

tion a few amendments which I desire to submit for his consideration. One amendment is with respect to the status of voters.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to adopt that, and abolish the necessity of the status being continued up to the time of the election.

Mr. COLTER. Another suggestion is with respect to this point: where property is held by the mother in the lifetime of the father, and occupied by the son of the mother during the lifetime of the father. There could very easily be a change made in that clause by striking out the words "after the death of his father, being owner of the farm, in respect to which the right of voting is claimed by or for him."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not had time to consider that suggestion yet. I think it can be done, and I will answer the hon. gentleman when we again go into Committee on the Bill. I should be glad to receive the amendment in the meantime.

Mr. COLTER. There is another suggestion, which interferes somewhat with the principle of the Bill, and it is this: to allow the sons of tenants without requiring them to be occupants or tenants for five years. It would simplify the Act, and simplify the working of the Act very much. I have prepared an amendment which I will submit to the hon. the Minister of Justice, if he will kindly consider it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will.

On sub-section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to add after the words "shall transmit to the Queen's Printer," the words "not sooner than the first day of August."

Mr. EDGAR. As I understand this amendment, the revising officer shall receive the names for putting on the lists up to the first day of August?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On sub-section 5,

Mr. COLTER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to another point. We will suppose that there are a large number of tenants or occupants in the riding; the assessment is simply *prima facie* evidence of "value." Why ought it not be *prima facie* evidence of the ownership by those persons? Those on the assessment roll are liable to pay taxes, and if there is anything wrong in putting them on the preliminary list, the revising officer could correct it at the final revision. I propose to add after the word "value" in this section, the following:—

"And that those who are assessed as owners, tenants or occupants are entitled to be placed on the preliminary list of voters as possessing such qualification."

I think that this would lighten the labors of those concerned in the preparation of the list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It really seems to me that this is the meaning of the section. For instance, when we say that it will be *prima facie* evidence of the "value," it surely means that it will be *prima facie* evidence of the value of A. B.'s property on which he is to go on the list.

Mr. COLTER. Suppose the revising officer finds a person entered as a tenant on the assessment roll, that does not prove conclusively that he has been a tenant for one year previous so as to qualify him under the Act. *Prima facie* he might be held to be a tenant for the year previous, for the purpose of the preliminary list, and if there is anything wrong in connection with the matter it can be changed on revision.

Mr. COLTER.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would meet the hon. gentleman's view if the words "and qualification" were added after the word "value."

Mr. COLTER. Yes, that would do.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to repeal section 13, which provides for the appointment of a reviser's clerk. In practice, it has been found that in some districts the revising officer has done the greater part of the duty himself, and the clerical expense has been small. In other sections the revising officers have imposed large duties on the clerks, and considerable sums have had to be paid. This destroys all uniformity in that particular, as we pay a clerk in one district a very much larger sum than in another. What I propose to do is to make an even allowance for each of the revising officers for clerical assistance, and let him get the clerical assistance where he likes.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice under what authority the original list has been printed by the Queen's Printer. It is not the original list that the revising officer is going to use; it is some new original list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, it is the list of 1886. This Bill was introduced last year, and it was intended that it should fit into the scheme of printing which was then explained fully to the House.

Mr. EDGAR. The original list does not mean the original list; it means the copy printed here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The original list does not mean any particular piece of paper; it means the list of voters.

Mr. EDGAR. I think an improvement might be made in this provision. It is certainly important that this list, as it comes back from the Queen's Printer, should be most carefully compared with the list signed by the revising officer which has been sent to the Queen's Printer. Therefore, I would suggest that in the fourth line of section 17 some such words as these, should be added—"after comparing and correcting the same with the list signed by him, he shall certify it," &c.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will make the price of voters' lists not exceeding 10 cents, instead of 25 cents, and add "reeves" and "deputy reeves," to those to whom will be transmitted copies of the lists.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will be advisable also, to add postmasters. They could post the lists up in their offices, where the people could read them when getting their mails.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would make a great number of lists. However, we will return to this section, and see whether provision cannot be made in this respect.

On section 3,

Mr. BURDETT. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that the post office address should not be the last post office address, but the post office address given in the list.

Mr. TISDALE. That would make it more certain.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to say: "the post office address mentioned in the list, or his last post office address." There are some addresses which are not known.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would move that the following words be added:—

"No application to insert or reject names shall be dismissed on account of error in the name or names designated therein, provided such error is corrected on the day of revision."

Sometimes a man whose name is John is called James, but I do not think anyone should be rejected on that account, if