

House to do as it did in 1874. I say, without discussing the bill clause by clause and point by point, that there is no analogy between this bill and the measure to which he refers. The bill which we had before us in 1874 was one which allowed no man to vote in Prince Edward Island unless he had \$333 worth of real estate.

HON. MR. PLUMB—By whom was that introduced?

HON. MR. HOWLAN—By the Mackenzie Government.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—That would have taken away some 25 per cent. of the voters of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment and myself appealed to this House to consider the position in which it would place the people of Prince Edward Island, and asked as one of the smaller provinces, the protection which we had a right to expect from the Senate. We received that consideration, and the franchise was preserved to the people of Prince Edward Island, and they have been thankful for that preservation, and with the exception of one constituency the whole province has returned supporters of the party which protected them on that occasion. The hon. gentleman who proposes this amendment contends that this House should not go back on what was its expressed opinion at that time, but as I have said there is a wide difference between the two measures. There is no question in my mind, or in the minds of hon. gentlemen acquainted with the subject, that the people of Prince Edward Island are in favor of manhood suffrage. I am aware that a very respectable minority indeed of the gentlemen composing the other branch of Parliament are also in favor of that suffrage. I am myself unreservedly in favor of it, and I have never hesitated to say so. I do not agree with the hon. member from DeLanau diere that it is a wretched franchise, and the reason why I am in favor of the Bill before us is that it tends towards manhood suffrage. A man must be a very poor student of the every-day incidents of the

Dominion if he cannot see that we are fast moving towards manhood suffrage.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—Hear hear.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I am surprised at the hon. gentleman's "hear hear." Our system of government is by a majority, and when the majority pronounce on that particular question it is beyond the power of the minority to alter it: but I wish to show how different this Bill is to the one we had under consideration in 1874. That was absolute. We have in Prince Edward Island an elective upper House with one franchise: we have our House of Assembly with another franchise, this manhood suffrage. Every man who comes to the age of 21 years can vote if he pays one dollar taxes and resides one year in the province. If he cannot find the \$1 he can work four days on the roads and be entitled to vote. The other franchise is \$333 on real estate. How different is this! It allows the father and sons to vote—the step-father's and step-mother's sons also. If you add the uncle and aunt you include everybody. I know that this arrangement was made in the interests of Prince Edward Island. The first provision made is that the franchise of those in Prince Edward Island who had the right to vote in the last election shall be preserved. With regard to the franchise, generally, there are several alterations which meet the views of the people of Prince Edward Island. For instance, fishermen's sons and farmers' sons are entitled to vote, and the fisherman himself, who absolutely owns no land, but has got a stand on the shore and a fishing net and a boat, has a right to vote, and his son also. The farmer has a vote, himself, and as many votes for his sons as the farm will give. The grandfather, the father-in-law, the mother-in-law, the step-father, and the step-mother all are included. This Bill will not rob the people of Prince Edward Island of their votes in the same way as the Bill of 1874 would have done. The grandson could not have voted, nor any of the sons of the farmer under the Bill of 1874, but they can vote now. The fisherman's son, or even the fisherman, could not have voted under the Bill of 1874. Therefore I say this measure is a much more liberal Bill. There is no comparison; but in the appeal which my