

not altered, but it does not convey properly the intention of the Bill. The defect was alluded to in the other House, at the last moment, by an hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, and it became evident that the amendment was necessary, and it has been carefully drawn, embodying the intention of the clause. I move:

Page 4, line 42.—After “district” insert “that the name or qualification of the person whose name is objected to is incorrectly entered on such list, but that he possesses such qualification as entitles him to be registered thereon, the revising officer shall retain such person’s name thereon, making the necessary corrections, or if it appears.”

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I am not quite sure whether that is intended to meet certain cases which arose in Prince Edward Island in this way: a number of voters were duly qualified by property and residence, but on quarter day, or mid-summer day, they changed their residences, and the consequence was that they were incorrectly described on the register and lost their votes. They appealed to the Superior Court and the court decided against the voters and in favor of the interpretation of the revising officer. It was obviously a misapprehension of the original Act, because these men were qualified in one place as well as in the other: they had merely changed their residence during the period when the lists were in course of revision. I hope that this amendment will have the effect of making those cases quite clear, and leave no doubt on them whatever.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I think it is quite clear that the case mentioned by my hon. friend is met by this amendment.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—These men do not know, until the time very nearly arrives, whether they will be in their old residences, or in the new.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—We made an amendment to the 7th clause, providing for sub-divisions by the revising officer of any polling district containing more voters than the law allows. It appears that there are in British Columbia one or two polling places—one especially—where I think there are 1,600 votes, where if an

election should occur before the lists are revised there would be considerable difficulty in holding a legal election, and it is thought best to give to the returning officer the power of sub-dividing such a district and dividing it into the divisions specified in the Franchise Act. That will only apply to the lists which are now in force up to the time of their next revision. I move that the following amendment be made at the end of clause 7:—

Page 3, line 37.—After “person” insert the following as sub-section 7:—

“7. But no lists now in force shall be deemed illegal on account of any polling district therein described containing a larger number of names of voters than is permitted by ‘The Electoral Franchise Act,’ and in the case of an election taking place before the next revision of such lists, a subdivision of such polling district may be made in due time for such election by the revising officer for the electoral division where such polling district is situated.”

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend from Halifax called attention, when the Bill was before the Committee of the Whole House, to a clause which he thought already existed in the Act. I differed from my hon. friend at the moment, because I was aware that, as far as the Revised Statutes are concerned, that clause to which he referred had been repealed, but on verifying the section with him to-day I perceive that while the section was repealed as it exists in the Revised Statutes, it was reproduced in an Act of last Session, and therefore the insertion of that clause is unnecessary. I therefore move that the amendment, which purports to be a reproduction of clause 16, be struck out.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Has my hon. friend decided what shall be done about the alteration of the expression “North-West Territories” to “Western Territories?”

HON. MR. ABBOTT—If the alteration is made it will have to be in the Bill respecting the North-West Territories of Canada. It is proposed, if the alteration is concurred in by the other House, to insert a clause in that Bill which will cover all the legislation relating to the North-West Territories, and therefore the expression “North-West Territories” must remain