

... was pretty well acquainted with the circumstances of every individual in it.

Mr. PARDEE was somewhat surprised that the member for North York (Mr. McCall) should have moved the six months' hoist. He had been almost led to believe that that hon. gentleman was in favour of universal suffrage. He knew this at least, that the honourable gentleman was in favour of extending the franchise to the other sex. (Hear, hear.) But, perhaps, it was his gallantry which induced him to do that and not because he thought they were rated sufficiently high, to entitle them to vote. (Laughter.) The member for Grenville (Mr. Clarke) was afraid that an income franchise might lead to fraud. But the same objection would apply to the existing franchise. It was well known that there was a good deal of fraud practised now for the purpose of enabling parties to get their names on the assessment roll. (Hear, hear.) Primarily, it might appear on that principle that every citizen of full age should be entitled to vote, because he was obliged to obey the laws that were made for him. But against this it was said that the man who contributed nothing to the revenue should have no voice in the spending of it. We thus arrived at the principle, that taxation should be the basis of representation, and with that he quite agreed, for he believed that universal suffrage could not be tolerated in any country, unless there was universal intelligence and education, which was hardly to be looked for.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Does not every person pay taxes?

Mr. PARDEE said it was necessary to draw the line somewhere. And the man who was assessed on an income of \$200 was just as much entitled to the franchise as the man who was assessed on a freehold of \$200. Both paid taxes into the treasury. The one was just as good a citizen as the other, and contributed as much towards the material wealth of the country as the other, and the chances were that, if called upon to defend the country, he was more available for that purpose than the other. He was not surprised that the Treasurer and the Provincial Secretary should oppose this measure. Their Conservative tendencies would induce them to do so. But he expected that a different course would be taken by their colleague, the Commissioner of Public Works (Mr. Carling). For the last three or four years that hon. gentleman and the member for Bothwell had been running a tight ship, who should be the foremost champion for a Liberal franchise, and on this occasion he was sure the hon. gentleman would not allow himself to be out-done by the member for Bothwell. (Laughter and cheers.)

Mr. CALVIN was of opinion that those who were intelligent should be allowed to vote, and he thought that the man who was receiving an income of \$200 or \$400 over the amount exempted from taxation, should be considered intelligent. (Hear, hear.) He had on his little island about 120 voters for members of Parliament. Only two of these men earned \$1,000 a year. They were intelligent, and were this law passed, they would have a right to vote equally with one of their sawyers—the man that sawed in the pit—the bottom sawyer. (Laughter.) It was argued that a man who got an income might be here to-day and away to-morrow. Well, if he was away to-morrow, he would not vote, would he? (Laughter.)

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. SEXTON resumed the debate. He called the attention of the Speaker to a breach of privilege on the part of the hon. member for North Huron, who, during the absence of the members, had placed bottles of brine on the desks. This he considered an assault on the House. (Laughter.) However, he would speak on the motion before the House. He considered that the property qualification should not be the only test of intelligence. If the man who could secure for himself property to the amount of \$200 possessed the intelligence necessary to exercise the right of the elective franchise, so did the man who was able to earn a certain income. He believed the man who was taxed should be allowed the right to vote, for in the majority of cases it would be found that the man who earned an income exceeding four hundred dollars was just as well qualified to have a voice in the management of public affairs as the man who possessed property to that amount. He believed the day was not far distant when taxation would be made the basis of the franchise.

