lute right, why make laws to restrict them in its exercise?

Mr. Needham proceeded to say that, though he believed the principle of universal suffrage perfectly consonant with the principles of common justice and of the British Constitution, he did not wish to be understood as seeking to carry it out where property was concerned. Take the example of a civic body, who only met to manage the affairs of a County and City, in reference to their property. That was a body created by law, but they were placed there to legislate on property; they had a right to impose rates. He would go for that. He would make a sliding scale to give votes according to property, when the question was simply that of property, and not the lives and liberties of men. He could understand the policy of imposing a qualification of the electors. When the question came to property, let them come down to a sliding scale, and let every man have a vote according to its value. They might think of those things as they liked, they would have to adopt them. He had now enunciated his principles with regard to universal suffrage. He would say, further, that there was nothing that made his blood glow so warmly, nothing that stirred his manhood more than when he thought of the glorious principles of liberty. Let them talk of their parties and their policies of Liberal, Conservative or Tories; the principles of liberty was the vitality and the reality of political life. He was prepared to stand or fall by this principle. It was a matter of little importance what he, individually, thought it was—of no importance what became of himself—but it was a matter of vital importance whether those indefeasible principles were held sacred or not.

Mr. Needham then went on to speak of the abolishment of the property qualification of members in England, quoting from the Imperial Act, which, he said, gave an emphatic denial to all who said that a property qualification was necessary in a member of Parliament.

Let them suppose a case, that an election had come round. On the day of nomination, the property qualification of a candidate had been tested, and that he had proved himself qualified and ran his election; but before the day of victory arrived, by some interposition of Providence the property upon which the qualification was founded was swept away, that man would be elected without any property qualification. Was he any the worse for it? But if that election held good, was the spirit of the law in that case carried out? If they make a property qualification, do not let them make any deception about the matter. If it was necessary before the election, it was as necessary after it. With regard to the property qualification, they all knew that it was evaded. By the first law that was enacted in the Province regarding it in 1846, all that a man had to do was to make a statement that he had real estate; it did not make it necessary that he should show it. Under that law it was impossible for any one to prove that a proposing candidate had not a property qualification, for he had to prove a negative, and to do that he would have to put every man and woman in the Province on the stand to prove that he had not the legal property qualification, and a prosecution under that law would have stretched out until the crack o doom. In the present law they put in a section that made it necessary to state where that property was, but that also could be evaded. (Here Mr. Needham entertained the House at great length with his own case under that law.) Mr. Needham then asked what was the good of a property qualification? and proceeded to put a case. He would suppose that when the present House was dissolved, at the end of four years, and he had no property qualification, but that he found some one to give him a deed of property, would that deed of property really be his? would the possession of it make him more capable to act as a legislator? The actual possession of property was no evidence of a man's powers of mind, it was an evidence that the man had the power of accumulating property, but no evidence that he had legislative talents; it was an evidence of prudence and forethought, but no evidence of statesmanlike capacity. How could the possession of so many acres of land prove that a man was fit for a legislator? The question was one of great importance, and one that would ultimately become the law of the land, and he hoped the present House would follow the example set them by the Parliament of England and pass this Bill.

Mr. LINDSAY thought the Bill required a good deal of consideration. He believed in an extension of the franchise to a limited extent, but he had never been and never would be in favor of universal suffrage. He was opposed to giving the right of voting to the loose, floating population of the country, who had neither interest or concern in its affairs. He objected to the principle of this Bill. It allowed a man to be a representative who had not a right to vote.

Mr. COSTIGAN.—That was not a fair way of putting the objection. The Bill did not give a man a right to be a representative who had not a right to vote, but it gave the electors the right to choose whom they pleased.

Mr LINDSAY.—That did not change the question. He thought, if the hon. mover did not expect an election this year, he had better consent to its postponement for the Bill required a good deal of consideration. He thought that every man, before he was either representative or elector, should have a stake in the country, and every man in this country might have a stake if he chose.

Dr THOMSON, (who was inaudible in the gallery) was understood to say that he agreed with the views of the hon. member for Carleton who had just spoken.

Mr. LANDRY was understood to speak in favor of the principle of universal suffrage, and to say that he supported the Bill willingly, as it would enable the French population of Westmorland, whose rights were neglected by the Government, to send Frenchmen of good education, and who could speak English, to attend to their interests. He only supported the Government on account of Confederation.

Mr. OTTY was glad the hon. member from Carleton, who had expressed his views on this subject, had seen the error of his ways, and given up the doctrine of representation by population, for he had distinctly declared he was opposed to universal suffrage—that property must be represented, and not people; that on the part of the Quebec Scheme was a recantation of Mr. George Brown's grand principle, representation by population. What would be the effect of that Bill? It would place in the House persons having no stake in the country, and no interest in the prosperity of the country. The principle was bad, and to elucidate it, he would read a letter he had received from one of his constituents that morning, wherein he complained that at the parish election four persons were elected for parish officers who paid neither rate nor tax in the parish, and one of the elected was a black boy under twenty-one years of age; and yet the Clerk of the Peace stated to the Magistrates, when called to give his opinion, that the election must stand. Although the property qualification laws had been repealed in England in 1858, still the circumstances of the people there and here were very different; and what might be very applicable there, would not suit our floating population, where a person might be here to-day and gone to-morrow, and his property was the only chain to bind him to his country. The Bill was an important one, and it required consideration. It was an alteration in the Constitution; and, although the Hon. Attorney General had stated it had been up for discussion before every House for some years back, he could not go for the Bill until he enquired further into the matter. If the hon. member who introduced the Bill would report progress, he might be induced to go for his Bill. And here he would allude, while they were upon the discussion of the qualification of members, to the inconsistency and injustice of the appointment of members of the Upper House under the Quebec Scheme, which, while it provided that the *first* members of the Legislative Council should be appointed from the present members of the different Provincial Legislative Councils, it made no provision or assurance that afterwards, or when vacancies occur, the members representing New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward's Island, should possess property, or reside in the respective Provinces for which they are appointed. By the 16th Section of the Quebec Scheme Lower Canada had the privilege of always having Legislative Councillors residing and possessing property in that district to represent her, but after the first Councillors die, or vacancies occur, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and P. E. Island might have to submit to be represented by Legislative Councillors, who possess no qualification in the Province they are to represent, need not even reside there and may not even ever have been in the country they are appointed by the Canadian Government to represent.

Mr. McMILLAN said they were not called upon at the present time to discuss the great scheme, with regard to the Bill before the House; it, in reality, extended the rights of the people, gave them a larger field to make a selection from in their choice of representatives. The law, as it now stood, was imperative, for property qualification was evaded. He should vote for the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS said he would be compelled to vote against the Bill. He thought that there ought to be property qualification demanded of candidates. It had been said that the possession of property did not give a man brains. That was true; but it would be very dangerous to have men with too much brains and no property, as representatives of the constituencies of the Province.

Mr. BOYD was opposed to the Bill, and thought its principle most dangerous. If it became law it would open the door