

some kind on the part of voters was undermined in the American mind by a famous speech of FRANKLIN's, which was repeated to me in the Hall of Independence, in Philadelphia, by one who regarded as conclusive his argument, which decided the open suffrage of the country. "If you give a vote to property," said FRANKLIN, "suppose a man's qualification is the ownership of an ass, when the ass dies, does his citizenship cease?" The story was a century old, but it had perfect freshness in the mind of the reciter of it, who considered the absurd-looking issue as warranting the non-provision of any qualification for citizenship. I confess it seemed to me that FRANKLIN's argument of the ass was only fit to impose upon one of that species. The possession of property is thought by all communities to be a guarantee that he who has it, is more likely to vote for its security than he who has none. If he who possessed only a five-dollar donkey was considered to have sympathy with property (without which no civilisation is possible) when the donkey died the sense of property died in the owner, if he had no other possession. If, instead of a five-dollar ass, the voter's sole qualification was a £5 note, if some one stole it from him, or the bank broke in which he had deposited it, and he was left penniless, the sense of possession of property would be no longer left to him, and he might become reckless, as penniless men usually do. There may be other things higher than the possession of property which should constitute the qualification for citizenship. It may be education in the duties of citizenship—it may be mere womanhood, or mere manhood—but if the condition taken as sufficient is that of property, the possession of a donkey or a pig is as good a qualification as the possession of a donkey-house or a pig-house—of a hunting stable or a mansion. I am one of those who think manhood or womanhood a sufficient qualification for citizenship in any State, where social education, by precept and example, is strenuously maintained, and all the conditions under which private interest can be pursued at the expense of the State—rendered, as far as they can be, impossible.

Mr. JOHN GLEDHILL, representative buyer in New York for the English and Scotch Wholesale Societies, gave important evidence before the Senatorial Committee on Education and Labour, on the "benefits to be derived from co-operation." As an exposition of the economic, social, and pacific force of co-operation, Mr. GLEDHILL's testimony is a distinct and