Mr. McKELLAR said that two years ago he had the honour of introducing a resolution embodying the principles that were involved in the Bill now under discussion. He had reflected on the principles involved in that resolution from that period to the present time, and had heard it discussed in the House and out of the House, and the more he had reflected on the matter, and the more he had heard it discussed, the more convinced he was of the justice and correctness of the principles involved in his hon. friend's

Bill. And he thought his hon. friend from Prescott might well feel proud at the inability of even two Ministers of the Crown—who had attempted the task—to answer one single argument that he had advanced in support of his measure. (Hear, hear.) The House to-night had heard the same tale that they had heard year after year for the last twenty-five or thirty years, or even longer, on questions affecting the extension of the franchise. He remembered when the franchise in this country was based exclusively on the actual possession of a patent. Nothing short of that would entitle a man to vote. When it was proposed that the franchise should be extended, they had heard the same objections that had been urged to-night, and urged by the same party—the Conservative party—of which the Attorney-General was now so distinguished a member. (Hear, hear.) The objection then to the extension of the franchise was, that it was a revolutionary measure, that it was Democratic, and that, if the franchise were changed, universal suffrage would certainly be the consequence. Well, it was changed; parties who were in possession of their lands were entitled to vote, and no evil results had flowed from it. At a later period it was still further extended to parties in occupation. If a person was found by the assessor in possession of a lot

of land, his name was put on the assessment roll, and, if the property was of sufficient value, he was entitled to a vote. When the franchise was extended in that way, there was the same objection that it would be a most revolutionary measure, that it would introduce evils of various kinds, and that Universal Suffrage would certainly flow from it, just as they had heard to-night. Well, they had not heard one of those hon. gentlemen get up to-night and say that the classes then admitted should now be disfranchised. (Hear, hear.) The Provincial Secretary, when he rose, said that property should be represented, and that the franchise which the friends of this Bill were contending for was not based on property. He asked the House whether a man receiving in cash a salary of \$400, or more, had not a larger, deeper, and more permanent stake in the country than the man who happened to settle for a time, perhaps for a few days, just when the assessor came round, upon a lot? The latter might be merely a monthly tenant, here to-day and away to-morrow. So far as interest in real estate went, so far as interest in the country went, so far as permanence of residence was concerned, he held that the class which his hon. friend, by his Bill, intended to cover, had by far a deeper stake in the prosperity of the country than the other. (Hear, hear.) He thought it might very fairly be enquired, why, in fixing the property qualification, \$200 qualified a man in the country, while a much higher amount was required in the city—or, why a man assessed for \$200 should have a vote, while the man assessed for \$199.99 had not. Was it the one cent which qualified or disqualified a man? It was clear that the fixing of the particular amount was merely an arbitrary or rough way of measuring the intelligence of the man, for he held that intelligence and moral worth should be the true tests of the qualification of a man to exercise the franchise?

Attorney-General MACDONALD—Who is to be the judge of that?

Mr. McKELLAR said that was the very point he was coming to. If property was to be the measure of intelligence, surely the man whose abilities and skill enabled him to earn \$400 a year, was fully as well qualified to exercise the franchise as the man who earned, it might be, \$100 or \$200 a year, but got a vote because he occupied a piece of ground of the value of \$200.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—If, according to this Bill a man who has \$400 income in a city, has sufficient intelligence to vote, how is it that the man who has \$399 of income has not?

Mr. McKELLAR said it must be measured in some way, and what he contended was, that the mode adopted in the existing franchise was a very arbitrary one. The member for Grenville, as he understood him, had not attacked the principle of the Bill, but had dwelt on the difficulty of ascertaining how a man was possessed of a certain income.

Mr. CLARKE—That attacks the principle.

