

should be put on the list for removal. It was pointed out on the one side that no information could be obtained as to income voters from the assessment rolls, and that these names were already on by judicial authority, and should not be removed unless cause were shown. On the other side it was contended that the only legal way for an income voter to be put on was by means of a declaration. Each view had numerous supporters. The question as to whether wage-earners whose names appear on the assessment rolls, should, or should not, be put on the first supplementary lists as income voters, was also left undetermined.

Various matters relating to the remuneration of the revising officers, and their re-imbursement for necessary expenditures were discussed and recommendations were made to the Government relating thereto. Great as is the expense involved in the working of the Dominion Franchise Act, the remuneration of the officers on whom the burden of the work falls is, in many instances, quite inadequate, and it seems unjust that they should have to pay out of their own pockets the expense of hiring court rooms for the final revision of the lists.

Some discussion took place as to the effect of the repeal of section 7 of the Act, thereby impliedly repealing the words "except as hereinafter provided" in sub-secs. 7 & 8 of sec. 3. Some doubt seems to exist as to whether it has not done away with the privilege of counting in the time of occasional and other absences as part of the time of residence of farmers' and owners' sons, as provided for in s.s. *a* & *b* of the repealed section. This seems to be the general impression.

Various points arising out of the criminal law were also discussed. The Dominion Act, 52 Vict., c. 44, s. 2, relating to the conditional release of first offenders in certain cases was considered, and the view that the words "punishable with not more than two years' imprisonment" were not to be restricted to cases in which the maximum penalty would be two years' imprisonment, but were to be taken as applying to any case in which the penalty may, in the judge's discretion, be not more than two years' imprisonment, was approved.

The Dominion Statute 52 Vict., c. 47, s. 4, speaks of the County Court Judge's Criminal Court of the County. Sec. 2 of chapter 49 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario calls the same tribunal the Judge's Criminal Court. Which is the proper name? The judges seem to be in favor of using the name fixed by the Dominion Statute. These courts have not power in Ontario to try perjury or forgery, though in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island they have. This seems anomalous.

Under the Dominion Act, 52 Vict., c. 47, s. 12, the County Attorney may, with the consent of the judge, prefer against the prisoner a charge or charges, for any offence or offences for which he may be tried under the provisions of this Act, other than the charge or charges for which he has to go to gaol for trial, although such charges are not mentioned in R.S.C., c. 174, s. 140. Suppose a prisoner tried and committed for robbery, and the County Attorney with the consent of the judge, prefers a new charge of indecent assault, the prisoner elects to be tried by a jury and is remanded. The question arises, whether the indictment must be preferred by the direction of the