

hon. friend has made to the Senate I think he should have stated clearly the difference between the two measures so that the Senate might understand it and we would be in a position to vote intelligently. I have no hesitation in saying that I am going to vote with my hon. friend on his amendment.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I am not at all satisfied that the amendment will carry, because it has been already pronounced upon in the other House. With regard to one thing, my hon. friend has stated in his speech that this Bill would not be acceptable to the people of Prince Edward Island, or they would be placed in a false position because they would have to go before a judge, and, as I took down a note of his speech, the judge or barrister would be sent down from here. I do not wish to misquote my hon. friend. Did I understand him to say so?

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—That is not exactly what I said. I said something to this effect—it might be a barrister from Ottawa or elsewhere.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Then I have taken down my hon. friend's remark properly. Now, as I understand, it is not the intention to take barristers from here to serve in any other locality—the barrister will be appointed in the locality where he resides.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Of course that is it.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Therefore the objection that a barrister might be sent from Ottawa to Prince Edward Island entirely falls to the ground. With reference to the difficulty of any person going before a judge I can only say this: I have run eleven elections, myself, and in my experience I do not think a voter would be any more displeased to go before a judge than he would be to go before a bantering crowd of his own neighbours with regard to his qualification as a voter. The matter struck me in that light. Again with regard to the question of Indian voters, I confess

I cannot see anything wrong about an Indian having a vote if he is possessed of property and is a permanent resident. I really can see no reason why an Indian who has a farm, on which he works, and which is to all intents and purposes his own, a man who can read and write and who pays his taxes and conforms to the laws of this country—I can see no reason why he should be refused a vote.

HON. MR. DICKEY—There is nothing in the Bill to prevent it

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I know there is not; that is what I say, and I can see no ground for the objection to the Indian vote. I am endeavoring to meet the objections which have been raised by some hon. gentlemen on that point. This matter of the franchise is to me, who have lived in a country where we have a free franchise, perfectly clear; to my mind manhood suffrage is the proper franchise, and if this Bill did not lead in that direction I should be inclined to vote against it, but I say it is a stepping stone to a free franchise. We must not forget this, that when we entered the Dominion of Canada as a province we did so to take our proper share of the burdens as well as the advantages of the union, and as the constitution gives the Dominion a right to legislate on this subject, and as this Bill has been passed after a very thorough discussion, and the public mind of the Dominion has been pretty well settled with regard to it, I do not see why we should seek to amend the Bill to meet our particular views. I have no hesitation in saying that if, under the working of this Bill, it should be found that any portion of our people are robbed of their votes, if the Parliament of Canada is appealed to it will remedy the wrong.

HON. MR. MONTGOMERY—If this Bill had come down as it was originally introduced, I should certainly have voted for the amendment. The hon. gentleman from Marshfield (Mr. Haythorne) has appealed to us to act on this occasion as we did in 1874, when a bill was introduced affecting the franchise in Prince Edward Island, but he seems to forget that the concessions made in this Bill were not made in that measure. I believe that the representatives of the Island are gen-

HON. MR. HOWLAN.