

Evans) thought that the parties so influenced ought to be disfranchised. But he did not concur in the statement of the member for Lambton. The inn-keepers wielded no such pernicious influence, but felt, on the contrary, that they had been singled out from the rest of the community through unwise legislation. They were debarred that position which their wealth and intelligence as a body entitled them to, and were forced to occupy a position which even their menials might aspire to. If all parties licensed by the Corporation were put on the same footing, the innkeepers would not complain; but it was undoubtedly a grievance that they above all others should be subjected to this class legislation. They were the only class who, as a body, were excluded by the Act; and he hoped hon. gentlemen would not continue that illiberality.

Mr. Barber said that from his experience of County Councils, the Legislature would be wise, instead of relaxing the law any, to make it more stringent.

Mr. McKellar concurred in the view that it would not be wise to allow any loophole in the Act of which the inn-keepers or saloon-keepers or liquor sellers generally could avail themselves in order to obtain seats in councils. He would therefore propose that the words "inn-keepers or saloon-keepers" be struck out of the clause, and that the proviso be inserted in lieu thereof to the effect that no persons holding licenses from the Corporation for the sale of intoxicating liquors, or for any other purpose, shall be eligible to a seat in the council.

Mr. Pardee was afraid, if the words were struck out, that those sought to be excluded would run, regardless of the law, and that it would lead to very vexatious and expensive litigation. If it were meant to exclude inn-keepers and saloon-keepers, the more manly course would be to say so.

Mr. McKellar's amendment was then put and carried.

In clause 75 it was resolved to insert the word "tenants" after "householders."

THE FRANCHISE.

A delegate from Brantford stated (in respect to this 75th clause) that they wished added to the list of electors all those who were assessed in a sufficient amount in real property, personal property, or income.

The Chairman remarked that this was opening up the discussion of a very broad question.

Several members urged that as they could not possibly complete a satisfactory measure on the franchise this session, they had better postpone it than produce such a crude measure as would cause them to be laughed at.

Mr. McKellar said he would be favourable to having income or salary to some given amount—he could not say exactly how much—entitle a man to vote. There were a large number of intelligent worthy young men in receipt of salaries of \$300 and \$400 a year, who did not keep house themselves, but who would be brought in as voters if this suggestion were adopted. But he feared that the machinery necessary to bring it into play would be rather too comprehensive for the time the committee had at their disposal this session. He would therefore prefer to let clauses 75 and 76 lie over till next session.

Mr. Barber fully concurred in the view that by adopting this income qualification a very large and intelligent addition would be made to the franchise; but the session was too far advanced to allow of satisfactory legislation on the subject before the adjournment.

Mr. Grahame, seconded by Mr. Gow, moved that the 2 sections in question be left over, except so much thereof as relates to the payment of taxes—(which section the committee desired to amend).

Hon. Mr. Carling advocated the discussion of this matter in committee. The present franchise, he contended, was higher than it ought to be in cities, so much so that fully one-third of those qualified to vote in cities had lost their right to do so under the present measure. In London there were many mechanics and respectable men having a house and lot worth \$400 or \$500. These men had deeds of their property and had the right to vote for 10 or 15 years; but they have been all disfranchised. It was, he considered, wrong to compel people in cities to possess three times the value of property held in townships by those having a vote, and one-third more than was necessary in towns.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS.

Mr. Coyne expressed himself favourable to allowing the franchise to those paying in-

terely necessary that men having charge of such important interests as those of the city of Toronto, Hamilton or London should be men having a large stake in those cities. Besides, no difficulty had yet arisen in finding gentlemen with these qualifications.

Hon. Mr. Carling could not see why a London alderman, in a city of 15,000 inhabitants, should be required to have five times the qualification of the representative of a town like Niagara with 10,000 inhabitants, or Chatham, or other towns. All the qualification required in these towns was \$300. The city qualification was altogether too high.

The Chairman remarked that they had had no suggestion from Hamilton or Toronto; that there ought to be a reduction.

Ald. Boulton (who attended on behalf of the City Council) said that in Toronto there was a unanimous feeling to leave the qualification as it stood. No complaint had been made about it, and the members themselves were perfectly satisfied. Besides, though the qualification for aldermen appeared higher than for a member of Parliament, it was not so,—as the latter had to be possessed of £500 free of all debts, while the former had only to be assessed at \$4,000, no matter its incumbrance.

Hon. Mr. Carling said it was all very well for wealthy Aldermen to take that view, but there was no doubt that shut out many excellent men from the Council. He knew some wards in London where they could hardly get men qualified to act as Aldermen. One ward in the northern part of the city, could barely get three men qualified. Now he wished a remedy for that state of affairs.

Mr. Coyne said that the statement of Ald. Boulton was hardly in accordance with the cry raised during the last elections for Toronto in the West End, when it was charged that Mr. McKellar and his friends had put the franchise too high. At election time the cry was that the franchise ought to be lowered; but when the elections were over it was discovered that that cry was only fit to be used in carrying elections. (Laughter). He thought the proposition of the member for London fair and reasonable. He (Mr. Coyne) was in favour of lowering the franchise both for candidates for Parliament and for City Councils.

