

who is entitled to vote can have his name placed on the list without much expense and very little trouble or loss of time by making affidavit, when he has demonstrated his right to vote. Another objection, and to my mind a pretty strong one, is that when this local and imperfect list is obtained, you have neither a written nor a printed list. You have first a printed list, second, you have a number of names written in, and third, you have a pen stroke drawn through a number of names. We had that experience at the last local election. Every one wanted to know where a revised list could be obtained; but nobody could secure one except with great trouble. We had first a printed list, but when the revised list was obtained it was found that a pen had been drawn through certain names and certain other names had been added in writing; and we had therefore a list partly printed, partly erased and certain names added in writing, a list that could be easily tampered with when dishonest men had charge of it, and we know dishonest men have had charge of it in the past and have tampered with the ballot boxes in my own immediate locality. The Government in introducing this Franchise Bill have utterly failed to justify it. We have evidence from every province in the Dominion of the iniquities perpetrated under the local franchise laws; we have had demonstrated to us the injustice of the Manitoba law, and we have had time and again evidence of the unfairness of the Franchise Act passed by the local legislature of Nova Scotia. In Ontario we have a franchise law which aims at disfranchising people. If a man moves from one electoral district to another he loses his right to vote. He does not dispossess himself of his property, he does not break any law of the land, but yet he is an alien when the election comes on. I know of one case, that of Mr. John Abell, who employs 150 men in the city of Toronto. Mr. Abell removed from West York to the city of Toronto; he could not vote in West York because he could not swear he was residing there, and although he had \$150,000 or \$200,000 worth of property in the city of Toronto, he could not vote there because his name was not on the list. So in the case of Dr. Orr, our candidate for the local legislature. He committed the crime of removing from the electoral district of West York, as it was constituted for the local legislature, and removing into the city of Toronto, but remaining in the old electoral district of York as it has been for fifty years constituted as a Dominion constituency, and although he was a candidate for the local legislature, he did not have a vote either in West York or in the city of Toronto. He was treated as an alien in the country in which he was born and had lived all his life. It looks perhaps as if we were going to have a

Mr. WALLACE.

change of government in Ontario, and if so we will have a new franchise Bill in that province. But, Sir, I refuse to let any local legislature—I care not what its politics may be—dictate the franchise for the Parliament of Canada. I know that if a Conservative Government came into power in Ontario they would have removed many of the inequalities and injustices of the franchise law of that province. That they would make it more just and equitable I have not the slightest doubt, but even so, I maintain that we have no right to delegate the franchise for the Parliament of Canada to any local legislature or to any county council or to any municipal council. I say, Sir, that we are lowering our dignity and doing an injustice to ourselves by taking such a course. There is still another objection to this Bill now proposed by the Government. Under the Dominion Franchise Act there is a simple oath specified, which sets forth four things: first, that you are a British subject; second, that you are twenty-one years of age; third, that you have not bribed anybody and that nobody has bribed you; and fourth, that you are the person mentioned on the voters' list. That is a form of oath that is understandable by anybody, but under the local law in Ontario the voter is met with a series of complicated oaths. The one most usual to be administered is that referring to the manhood suffrage, and I venture to say that that oath will not be properly administered by one returning officer out of a hundred. There are half a dozen blanks to be filled up and these blanks state certain dates, and one of the dates is:

That you have resided within this province for twelve months before the.....day of....., being the day up to which a complaint could be made to the county court judge under the Ontario voters' list, and to insert the names of any persons in this list.

That date varies in every municipality in the province of Ontario, and who is going to fill up that blank? The deputy returning officer knows nothing about it, the polling clerk knows nothing about it, the returning officer knows nothing about it, the Ontario legislature provides no date, and the whole thing may be used and is used effectively as a bluff to prevent certain people from voting, whom it is considered desirable should not vote. This oath acts as a deterrent to people from voting and indeed the whole Ontario Act seems to tend in that direction. For all these reasons, I say that we should stick to a Dominion franchise law and amend it, as we easily can do. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the fact that we have admitted that changes should be made in the Dominion Franchise Act is sufficient to condemn it. Not so. We do not claim that the Bill is infallible. In 1894 Sir John Thompson introduced an amendment, in the first place to make the Dominion Fran-