

Belleville, and who has property there, and has a family of children who are native Canadians, and yet those children have not the right to vote because their mother married a Chinaman.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I certainly would think the case referred to would be a hard case, and that the sons should be allowed to vote ; but I do not think that for one case of this kind we should send the Bill back for the purpose of amending it.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 3rd clause.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Referring to sub-section B, it seems to me it discriminates in favor of a party that is not qualified. If the father dies and the property is not sufficient to qualify all the children one or two will qualify, according to the value of the property. It is quite clear that the moment the father is dead the children are his heirs, and if he dies without a will they have an equal share in the property. Take for instance a property worth \$500, and there are 10 children, and each child shares to the amount of \$50—the eldest and the second and third have no more property than the others, and I do not see why those parties should be qualified to vote when other parties, say ten persons, who have bought a property in partnership worth \$500 could not. Why in this case should not one, two or three of them be qualified to vote, as one, two or three sons of the farmers who are qualified on the same amount of property?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think it is in furtherance of the franchise ; it increases the franchise. The provision seems to be that where a man dies his sons living upon the place have a right to vote at the following elections, provided there is sufficient property to qualify them to vote. This supposes a case where the registration is finished, and the man dies before the election ; if the election takes place soon after his death, if there is property enough to qualify, say three of the sons to vote, they can do so, but if there is only enough property to qualify one, only one can vote.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—It seems to me the moment the father dies the sons are only proprietors of a part of the real estate worth \$50. I think that is widening the right too much.

HON. MR. POWER—As I understand the clause, if a man owns a farm and leaves by will all his property to his daughters, and has also sons who continue to live on the farm, these men who have no interest in the property at all except their residence there, under this clause have a right to vote.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—They have no interest in the father's lifetime. It is a vote given to them in consideration of residing on the farm and being concerned in the welfare of the country.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I give notice that I will move an amendment to that clause at the 3rd reading.

The clause was adopted.

On the 5th clause,

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Is it not likely that disputes will arise on the question of occupation? This clause may give rise to a good deal of wrong-doing. The Crown has at its disposal large tracts of land, and if they should be evil disposed, as members of the Ministry sometimes are, large grants might be made to persons a year before an election, and a great deal of wrong might be done in that way.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL.—We have had that qualification in Ontario for a long time, and I have never known any abuse to creep in. There are certain persons having license of occupation—lock keepers, bridge keepers, &c. They have a license to occupy the property. There are also persons who occupy land under license from the Crown at fortified places like Kingston.

HON. MR. SCOTT—They would not have a vote in the past if they were not paying taxes.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I know a member of the other Chamber