

the exercise of any improper influence, although he did not think that it was particularly needed in Ontario for that purpose. He did not consider a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion practicable, and pointed out that the Legislature of Prince Edward Island would meet within a few months at the furthest, and would then be able to choose any franchise for that Province which they pleased.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he did not propose to enter into all the points raised by the hon. gentleman opposite, as it seemed unnecessary. He said there were two points upon which amendments had been proposed, one for a property qualification, by the hon. member behind him, and the other by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, who had suggested a uniform qualification over the whole Dominion. With regard to the first objection, there were very few cases where a man would possess enough influence to be returned to Parliament without possessing sufficient property to qualify him under even the existing law; but he could not see why, if the people chose to elect a man to represent them, they should not have that right. It was not for us to dictate to them on the subject. As to the second point, he thought it would be very unfair because universal suffrage happened to prevail in Prince Edward Island that it should be forced upon the rest of the Dominion, because, if they followed the hon. gentleman's advice, he supposed the uniformity would be in favor of that principle. Many of those who had supported the hon. gentleman's view in favor of a uniform qualification were much opposed to universal suffrage (hear, hear), and yet if they would vote for uniformity with the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, they would be practically voting for universal suffrage. The hon. gentleman replied to various objections to the bill, arguing that it was not necessary to change the provisions as to the franchise to meet such a possibility as an election before the next meeting of the Island Legislature. It could decide in what sense the franchise should be settled. It seemed to him far more reasonable to leave the bill as it was, than for the accident of the Island having one House, elected by universal suffrage, to saddle the rest of the Dominion with that system. He thought it, therefore, far more reasonable to adopt the Ministerial propositions. Moreover, the six Island members of the other House of Parliament—a number greater than in the Upper House—had allowed the bill to go through its stages without any division upon it. Under all

these circumstances, not only from the fact of the action of the other House, which was wholly concerned in this measure, he held the House should make no alterations. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY said that there were two or three little things in the Bill which he did not entirely assent to, but generally he approved of it.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL had some objections to the ballot, but was in favor of its being tried. He did not approve of doing away with the property qualification.

The hon. gentleman was still speaking when six o'clock arrived, and the Speaker left the chair.

After recess.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL resumed the debate. He said that he did not see how a House which agreed to allowing candidates without property qualification to be elected, could refuse to adopt the principle of universal suffrage, and he thought that those who bore the burden of taxation should have the right of election of Parliamentary representatives. He thought that electors should be compelled to vote, or lose their franchise at the next election.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD expressed his intention of voting for the bill.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD, (British Columbia,) said that he thought this bill would not be in operation more than one election until the people would wish they had never heard of it. His experience of the ballot in British Columbia had been that it opened the door to all species of electoral corruption.

Hon. Mr. BOISFORD considered the bill a good one. He approved of the principle of the ballot, but from his experience of that system of voting, he thought the chief advantage gained by adopting it was that it would secure more quiet elections than under the system of open voting. He had found that the ballot was not a panacea for open bribery.

Hon. Mr. WARK thought the bill a good one.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER replied to the various arguments hostile to the bill, which he extolled as consistent with the principles of a Liberal Government, and calculated to benefit the country.

After remarks from Messrs. Bellerose, and Trudell in reply to Mr. Letellier and in explanation of previous points, the bill was read a second time, and referred to Committee of the Whole.

Hon. Mr. EBLLEROSE, in Committee, moved his amendment to restore a property qualification for candidates.

Hon. Messrs. CAMPBELL and hon.