Mr. McKELLAR said, if the hon. gentleman would only look into the Bill which had been introduced in the Dominion Parliament, he would discover that machinery had been constructed, by which all the difficulty that he apprehended could be overcome—and the same machinery might be applied here. It was proposed to have a revising Committee, who should have the power of subpoenaing the parties, of putting them on oath, and of bringing up witnesses and examining them, and if the evidence was not satisfactory to him, he could have the parties struck off the roll altogether. That difficulty, therefore, suggested by the hon. gentleman was easily overcome. As regarded his hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Ferrier) he did not think the excuse which that hon. gentleman gave for not voting for the Bill was a good one. The hon. gentleman said he was opposed to the Bill, because the sums named in it were too small. Now it was not the details of the Bill they were to vote upon at present. They had to vote on the principle of the Bill—whether they should enfranchise that class of people at all or not. When they went into Committee on the Bill, the hon. gentleman could propose what amendments he chose, and, if his amendments were not agreed to, he would then be at liberty to vote for throwing out the Bill at the third reading. He (Mr. McKellar) was not certain that he should himself vote for the sums which his honourable friend had put in the measure, but he would vote for the principle that the class referred to in the Bill, of intelligent, industrious men, who were a source of profit to the country, should not be excluded from exercising the franchise. (Hear, hear.) It was a very singular thing, that, as the law now stood, a man might become a member of this House, and come here to make the laws, who was not at liberty to vote for another to be sent here. He held that the greater contained the lesser, and that, if a man was qualified to be a member of this House he should be empowered to vote as an elector. (Hear, hear.) This Bill would enfranchise a large class, a class embracing a large proportion of those who would be called out to defend their country in the hour of need. It was well known that a large number who left this city for the frontier at the time of the Fenian raid, were the very flour of the country. Many of them had graduated in the University, many of them held lucrative positions in commercial houses and banks, many of them were men of the highest intelligence and moral worth, and some of them sacrificed their lives in their country's cause. Would this House now deny to such the right to vote for the members of the Legislature, which made the laws they were bound to obey? There was also a large class of school teachers whom this Bill would admit, and surely none would more intelligently exercise the franchise than these. It had been objected to the Bill, that there had been no agitation throughout the country on this question. It might be true that the question had not been very much agitated; but wherever it had been discussed or thought of, this proposed income franchise had been generally approved of. It had been stated by the Provincial Secretary, that this question had been twice voted upon by the House, and the honourable gentleman apparently contended that that was a reason why it should not be brought up again. He (Mr. McKellar)

held that it was quite a proper and legitimate course to bring the question before the House again, so as if possible to induce members who had opposed the income franchise formerly, to reverse their votes now. If not carried now, or next session, he believed it would be carried after the next election. (Hear, hear.) For his part, he went heartily for the Bill. There was one feature of it—a matter of detail—which he thought should be altered. His hon. friend proposed that the qualification should be the income over and above the amount exempted from assessment. He (Mr. McKellar), as regarded the conferring of the franchise, would be disposed to allow no exemptions; but would tax him on the full amount of his income, for the privilege of voting. (Hear, hear.) He had no doubt that the Bill would receive the support of the hon. Commissioner of Public Works, Mr. Carling. That hon. gentleman had been very much exercised about the qualification that was fixed in the Act of 1866. He raised the outcry that poor men were disfranchised—that poor men were deprived of the right of voting. If the hon. gentleman was sincere then, he had now the opportunity of bringing within the pale of the franchise another large, intelligent and influential class, equally worthy with those whose interests the hon. gentleman had formerly advocated. He believed, therefore, they would have the support of that hon. gentleman, (Hear, hear,) even though it should present the spectacle of a divided Government, on this as on some other occasions. He believed if they did not carry the Bill to-night, they would carry it at no distant day. He believed the country was in favour of it, and that, as its principle must commend itself to every one who examined it seriously and dispassionately, its ultimate triumph must be certain. (Cheers.)

Mr. RYKERT believed the House had a perfect right to bring up any measure session after session, but if so, some new arguments should be adduced in favour of it. When an attempt was made two years ago to reduce the franchise in the townships no man was more strenuously opposed to it than the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. McKELLAR—I must deny this. The journals of the country are here; let the hon. member show where I ever made such statements.

Mr. RYKERT went on to say that he perfectly agreed that intelligence should be the qualification, but he would like to know if this was the principle of the Bill? He denied that it was. It was a money qualification, and throughout the speech of its framer there was not the slightest proof that there was any such tendency in the Mother Country.

