

that qualifies him. However, I am not going to make any ado about it any more than to perform the duty of bringing the matter under the notice of the leader of the Government.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think it is a very desirable clause of the Bill. I think we can find in every province barristers of five years' standing qualified for the duty.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I rise to a point of order, we are not on that amendment now; we are on another amendment.

THE SPEAKER—Very wide latitude is allowed on a debate of this kind.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think the revising barrister should have some local knowledge, and he should have a certain term of residence before he acquires that local knowledge and is qualified for the office. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island opposed this clause of the Bill on the ground that the revising barrister might be taken from any other province. The Bill provides that he cannot be taken from any other province. I am surprised that those gentlemen who are in favor of universal suffrage should be opposed to this Bill. It is clear to my mind that no man is disfranchised by it. Even in Prince Edward Island it is only a sentiment. The right of franchise does not descend from father to son, and it should not descend in that way in perpetuity. No man in any part of the Dominion of Canada who ought to have a vote is deprived of it under this Bill.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman from Amherst, made a statement which was re-echoed by several other gentlemen, and in answering him I shall also answer them. He spoke of the Nova Scotia franchise as one which had existed only for six or seven years, whereas the present franchise in Prince Edward Island must have existed three or four times that length of time. The hon. gentleman spoke of the right of voting not being transmissible from father to son. But is that doctrine consistent with historical facts? Has not permanence been an im-

portant factor in all great struggles for freedom? I say that the very essence of our liberties is that it shall descend from father to son, and that they transmitted the liberties which they won for themselves from father to son from the remotest generation to our own time; and that when at any time they relaxed their vigilance, or allowed any power to encroach upon their liberties, in that way they lost them, and in that way the miserable state in which the municipalities of England existed up to the year 1835 or 1836 is accounted for. It was from this very remissness of the people, and remissness of their representatives in not faithfully guarding their rights and privileges that this loss of liberty occurred. And how am I or how is any gentleman who represents Prince Edward Island to meet the people of our province face to face and admit to them that we have allowed those liberties of theirs to slip away from them without making a protest against it and attempting to preserve them faithfully? I will not lay myself open to any such imputation. I have before stood up in my place to advocate the liberties of my people, and although ten years have elapsed since that occasion, and my hairs have grown from gray to white, and my frame becomes more feeble, still I thank God that I have voice and strength enough yet to stand up in my place and defend the liberties of the people of my province. Have hon. gentlemen ever thought—has it occurred to them, or have they forgotten what occurred in the history of our cousins and neighbors in the United States? Did they not struggle most manfully against the first attempt of the British to impose taxes upon them? Everybody knows the history of those times, and some gentlemen will here recollect the words of our great English statesman Lord Chatham. They are noble words, and the people of whom they were spoken fully deserved them. I think also that my own people fully deserve credit for their care and zeal, and the manner in which they have guarded the liberties they possess. What did Lord Chatham say of the conduct of the Americans in resisting the encroachment of the British Parliament, or rather of the British sovereign, on their liberties? Because those encroachments made upon the