

asked to make this Parliament the mere creature of the local legislatures in this most important matter.

One of the strong reasons against this measure is the fact that it will have the effect of disfranchising a very large number of people who ought to have the right to vote at Dominion elections. Take the province of Ontario, for instance. The franchise of that province differs materially from that of every other province, particularly in this respect that residence is there made a special qualification. To be entitled to be put on the list, the applicant must, as a first essential, have resided in the province one year, and within the particular electoral district for at least three months. Apply this rule to the cities of Hull and Ottawa. A man might be eleven months a resident of the city of Ottawa, and it would be impossible to have his name put upon the list, but a similar rule would not apply when he crossed the provincial line into the province of Quebec, unless a similar Act should be passed by that province. Although a man may be a resident of Canada, although he may have every right one can imagine to entitle him to vote, although he may own half a million dollars worth of property in the city of Ottawa, if he were not a whole year in the province he would, under this Bill, have no right to vote in a Dominion election; and having changed his residence, neither would he have any right to vote in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend the Solicitor General must see the necessity of protecting that class of persons, which is very numerous. The means of travel, the disposition of our people to change about a good deal, point to the necessity of protecting that class of people from disfranchisement. This measure would operate in every case against a person coming into the province of Ontario from any one of the other provinces, unless he had been a resident of Ontario at least a year.

There is another reason which I do not think my hon. friend the Solicitor General can have taken into consideration. The constituencies for the Dominion elections are not now, and never can be, the same as those for provincial purposes. That is perfectly obvious from the fact that there ought not to be so many constituencies represented in a provincial legislature as in the Dominion Parliament from any one province. Consequently, by this Bill you will disfranchise a very considerable number of voters. Let me put a case to the hon. gentleman. Take three local municipalities, A, B and C. These may be all in a single electoral division for the Dominion and in different electoral divisions for the local. Take, for instance, the riding I have the honour to represent, in that riding there are three local municipalities, which are in three separate electoral districts for the provincial elections, but which are all in the one electoral

Mr. CLANCY.

district for Dominion purposes, so that any change of residence from one to the other might have the effect of disfranchising those who make the change. By this means a very considerable number of persons, who possess all the qualifications, would be unable to vote at a Dominion election, owing to their names being excluded from the provincial lists.

It was stated the other evening by an hon. member, as one of the difficulties in connection with the Dominion franchise, that owing to the revision in some cases only taking place at very great intervals, a large number of persons were disfranchised, and consequently the number of votes polled in the Dominion elections showed a smaller percentage of the total number of voters than was the case in the local election. I took the trouble to look into that matter, and I found the reverse to be the case. I compared the Dominion election of 1891 with the provincial election of 1890, in the province of Ontario, the former of which took place in March and the latter in June. I found that the number of votes on the Dominion lists for the province of Ontario in 1891 was 553,904, and that the number polled was 371,105, or 65 per cent of the entire lists. Then I took the provincial votes cast at the elections of 1890, as compared with the number on the provincial lists, and I found that whereas the number on the lists was 528,902 the number polled was 339,287, or 62½ per cent of the total vote as against 67 per cent polled at the Dominion elections.

Mr. CASEY. What was the percentage?

Mr. CLANCY. The percentage of votes cast compared with those on the lists in the Dominion elections was 67 per cent, and in the local election only 62½, taking the list of 1891 for the Dominion and the list of 1890 for the province. There were 25,002 more names on the Dominion lists than on the provincial lists, and there were polled on the provincial list 31,818 less than on the Dominion lists, showing, first, that there was a greater number on the Dominion list than upon the local, and next, that a greater percentage of those cast their vote. That arose from causes that must be perfectly apparent to hon. gentlemen. It was largely due to the fact that persons changed about their local residences, and local residence being the essence of qualification in Ontario, many persons lost their right to vote from the fact that they had changed their residence from one riding to another. I am perfectly well persuaded that that accounts for the smaller vote always being obtained under what is called one man one vote, in the province of Ontario, than would have been the case, had the local residence not been, as I said, the basis of the right to vote. Now, that would affect persons already on the list, and it would affect those to be placed upon the list as being entitled