In point of intelligence we were rapidly passing the Mother Country, yet if intelligence were to be made the qualification where was the line to be drawn. Let intellectual development be the test; but he must oppose a Bill which would give the most ignorant man a right to vote so long as he possessed a certain salary.

Dr. McGILL had listened attentively to the introductory speech, and believed it amounted to nothing more or less than declamation; yet it had not excited his (Dr. McGill's) passions at all. For the last two sessions this measure had been brought before the House, without a single new argument to support it; and now it was brought up again in even a worse and more crude state than ever. It had degenerated in the hands of the hon. member for Prescott First, the qualification was limited to \$600; next it was reduced to \$500, and now it had come down to \$400. In a few more sessions it would, following the same rule, be reduced to universal suffrage. The sole object of the supporters of this Bill was to obtain notoriety—a notoriety which would not survive. (Laughter.) This measure was a partial and unfair one. It reminded him of the violated sepulchre; it was sprinkled with benevolence and patriotism, and apparently got up to benefit those who did not desire it.

Mr. LYON rose to speak of a few charges made against the Conservative party. It had been asserted that they had opposed this measure throughout on the ground that it led to universal suffrage. He contended that this very Bill now before the House was a proof that such an attempt was being made, and for that reason he opposed it.

Mr. EVANS recommended the hon. member for South Ontario to make use of the bottle of brine, with which, he observed, each member was furnished, to preserve those brilliant ideas with which he had amused the House. He (Mr. Evans) believed the measure was a good one, and deserved support.

Mr. CUMBERLAND contended that the Bill did not serve the purpose for which it was intended. If intelligence was to be the test, why not include the graduates of the universities, who, though without the necessary income qualifications, possessed the highest standard of intellect.

Mr. McDUGALL contended that the House should vote on the principles contained in the Bill, and not on what it did not contain. If the hon. member for Algoma desired to extend the franchise still further, he could introduce a measure for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON said this Bill, if passed, would give the franchise to nearly every man over twenty-one years of age, for there were few who did not earn more than \$200 in one way or another. If the framers of this Bill intended to introduce the principle of universal suffrage they should say so openly, and not endeavour to bring it into the House in this underhand manner. If this Bill should become law bribery would become universal at the elections, candidates could easily purchase these \$200 voters. If this law were passed it would pave the way to universal fraud and corruption.

Mr. SMITH (Leeds) believed that this measure did not interest his constituents in the least. He believed those who had not the right of the franchise now did not look for it, at least they never expressed a desire to obtain it. He looked upon this Bill as an abortion and unworthy of the hon. member, who had delivered a really brilliant speech when he introduced it.

Mr. SINCLAIR said that he was in favour of the Bill, though he had voted against it

on two previous occasions. He thought the Bill would create voters who were intelligent and who were also conscientious enough to do what was right, and the persons gaining the franchise under this Act would not be more liable to intimidation than other classes which now possessed the franchise. After the warning given at Ottawa by the Minister of Justice, he did not think that they would be going far wrong in giving this extension, and that if the Indians at Algoma could send such a representative as the hon. member for that district, they might trust the clerks and accountants of the city of Toronto with the franchise. (Laughter.) It was not necessary that this step should lead to universal suffrage.

Mr. COCKBURN briefly opposed the Bill.

Mr. BEATTY said he had voted against the Bill when it was before the House, and he saw no reason to alter his opinion. The consideration put forward in favour of the Bill was, that the basis of the franchise was taxation, intelligence, and obedience to the laws. But if these constituted the true, legitimate basis of the suffrage, they could not stop short of universal suffrage. The suffrage was now sufficiently wide, and but few voters would be added to the list by this Bill; and was the House for the sake of a few to disturb the basis of the present representative system, and adopt a principle which would lead to universal suffrage? The measure was unwise and hasty, and was not necessary in the face of present circumstances.

