say in reply to them, because they called for no reply. He was surprised, therefore, that the member for Dundas should have wondered that supporters of the Government had not taken up much of the time of the House with speeches.

Mr. Whitney—I thought you were an independent member, so my remark would not apply to you.

Several members on the Government side of the House at once shouted that "they were all independent on that side of the House," and Mr. Garson made Mr. Whitney regret his interruption by pointing out that his words showed clearly that he did not, at least, regard himself as an independent member.

Col. Clarke, the ex-Speaker, made an effective half-hour speech. He dwelt on the fact that forty years ago he had written in the press in favor of the use of the ballot, and when elected to the House seventeen or eighteen years ago he had worked still more actively on behalf of it. He congratulated several members of the Opposition, then and now members of the House, on their conversion to the ballot system. They were not all so favorable to it then. The experience of the existing system had proved it a success. Had it been otherwise the House would have heard of it before this. Even the introducer of the bill had failed to show any advantage to be derived from the bill, and he feared that in his (Mr. Wood's) advanced period of life he was becoming as radical as his leader—that he was seeking new worlds to conquer and that he was losing that steady conservatism that had distinguished him throughout his career. (Laughter and applause.) He yielded to no man in his desire for an effective ballot. He had seen scenes at elections that made him a believer in it. He had once even seen a man shot down at an election, and for this and other reasons he wanted the ballot. But the ballot system that prevailed was, he thought, in every way satisfactory and effective, and there was no necessity for Mr. Wood's bill or the changes proposed by it. Col. Clarke referred to the fact that the system of Ontario was the same that prevailed in the United Kingdom. No fault was found with it there, and it was an insult to the people of Ontario to say that they were not fit to be trusted with the same ballot system as the people of Great Britain and Ireland. (Applause.)

The shining lights of the Opposition had now all spoken, and others besides, so the House had next to listen to a speech from Mr. Hess, the German member, who spoke good-temperedly, but not brilliantly, in favor of Mr. Wood's bill.

Mr. G. B. Smith drew attention to some of Mr. Clancy's extraordinary statements, as, for instance, that the oaths of the election officials were flimsy pretexts behind which they screened their actions, and again, that every vote in his riding could be identified. He thought the people of Mr. Clancy's constituency should be made aware of the fact that he had made such statements in the House. They called, however, for no refutation. That was carried on their face. Going on to discuss the ballot system Mr. Smith showed that Mr. Wood's bill contained no advantage over the existing system, but would rather bring about the same stuffing of ballot-boxes which had taken place in Toronto on the occasions to which Mr. Harcourt had referred.

Mr. Ballantyne, in a few vigorous, pointed remarks, showed that secrecy was not the only object of the ballot, nor the main object, save in so far as it would prevent the intimidation that could take place under a non-ballot system. He referred to the wholesale bribery and intimidation that had taken place before the present system was introduced, and to its entire absence now, and warmly denied the insinuations of the member for North Perth that extensive intimidation had taken place in that constituency, which adjoined his own (South Perth), and that in that way Mr. Hess had lost a good many votes, as he claimed. If there had been any intimidation there it had not been practised by Reformers.

Mr. Marter continued on behalf of the Opposition, talking along the usual line of argument. Half the House paid him the doubtful compliment of vacating their seats as soon as he got on his feet. The House had had enough of it and the division took place as soon as Mr. Marter had finished, everybody feeling, no doubt, that he had satisfactorily disposed of the matter.

The division took place on the "six months' hoist" amendment, moved by the Attorney-General, and resulted as follows:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Allan, Armstrong, Awrey, Ballantyne, Bishop, Blezard, Bronson, Caldwell, Clarke (Wellington), Conmee, Dack, Dance, Davis, Drury, Dryden, Evanturel, Ferguson, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Garson, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gilmour, Gould, Graham, Guthrie, Harcourt, Hardy, Leys, Lyon, McAndrew, McKay, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mack, Mackenzie, Master, Morin, Mowat, Murray, O'Connor, Pacaud, Phelps, Rayside, Robillard, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Smith (York), Snider, Sprague, Stratton, Waters, Wood (Brant)—54.

NAYS.—Messrs. Biggar, Blyth, Clancy, H. E. Clarke (Toronto), Craig, Creighton, Cruess, Fell, French, Hammell, Hess, Hudson, Ingram, Kerns, Lees, Marter, Meacham, Meredith, Metcalfe, Miller, Monk, Morgan, Ostrom, Preston, Rorke, Smith (Frontenac), Stewart, Tooley, Whitney, Willoughby, Wood (Hastings), Wylie—32.

It was a strictly party vote. Mr. Chisholm and Mr. Balfour were the only members of the Liberal party absent, and Mr. E. F. Clarke the only absent Conservative. Mr. Clarke and Mr. Chisholm had paired.

The original motion for the adoption of the bill was then declared lost on the same division.

PUBLIC LANDS ACT.

It was now about 10.15, but the House nevertheless proceeded with public bills. The first taken up was that of Mr. Creighton to amend the Public Lands Act. The bill is simply this:—"That section 13 of the Public Lands Act is hereby amended by adding thereto the following words:—'And no grant shall be made under this section for any of the purposes aforesaid until the proposal to make it has first been submitted to and received the approval of the Legislative Assembly.'"