Mr. Pardee remarked that neither Toronto, Hamilton, Kingston or Ottawa had called for this change. But one city, and that the smallest in the province, required it. Property qualification was, of course, the only practical test of fitness they had; and it would not be well to act hastily in reducing it.

The Chairman stated that there had been a communication from the municipality of Kingston from which it appeared that they were desirous of going back to annual value. The qualification for alderman they ask to be of the annual value of £50, freehold, or £100, leasehold. Formerly it used to be £40, freehold, and £80, leasehold.

Mr. McCall seconded Hon. Mr. Carling's motion.

Mr. Gibbons thought it would not be wise to lower the standard for city representatives. One great guarantee for the good conduct of these men was that they had a considerable interest in the prosperity of the city and were themselves taxed in proportion to the rest of the citizens.

Hon. Mr. Carling agreed to amend his motion by making the qualification \$3,000 in real estate and \$6,000 rental; and this amendment carried.

DISQUALIFICATIONS.

On clause 73, respecting the disqualifications for the office of Councillor,

Mr. Coyne asked on what principle were sheriffs excluded from the Council Chamber.

The Chairman replied that if they had a seat there, they could audit their own accounts. Suggestions had been made from many quarters that aliens should be disqualified. Nothing in the oath prevented an alien from being elected, but he could not take his seat.

It was resolved that aliens, Clerks of the Peace, County Attorneys and Police Magistrates should be disqualified.

The 73rd clause also states that "No person, not having paid all taxes due by him, no inn keeper or saloon keeper, or no person having by himself or his partner an interest in any contract with or on behalf of the corporation, shall be qualified to be a member of the council of any municipal corporation."

The Chairman said it had been objected that the clause was not definite. It did not

come tax to a certain amount. He was in favour of another change. There were large numbers of women (laughter) who had property in their own right; and it was not fair that they should be able to exercise the franchise (laughter). He would move, seconded by Mr. Greely, that the word "male" in the 75th clause be struck out.

Mr. Greely requested the committee to treat the subject with the gravity it merits (Laughter).

Mr. Fitzsimmons had seen women so excited about at school trustee elections that never wished to see them near a poll more.

Mr. Gow thought they were much better at home.

Hon. Mr. Carling would like to know how far it was proposed to carry this. Perhaps all the old women in the country would get up on the assessment roll. (Laughter)

Mr. Pardee imagined that the harmony many a household would be disturbed if husband voted on one ticket and the wife the other. (Laughter.)

Mr. Coyne's motion was put and lost.

On motion of Mr. Gibbons the words "or before the 16th Dec. next," in the clause were struck out.

Mr. McKellar said he was happy to see the committee such a unanimous feeling in favour of an extension of the franchise such as proposed. Allowing those with incomes of \$300 to vote, would, beyond question add a large number of valuable electors to the rolls. He would even go further and extend the franchise so as to include the sons of farmers, over 21 years, living at home with their fathers. It was true, as had been stated by the member for London, that the law struck off a large number who had voted, but it gave the power of the franchise to a very much larger class who had been unjustly deprived of it. There was a large number of young men in the country—who did not keep house themselves—such as school teachers, reporters and others—men whose intelligence and morality were of the highest character—and these ought not to be deprived of the franchise.

The Chairman suggested that they should not make the qualification lower than \$300 as any person going to vote would have to pay taxes.

Mr. Gibbons concurred in the Chairman's remarks.

The Chairman believed the difficulty would be met by inserting a proviso in section that any person receiving an income of \$300 a year shall be entitled to vote; before qualification, shall go before a Committee of Revision, establish the fact of his receipt of income, and on it pay the taxes.

Hon. Mr. Carling congratulated the member for Bothwell on becoming so liberal. Only a year ago he fixed the franchise at \$600, and thereby disfranchised so large a number of the community by his pet measure that it was no wonder Kent had disowned him. Nearly every one of those he disfranchised at the last election were receiving over \$300. Now he advances so far that he is more than liberal. He would allow a man to vote on \$300, and that, without being a householder. It was a universal suffrage.

Mr. Pardee was afraid they were tending towards universal suffrage. If intelligence and education were the real tests of a qualification to vote, then the property qualification could not safely be lowered as proposed.

Mr. McKellar said that \$600 was undoubtedly too high. He would have a motion to make it \$400, if it met the view of the committee.

Mr. McCall said this would be ten times worse than universal suffrage. (Laughter) First they fix the qualification at \$600 then they talk of reducing it to \$300 or \$400. It was absurd.

Mr. Graham of Hastings, maintained there was nothing like universal suffrage. The proposition before the chair. The franchise of a large and intelligent class of the community had been overlooked, and this was proposed to recognize.

Mr. Graham of York, thought that there was no difficulty in the way of any intelligent man acquiring sufficient property to qualify as a voter.

Mr. Graham of York, seconded by Mr. Greely, moved in amendment, that the amount be \$600 and not \$400.

Mr. McKellar rose and justified himself for the accusations of the member for London. Anathemas had just been cast at him by a minister of the Crown, b