

pared to move. I would ask the consideration of the committee as to whether there should be some provision made under the head of tenancy in cities and towns. There the rental is nearly always a money rental; a rental of any other kind is so rare that the number of such cases would not be appreciable. The reason I bring it up is that what I said before was with reference to counties altogether. Meanwhile, however, we might turn to the franchise for counties.

Mr. MILLS. I am not going to re-open the question further than to say that it would simplify the preparation of the voters' list very much if the hon. gentleman, at all events in counties, if not elsewhere, should adopt the rule of taking the assessed value not simply as the *prima facie* right to vote, but as the actual right to vote, thereby putting tenants, in that respect, on the same footing as owners and occupants.

On section 4, paragraph 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the insertion of the following words:—

Provided further, that where, in any revised or final assessment roll, the amount of a tenant's rent is not stated, the fact that the real property in respect of which he is entered on such roll as tenant thereof is assessed at \$150, or over that sum, shall be held to be *prima facie* evidence of his right to be registered as a voter.

Mr. EDGAR. As to making that applicable to towns and cities, surely, if the same proportionate value has been arrived at in this Bill, to fix the qualification as to ownership or occupancy, it would be simple enough to make the same limit *prima facie* evidence of the tenant's right to vote. If \$150 in the country is about equivalent to \$300 in towns, it would be quite safe to take the assessed value in the cities and towns as well as in the country. I do not see why this principle cannot be made applicable to cities and towns as well as to the country. It would simplify the trouble of proving the right of tenants to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I think in the cities and towns the rental is likely to exceed the simple interest on the assessed value of the property. I would like to hear from other gentlemen acquainted with cities who can speak on that point.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. MILLS. I am satisfied that to take the assessed value of the property would be a better precaution against fraud, and would facilitate the placing of names on the assessment roll. Of course, I except the Province Quebec, because there, I believe, the amount of the rental is marked on the assessment roll; but that is not done anywhere else, and I have never been able to understand why the hon. gentleman desires to take the rent as the basis instead of the actual value in the case of tenants. Without that, how is the revising officer to obtain *prima facie* evidence for putting the names of tenants on the voters' list? Is he to make personal enquiry in every case? For instance, take the case of an owner of property having about the necessary value: if he found that the tenant was politically opposed to him he might have no objection, on condition that it did not give a vote, to accepting a rent just below the amount necessary to qualify the tenant. That could not happen if the assessed or the actual value of the property were taken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose that at this stage we should re-open that question. It may be re-opened at a subsequent stage. The reason I asked that the 5th clause should stand over I mentioned at the time. The Act provides that the property qualification shall be, in cities \$300, and in towns \$200. It has been pressed upon me that there are two towns in the Province of Quebec, Hull

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

and St. Hyacinthe, which got themselves declared cities, in which a large number of voters, who are now qualified, will be disqualified, if the qualification is raised from \$200 to \$300. I do not desire that these voters shall be disqualified, because these towns, by a rather misjudged ambition, got themselves declared cities, when I do not think either their wealth or their population entitled them to that position. I believe that everywhere else, in all the Provinces, the cities are sufficiently important to justify the distinction in value the Bill provides for. There are two ways of meeting the case of these two places—either by excepting them, and stating that in those two cities the qualification shall be \$200, or by providing that all cities of a population under 9,000 shall be considered as if they were towns.

Mr. LANGEIER. I think there is a better way, which is the system adopted in the election law of the Province of Quebec. There, there are different qualifications; one \$300 and the other \$200. The higher qualification applies only to cities which return one member or more, and the other applies to every other municipality, whether parish, township or town, or even city. If you apply this rule it will be general, and there will be no difficulty whatever.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the case of cities like Hull and St. Hyacinthe, which are cities by Act of Parliament, but still, from their population and position, the value of property there is not greater than if they were towns. The effect of making a distinction between cities and towns in the value of property would disfranchise a great many men in those places. I think the better plan would be to make it a matter of population. I find that these cities are both of them under 9,000, in which case they would be considered for valuation purposes as towns, still we cannot prevent their being cities as they are so by Act of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has maturely considered this, and will propose such an amendment as will be in the public interest.

Mr. CASEY. The suggestion of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langeier) is by far the most logical way of getting at what he desires. A limit of population is not as logical a distinction as the distinction between cities that return members and those that do not. There are several cities in Ontario which are over the limit of 9,000 population, and yet in which property is no more valuable than when they only had 9,000 or than it is in other places of 9,000 population. Take St. Thomas, which is a very prosperous city, the value of property there is not at all to be compared with the value of property in London, Toronto or other cities. The best plan would be to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Quebec.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will let this proposition stand, and consider it, and in the meantime the section can be adopted as it is.

Mr. MILLS. In clause 9 we carried a provision disqualifying, amongst others, police magistrates, stipendiary magistrates and recorders. Some of these are not salaried officers, but are only municipal officers.

Mr. VAIL. I pointed out to the First Minister that seven or eight officials were appointed in Digby county last year, and that, though they were called stipendiary magistrates, they received no stipends. Under the Bill they will be deprived of a vote, but I am sure that is not the intention.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One cannot very well see how a man can be a stipendiary magistrate without a stipend. I have no objection that the clause should be re-opened, with unanimous consent. We might say "police