

apprised of this deficiency in order to have it remedied, but after due consideration it was deemed that the period of time remaining between then and the day of voting was too short to permit of a revision being made under the provisions of section 9 of the Franchise Act; the voting had therefore to take place in such cases on the lists which were last in force, which was done. In the province of Manitoba, the voters' lists had not been revised since 1895, while in some places in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and in a few polling divisions in the lower provinces, the lists of 1897 had to be used. It might here be stated, in explanation of the course pursued with regard to the use of the voters' lists above referred to, that while in the matter of an election of a member to the House of Commons, the Franchise Act provides that the voters' lists to be used at such an election shall not be over one year old since last revised, on the other hand, for the purpose of taking the plebiscite, the Prohibition Plebiscite Act provides that "the same proceedings, *as near as may be*, shall be had as in the case of a Dominion general election"; the foregoing words in italics would appear to offer sufficient latitude to warrant the use, under the existing circumstances, of the voters' lists which served at the plebiscite.

Another matter to which the attention of this office was called, was the exceptional position held by the electors of the city of Saint John, N.B., in connection with the voting on this question. Under the Dominion Representation Act to the House of Commons, the electors of the city of Saint John can vote in two separate electoral districts, but for two distinct members, however, to wit:—in the electoral district of "The city of Saint John," and in that of "The city and county of Saint John." It was thought that on the question of prohibition the voting should take place on the principle of one man one vote only, hence the question raised; but after consulting with the Department of Justice, it was decided to allow the voting to take place according to the provisions of section 6 of the Prohibition Plebiscite Act, *i.e.*, as in the case of a Dominion general election. Under this ruling, owing to the peculiarity of the law (peculiar only in so far as it affected the voting on this particular question, for which it was not framed), the electors of the city of Saint John who voted on this question, with few exceptions, voted twice for one and the same thing. As the majority of the votes cast in favour of prohibition in the city of Saint John was 1,485, it is reasonable to suppose that nearly the same majority obtained from the same source in the electoral district of "The city and county of Saint John," judging from a comparison made of the recapitulation tables of the votes cast in both of those districts, which are almost identical.

That the voting appears to have taken place very quietly throughout the country is borne out by the fact that no adverse report has been received at this office from any one of the returning officers; on the contrary, some of them took occasion to mention the complete apathy shown by the electors on the question at issue, which was fully confirmed by the smallness of the vote polled, as compared with the vote polled at each one of the last three general elections, a comparison with which will be found further on.

Errors occurred on the part of the deputy returning officers as is always the case on the occasion of a general election, most of which were rectified, however, while those which were not would only affect the general result of the voting by a few hun-