did not believe that I had established my case against this particular revising officer, he should have denounced proceedings, which, if established, are, on the face of them, unfair, unjust, and without precedent. If the Government have been already lacking in their duty in not sending instructions to the revising officers which would have prevented transactions of the sort, I have still further ground for regretting the course they have taken. Leaving aside these particular cases I have brought before the House, the point I wish to emphasise is this: when the officer is compiling his first list, he is not sitting in his judicial capacity, as he will be on the final revision; he is merely acting as the municipal clerk used to act and not as a judge, and should therefore require no greater acquaintance with the law on the part of those applying to be registered than a municipal clerk required on the part of those who applied to be put on the old voters' list. In this case, excessive technicality has been insisted on in my county; I do not know to what extent in other counties. Possibly, in many of them, the same technicality has been insisted on, but the revising officers have been more secretive than in Elgin, and have not given reasons for rejection or probably not notified the applicants at all of their rejection. For this reason more particularly, I brought on the debate, so that voters all over the country should be warned in time to enquire into the fate of their applications. As I stated last year, the officers require watching, and the facts prove the truth of that assertion. I agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that it is quite possible the revising officers, without the intention of doing wrong, may do injustice, as they are men unused to this procedure and accustomed to purely legal proceedings. They have attempted to apply this in many cases where it did not apply, where it should not apply, and in these cases they will do serious injustice, even where they do not mean to do wrong. Of course, I do not deny that there are places where the revising officer may have been appointed, and probably has been appointed, with the intention, on the part of the Government at least, of getting the most favorable consideration for one side of the case. In such cases as these, he will specially pay for watching. All I ask now is simply publicity. We want to know what the Government has told these officers to do. As to this question of printing, it seems to be no secret. We are told on every hand—it seems to have leaked out from the returning officers themselves—that the printing is to cost so much per name—12c. or 12½c. per name—and this is, of course, a pretty large figure. I am informed by practical printers that 6c. per name would be ample and would give a good profit. I do not know of my own knowledge whether that is correct or not, but I know that, unless you have competition, unless you do what the townships do, ask the printing offices in the various towns to compete, you will never have the list printed at the lowest rate. No matter how low you fix your arbitrary rate, it will always be higher than that which you would get as the result of competition; and, further, it will always be in the hands of the papers on one side. If that amount of 12c. per name is correct, it will amount to from \$450 to \$500 for every constituency in Canada. That is over \$100,000 which is to go into the pockets of Conservative newspapers, for it will all go to Conservative newspapers.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not so.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. CASEY. Unless some very Conservative independent organ can be found in some town which will get a slice of it. As to the form, we are told that the instructions to the revising officer were that he must not print the list three times, as the Act says; that he must contravene the Act, and print it only once; that he may print all the copies from the assessment roll, say 600 numbers per constituency, that he can use 200 copies for the preliminary revision, and then, by adding names at the foot of the pages in blank spaces, can prepare the list for the final revision, and so, in the same manner, can complete the list by striking out with his pen or by adding names as the case may be. In this way we will have a very peculiar, scrappy looking list, a list full of erasures, and subject to manipulation by the revising officer after the final court has been held, because there is nothing to prevent his running his pen through any name he likes, and the result will be that that person will be disfranchised, and we will have no security as to the composition of the list. Of course, this is an attempt to avoid the expenditure for printing which would be necessary if the Act were carried out. The Government see that the Act involves more expenditure than the country will stand, and they have contrived a plan to avoid some of this expense, but the result will be very inconvenient lists. As to the Indian question, I have been informed, since this debate began, from my constituency that the statement made as to other counties is true there also, and that the course pursued by the revising officer in my own county was that which has been alleged. I am told that the judge interviewed Mr. Beatty, the Indian agent at Highgate, and got a list of the Indians on the Moravian reserve who ought to go on the primary list. I mention this only to urge that such procedure is dangerous and improper, and I doubt if it is not illegal, and it certainly should be put a stop to.

Motion agreed to.

TEMPORARY GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Return showing in detail sums borrowed by way of temporary loan by Government on 1st March, 1886, from banks or other parties, in Canada or elsewhere.

He said: I do not want to enter into a lengthy discussion on this matter, but in making the motion I would be glad to know from the Minister of Finance whether the \$14,300,000 which he stated to be now borrowed by way of temporary loans from parties, either in Canada or England, are new loans, or whether they were loans of last Session carried over. Last Session there was an amount, either equal to or somewhat larger than this, which had been borrowed temporarily, and I had understood that the loan was in part for the purpose of paying those off. However, as I had observed that the Minister of Finance did not contract as large a loan as had been expected, I suppose in point of fact this had been renewed from time to time. I would like to know, if the hon. gentleman's memory permits him to state it, how that was.

Mr. McLELAN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that part of that sum is made up by the old loans and are still standing, and some by new loans contracted since. The parties loaning object to our giving their names. We can give the dates at which certain amounts were loaned, and when they will be payable, but the names of the banks and the names of the institutions loaning we object to give, as they decline to have their names published, but we will give the rates of interest and the dates at which they were contracted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year the hon. gentleman's predecessor, I think, objected to giving the rates of interest, but did give the names. Now, although I do not want to embarrass the Minister of Finance, who has