Hon. Mr. Hardy saw no object in the bill, nor any good purpose that could be gained by enacting it. The Public Lands Act had worked well since 1842, and was similar to the Dominion law, with which also no fault had been found. He argued at some length to show that the Act had worked excellently in its present shape, and that there was, therefore, no reason for changing it.

Mr. Meredith objected to the mentioning of the Dominion law in connection with the subject, and endorsed the change proposed by Mr. Creighton.

The Attorney-General said it was very queer that after this law had been on the statute books for half a century the member for North Grey and Mr. Meredith, too, should suddenly discover that it was so bad as they now declared it to be. He was a pretty constant reader of The Empire, he said, and he had not noticed that Mr. Creighton had condemned this measure in the columns of that journal. That might be accounted for by the fact pointed out by his hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, that the same law prevailed in the Dominion as in the Province. Viewing the law in the light he now professed to, it was strange, too, Mr. Mowat said, that during all the years he had sat in the House he had made no effort to secure information as to the workings of the Act. The Attorney-General insisted, as Mr. Hardy had done, that the present law worked well, and that there was no necessity for a change.

Somewhat to the surprise of the House, Mr. Meredith or Mr. Creighton, or both of them, demanded a division, which, however, resulted even worse for them than the first. The figures were 56 to 31 against the bill. The list was the same as the first, with the addition of the name of Mr. Balfour to the majority and the dropping of Mr. Miller from the ranks of Mr. Meredith to those of the Attorney-General, which gave the Government a majority of 25.

Then, at 10.50, the House adjourned.

REFORMATORY AGE LIMIT.

The bill which Hon. A. M. Ross introduced to-day touching the Ontario Reformatory is one of considerable importance, particularly in so far as it affects the action of Magistrates under the Dominion statutes. At present a Magistrate may commit to the Reformatory lads under the age of sixteen. The Provincial statutes place the age limit of lads that may be committed at from 10 to 13, but in spite of this lads outside of these limits are frequently committed and received into the Reformatory, the Provincial authorities not disputing the question. The present bill proposes to make 13 the minimum age at which boys will be received into the Provincial Reformatory, and it is probable that more attention will be devoted to the enforcement of these limits. This will do away with the existing evil of associating very young boys with lads much older and much more hardened in crime than themselves. Magistrates will have the option of sending lads outside of the limit now made, namely, 13 to 16, either to the Industrial School or to prison. The bill will also provide means for the transposition of a lad from the Industrial School to the Reformatory in case he is found unmanageable in the former institution.

THE DULMAGE MATTER.

In THE GLOBE's report of Mr. Aubrey White's examination before the Public Accounts Committee, the misprint of a word made him say that "the collection of moneys (by Mr. Dulmage) was irregular, and the only excuse that could be urged for the irregularity was that things generally in connection with the Department were in such a chaotic condition." The word "department" should have been "district" or "disputed territory." What Mr. White gave the Committee to understand was that owing to the territory being in dispute the Department had not dealt with it like the rest of the Province, and did not intend doing so until it was finally decided to be Ontario's, and therefore matters in the territory were in a state of chaos.

LONDON SOUTH TO BE ANNEXED.

Mr. Meredith's bill for the amalgamation of London South with the City of London came up for discussion and for final action this morning before the Private Bills Committee. There were several deputations—two in favor of the amalgamation coming respectively from London South and from London City, and a third coming from London South in opposition to amalgamation. There were present representing the unionists:—Messrs. E. R. Cameron, Thos. Alexander, John Marshall, R. J. Blackwell, E. Parnell, J. S. Dewar, W. Row, J. D. Clarke, John Pritchett, Mayor Taylor, and Aldermen Taylor, Meule, Jones, Garratt, Heaman and Anderson. The "antis" were represented by Messrs. J. R. Minhinnick, Chas. Hutchinson, F. B. Leys, W. J. Clarke, John A. Blackwell, George Shaw, A. Green, John Osborne, Adam Murray, J. Luney and James Brown. Mr. Meredith commenced proceedings with a brief explanation of the object of the bill. Then the "antis" had the floor. Mr. Hutchinson acted as spokesman, and the arguments advanced against the proposed amalgamation were briefly as follows:—That the people of London South are satisfied with their present position, and will accept amalgamation on no terms whatever. Last summer it was admitted the people of London South were embarrassed to know how they were going to provide themselves with water, and thus there sprang up in the village a feeling in favor of annexation to the city, which would solve the difficulty. A consultation with the City Council took place, and Committees were appointed by the two municipalities to meet together and discuss matters relating to the proposed annexation. It was subsequently discovered that under the Municipal Act London South could borrow money that would enable it to supply itself with water, and so, for that purpose, amalgamation was no longer considered necessary by the entire community of the smaller municipality. Eminent counsel were consulted, and a division soon came about among the people of London South, some being for and some against amalgamation. As it was no longer necessary, it was held by many that it was unreasonable that the people of London South should subject themselves to a change which would raise their assessment by fifty per cent. The deputation claimed to represent property to the extent of $408,705 out of a total of $800,000.

On the other side, it was claimed that London South is in such close proximity to the centre of the city that the people get practically the full benefit of the heavy expenditure of the city without themselves paying any of the cost. Most of the residents of London South, it was urged, do business in the city, and on general grounds it was right and pro-