

can only say that it is better for the vast manufacturing and all other industries of this country that hon. gentlemen opposite, from that sturdy advocate of free trade, the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) down to the lowliest and humblest member of the party, should take a political somersault rather than that there should be such an interference with the tariff of this country as to undo the good that it has accomplished in the last fifteen years, and destroy our bright expectations for the future so long as that policy is continued.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, as one member who has not occupied much of the time of this House, but who has been an interested listener to the arguments of hon. gentlemen on both sides, I desire to make a few remarks on the question now under consideration. I believe I am expressing the sentiments of my constituents when I say that I am heartily in accord with the principles of the Bill presented to this House by the hon. the Solicitor General. I think I can clearly understand why the late Government forced upon the people of this country an Act which I know did not meet with the approval of a large number of Conservatives. They did so simply because it assisted them in connection with the voters' lists. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who has just taken his seat; but there is one point in his remarks to which I take exception. I cannot believe that his estimate of the expense in connection with the voters' lists is exactly correct. My hon. friend says that it costs about \$1,000 in each riding. He has correctly stated that after a municipal council is formed, it selects its assessors; that the assessor then goes round and prepares his list; that after that a Court of Revision is held by the council, and that there is an appeal finally from the Court of Revision to the county judge. I have had the honour of representing a municipality in the county of Middlesex for a number of years; and during that time we never had occasion to appeal to the county judge, and I do not know of any municipality that has had to do so except on rare occasions. If it cost \$1,000 for the municipal lists in each riding, then why under the sun should we insist on having a dual system, whereby the cost would be doubled? There is not only the cost of about a quarter of a million dollars for each revision under the Dominion Franchise Act, but also the cost to the Liberal candidates and their friends and the cost to the Conservative candidates and their friends, which together would involve a sum equal to if not more than the direct cost. In the constituency of West Middlesex the late revising barrister took the old lists of 1891 as a basis, consequently we were compelled to put on or strike off three or four thousand

names; and when you take into consideration the large number of constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, the number of municipalities in those constituencies and the number of subdivisions in those municipalities, you can realize the amount of trouble and expense connected with the preparation of the lists. I saw an estimate that it cost the Liberal party \$150,000 to prepare the lists in the last revision, and it must have cost the Conservative party an equal amount; so that you have a cost of \$300,000 to the two parties, added to the \$250,000 paid out of the Treasury, or over half a million dollars, for the preparation of the lists. As the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said, we have a list prepared by the municipalities every year. He says that costs over \$200,000 each year. I do not think it costs that much; but even assuming that it does, why is it necessary for us to prepare another list? But unless we prepare a list every year, which cannot be done except at enormous expense, we are compelled to vote on a list two years old, as we did in the last election. What does that mean? It means that thousands of young men who came of age from 1894 to 1896 are debarred from casting their vote, although compelled to pay their share of the expenses in connection with this iniquitous Act. Not only that, but thousands of men who sold out and left this country and took up their abode under the Stars and Stripes, are allowed to come back to this country and cast their votes against honest men who are compelled to bear their share of the expense. I need not dwell on that subject. I believe in the principle of one man one vote, which is in operation in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) asked why we should have the principle of one man one vote in Ontario when in the province of Quebec a man might vote three or four times. I am in favour of the principle of one man one vote. Why should a man, simply because he owns five or six pieces of property, situated in five or six constituencies, cast a vote for five or six candidates, while a man who may own property ten times the value, situated in one constituency, has the right to cast but one vote. I do not think it is right, but if the people of the province of Quebec are prepared to continue that system, I do not see why we in Ontario should find any fault with them. I am in favour of the principle which holds in Ontario. I think a man should vote where he lives, and I do not think he should vote simply because he owns a few pieces of property. If this Bill be passed, as proposed by the Government, we shall be free to vote in Ontario under the Ontario system. It may be necessary to have some amendments made. I do not think it embraces the privilege of manhood suffrage, as we have it in the cities and certain towns of Ontario. If that is not