

of the franchise. They are a wise and conservative population, amongst whom there is no taint of socialism or nihilism, and they would therefore be a safe population to exercise such a privilege. I do not believe in so frequently bringing up the questions of socialism or radicalism in a land like ours. The tendency of such a course would be, were our population not so conservative in their social principles to give rise to the very evils which we deprecate. The hon. gentleman from De Lanaudiere, says that this Bill takes the control of the family from the father. I say it strengthens the influence of the family instead of weakening it, because, for instance, a family consisting of a father and four grown-up sons will have five votes under this Bill, whereas at present they have only one. Children generally, with rare exceptions, obey their fathers, and by this law you offer inducements to the boys to stay at home with their parents. The Bill does not give the sons a share in the father's property except for political purposes, and therefore cannot place them in a more independent position as members of the family. I say the Bill is a good one for the Province of Quebec, and even a liberal one. It extends the franchise, at the same time taking precaution to extend it mainly amongst the agricultural population, who deserve to enjoy the right of voting for candidates for the Dominion Parliament. An agricultural population is one which can safely be entrusted with the ballot; it is not such a people that abuses the privilege. These are my principal reasons for supporting the measure—because it relates especially and exclusively to the House of Commons, and because it does not abridge any existing right, but extends the franchise to classes who ought to have a right to vote. The only consideration which could properly justify the Senate in interfering with this Bill would be if the provinces were in any way wronged by the majority in the House of Commons, or if in our opinion the measure were in any way unconstitutional. Neither of these objections being alleged, and the Bill being one peculiarly affecting the House of Commons and the intimate relations of members with their constituents, there is no occasion for us to interfere. Therefore, I repeat, I shall vote for the Bill as it stands.

HON. MR. POIRIER

The Senate divided on the amendment, which was rejected on the following vote :—

CONTENTS :

Hon. Messrs.

Armand,	McMaster,
Baillargeon,	Pâquet,
Bellerose,	Power,
Boucherville de,	Reesor,
Chaffers,	Scott,
Guévremont,	Stevens,
Haythorne,	Trudel,
Leonard,	Wark.—17.
McClelan,	

NON-CONTENTS :

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	Macdonald,
Bolduc,	MacInnes,
Campbell, (Sir Alex.),	Miller (Speaker),
Carvell,	Montgomery,
Chapais,	Nelson,
Clemow,	Northwood,
DeBlois,	O'Donohoe,
Dever,	Ogilvie,
Dickey,	Plumb,
Girard,	Poirier,
Gowan,	Read,
Howlan,	Robitaille,
Kaulbach,	Ross,
McDonald,	Smith,
McKay,	Sutherland,
McKindsey,	Vidal.—33.
McMillan,	

The Bill was then read the second time.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT 1883,
AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the Whole on Bill (134), "An Act respecting the Liquor License Act 1883."

In the Committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This is a Bill consisting of one clause to suspend, while the discussion is going on in the courts with reference to the legality of the clauses referred to in the Bill, the operation of certain clauses of the Act which have, in the meantime at all events, been pronounced *ultra vires* by the court

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE, from the Committee, reported the Bill