

A petition had been presented against the union of these ridings, and he himself was opposed to the matter being referred to the Committee again after it had been so fully discussed.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE said it was found that the county was divided for registration purposes under the Government of Sandfield Macdonald, but this action was unpopular, and the County Council up to the present time had refused to appropriate money to erect a Registry Office on the place designated by Mr. Macdonald's Government. This was a matter of public policy, and one that affected this particular section of the country, and if it were in the interest of the people that there should be another Registry Office at that part of the county he thought they should pass the Bill. He considered the policy of dividing counties into small sections for registration purposes was very questionable indeed.

Mr. PRINCE said it always appeared to him that new registry offices were generally created for the purpose of making offices for office seekers, rather than from a desire to do public service. He spoke of the advantages to be derived from registration, and argued that, since the gentleman filling the office in question had been in receipt of the salary arising from the appointment, and it was proposed that this House should take that away, some provision should be made to capitalize a sum equal to his salary.

Mr. DEACON was opposed to the motion, because he thought it had already been sufficiently considered in the Committee, and he thought the Government should take the responsibility. If the motion was merely to refer the Bill back to Committee for consideration, instead of giving a direct instruction to adopt the preamble, he would not be so much opposed to it; but the motion was absolute, and left no power in the hands of those opposed to the Bill to appear and give their evidence, and he was, therefore, bound to oppose it.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said he thought it very unfortunate that the law had been passed which prevented the summary dismemberment of counties. Many divisions had been made which he regarded as inexpedient, and he did not think any of the divisions made in Grey could be justified. If a wrong was perpetrated on any county, it was on the county of Huron. He was acquainted with the geography of the county, and asserted that the division was a very unfair one, and one that created great inconvenience. He thought it would be proper to do what his hon. friend had asked, but he would not be prepared to dismiss the Registrar without giving him compensation. It was proposed to give him \$1,000 for five years, but he would suggest that the term should be lengthened to seven years. This would enable him to look about, and perhaps enter his profession again as a lawyer; and, at the same time, the public would be accommodated. He was quite prepared to support the Bill which his hon. friend had introduced, and in so doing he believed that he was doing that which was in the interest of the county, and the unanimous wish of the two ridings.

Mr. BOULTBEE was opposed to the recommendation of the action of the Committee, for which no reason, so far as he could hear, was given. On the contrary, he thought every reason had been given for the opposite course, and he proceeded to attack the Commissioner of Public Works and the promoter of the Bill, who he charged with being animated with political spite against the gentleman who holds the office of Registrar, for whom insufficient recompense was proposed to be made. He was strongly opposed to the motion.

Mr. BETHUNE thought where public interest was really served by interference with private rights, that interference should be taken. This seemed to be a case of the character referred to, and the very fact that the County Council were unanimous in petitioning for the Bill was a proof of it. Whether there was sufficient provision made for the occupant of the office was another question. It seemed to him that the whole weight of the evidence was in favour of the proposition that it would be in the public interest that the Registry Office should be removed to the town of Goderich. He was in favour of making a liberal provision for Mr. Hayes, the holder of the office, upon the principle of a life annuity, or some other principle equally fair. What the Committee was asked to do by the motion before the House was to approve of the preamble of the Bill; and when the Bill came to its second reading the House could make whatever provisions for Mr. Hayes they thought right and fair.

Mr. McCALL opposed the motion, on the ground that to do away with the Registry Office in question was opposed to public interest and convenience. He could entirely acquit his hon. friend from North Huron from any improper motive in connection with this matter, and was sorry that any insinuation to the opposite should have been made. The hon. member had been acting under strong pressure from a certain number of his constituents, who, he thought, had been induced to take this action by the Registrar for the other riding and the legal gentlemen of the county. He dealt with the question of remuneration to Mr. Hayes, and the precedent cited by the hon. member who promoted the Bill, and declared his intention of voting against the motion.

Mr. MERRICK also opposed the Bill on the same grounds as the former speakers.

Mr. BISHOP quoted the remarks of Mr. Blake upon the Bill to deprive the Executive of the power of dividing offices, as well as the remarks of the hon. member who had just sat down, and he remarked that the latter had changed his views very considerably—he thought very wonderfully. He strongly favoured the principles of fairness upon which the Bill was founded, and showed from a chart of the county that public interest would be served by the proposed re-union. As to the petition, he showed that it had received nearly all its signatures at a funeral, and then with very little discrimination. The gentlemen of the Opposition had made this, to some extent, a political cry. He could tell them that it was also made a cry against him in his election, and the question was asked of the electors whether they were prepared to vote for a man who was going to support a Government which would not reunite the two ridings of the county for registration purposes. It was an inconvenience, a trouble, and an expense to the county to have the Registry Office in an out of the way place like that in which it now was, and he repudiated the idea that the Government should not allow any change to be made in the legislation of another Government.

Mr. HARDY said if justice and convenience and local interests required that the county should be reunited, he was prepared to vote for the motion. It did appear to him that hon. gentlemen opposite gave these questions no consideration, and all their interests, especially in the Committee, where they mustered in full force to defeat the Bill, were centred in the person of the Registrar. (Hear, hear) The voices of the local representatives of the county, the County Council, composed of the Reeves and Deputy-Reeves, and the general public were all in favour of the Bill, and there did not appear to be any reason why it should not be passed. He laid great stress upon the voice of the local representatives, who knew best about the circumstances, and if some more attention were paid to the voice of local representatives in such matters, he thought it would be better. There were precedents for the abolition of offices, and it was absurd to say that an office should not be abolished because it was held by a gentleman who derived his income from it. He thought the gentleman in question would be amply provided for if the provision proposed were made for him. He considered that the convenience of the public should be taken into consideration.

Dr. BAXTER was in favour of the Bill being referred to the Committee for further consideration, and if this were not done he would have to vote against the Bill.

Mr. WOOD said the question to be considered in this matter was would the public be inconvenienced by the change. He thought that it would, and he would vote for the motion if a fair remuneration were paid to the Registrar.

Mr. CAMERON considered the discussion had been irregularly sprung upon the House. The hon. gentleman who desired this legislation thought it an injustice because some of the people in this county were inconvenienced by the existing arrangement, while some were inconvenienced by the location of the present Registry Office. He was rather in favour of registry offices being established within a smaller compass. This action was due to the cupidity of the county, who desired to obtain possession of the paltry sum of \$600 a year for a few years. An injustice should not be done to one man in order to convenience a few hundreds, and he was of opinion, considering the petition that had been received, that the matter should be allowed to stand over until next session. The Government of the country ought not to permit the wrong to be