am, Preston, Rorke, White, Whitney, Willoughby, Wylie—14.

Mr. Whitney's amendment was lost on the same division, and the bill was then read a third time.

REGISTRATION BILL AGAIN.

On the House resuming consideration of the registration bill the Attorney-General stated that suggestions as to the purgation of part one of the voters' list—that compiled by the assessors—had been considered by the Government, and they were prepared to make an arrangement which they thought would be fair to both parties.

Mr. Meredith asked if this purgation would be by the registrars, as he wanted.

The Attorney-General replied that he was in favor of keeping the lists apart, but that it was proposed to make sure that the County Judge had time enough properly to purge part one of the list.

The discussion then continued on the residence qualification, the Opposition, led by Mr. Meredith and Mr. E. F. Clarke, contending that voters who have resided in one division of the city for a sufficient time to qualify, and who have removed to another division just before the time for registration, may retain their votes in the division which they have just left. Mr. Meredith finally moved an amendment to that effect. Mr. Balfour objected to any concession being made to Toronto over that made to other parts of the Province. There were changes made in every constituency. Hon. Mr. Gibson, after some further discussion, said he thought it might be arranged in regard to the approaching election, seeing it was so near, that a voter changing from one electoral division to another in such a way as to be outside the residence qualification could register and vote in the division from which he had removed, while being resident in an other division. In this way he would save his vote and colonization would be prevented. The Government would not suggest this provision should apply to subsequent elections. Mr. Meredith said this was all right as far as it went, and subsequent elections could be arranged for at a future session. Mr. Meredith said he thought the Government was getting more reasonable. Mr. Ross retorted "ditto." Mr. McColl, speaking specially for St. Thomas, urged that the objections as to personation and improper lists which had been used in the case of Toronto, did not apply to the smaller cities, and there was therefore no reason why the County Judge should not do the work of revision. The Government side pointed out that this would kill the principle of registration, which was, however, only to apply in these cases if the revision of the list was not complete when the writs were issued.

The bill then made rapid progress, a dozen clauses being passed in almost as many minutes, amendments being made which met with little objection from either side.

The Opposition objected to the Government determining the districts to which the respective registrars should be appointed. It should be left to the board. There was danger the Government would use the power improperly. The Attorney-General said if the only reason advanced for this change was that the Government would use the power corruptly, he most certainly would not consent to the change. Mr. Meredith said then the Opposition must revert to war again. However, after Mr. Meredith had explained that he thought it of the essence of the bill that this power should be left in the hands of what the Government at least considered to be a non-partizan authority, and that he did not mean to imply that it would necessarily be improperly used by the Government, the Attorney-General promised to consider the point.

Some further progress was made when 6 o'clock was reached.

EVENING SESSION.

After recess, the House resumed consideration of the bill in committee. The Minister of Education announced that the Government had considered Mr. Meredith's suggestion as to the apportionment of the eight ex-officio registrars in the case of Toronto amongst the four electoral divisions being left to the board itself, instead of being determined by the Government, and were willing to accept it. Another clause, which in the original bill had provided for the attendance of an ex-officio registrar at one of the two adjoining registration divisions in each electoral division, was changed, it having become impracticable by reason, through another amendment, of the increase in the number of registration divisions from four to six, or in all the electoral divisions from sixteen to twenty-four. The change in this clause simply provided for the attendance of an ex-officio registrar or an appointed registrar at each registration division. It was further agreed that the officials engaged in the preparation of the lists shall not be candidates, and shall not have votes. The bill was gradually passed through committee, an informal discussion being held on the various points as they came up. A discussion of some length occurred on the question of challenging persons who wish to be registered. Mr. Meredith favored a plan whereby the challenged voter could be registered, but a searcher sent out to investigate as to whether he is really entitled to a vote. Any other system of challenges, he said, would lead to many persons being worried out of their votes. It was decided that the registrar is to decide on the spot, on the affidavit of the applicant, his answers to questions and any evidence then before him. The clause allowing the photographing of applicants at the request of an agent was struck out. There were various other slight amendments and the bill was reported at 11.45. The redistribution bill was then read a second time, and the reading of it in committee deferred till tomorrow. Mr. Meredith announced that he would oppose the feature of the bill which deals with Ottawa. There was no discussion on the second reading.

MR. CONMEE'S POSITION.

Mr. Conmee's remarks on the mining bill on Wednesday were too briefly reported in The Globe of Thursday to give perhaps an adequate idea of the stand he took in relation to a measure in which he is peculiarly interested, and with which his name has been closely associated.

With regard to the charge of 2 per cent. imposed on the value of the ore, after deducting therefrom the actual cost of mining and raising the same and subsequent treatment for market, which is by the act substituted in lieu of the royalties upon all mining lands sold or leased by the Crown since 1891, as well as upon all lands that may be sold or leased by the Crown until the year 1900, Mr. Conmee's contention was that, instead of the royalties imposed in 1891, as modified in 1892, applying to lands sold by the Crown since the year 1891, or to lands sold or leased by the Crown until 1900, as provided by the bill, the royalties should be abandoned for all time to come, and that if any charge was imposed it should be in the nature of a percentage upon the net profits, or if that would not be conceded, then upon the product after deducting all cost of mining and subsequent treatment. The principle of a percentage was adopted in lieu of royalties upon all lands sold or leased since 1891, as well as upon all lands that may be sold or leased up to the year 1900, except that the words "actual cost" are used instead of the words "all cost," as contended for by Mr. Conmee. After January, 1900, the royalty will again prevail on sales subsequent to that date. Mr. Conmee was made to say that the charge of 2 per cent. should be applied to all cost of production instead of actual cost. What he argued was that it should be applied to the product only after deducting therefrom all cost of mining and subsequent treatment, which principle was adopted, except that the words "actual cost" are used instead of the words "all cost." Although Mr. Conmee labored hard to have the percentage principle substituted for the royalties, he did so on the ground that it was less objectionable from his standpoint, and of the two evils he preferred to choose the least. He stoutly contended against royalties or any other special charge being imposed upon the products of the mines.