

agents, collectors of provincial revenue, and the officers and members of the provincial police force.

There is great solicitude expressed by the hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for Brant for the Indians because, I suppose, there happens to be a certain number of them in their constituencies, and they happen to be a class of the community I suppose who can, at all events, discriminate between the methods of Liberal and Conservative candidates towards the electors, and they probably have recognized their influence in the way of bringing the Indians to their way of thinking, at all events to their way of voting. With virtuous indignation the hon. member for Lambton says that if we once enfranchise a man it is an insult to him to withdraw the franchise. Here are: "Clerks of the Crown, clerks of the peace, sheriffs, registrars, Crown lands and timber agents, collectors of provincial revenue." who from time immemorial have the right to vote on the Dominion Franchise Act, but who by subsection "a" of this Act will be disfranchised, because the qualification necessary to entitle any one to vote at Dominion elections shall be that established by the law of the province and such as is necessary to entitle the same party to vote at provincial elections. So it is impossible for all these officers to vote at Dominion elections. Is this disqualification imposed because these men are officers of the provincial Government, is it because they are personally not competent men, is it because officers of the provincial Government are unable to discriminate between what is right and wrong? The hon. member talks about outraging the feelings of the people. I cannot conceive a greater outrage on these responsible officers of the provincial Government of Quebec than to provide that they shall be disfranchised by a single clause of the Bill. It shows the absurdity of having for the Dominion of Canada a sort of crazy-quilt Franchise Act, instead of adopting one system for the whole Dominion. We find in one province men entitled to vote because they come under the provincial law, while in another case provincial men are disfranchised because the ideas prevailing in that province happen to be more narrow than those existing in a province next door.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are disqualified in the province of Quebec now?

Mr. QUINN. The judges of the Supreme Court, the Exchequer Court, the Court of Queen's Bench, the judges of sessions, the district magistrates and recorders, clerks of the Crown, clerks of the peace, sheriffs, registrars, Crown Land and Crown Timber agents, collectors of provincial revenue and officers and men of the provincial police force. Under the Manitoba Act I am informed that the exemptions are: the provincial judges, Indians, those disqualified for corrupt practices, lunatics and prisoners, all

Mr. QUINN.

officials and employees of Dominion and Manitoba Governments, in receipt of a salary to the amount of \$350, all regular soldiers and persons enrolled in military services, and all registrars, sheriffs, county court clerks and bailiffs in receipt of fees to the amount of \$350 per annum. If they are so accomplished as not to be able to earn \$350 a year they are entitled to vote, but if they are intelligent enough to merit \$350 a year by salaries or fees, then the Manitoba law says they are too intelligent to exercise the Dominion franchise.

Another peculiarity of the Provincial Franchise Act in Quebec is, that it includes as persons who are disqualified, men who have committed offences against the provincial Act. We can easily understand why persons who have been guilty of an infraction of the Dominion Franchise Act should be disqualified in a Dominion election, and that persons who have been guilty of an infraction of the Provincial Franchise Act should be disqualified at a provincial election, but why persons who have been guilty of an offence against the provincial franchise should be disqualified at a Dominion election, is something I cannot understand. In Quebec you will have men disqualified, while at the same time men who are guilty of the same offences in the other provinces would be entitled to vote. I say, Sir, that the Act which is presented to us here is more in the form of a crazy quilt enactment than anything that has ever before been presented to this Parliament. It seems to me an absurdity that we cannot, for the purpose of Dominion elections, form some basis upon which the voters of this country shall vote in the election of members to this House of Commons. Why should we here in the Parliament of Canada be governed by the prejudices which exist in the different provinces in local matters. It is not my intention to reflect disparagingly on the prejudices or privileges that exist in the different provinces concerning the right of one man to one vote or to many votes. In the province of Quebec we have the principle, that if a man holds property in two or in fifty constituencies, he has the right to poll his vote in each, if it be a physical possibility for him to do so. With the greatest deference and respect to the majority in the province of Quebec, I may tell the House that this was an enactment made for the protection of the English-speaking minority of that province. It was a concession granted to the English-speaking minority, who in the province of Quebec are usually those possessing most real estate. It was enacted for the purpose of giving them not only the representation to which they are entitled by their numbers, but also the representation which their more extensive ownership of land in that province might entitle them to. That was done in Quebec for provincial purposes and for municipal purposes. But, it was never contemplated that it should be extended to the