

Secretary of State to take advantage of the fact that there was only one copy of the Australian Act in Ottawa. It was not right of him to say that he had a precedent in what was done in Australia, when such was not the case. I trust such practices will not be followed any more in this House, and that the minister will take an early opportunity of putting himself right. Perhaps he has been misled. When a minister makes a statement in Parliament there should not be the slightest doubt that he gives the facts, particularly when dealing with an Act of Parliament of another country.

I also wanted to deal briefly with the breach of faith on the part of the Government in this matter of votes for women. We were told that there was no time to bring about the changes that were necessary in order to give the vote to the women. The Government seems to blow hot and cold at the same time. In 1916 the Government was asked to provide Dominion-wide prohibition in Canada, and the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister told us it would not be fair to pass a Dominion prohibitory law when the provinces themselves had not adopted prohibition, and they passed a law to aid any province which had passed a prohibitory law. If they were true to that principle they would now extend the franchise to the women of any province who have the right to vote at provincial elections. They were willing to follow the provinces on the question of temperance, when it was to their interest to do so; but now when it is a question of following the same principle, in taking advantage of the provincial franchise for women, that does not suit them at all. They do not want the women of this country to have a voice in the selection of the next Parliament. So they say: We will not follow the principle we adopted in 1916, but will disfranchise these women altogether. No matter what technical objection may be raised, I submit that our law clearly gives to women the right to vote in a Dominion election unless they are prevented by officers of this Government. There is no question but that the law gives the women of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario the right to vote. Section 6 of the Election Act says:

For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, the voters' lists shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those prepared for the several polling divisions established, and which, on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomi-

[Mr. McKenzie.]

nation of candidates for such Dominion election, were in force, or were last in force, under the laws of that province, for the purposes of provincial elections.

Section 10 of the same Act states the qualifications of voters, and I say emphatically that, on the face of it at all events, this covers the cases of women to which the local legislatures have given the vote. The section says:

The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Nothing can be clearer than that. These two sections give the women of the Dominion of Canada the right to vote, but for some reason or another—perhaps for the reason that they fear the judgment of these women—the Government refuses to give them the franchise. This Government is supposed to be a democratic government, which is supposed to represent a free people, which is supposed to have its life for the constitutional term of five years, and under that constitution it is compelled to go back to our free people to pass judgment upon it. It is not an act of bravery or a constitutional act for this Parliament, or this Government, to change the condition of things from that which existed when it received the mandate from the people. It should go back to the same free people that elected it. But it has changed the law, and has put itself in the position of the man who is on trial for a crime, and who arrogates to himself the right to make the law under which he is to be tried, to appoint the judge who is to pass judgment upon him, and to select the jury which is to try him. That is the kind of government we have to-day, a government which has thrown aside the constitutional right which the people of this country have been enjoying; and now that they are before the bar of public opinion, and when the trial is on and the indictment is about to be made, they take to themselves the power of naming the jury, naming the judge, and making the procedure under which they are to be tried. I submit that is not fair treatment for the people of this country, and I believe that the people will not tolerate any such doctrine or any such principle, but that that freedom which characterizes our people, that freedom of which we are so proud, will be maintained, and that any one who endeavours to contaminate, the streams of justice and freedom in this country will go