

Dominion franchise because as we know the English-speaking minority in the province of Quebec becomes the majority in the whole Dominion of Canada. The French Canadian majority in the province of Quebec, with their usual liberality, gave to the English-speaking minority the right to protect themselves in all the constituencies in which they might own land. There is no necessity for protecting the English-speaking people in the Dominion of Canada in that way, but it was felt by the French Canadians in Quebec that in that province where the English are a minority they should have that protection. In consequence of that principle, Mr. Chairman, you see a larger representation of the English-speaking minority in the provincial legislature in Quebec, than you do of any proportionate minority in any provincial legislature in the Dominion of Canada. That principle has worked admirably for the protection of the minority in that province. The reason why this liberality was evidenced on the part of the French Canadians, is because in the provincial legislature the civil rights of the people are legislated for, and in municipal institutions the property of these people is taxed. It was felt that those who contributed to municipal taxes and who held real estate should be properly represented in the different municipal councils. But no such reason for this principle exists when we come to elect members of the House of Commons of Canada. While the principle in Quebec works well and is a just principle, yet I do say, that when the principle is carried into the Dominion franchise, and when a man owning property in fifty or sixty constituencies in Quebec can vote in every one of them if it is physically possible, it is absurd that he can do so while in the province of Ontario, a man equally wealthy and holding as much property can only poll one vote. Instead of passing section 5 as it appears in the Bill, it is in my opinion the duty of the Government to strike out the clause and to present to the House some settled basis of a Dominion franchise, which will make it uniform throughout the whole country, and which will include not only the Indians of the Six Nations, but these Indians and other persons all over Canada who are included in the Dominion Franchise Act which it is now sought to repeal.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) says that his party is committed to repeal the present Dominion Franchise Act, which he says is a bad law. That is one thing, but to repeal that law by abandoning Dominion rights and by surrendering to the provinces our most important privileges is quite another thing. I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that one does not at all follow from the other.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to call the attention of the Solicitor General to the statement that was made by the hon. gentleman

from Lambton (Mr. Lister) in regard to the number of Indians who will be disfranchised by this Bill. I am quite sure that my hon. friend made the statement he did in all good faith, that comparatively few would be disfranchised, and that a comparatively large percentage would still retain the franchise under the local law. With regard to my own constituency, where there are two bands of Indians, my hon. friend's remark is really not correct at all. I do not think that any of them would have a vote under the local law; if any would have, they would be very few. This Bill practically disfranchises the Indians in my constituency and, as my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) said, it is a very strong measure to deprive any class of the community of rights which they have enjoyed, and have not abused in any way, for many years. As the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) has pointed out, it is not only the Indians who are going to be deprived of their franchise, but many other people throughout the Dominion. When the hon. leader of the Opposition called attention to this matter, my hon. friend the Solicitor General asked, What became of the rights of the people that we allege are now being assailed, from 1867 to 1885? Well, I will tell my hon. friend what became of them. Those rights were subject to the caprice of the local legislature, and the local legislature so abused the power with which they had been entrusted by this House, that this House itself had to pass an Act to protect the rights of the people of Nova Scotia from the improper action of the local legislature.

Mr. CHARLTON. Were there any complaints made by the public upon which this House acted?

Mr. McNEILL. I am astonished that a gentleman who has had a seat in this House so long as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should ask such a question as that. Does my hon. friend suppose that this House would put an Act upon the Statute-book without reason?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). When did the legislature of Nova Scotia commit these outrages?

Mr. McNEILL. I do not think it is at all necessary for me to state the date. It is the Act of 1882 I am referring to. It was previous to that Act, I think, in 1871 that the wrong was done and the Act of 1871 was recognized in 1889. But the hon. Postmaster General knows that it does not matter what the date was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it does.

Mr. McNEILL. It does not matter at all. This Parliament felt it incumbent upon itself, in defence of its privileges, to pass an Act to protect itself from the Acts of the legislature of Nova Scotia. I think that is