

the six or seven hundred persons in Hamilton, for instance, who have always enjoyed the rights of franchise, but who were deprived of it by Mr. McKellar's Act of 1866, are still considered by him to be unworthy to be trusted with the political rights of freemen."

This statement was quite untrue. What the committee did was this. They agreed to the franchise stated here, as far as municipal elections were concerned, being the very franchise which he (Mr. McKellar) had himself recommended in his Bill, introduced and passed in 1866. It was moved by Mr. Carling that the franchise for Parliamentary elections should be reduced to the same amount, but the committee agreed almost unanimously that it was inexpedient for the committee then to deal with that question.

Mr. FERGUSON rose to a question of order. He did not think the hon. gentleman was in order in bringing before the House a report of what took place in Committee.

Mr. SCOTT (Ottawa)—Questions of privilege are always in order.

Sir HENRY SMITH said the hon. gentleman could put himself in order by moving the adjournment.

Mr. McKELLAR went on to say, that, instead of the Committee, or those who were termed the Reform members of it, opposing Mr. Carling's motion, they merely decided that it was expedient that the question be postponed. One reason was, that the member for Frontenac had a Bill before the House, dealing with the election law generally, in connection with which the question could better be discussed. He thought when newspapers deliberately misrepresented what took place in Committee, with a view of fastening odium on those whom they called Reformers, although the same parties had declared that all party lines were now obliterated, the offence was of a nature which ought to be brought before the House. He appealed to the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. Rykert) to say whether the statement he had now made was correct or not. To put himself in order, he moved that when the house adjourns at six o'clock it do stand adjourned till to-morrow at three o'clock.

Hon. Mr. CARLING said he thought the statement in the *Spectator* was correct, as to what actually took place in the committee. The member for Bothwell and a number of other members voted against his (Mr. Carling's) motion.

Mr. BLAKE—That was not "re-affirming the principle," &c.

Mr. RYKERT, the chairman of the committee, said he entirely coincided with the action of the member for Bothwell, and the majority of the committee, in the matter referred to. Some of his Conservative friends—especially the member for Peel (Mr. Coyne)—appeared desirous to out-radical almost every radical in the house, and, but for the restraint put upon that honourable gentleman by the committee, he would have had universal suffrage recommended. He had not understood that the "Reformers" had acted as a body, but by the preconcerted action of the majority of the committee, in common with himself, and it had been decided to oppose any alteration of the franchise this session. The committee decided to confine themselves this session to remedying the obvious mistakes committed in passing the Act of 1866. As to the charge against the Reformers—and he considered himself a Reformer in reality, if not one in the common acceptance of the word—he did not understand the Reformers on the other side of the house were opposed to altering the franchise; but the committee, as he thought, wisely, determined not to interfere with it this session.

Mr. GOW thought that, when reporters