Mr. BOYD then replied on the whole debate. He severely criticized the conduct of the hon. member for South Ontario (Dr. McGill), and commented on the arguments that had been brought forward. He repeated some of the statements that were made in his opening speech, and closed with an eloquent appeal to the patriotism of the members to give their assistance in conferring the franchise upon a class who were continually adding to the capital of the country, and assisting in bearing the burdens of the State.

Mr. SPRINGER asked whether the meaning of the Bill was that persons in villages should be possessed of \$200 over the \$400 of the Assessment Law? If so he should vote for it.

Mr. BOYD said it was so.

Attorney-General MACDONALD said he had listened to a great deal of talk and elaboration of what had been said on former occasions, and did not consider it necessary that he should make any lengthy remarks. Former attempts had been made to pass a similar measure to the one now proposed, but they had been defeated; and if this Bill was carried, he thought that the leader of the Opposition, who had tried his hand, and failed would have to surrender his place to the hon. member for Prescott, (Mr. Boyd.) The right of voting had always been connected with the soil, and whatever might be the condition elsewhere, there was no doubt that it was an easy matter for a man to obtain possession of sufficient real property in this country to qualify him for the franchise. With reference to the franchise as exercised in Nova Scotia, it must be remembered that the Dominion Parliament had not created a new class of voters, they had only confirmed the right to those who had possessed it before Confederation. In the present case, however, they were legislating for themselves—for their own country, and they were asked to create an entire new body of voters, to adopt a principle which to his mind, would be disastrous to the best interests of the country, and which would according to the sliding scale of one hon. gentleman inevitably lead to Universal Suffrage. If it was agreed that taxation gave the right to a vote, why should not a vote be given to all parties who paid taxes? The effect of the Bill would be to separate the franchise from the soil, and to destroy the principle which had guided legislation up to the present time. He did not believe that the Bill in the Dominion Parliament would be passed; at any rate, he intended to vote against it. After some humorous remarks in reference to the manner in which the measure had been introduced in this and preceding Parliaments, the Hon. Attorney General concluded by saying that the hon. member for Prescott ought to have better gauged the feelings, both of the members of that House and of the country, before he introduced such a measure, after the defeats of former sessions.

The amendment that the Bill be read that day six months was then put, amid considerable excitement, and the result was—yeas, 46; nays, 27. The division list was as follows:—

YEAS—Messrs. Beatty, Boulter, Cameron, Carling (London), Carling (Huron), Carnegie, Clarke, Cockburn, Code, Corby, Craig (Sten gary), Craig (Russell), Cumberland, Eyre, Ferguson, Ferrier, Galbraith, Graham (Hastings), Grahame (York), Greely, Hays, Hooper, Lauder, Lount, Luton, Lyon, Macdonald, Matchett, Monteith, McCall (North York), McCall (Elgin), McGill, Read, Richards, Rykert, Secord, Smith (Leeds and Grenville), Strange, Swinarton, Tett, Trow, Wallis, Wigie, Williams (Durham), Wilson and Wood—46.

NAYS—Messrs. Baxter, Boyd, Calvin, Christie, Clemens, Cook, Coyne, Crosby, Currie, Evans, Fitzsimmons, Gow, McDougall, McKellar, McKim, McLeod, McMurrich, Oliver, Pardee, Paxton, Perry, Sexton, Sinclair, Smith (Kent), Smith (Middlesex), Springer and Williams (Hamilton)—27.

The Bill, consequently, was lost.

NOVA SCOTIA RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. McKELLAR announced that he had received a telegram from Mr. Blake, desiring to have the resolutions in reference to Nova Scotia, of which he had given notice, set down for Monday next.

The House adjourned at 10:45.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS.

The following notices have been given:— Mr. Greely—Act to permit solemn declarations to be substantiated for oaths in certain cases. Mr. Greely—Bill to amend chap. 81, section 73 of the Consolidated Statutes of Upper Canada.